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ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

VOLUME I

P. 4a, ABAZA, l. 26, read 1036/1627.

P. 7b, ABBAS I, l. 2, for second son read third son.

P. 6b, 'ABD AL-JAAK B. SAYF AL-DIN, l. 13, for studying read staying.


P. 173a, l. 30, for Memons read Moplahs.

P. 207b, ADJDABİYA, l. 22, for Zanana read Zanəta.

P. 313a, AK SHEHR (i), last line, read 386/996.

P. 320b, AKHJİ TEKKE, l. 6, after Durün delete [g.v.].

P. 392b, 'ALİ BEY, l. 6, read Abu 'l-Dżahab.


P. 444b, AMIR KHUSRAW, l. 35, for Şihîr read şığhar; l. 40, for Bahîyya read Bâhiyya; l. 70, read 718/1318.

P. 447b, 'AMIŅ, l. 4, insert comma after Palestine.

P. 447b, l. 4 of Bibliography, for Princeton read Princeton.

P. 531a, after ANKARA add: ANMAR [see GHATAFAN].

P. 607b, ARBÜNA, signature: for Ed., read CH. PELLAT.

P. 630b, ARISTUTALIS, l. 7, after Nicolaus of Damascus [saec. I B.C.]


P. 631b, l. 25, for will be published by Muhsin Mahdi read has been published by Muhsin Mahdi (Beirut 1961).

P. 632b, l. 52 and l. 60, for 'Middle Commentary' read 'Short Commentary'.

P. 632b, l. 9 (De Interpretatione), add: and, together with the commentary of al-Fârâbî, by W. Kutsch and S. Marrow (in an Istanbul manuscript [see AL-FAÎRÂBÎ], iii a).

P. 632b, l. 36 (Rhetoric), add: Arabic text now edited from the Paris manuscript by A. Badawi, 1959.

P. 632b, l. 47 (Poetics), add: Good use of the Arabic version has been made in the new Oxford edition of the Greek text by R. Kassel, 1965.


P. 632b, l. 55 (De Caelo), after al-Bītīq, add unreliable edition by A. Badawi, in Islamica, xxviii (1961), 123-38.

P. 632b, l. 65 (Meteorology), add: Unreliable edition by A. Badawi in Islamica, xxviii (1961), 1-121.


P. 632b, l. 16 (De Anima), after (Typescript), add: now published in the Proceedings of the Arab Academy of Damascus.

P. 632b, l. 27 (De Sensu, etc.), add: Critical edition by H. Gätte, Die Epitome der Parva Naturalia des Avreroes, 1961.

P. 632b, l. 48 (Nicomachean Ethics), add: Books 1-9 have been discovered by D. M. Dunlop in the library of the Karawiyin, Fez, see Orients, xv (1962), 18-34.

P. 632b, l. 52 (De Mundo), add: S. M. Stern, The Arabic translations of the Ps.-Aristotelian treatise De mundo, in Le Muson, lixvii (1964), 187 ff.

P. 632b, l. 63 (Protopicetics), add: I. Düring, Aristotle in the ancient biographical tradition, 1957, 203.


P. 637b, ARNAWUTLUK, l. 18, read 29 July 1913.

P. 662b, ARSLAN B. SALDİJİK, l. 34, read 427/1035-6.


P. 686b, for ĀSÂF-DJâH read ĀSAF-DJâH.

P. 697b, after AL-ASHĐAK add: ASHDJA [see GHATAFAN].

P. 822b, ĀZİM ALLAH KHan, add to Bibliography: Pratul Chandra Gupta, Nana Sahib and the rising at Cawnpore, Oxford 1963, 25-7, 63-4, 70-1, 75, 82, 84, 102-3, 115-7, 171, 177, 179, 190.

P. 825b, ĀZİZ MIŞİR, l. 25-6, read According to Mendîdh Frâhâ, later Ottoman Minister of Internal Affairs, this . . .

P. 856b, BADÂ'UN, add to Bibliography: On the name Badâ'un: A. S. Beveridge, in JRAS, 1925, 517; T. W.Haire, ibid., 715-6; C. A. Storey, ibid., 1926, 105-7; E. D. Ross, ibid., 192.

P. 895b, BAGHDAD, l. 59-60, for S.W. read S.E. and for S.E. read S.W.

P. 973b, BALADIYYA, l. 50 and 54, for Commission read Council.

P. 989b, BALât AL-SHUHADÂ, l. 22, for Ta'rifâh al-Umam wa'l-Mulâk read Ta'rifâh al-Rusul wa'l-Mulâk.

P. 1161b, before BEIRUT insert BEING AND NON-BEING [see wuqrûd and ʿadam respectively].
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA XIX

P. 1195, BHITA, add: Bibliography: Annemarie Schimmel, in Kairos (Salzburg), iii–iv (1961), 207-16 (where additional references are given).


P. 1211, BIHZAD, l. 16, for printers read painters.


P. 1259, BORNU, l. 7, for were read where.

P. 1280, before BRUSA insert BROKER [see DALLAL, SIMSĀR].


VOLUME II

P. 19, ČELEBI, l. 26, for ‘barbarian’ read ‘barber’.

P. 20, before CONSUL insert CHILD [see ŞAGHIR and WALAD].

P. 60, before DABB, l. 1, for TāBIKHA read TĀBIKH.

P. 71, DABB, l. 1, for TĀBIKH read TĀBIKH.

P. 72, l. 16, for 7th/13th century read 7th/12th century AD.

P. 79, l. 21, for Adab ḥalātī read Adab al-Kuttāb.


P. 122, DĀR FŪR, l. 39-40, for [see DANKALI] read [see DONGOLA].

P. 128, l. 28, for 1894 read 1874.

P. 123, l. 21, for Abu ‘l-Kásim read Abu ‘l-Kāsim.

P. 137, DARD, l. 36, delete Bahādur Shāh I.

P. 183, DAVŪD PASHA, l. 18, for 1021/1612 read 1025/1616.

P. 224, DĀHĪ NUWĀS, passim, for Yusuf Aš‘ar read Yūsuf Aṣ‘ār.

P. 280, DIMASHK, l. 48, after Maţwān, add and nephew of the famous Ḥadījīdā b. Yusuf.

P. 288, l. 27, for in 950/1552 read before 926/1520.

P. 288, l. 21, for Bah al-Hadīd read Bāb al-Naṣr.

P. 289, l. 23, for Bāb al-Hadīd read Bāb al-Naṣr.

P. 290, l. 27 of Bibliography, to Arabic texts add: Muhammad Ṭabl Ta‘ī al-Dīn al-Ḥusnī, Muntahābāt al-tawāridh li-Dimashq, 3 vols., Damascus 1928-34.

P. 337, DĪWĀN-I HUMĀYŪN, l. 13, for Bāyazid II read Bāyazid I.

P. 338, l. 16, for every day read four days a week.

P. 339, l. 23, for 1054/1644 read 1064/1654.

P. 352, al-DIJAR wa l-MUKĀBALA, signature: for W. Hartner read W. Hartner and M. Schramm.

P. 376, mīr DĪJAR FAR, add to Bibliography: M. Edwardes, The battle of Plassey and the conquest of Bengal, London 1963, index.

P. 392, DĪJALĀL AL-DĪN HUSAYN AL-BUKHĀRĪ, add at end of Bibliography: A collection of 42 of his letters addressed to one Mālamān i ‘izz al-Dīn and compiled by Tādir al-Hakk wa l-Dīn Ahmad b. Mu‘īn Siyāḥ-pūsh is preserved in the Subbān Allāh collection of the Muslim University, Aligarh.

P. 404, DĪJĀLIYA, l. 1, for (al-Andalus) read (al-Uṣba).


P. 433, DĪJAMIYYA (iii), l. 27, for Dīrāz read Shīrāz.

P. 434, penultimate line, for the read they.

P. 435, l. 28, for op. cit. (in Bibl.) read Ta‘īrh-i maḥsurā-i Irānī.
XX ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

P. 470, DJARIDA (i), B, l. 33, for (1955) read (1956).


P. 471b, (i) C, ll. 29-30, delete magazine; for 1928 read 1933; delete organ of.

P. 472b, (ii), ll. 10-12, for In 1875 . . . . Constantinople; read Newspapers in Persian appeared in India as early as 1822 and 1835 (see S. C. Sanial, The First Persian newspapers of India: a peak into their contents, in IC, viii (1934), 105-14), and in Constantinople in 1875;

P. 473a, last line, for Isfahān 1321/1949, 2 vols. read Isfahān 1321-2/1949-54, 4 vols.

P. 475b, DJARMĀ, l. 1, 2, after divem, add and currently in Iran,

P. 501a, AL-DJAWNPŪRī, add to Bibliography: A. S. Bazmee Ansari, Sayyid Muhammad Jawnhūrī and his movement, in Islamic Studies, ii/2 (March 1963), 41-74.

P. 501b, AL-DJAWWĀNĪ, l. 40, for Aḥmet III, 2799, read Aḥmet III, 2759, and after, A Ḥ a l-Nāzīd, ed. M. M. Shāhīz, Cairo 1381/1962, intr. 32 ff.

P. 504a, DJAYPUR, l. 3, for craftsmen read craftsmen.

l. 7, for Yādash-i Ayādī read Yādash-i Ayādī.

P. 518b, DJAZā, (ii), l. 2, for hāmān-i dājādī read hāmān-i dājūdī (cezā).

P. 539b, DJIBUTI, after the third paragraph, ending of the majority, insert the following paragraph, omitted in error in the English edition:

Djibuti is the administrative centre of a region misleadingly called “Côte Française des Somalis”, “French Somaliland”; in fact more than three-quarters of its area (ca. 23,000 sq. km.) and of its coast belong to the ‘Arab, while less than a quarter belongs to the Somalis. It is a desert region, with practically no agriculture. Outside the capital, the population is agriculturally nomadic; all the inhabitants are Muslims. Besides the ‘Arab (numbering some 25,000), it contains the subjects of four “sultanates”: the whole of Tadjoura (Tadjurra, in ‘Arab Tagorryri) and Goba‘ad, the majority of Raḥayto, and a small part of Awaṣa. The ‘Arab (called by the Arabs Danākīl [q.v.]) form a relatively organized population, with a firmly hierarchical social structure, divided into regional ‘commands’ ruled by hereditary chiefs and based on a family and tribal organization. Among the Somalis, the only autochthonous tribe is that of the ‘Iṣe, nine-tenths of whom in any case belong to Somalia or to Ethiopia. This tribe is unusually anarchical, having no true chiefs: the uga’a, who lives in Ethiopia, has no effective power; a minimum of authority is exercised by councils of elders, who dispense justice. The ‘Iṣe groups which normally wander throughout the country during part of the year total about 6000 individuals. They belong mainly to the sub-tribes Rér Mūse, Urwāne, Furlabe, Horrāne and Māmmānān.

P. 576b, DJUGHRAFIYA, ll. 50, 57 and 71, for Aṣyabhaṣa read Aṣyabhaṣa.

P. 578a, l. 24, for Sīyāḥī read Sīyāḥī.

P. 578b, l. 18, for after insert of.

P. 579a, DJUMHŪRIYYA, l. 44, for Sīyasat read Sīyasat.

P. 579b, DJUMĀNĀGH, l. 15, before thriving insert a.

l. 19, for ensinhas read ensinhas.

P. 597a, l. 3, for Rīdī read Rādiā.

l. 65, for Aṃnāwādār read Aṃnāwādār; for tālhūkas read tālhūkas.

l. 67, for zāralbī read zāralbī.

P. 598a, l. 11, for read college.

l. 25, for tālhūkas.

ll. 41-5, for It has . . . . employ of the ruler. read It has two large-size cannon, originally from the armament brought by Khādīm Sūleymān Paṣḥā, Ottoman governor of Cairo under Sūleymān I and commander of the fleet sent from Suez against the Portuguese settlement of Diū in India; they were brought to Dūnāgharā by Mūljāhid Khān of Pālīṭāna (see Cam. Hist. India, iii, 334, 349). P. 598b, l. 15, for Zarfīn read zarīn.

P. 600a, al-DJUNAYD b. ABD AL-LĀH, l. 7, for Dīghaba b. Dīghābī read Dīghābī b. Dīghābī; l. 12, for Ibn Dīghābī’s read Ibn Dāhī’s [These readings, kindly communicated by Mr. A. S. Bazmee Ansari, make it possible to correct the texts of Ibn al-Athīr, iv, 465, 466, v, 40, 101, and al-Baladhuri, 441-2, which have respectively Čādīm and Čādīm and al-Kāmil, 441-2, which have respectively Čādīm and Čādīm and Čādīm and Čādīm].

P. 602a, DJURĀT, l. 11, for Muhabbāt read Muhabbāt.

l. 33, for Yākta read Yākta.

P. 602a, l. 1, for Mohāhī read Mohāhī; for Kanpur read Kānpur.


P. 603b, al-DJUWAYNĪ, ABD AL-MALIK b. ABD AL-MAŁIK, l. 17, after century, add It was printed repeatedly, and was translated by L. Bercher in Revue Tunisienne, 1930.

ll. 33-4, for Unfortumately, . . . . published, read Only the first section of his great work, the Šakīm, has been published (ed. H. Klopfer, Cairo 1960).

l. 41, read 1817-4.

l. 49, after edition. add There is, finally, his ‘akīda, which he dedicated to Niṣām al-Mulk (al-Ąkīda al-Niṣāmīyya); it was edited by Muhammad Ṭāhir al-Ṭabākhī (Cairo 1367/1948) and translated by H. Klopfer (Das Dogma des Imām al-Haramain, Cairo and Wiesbaden 1958).

P. 606b, l. 11, for Brockelmann, I, 388 read Brockelmann, I, 486, S 1, 671 and add to the Bibliography: A. S.
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA XXI


P. 609a, al-DUZDIJANI, Abû 'Amr, l. 21, read ḥarīm.

P. 609b, l. 7, for the ḥad his.

l. 10, ḥad Rayhān.

l. 47, ḥad Nāṣirī.

l. 59, ḥad Zakariyyā’.

l. 63, ḥad Amīr Ḥasan.

P. 640b, DUSTDIR, l. 4, for 8807 read 1808.


P. 674b, ELİÇİPÜR, for [see GAWİLGAṆ] read [see İLİÇİPÜR, also BERAK, GAWİLGAṆ, ʾMAD ŚRAH].

P. 725a, FADAK, l. 5, after from Medina. add: C. J. Gadd has shown that the name reflects the ancient Padakku, which was occupied in 550 B.C. by the Babylonian king Nabonoudus (see Anatolian Studies, viii (1958), 81).


P. 741b, FAHD, l. 51, for (baṣā’a) read (kaṣā).

P. 751a, FAKHR AL-DIN, l. 13, for westwards read eastwards.

P. 852a, FĂTİMİD, l. 52, after biribery add (see also H. Monès, Le maléthisme et l’écouche des Fatimides en Ifriqiya, in Ét. or. . . . Lévi-Provencal, i, 197-220).

P. 853a, l. 11, after in the 24b add (on which see L. Massiera, M’tila du Xe au XIe s., in Bull. Soc. hist. et géogr. de la région de Sétif, ii (1941), 183 ff.; M. Canard, Une famille de partisans puis adversaires des Fatimides en Af. du N., in MéI. d’hist. et d’archéol. de l’Ott. mus., Algiers 1957, ii, 35 ff.).


P. 864a, FĂTİMİD ART, l. 52, after traditions which they continued. add: On the representation of living creatures in Fatimid art, see al-Makrizi, Kitâb, i, 416, 472, 477; figurines (tamâkhib) representing elephants, gazelles, lions, giraffes, or birds, peacocks, cocks, etc.; elephants sometimes bearing warlike accoutrements. More particularly, the tents of the caliphs and the viziers were decorated with swar adamiyâ wa-wakhîjiya: op. cit., i, 474; some tents bore a special name according to whether they were decorated with elephants, lions, horses, peacocks or birds: op. cit., i, 418. On the activity of Fatimid painters (musaŭrâhân), see al-Makrizî, op. cit., ii, 318.


P. 929b, FIRDAWSI, l. 53, for ii, 477 read i, 493.

P. 965a, FURTUWWA, l. 36, for Bast madad al-tawfiq read Kitâb al-Futuwwa (Bast madad al-tawfiq being the title not of the K. al-Futuwwa but of a short treatise composed in Ottoman Egypt; see the preface of H. Thorning, Beiträge zur Kenntnis des isl. Vereinswesen, 1913, 9 f.).


l. 13 of Bibliography, add: Irène Melikoff, Abū Muslim, le “Porte-hache” du Khorasan, Paris 1962; and at end of Bibliography, add: M. Mole, Kubrawiyût, i, 191-194, 477; figures representing elephants, gazelles, lions, giraffes, or birds, peacocks, cocks, etc.; elephants sometimes bearing warlike accoutrements. More particularly, the tents of the caliphs and the viziers were decorated with suwar adamiyya wa-wakhîjiya: op. cit., i, 474; some tents bore a special name according to whether they were decorated with elephants, lions, horses, peacocks or birds: op. cit., i, 418. On the activity of Fatimid painters (musaŭrâhân), see al-Makrizî, op. cit., ii, 318.

P. 995a, l. 9-10 of Bibliography, for A copy complete . . . , read A complete copy, formerly in the possession of Prof. Tschudi, is now in the University Library of Basle (M. VI. 35).

P. 996b, l. 15, after (Rieu, 46) add see now the communication by R. M. Savory, in IsI., xxxviiii (1963), 161-5.

P. 970b, GABAN, at end of article and add: In 1137 Gaban was taken by the Byzantines, but was occupied soon afterwards (1138-9) by Malik Ahmad Dânîghmand. In 613/1216 the district was attacked by Kay Kâhus i [q.v.]. In 666/1268 king Hayrām was obliged to cede the fortress to Baybars. and add to Bibl.: Alîshan, Sisouk, 49-2, 210; Cl. Cahen, La Syrie . . . , 560, 623; R. Grousset, Hist. des Croisades, ii, 87, 266; K. M. Setton (ed.), History of the Crusades, iv, 637, iii, 635; Makrîzî, Sulûk, i/2, 528-9; Ibn Iyâs, Taʾrîkh, i, 220-30; Ramsay, Asia Minor, 382.

P. 995b, GHALÂFIKA, l. 13, for L. O. Schuman read L. S. Schuman.

P. 1021a, GHASSÂN, l. 6, after ‘Ayn Ībârī delete [q.v.].

[Shortly before this article by Dr Shahid was published, the editors interpolated a note communicated to them by another scholar, which introduced a newly-discovered inscription from a Ghassânid building. Dr Shahid has now pointed out to them that this note on buildings deals with an aspect of the subject which he had discussed in articles listed in his Bibliography and which he had therefore decided not to treat in detail in the body of the article; the insertion of the note might give the impression that the editors had thought that the part allotted to Ghassânid buildings was insufficient. The editors readily express their regret if any such misunderstanding has occurred and take this opportunity of mentioning that Dr Shahid is at present engaged on a book on Arab-Byzantine relations before the rise of Islam which will include a comprehensive chapter on Ghassânid structures.]
CABRA [see KABRA]
CADIZ [see KADIS]
CAESAREA [see KAYSARIYAH, KAYSERI, SHAR-SHAL]
CAGHANIYAN (Arabic rendering: Şaghaniyan). In the early Middle Ages this was the name given to the district of the Caghan-Rud [q.v.] valley. This river is the northernmost tributary of the river Anu-Daryâ [q.v.]. The district lies to the north of the town of Tirmidh [q.v.], the area of which, however, (including Camaangân) did not form part of Caghaniyan either politically or administratively (Ibn Khurraḍâdhibh, 39). Wâdschâjî (i.e. Fayâdbâd) was regarded as the boundary with the district of Khuttalan [q.v.]; between the rivers Pandj and Wakhsh. Incidentally, the area around Kabâdiyân (Kuwâdiyân; [q.v.]) to the south-east, has frequently been regarded as an independent district.

The region had a pleasant climate, good water supplies, good soil, and corresponding agriculture. Its peasants, however, were considered lazy, thus a considerable number of poor (dârsîgân) were to be found in Caghaniyan, and the area was sparsely populated. The capital was also called Caghaniyan (the derivation by Markwart, Wehrot 93, from the Mongol Caghan 'white' is surely wrong). It was situated on the side of a hill where there was running water. The population of the town was also regarded as poor and ill-educated, and despite its greater size, it was soon overshadowed by Tirmidh (Istakhri, 298; Mukaddasi, 332). Round the year 985, the taxes were 48,529 dirhams (Mukaddasi, 283, 305). Other known places in the district were Bârangî and Dârzangî. Maps of the area: Hûdâd al-'Alâm, 339, and Le Strange, map ix.

History: In the 5th and 6th centuries, Caghaniyan was one of main Hephthalite (see HAYTAL) areas and was under Buddhist influence. Even in the 4th/10th century it was considered a border region against the 'Kumdâli', who are regarded as remnants of the Hephthalites (Bayhâkî, ed. Morley, 495, 576, 611, 666; and also Markwart, Wehrot 93 f., with further data), though they may also have belonged to the Saks (Hûdâd al-'Alâm, 365). In Sâsânî times, it was ruled by its own dynasty with the title Câghân-Khudât (Tabari, ii, 1596). In 31/651, its troops took part in Yazdaqirdâd's [q.v.] fight against the attacking Arabs. Some of them (prisoners?) could be found in Başra around 59/678 (Bâlâdjâhi, ed. De Goeje, 419 f. = ed. Cairo 1901, 413; Spuler, Iran, 19). In 86/705 the Câghân-Khudât submitted to Kutâbyâ b. Muslim [q.v.], who had conquered Transoxania for the Muslims. Thus Caghaniyan became part of an Islamic region, and accepted its culture from Balîk rather than from Bûkhâra and Sâmarqand (Tabari, ii, 1180; Dînawari, Abûbâr, 330; Spuler, Iran, 29 and note 6; H. A. R. Gibb, Arab Conquests in Central Asia, 1923, 32 (Turkish ed., 28); Gh. H. Sadighi, Les mouvements relig. iraniens, 1938, 24 f.). In 119-121/737-9, the inhabitants fought on the side of the Arabs against the western Turks, their allies, and Süghd refugees (Tabari, ii, 1596; Ind., p. 735; Barthold, Turkestan, 191 b. G. Gafurov, Ist. Tadzhiskoj Naroda, i, 1949, 147). They took part in the civil war between the Umayyads and ʿ Abbâsids (Tabari, ii, 1423, 1767); in 191-195/806-10, in the rising of Râdî b. Layâf against the ʿ Abbâsids (Yaʾkîb, Hist. Istl., 1883, ii, 528), and in 323/934, followed for a short time a certain 'False Prophet' Mahdi (name? title?) (Gardizi, 37 f.). Abû ʿAlî (see ILVAŠID), who ruled over this district as well as over Tirmidh and Shîman and Khartân further east, had come here for purposes of defence in 337/948, after he had been deposed as governor of Khurâsân. He is described as a member of the Muḥâdî dynasty. It is not evident whether there was a link between this house and the Caghan-Khudât. When he became governor of Khurâsân once more in 341/952, he passed the rule of Caghaniyan on to his son. Deposed again in 343/954, he was buried in Caghaniyan (Radab-Shâbân 344/Nov. 955) (Ibn Hawâkal 401; Mukaddasi 337; Gardizi 36 f.; Yâkût, Learned Men (Gibb Mem. Ser. VI), i, 143; Barthold, Turkestan, 233, 247/49; Spuler, Iran, 97).

Towards the end of the 4th/10th century, a lengthy war broke out between the amir of Caghaniyan (who ranked as one of the Mulâk al-ajrād), the rulers of Gâzân (Dişânjân; [q.v.]), and other candidates (Narâşkhâl, 157; further information in Barthold, Turkestan, 294; Minorsky in Hûdâd al-'Alâm, 178, with further data). It ended in 390/999, when Caghaniyan came under Kârâkhânîd rule. In 416/1025, the district joined Mâmûd of Ghâzna, and in 426/1035, it repelled Kârâkhânîd attempts to recover it with the assistance of the Gâzânawîs (Bayhâkî, ed. Morley, 82, 95, 355, 575 f., 611, 616 (see KARGÂNÎNÎ). Finally, Caghaniyan came under Sâlджâk rule in 45/1059. They suppressed a rising in 457/1064 (Ibn al-ʿÂghî, ed. Tornberg, x, 22). By ca. 561/1165, the Kârâkhânîds (who were subject to the Kârâ Khîṭāy) had once again achieved a position of great influence (al-Ḳāṭîb al-Samârâkandî, in Barthold, Turk. rûss., i, 71 f.). Around the years 570-571/1174-75, the country came under the rule of the Ghûrîds (Dîrjânî, Tabâgî, 423-6).

The district is not mentioned during the time of the Mongol conquests; and subsequently it is hardly found in Mongol sources. In the 7th/13th century, Câghânîyân belonged to the Câghâtî empire, and the Transoxanian Khân Barâk (generally called Burâk [q.v.] by the Muslims) had the centre of his empire here in 663-670/1264-71. In Timîr's time, the place-name Dîh-i naše (now: Dënow) is mentioned (Sharaf...}

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
al-Din Yazdi, ed. Ilahdad, 1885, i, 124), and this appears to be on the site of the ancient town of Caghāniyān (thus, Bol'shaya Entsiklopediya Sovetskoi Entsiklopedii, 63, St. Petersburg 1901, 109; Bol'shaya Entsiklopediya Sovetskoy, 41, (1956) 315). CAGHATAY KHAN, founder of the Caghatay Khanate (q.v.), the second son of Cingiz-Khan and his chief wife Borte Fudjin. Already in his father's lifetime he was regarded as the greatest China (1211-1216) and against the kingdom of the Khwarzim-Shah (1219-1224). Urgandj, the latter's capital, was besieged by the three princes Dioci, Caghatai and Ögedey and taken in Safar 618/27th March-24th April 1221. In the same year Caghatai's eldest son Djoci had predeceased his father) he enjoyed enormous prestige. In the year 1229 he presided with his uncle Öttügen over the Kurilay at which Ögedey was elected Great Khan: owing to his position as the recognized authority on the yasa, he exercised an influence which even the Great Khan Ögedey had to bow. He seems to have spent this period partly in Mongolia at his brother's court, partly in the territory allotted to him by Cingiz-Khan, where he held his own court-camp. Like all the Mongol princes Caghatai had separate camps (ordu) for summer and winter. His summer residence according to Djulwanj was at some place on the Ili whilst his winter quarters were at Kuyas, probably to be identified with the Jugius of William of Rubruck, near Almaliq, i.e., in the region of the present-day Kulja. The residence of Caghatai's successors is called Ulugh Ef (in Turkish „Great House") by Djulwany and others.

Caghatai had received from his father all the lands from the Uyghur territory in the east to Bokhara and Samarqand in the west; we must not however regard these lands as a single kingdom governed from the Ili valley and only indirectly subject to the Great Khan. Everywhere, even in the Ili valley itself, the local dynasties who were there before the Mongols remained. On the relationship of these dynasties to the Mongol rulers we have no accurate information; we know equally little about which dynasties held the right to the court on the Ili could claim from the Great Khan and his deputies. The settled lands of Central Asia were certainly not governed in the name of Caghatai but in that of the Great Khan. In the account of the suppression of the rebellion in Bukhara in 636/1238-1239 Caghatai is not mentioned; the governor of Má wará al-Nahr at this period was Mahmúd Yalavac, a Khwarzim by birth, who had been appointed by the Great Khan. Even the generals of the Mongol forces in Má wará al-Nahr were appointed by the Great Khan. When, soon afterwards, Mahmúd Yalavac was arbitrarily dismissed from his office by Caghatai the latter was called to account by his brother and had to admit the illegality of his action. Ögedey was satisfied with this apology and granted the land to his brother as a fief (indju), but the legal position of this territory was not thereby altered. During the last years of Ögedey's reign, as well as under Mongke, all settled areas from the Chinese frontier to Bukhara were governed by Mášûd Beg, the son of Mahmúd Yalavac, in the name of the Great Khan.

It cannot be ascertained how far Caghatai's Muslim minister Kürb al-Din Habash 'Amid had a share in the administration of the country along with the representatives of the Great Khan. According to Rashid al-Din this minister came from Otrar, according to Djamal Karsli from Karmina, and like many other Muslim dignitaries at this time had made his fortune among the Mongols as a merchant. He was on terms of such intimacy with the Khan that each of Caghatai's sons had one of Habash 'Amid's sons as a companion.

In general Caghatai was not favourably inclined towards Islam. Among the infringements of Mongol law which he rigidly punished was the observance of certain prescriptions of Islam. Among the Mongols it was forbidden to slaughter an animal by cutting its throat, which is the method prescribed by the shari'a, another law frequently broken by the Muslims. In the year 1247 the ruler of the town of Noyon was brought to Caghatai's court and severely punished because he slaughtered an animal by cutting its throat.

The cruel punishment which Caghatai visited upon any such transgressions made his name hated among the Muslims.
According to Djuwayni, Caghatay survived his brother Ögedey, who died on 5 Djumada II 639/1141 December 1241 though only for a short period. On the other hand Rashid al-Din states that he died seven months before Ögedey, i.e., apparently in the beginning of May, 1241.


**CAGHATAY KHANATE**

The Caghatay, or Great Asian Khānate to which Caghatay gave his name was really not founded till some decades after the Mongol prince’s death. Caghatay was succeeded by his grandson Kara-Hülegü, the son of Mövêtiken who fell at Bāmīyān. Kara-Hülegü had been designated as Caghatay’s heir both by Cingiz-Khan himself and by Ögedey; he was however deposed by the Great Khan Gūyūk (1241-1248) in favour of Yesū-Mönkè, the fifth son of Caghatay, with whom Gūyūk was on terms of personal friendship. In 1251 Yesū-Mönkè was involved in a conspiracy against the Great Khan Mönkge, who reinstated Kara-Hülegü and handed Yesū-Mönkè over to him for execution. Kara-Hülegü however did not survive the homeward journey and the executors, not being sure of his worst, proposed to Orkina, who now ruled in his husband’s stead, though her authority does not seem to have extended beyond the Ili valley. As appears from the narrative of William of Rubruck, the whole Empire was at this period divided between Mönkge and Batu: Batu’s portion was the whole area west of a line between the rivers Talas and Ću, east of which all territories were directly subject to the Great Khan. Mas’ud Beg [see the previous article], who enjoyed the confidence of both Khans, was governor of all the settled areas between Baş-Barch and Khwarizm.

With the death of the Great Khan Mönkge in 1259 a different condition of things arose. During the struggle for supremacy between Kubilay and Arigh Böke, the brothers of the late Khan, Alūghū, a grandson designate, assumed possession of Central Asia for Arigh Böke and support him from that quarter against his enemies. He actually succeeded in bringing the whole of Central Asia under his sway, including areas such as Khwarizm and other princes, remained pagans and resided in Muslim culture. Kaydu and Capar, as well as Djuwayni, postponed for several decades the final victory of the Mongols in this part of Asia.

The Mongols, particularly the rulers; but this influence was not strong enough to induce the mass of the people to change their mode of life. When the ruling family decided to settle in Mā wara al-Nahr and break with the customs of the people, their action resulted in the complete separation of the eastern provinces.

Even the brief reign of Yesū-Mönkè (1246-1251) appears to have been favourable to those who professed Islam. The chief minister then was a friend of the Khan’s youth and a foster-son of Habashʿ Amīd, Bahāʾ al-Dīn Marghānā, a descendant of the Shuyukh al-Islām of Farghāna. As a patron of poets and scholars he is praised by his contemporary Djuwayni, who was personally acquainted with him. Habashʿ Amīd, who was hated by the Khan as an adherent of Kara-Hülegū, owed his life to the intervention of Bahāʾ al-Dīn. Nevertheless, when Bahāʾ al-Dīn was involved in his master’s downfall, he was handed over to his foster-father, who ordered his execution in the cruelest fashion.

Under Orkina, Habashʿ Amīd again occupied the position he had held under Caghatay; this princess however was favourably inclined to the Muslims; she is described by Wāsīf as a protectress of Islam, and by Dīmāl Karšī was even said to be a Muslim. Her son Mubārak-Shāh, raised to the throne in Mā wara al-Nahr, certainly adopted Islam, as did his rival Burāḳ Khan some years later. The rule of Alūghū seems to have been less favourable to the Muslims, and the events of the following years postponed for several decades the final victory of Mongol culture. Kaydu and Capar, as well as Dū’s and other princes, remained pagans and resided in the eastern provinces. In the reign of Esen-Būkā the armies of the Great Khan penetrated deep into Central Asia and ravaged the winter and summer.
residences of the Khan; the continuator of Rashid al-Din in his account of these happenings says that the winter residence was in the region of the Isik-Kul, while the summer residence was on the Talas.

Esen-Buqta's successor Kebek was the first to return to the settled lands of Mā warā al-Nahr. Though he did not adopt Islam he is praised by Muslims as a just prince; he is said to have built or restored several towns; he also had built for himself a palace in the neighbourhood of Nāghshāb, from which the town takes its modern name of Karshi (from the Mongol word for "palace"). He introduced the silver coins afterwards called Kebeki, which may be considered the first independent coinage of the Caghatay Khānate.

After two brief interregnums Kebek's brother Tarmashirin was raised to the throne. This Khan adopted Islam and took the name of 'Alā' al-Din; the eastern provinces were entirely neglected by him and the nomads of those provinces rose against him as a violator of the Yasa. This rebellion appears to have taken place about 734/1333-1334; it was headed by Buzan, a nephew of the Khan, and resulted in Tarmashirin's flight and death. Buzan can have reigned only for a few months since he was succeeded in 1334 by Cangshi, another nephew of Tarmashirin and the co-arbiter in Khwarizm. Christian missionaries show that the centre of the Khānate was now again transferred for a brief period to the Ili valley and Christians were allowed to propagate their religion unhindered and to build churches; it is even said that a 7-year-old son of Cangshi was baptised with his father's consent and received the name of Johannes.

Some years later Nakhshab is mentioned again as the residence of the Caghatay Khan. This was Kāzan, who was descended, not like Du'a and his sons from Yessin-To'a, but from Būrī, another son of Mōḥetūken. Kāzan fell in battle in 747/1346-1347 in the course of a struggle against the Turkish aristocracy, and with his death the rule of his house in Mā warā al-Nahr came to an end. Till 1370, descendants of Caghatay were placed on the throne by the Turks as puppet-rulers; in the time of Türk-Tūmūr these rulers were chosen from the family of Ūgend. Nevertheless under Türk-Tūmūr and his successors the nomad population of Mā warā al-Nahr, who as a warrior caste enjoyed many privileges, were still as before called Caghatay.

Bibliography: As in the article on Caghatay. For genealogical tables of the House of Caghatay, based on both the Chinese and the Persian sources, see Louis Hambis, Le chapitre cⅷ du Yuan che, Leiden 1945.

(W. BARTHOLD-J. A. BOYLE)

CAGHATAY LITERATURE [see TURKS]
CAGHATAY TURKISH [see TURKS]

CAGHRI-BEG [see TURKS]

CAGHRI-BEG DAGGūD MĪḤĀJIR B. SALTUQ was the brother of Tughrīl-Beg [q.v.], and the co-founder with him of the Saltūqid dynasty. The careers of both brothers were, for the most part, interwoven. Some years later Nakhshab is mentioned again as the residence of the Caghatay Khan. This was Kāzan, who was descended, not like Du'a and his sons from Yessin-To'a, but from Būrī, another son of Mōḥetūken. Kāzan fell in battle in 747/1346-1347 in the course of a struggle against the Turkish aristocracy, and with his death the rule of his house in Mā warā al-Nahr came to an end. Till 1370, descendants of Caghatay were placed on the throne by the Turks as puppet-rulers; in the time of Türk-Tūmūr these rulers were chosen from the family of Ūgend. Nevertheless under Türk-Tūmūr and his successors the nomad population of Mā warā al-Nahr, who as a warrior caste enjoyed many privileges, were still as before called Caghatay.

Bibliography: As in the article on Caghatay. For genealogical tables of the House of Caghatay, based on both the Chinese and the Persian sources, see Louis Hambis, Le chapitre cⅷ du Yuan che, Leiden 1945.

(W. BARTHOLD-J. A. BOYLE)
the neighbouring Karakhanids. On their side, the Seljukids interfered in the internal quarrels of Ghazna, where Mas'ud's successor, Mawdud, had been murdered. Sons of Caghri, but without a successor of Mawdud, the Seljukids encouraged the usurper Farrukhzad, only to find themselves soon afterwards at war with him also. Hostilities went on intermittently in the Balish and the Sistan districts, and in Sistan the danger was for a while so grave that it became necessary to recall the Turcomans temporarily from Kirmán. Caghri was, by that time, old, and the conduct of operations fell in fact upon his son Alp-Arsalan [q.v.]. Seljukids and Ghaznavids were forced to recognize that their power was about equal, and in 457/1060, Caghri and Ibrázim of Ghazna concluded a peace that remained virtually undisturbed by their successors. Some months later, Caghri died (at the beginning of 458/1060).

Practically nothing is known of Caghri-Beg's government. The chief of the plundering nomads became prince of a territory in which the traditional administration was continued or resumed. He gave himself the title of Malik al-Mulk. A brother of the famous Isma'îîlî writer Nasîr-i Khusraw for a long time held a prominent position in the service of the sovereign. Nevertheless, the fact that neither Ni'am al-Mulk nor the authors of moral tales, nor the divans of the poets, have preserved any noteworthy information about Caghri from the time that he was separated from his brother, gives the impression of a weaker personality and a rather passive political attitude, from a religious and all other points of view.

It is difficult even to obtain a clear assessment of Caghri's relations with his kinsfolk. After Dandakan, Sistan appears to have been handed over to Músa Payghu (Payghu?), the uncle of Caghri and Tughril, but the power of the chiefs of this family seems to have been unstable, and in 448-1057, hostilities arose between them and Yakûl, one of Caghri's brothers, who came into dispute from Kirmán. It appears that from then onwards Caghri was communication in Sistan as the suzerain over his young cousins. A more important question is that of the relations between Caghri and Tughril, holding in mind the successes that made the latter the protector of the Caliphate and the legally recognized master of the entire Muslim East. The only certainty is that the good relations between them were never belied. It seems that in Sistan Caghri accepted Tughril's decisions. In any case, when in 450/1058-9, the revolt of Ibrázim Inal constituted a grave threat to the sovereignty, Caghri in Armenia, the article of Ibrahim Kafesoglu, Dolû Anadoluya ilk selçuklu akini, in Fuad Koprulu, Ah b. Nasir (Akhbâr al-dawla al-Seldiu-i din) of the latter was utilized by Ibn Khurrasam, which is lost but utilized by Ibn Khurrasam, Safar-i nâmâ. In any case, when in 450/1058-9, the revolt of Ibrázim Inal constituted a grave threat to the sovereignty, Caghri in Armenia, the article of Ibrahim Kafesoglu, Dolû Anadoluya ilk selçuklu akini, in Fuad Koprulu, Ah b. Nasir (Akhbâr al-dawla al-Seldiu-i din) of the latter was utilized by Ibn Khurrasam, Safar-i nâmâ. In any case, when in 450/1058-9, the revolt of Ibrázim Inal constituted a grave threat to the sovereignty, Caghri in Armenia, the article of Ibrahim Kafesoglu, Dolû Anadoluya ilk selçuklu akini, in Fuad Koprulu, Ah b. Nasir (Akhbâr al-dawla al-Seldiu-i din) of the latter was utilized by Ibn Khurrasam, Safar-i nâmâ. In any case, when in 450/1058-9, the revolt of Ibrázim Inal constituted a grave threat to the sovereignty, Caghri in Armenia, the article of Ibrahim Kafesoglu, Dolû Anadoluya ilk selçuklu akini, in Fuad Koprulu, Ah b. Nasir (Akhbâr al-dawla al-Seldiu-i din) of the latter was utilized by Ibn Khurrasam, Safar-i nâmâ. In any case, when in 450/1058-9, the revolt of Ibrázim Inal constituted a grave threat to the sovereignty, Caghri in Armenia, the article of Ibrahim Kafesoglu, Dolû Anadoluya ilk selçuklu akini, in Fuad Koprulu, Ah b. Nasir (Akhbâr al-dawla al-Seldiu-i din) of the latter was utilized by Ibn Khurrasam, Safar-i nâmâ.

CAGHRt-BEG — CAIN
the neighbouring Karakhanids. On their side, the Seljukids interfered in the internal quarrels of Ghazna, where Mas'ud's successor, Mawdud, had been murdered. Sons of Caghri, but without a successor of Mawdud, the Seljukids encouraged the usurper Farrukhzad, only to find themselves soon afterwards at war with him also. Hostilities went on intermittently in the Balish and the Sistan districts, and in Sistan the danger was for a while so grave that it became necessary to recall the Turcomans temporarily from Kirmán. Caghri was, by that time, old, and the conduct of operations fell in fact upon his son Alp-Arsalan [q.v.]. Seljukids and Ghaznavids were forced to recognize that their power was about equal, and in 457/1060, Caghri and Ibrázim of Ghazna concluded a peace that remained virtually undisturbed by their successors. Some months later, Caghri died (at the beginning of 458/1060).

Practically nothing is known of Caghri-Beg's government. The chief of the plundering nomads became prince of a territory in which the traditional administration was continued or resumed. He gave himself the title of Malik al-Mulk. A brother of the famous Isma'îîlî writer Nasîr-i Khusraw for a long time held a prominent position in the service of the sovereign. Nevertheless, the fact that neither Ni'am al-Mulk nor the authors of moral tales, nor the divans of the poets, have preserved any noteworthy information about Caghri from the time that he was separated from his brother, gives the impression of a weaker personality and a rather passive political attitude, from a religious and all other points of view.

It is difficult even to obtain a clear assessment of Caghri's relations with his kinsfolk. After Dandakan, Sistan appears to have been handed over to Músa Payghu (Payghu?), the uncle of Caghri and Tughril, but the power of the chiefs of this family seems to have been unstable, and in 448-1057, hostilities arose between them and Yakûl, one of Caghri's brothers, who came into dispute from Kirmán. It appears that from then onwards Caghri was considerer in Sistan as the suzerain over his young cousins. A more important question is that of the relations between Caghri and Tughril, holding in mind the successes that made the latter the protector of the Caliphate and the legally recognized master of the entire Muslim East. The only certainty is that the good relations between them were never belied. It seems that in Sistan Caghri accepted Tughril's decisions. In any case, when in 450/1058-9, the revolt of Ibrázim Inal constituted a grave threat to Tughril's sultanate, Tughril in part owed his preservation to the help brought to him by Alp-Arsalan and Yakûl. Relations between Caghri and Tughril must have been made easier by the fact that the latter was childless. Therefore when the Caliph wanted to form a marriage alliance with him, it was a daughter of Caghri that became the wife of al-Ka'im. Caghri had married a Khwárizmian princess, who had already a son, Sulaymán. When his brother died, Tughril married her. It is not certain whether Alp-Arsalan, who was to unite the two inheritances, had been selected for that fortune by the two ruling brothers, or whether, as Tughril's vizir declared, Sulaymán had been intended to all events, the latter had played no role under either Caghri or Tughril.

Bibliography: A. Sources. On the origins and history of the various tribes from 400,000 to a million.

The origins of the poet, have preserved any note-worthy information about Caghri from the time that he was separated from his brother, gives the impression of a weaker personality and a rather passive political attitude, from a religious and all other points of view.

It is difficult even to obtain a clear assessment of Caghri's relations with his kinsfolk. After Dandakan, Sistan appears to have been handed over to Músa Payghu (Payghu?), the uncle of Caghri and Tughril, but the power of the chiefs of this family seems to have been unstable, and in 448-1057, hostilities arose between them and Yakûl, one of Caghri's brothers, who came into dispute from Kirmán. It appears that from then onwards Caghri was considered in Sistan as the suzerain over his young cousins. A more important question is that of the relations between Caghri and Tughril, holding in mind the successes that made the latter the protector of the Caliphate and the legally recognized master of the entire Muslim East. The only certainty is that the good relations between them were never belied. It seems that in Sistan Caghri accepted Tughril's decisions. In any case, when in 450/1058-9, the revolt of Ibrázim Inal constituted a grave threat to Tughril's sultanate, Tughril in part owed his preservation to the help brought to him by Alp-Arsalan and Yakûl. Relations between Caghri and Tughril must have been made easier by the fact that the latter was childless. Therefore when the Caliph wanted to form a marriage alliance with him, it was a daughter of Caghri that became the wife of al-Ka'im. Caghri had married a Khwárizmian princess, who had already a son, Sulaymán. When his brother died, Tughril married her. It is not certain whether Alp-Arsalan, who was to unite the two inheritances, had been selected for that fortune by the two ruling brothers, or whether, as Tughril's vizir declared, Sulaymán had been intended to all events, the latter had played no role under either Caghri or Tughril.

Bibliography: A. Sources. On the origins and history of the various tribes from 400,000 to a million.
CAIRO [see AL-KAHIRA].

CAKIRI-BASHI, chief falconer, a high official of the Ottoman court. In the 16th century the numbers and sub-divisions of the aghas of the hunt (şikâr aghaları) increased greatly, and the Cakirî-bashi is joined by separate officers in charge of the peregrines, lanners, and sparrow-hawks (Şahînî-bashi, Doghânî-bashi, and Âmânaştî-bashi). Until the time of Mehmed IV (1088/1678-1687) the Doghânî-bashi and his staff belonged to the Inner service (Enderûn); the others to the outer service (Bırûn). During the 17th and 18th centuries the falconers dwindled in numbers and importance.

Bibliography: Gibb and Bowen i/i, 347-8; Ismail Haikâ Uzunçarşı, Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilâtı, Ankara 1945, 420 ff.

ÇAKMAK, AL-MALIK AL-Zâhir SAYF AL-DIN, Sultan of Egypt, was in his youth enrolled among the Mamluks of Sultan Barkok. He gradually rose, till under Sultan Barsbay he became Chief hâdîcî (Chief Master of the Horse, and finally Atâbeg (Commander-in-Chief). On his deathbed in 842/1439, Barsbay appointed him regent to his infant son al-Malik al-'Aziz Yusuf. The various divisions of the Mamluks, originating in the bodyguards of the Sultan's Barkok, Nasir Faradji, Mustayyad Shâykeh and Barsbay, were at enmity with one another and their sole aim was to obtain all the wealth and influence they could. In the confusion that arose the only course open to Çakmak was to seize the reins of government for himself. Sultan Yusuf was deposed, placed in confinement in the citadel, retaken after an attempt to escape and finally taken to Alexandria and kept under a mild form of custody. Soon afterwards the resistance of the governors of Damascus and Aleppo also collapsed; they had been defending Sultan Yusuf's claims to further their own interests. The Syrian rebels were defeated, the leaders executed and Çakmak's supremacy was assured, in 842/1439. Like his predecessor Barsbay [q.v.] Çakmak wished to make war on the Christians under pretence of checking piracy on the north coast and therefore sent ships via Cyprus to Rhodes but the Egyptians had to return as the resistance offered by the Knights of St. John, who were well prepared, was too strong for them. In the years 840/1442 and 848/1444 the Egyptians again made unsuccessful attempts to conquer Rhodes, and had finally to make peace with the Knights. Çakmak's foreign policy was a successful one; he was on good terms with all Muslim rulers and did not, like Barsbay, fall into the error of causing irritation by petty trickeries. Against the advice of his amîrs, he allowed Timur's son șâhab Rûsh to send a covering for the sacred Ka'ba, although this was a privilege of the Sultans of Egypt (see the article BARBARS in E1). The populace was still so strongly incensed against the Mongols that they actually attacked an embassy which included one of Timur's widows. He was also on good terms with the Ottoman Sultan and the princes of Asia Minor. In his domestic policy, in Egypt itself, he was not quite able to put a stop to the mismanagement of the state monopolies [see BARBARS]. Jews and Christians were tormented with strictly enforced petty regulations. He could not restrain the arrogance and outrages of the Mamlûks so that the only way he could protect women from them on the occasion of festivals was to forbid them to go out. He himself was an exceedingly frugal and pious man, liberal only to the learned, and thought no price too high for a beautiful book; he left but little property behind him on his death. Through his example the morals of the court improved. When, in the year 854/1453, he felt the approach of death—he was now over 80 years old—he had homage paid to his son Uğmân whom the Caliph chose to be Sultan. The amirs and officials of the court and a large multitude of the people attended his funeral, contrary to the usual custom sincerely grieving at his loss.


ÇAKMAK, MUSTAFA FEVZI, also called Kavakî, marshal in the Turkish army. Born in Istanbul in 1876, he was the son of an artillery colonel. He entered the war academy (Harbiye, [q.v.]) where he became a lieutenant in 1895, joined the staff course, and was gazetted as a staff captain in 1898. After spending some time on the general staff, he was posted to the First Corps where he became a successful Colonel, divisional commander, and Army Corps Chief of Staff. He served on the staff of the army of the Vardar during the Balkan War, and during the World War saw service at the Dardanelles, in the Caucasus, and in Syria. He became a general in 1914. In December 1918 he became, for a while, Chief of the General Staff in Istanbul, and in Feb. 1920 Minister of War. He used his position to send arms and give other help to the nationalists in Anatolia, and in April 1920 left with Ismet [Inönü] to join them. In May he became minister of defence and on 21 January 1921 was elected president of the council of ministers of the Ankara government, and was sentenced to death in absentia in Istanbul. On 2 April 1921, after the second battle of İnönü, he was promoted to the rank of Grand Marshal (Mushîr). He remained chief of the General Staff until his retirement, ostensibly under the age limit, in January 1944. In 1946 he was elected as an independent candidate on the Democrat Party list, and in August was nominated as opposition candidate for the Presidency, receiving 59 votes in the Assembly, as against 378 for Ismet İnönü. In 1948 he appeared as honorary president of the newly formed Party of the Nation (Millî Partisi). He died on 10th April 1950.


ÇALA [see BÜKHARA]

CALATAYUD [see KALCAT AYYUB]

CALATRAVA [see KALCAT RABAH]
CALCUTTA (KALIKATĀ), the capital of West Bengal and the largest city in India, situated about 80 miles from the sea on the left or east bank of the Hugli, a branch of the Ganges (Ganges), which is navigable for the largest ocean vessels. A centre of rail, river and ocean traffic, and lying midway between Europe and the Far East, it is one of the busiest ports of the world. About five-sevenths of India's overseas trade is shared by Calcutta and Bombay, with Calcutta having the major share; about one-third of the country's organized factory industry is in its vicinity. It has a large international airport. Area, 32.32 sq. m.; pop. (March 1, 1951) 2,548,677, a density of 139 persons per acre. Including Howrah (pop. 433,630) which is really a part of Calcutta, and the suburbs which are within half an hour's bus journey to the city, Calcutta has three and a half million people.

The crowded metropolis of today grew out of a cluster of three mud villages at the end of the 17th century. Calcutta is first mentioned in a Bengali poem, Manasā-rājya by Viprādāsa (ASB text, 144), written in 1495, but the portion in which Calcutta is referred to is possibly a later elaboration. The first definite mention of Calcutta then occurs in the Šāh-i Akbari (Lucknow text, ii, 62), compiled about 1596, as a rent-paying village in the sārkār of Sātgāon under the Mughal emperor Akbar. The foundation of the city occurred about a century later in 1690. The English merchants, who had been in Bengal for about fifty years, felt the necessity of a fortified place, and under the direction of Job Charnock and after two futile attempts after 1686 they finally settled at Sātgāon, the northern portion of present Calcutta, on 24 August, 1690. In 1696 the English were permitted to build a fort and two years later they secured permission from Prince Šāzīm, grandson of the emperor Awrangzīb, to rent the three villages of Sātgāon (north), Kalikātā (centre) and Govindapur (south), which formed the nucleus of modern Calcutta. In 1707 Calcutta was made the seat of a separate Presidency. In 1717 the English were permitted by the emperor Farrukhshāy to purchase 38 villages in the vicinity of their settlement. The names of these 38 villages still survive in the street-names of the city today. In June, 1756 Sirādž al-Dawla, Nawwāb of Bengal, captured it and during his temporary occupation he named it Ahnagar. Modern Calcutta dates from 1757 when, after the battle of Plassey (June), the English became virtual masters of Bengal; the old fort was abandoned and the present Fort William begun by Clive on the site of Govindapur. In 1772 the treasury of the province was transferred from Murshīdābād to Calcutta, which in 1773 became the official capital of British India. It remained India's capital until 1911 and that of Bengal as well until 1947.

Though Calcutta is a creation of English rule, it is an important centre of Muslim life. On 1 March 1951, Calcutta city had a Muslim population of 305,932 and including two of its immediate suburbs, Howrah and Garden Reach, Calcutta had a Muslim population almost equal to the entire population of Dacca (Dhaka), the capital of East Pakistan, and the historic centre of Muslim activity. About one-third of Muslims had left Calcutta on the eve of the census of 1951 in view of the unsettled conditions of the time, and the census of 1961 is likely to show a considerable increase of Muslim population. Calcutta is an important centre of Muslim culture. The Calcutta Madrasa was founded in 1781 by Warren Hastings for the encouragement of Islamic learning. It had among its Principals Islamic scholars of repute like H. Blochmann and Sir John Denison Ross. The Asiatic Society, founded in 1754, possesses over 6,000 Arabic and Persian MSS. and has to its credit a large number of valued publications bearing on Muslim history and culture. The National Library has in its Būhār collection a good number of Arabic and Persian MSS. and has recently acquired the rich collection of the distinguished historian of Muslim India, Sir Jadhānār Sarkār. The Indian Museum and the Victoria Memorial exhibit some rare and beautiful examples of Indo-Islamic paintings. The University of Calcutta has two Post-Graduate Islamic departments: (i) Arabic & Persian and (ii) Islamic History & Culture. In Calcutta lived the sons of Tipu Sulṭān, and the last king of Awadh (Oudh), Wādiḍī Allī Shāh, who died in 1857. Of the Muslim monuments, the only one with any architectural pretensions is the mosque in Dharamtala St., built in 1842 by Prince Ghūlām Muḥammād, son of Tipu Sulṭān; the oldest are the Nīmṭalā mosque (built some time after 1784), the mosque and tomb of Bhonsri Shāh at Chitpur (1804) and Djamma Shāh's tomb in Netājī Subhās (Clive) St. (1808).


CALDIRAN, the plain in north-western Persian Azerbaijan, near the western bound of the province of the present-day frontier with Turkey (cf. Farhang-i Dvṛghārdī-yi ʿIrān, iv (Tehran, 1330 šahīdī, 154), which on the 2 Radjab 920/23 August 1514 was the scene of a decisive Ottoman victory over the Şafawids.

The campaign was launched by Selim I, despite the reluctance of his troops and military advisers, on 23 Muharram 920/20 March 1514, as the first enterprise of his reign after he had secured his throne by the elimination of his brothers, and is properly to be regarded as the final response to those separatist tendencies which for over half a century had been manifesting themselves among the Turkish tribal elements of Anatolia in darvāg revolts or in active support for pretenders of the Ottoman line, and which now threatened to draw the entire province into the Şafawid orbit. The profound disquiet of the region may be judged from the mass executions and arrests of suspected dissidents which preceded the actual military operations, and the gravity with which this situation was regarded is to be inferred from the risks which Selim felt compelled to take in order to achieve a final settlement. Whether the Şafawids had inspired this dissatisfaction by their subversive missionary activities or merely benefited from the prevailing anti-Ottoman sentiments by appearing as an alternative hegemony is difficult to determine; but it is clear that the countereretical allure which the Ottomans gave to their attack upon the Şiʿī Muslims of the east was but the façade to a starkly political purpose.

The campaign, which seems to have been modelled on that of Mehmed II against Uzun Hasan in 1473, is described in detail in the journal preserved in Ferîdūn Beq, although the fundamental logistical
problems of moving an army of the size attributed to the Ottomans across home territories where they could not live off the land are scarcely touched upon. But that these could be solved and that the fraticious troops could be held under discipline throughout all the unfamiliar hardships of campaigning in these regions was certainly the most impressive display of Ottoman might that Anatolia had ever witnessed and far more overawing to Shah Isma'il and his supporters than the firearms and artillery which usually figure so prominently in the narratives as the reason for the Ottoman victory (cf. Lutfi Pasha's Dîjâkîn-dîr). The dominant early European account is that of Paolo Giovio, *Historiae Sui Temporis*, Paris 1558, i, 133-163 ff. (an Italian translation of this section is given in F. Sansovino, *Historia Universale dell' Origine, Guerre et Imperio de Turchi*, Venice 1654, ff. 323-360); also in Sansovino are the Fida al Legge Turchesca by G. A. Menavino (ff. 17-75), who, although claiming to have accompanied the Turks on this campaign, gives a highly distorted account of its outcome (a Latin translation in P. Lonicerus, *Chronica Turchorum*, Frankfurt 1578, i, ff. 95-97). The narrative in R. Knolles, *The General History of the Turks*, London 1621, 505-515, while noticing Menavino, follows Jovius throughout, as does also that of T. Artus in his continuation of De Vigenere's translation of Chalcoondylas, *L'Historie de la Decadence de l'Empire Grec*, Paris 1650, i, 358-374, though this does include, too, the accounts in J. Leunclavius, *Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum*, Frankfurt 1591, cols. 697-704, 742-745. F. Bizzar, *Rerum Persicarum Historiarum Perpetuum Libri*, Frankfurt 1607, is important only in that it contains the letter of H. Penia from Constantinople, dated 6 Nov. 1514, 275-278. The article by M. Tayyib Gökblin in *IA*, fasc. 24, 329-331, presents the familiar Ottoman version.

---

**Bibliography:** Among the general histories of the Ottoman Empire, Hammer-Purgstall's is still the most circumstantial account of this campaign (ii, 352 ff.), Zinkeisen (ii, 566 ff.) and Jorga (ii, 327 ff.) affording it but casual mention; I. H. Uzunşarılı, *Osmanli Tarhi*, ii, Ankara 1949, 246 ff. adds a diagram of the battle. To Ottoman historians: Kamâl Paşa-zâde, *Tâwarîkh-i Âlî-ı 'Othmân*, ix, Millet, Ali Emiri, no. 29, f. 35b, ff.; *Kunh al-akhbâr*, Süleymaniye, Esʿad Ef., no. 2162, f. 238a ff.; *Sa'd al-Dîn, Tâdž-dâl-Tâwarîkh*, ii, Istanbul 1279, 239 ff.; Luṭfi Paşa, *Tâwarîkh-i Âlî-ı 'Othmân*, ed. 'Âli, Istanbul 1341, 206 ff.; *Šâlâzâdê, Târîkh*, Istanbul 1287, 339 ff. (gives very much the same picture as presented by H. Peñitia). J. Leunclavius (ii, 566 ff. hot use of Kamâl Paşa-zâde and Luṭfi Paşa) which can be usefully supplemented in certain aspects by the various *Selim-nâmes* (a fairly complete repertoire of which is to be found in A. S. Levend, *Gazâvât-nâmes*, etc., Ankara 1956, 22 ff.), the most important being those of Şukrî, British Museum, Or. 1039, f. 62b ff. (repeated in Şawrî, Millet, Ali Emiri, no. 1310, f. 54a ff., and Yûsuf Efendi, Süleymaniye, Esʿad Ef., no. 2146, f. 11a ff.), Kaşghi, Süleymaniye, Esʿad Ef., no. 2147, f. 31a ff.; *Sa'dî b. 'Abd al-Muta'âl*, Topkapı, Revan, no. 1277, f. 64a ff.; Abu 'l-Faqîr b. İdris Bütîlî, British Museum, Add. 24,960, f. 63b ff.; Sudjüdi, Topkapı, Revan, no. 1284/f., f. 58 ff.; *Dîjâl-zâde Muşafâ Çelebi*, British Museum, Add. 7648, f. 120b ff. The documents in Ferîdun Beğ, *Mehmed-i Sâlihâb*, i, Istanbul 1374, 396 ff. (correspondence, journal of the campaign, *fatâh-nâmes*) are of exceptional importance. The Persian sources (a full discussion of which is to be found in Gholam Sarwar, *History of Shah Isma'il Sa'awî*, Aligarh 1939, 3-16) seek to palliate the magnitude of the defeat and their accounts are coloured by this purpose; the most important being those of Khwâjah, *Fâhib al-isâr*, iv, Tehran 1333, 543 ff., whose version underlies those of Hasan Rûmûlî, *Abîsân al-Tâwarîkh*, ed. C. N. Seddon, Baroda 1931, 143 ff. (with various expansions) and Iskandar Beğ Munhî, *'Alam-dâr-i 'Abîsân*, Tehran 1341, 31 ff. (who, in addition to the above two, uses also Ghâfârî's *Dîjâkîn-dîr*).
seriously practised by the Cham until after the fall of their kingdom.

To-day two-thirds of the Cham living in Viet-nam still practise Brahmanism; the other third, together with the Cham who emigrated to Cambodia, are Muslims. In the absence of precise and up-to-date statistics, there are an estimated 15,000 Cham living in the south of central Viet-nam (the provinces of Phan-rang and Phan-thiet) and 20,000 living in Cambodia (on the banks of the Mekong).

Cham society, originally matriarchal and organised in clans, adopted, under influence from India, the caste system and Hindu customs. The Cham, skilful craftsmen and experienced farmers, with a reputation as courageous soldiers, lived as pirates, raiding the neighbouring provinces and trading in slaves. Nowadays they constitute racial minorities in process of assimilation. Apart from work on silk and metals and the cutting of precious stones, the Cham were outstanding builders. Cham architecture has left us numerous sites and monuments, of which most are unfortunately in extremely bad condition. Cham monuments are all identical in silhouette, a tower with diminishing stories, built in pink sandstone, terra cotta, and above all in brick. However their style is not uniform. Hindu motifs can be recognised in their decoration. These towers were religious buildings (temples), and all of whose interior furnishings have disappeared. The scenes on the bas-reliefs again give concrete expression to the Cham’s pronounced love of music, which has had a very deep influence on the music of Viet-nam.


(C. MILLON)

Phan-rang and Phan-thiet) and 20,000 living in the south of central Viet-nam (the provinces of Phan-rang and Phan-thiet) and 20,000 living in Cambodia (on the banks of the Mekong). The population of the forest-covered south is 2,000,000; of the savannah and the uplands, 500,000; the rest is composed of immigrants and refugees from the mountains, long-established palaeo-nigritic peoples; in all, 3,100,000 Africans and 15,000 immigrants.

After the 1914-18 war, Camerons was placed under a Mandate by the League of Nations. In 1940, under Col. Leclerc, it rallied to Free France. In 1946 the system of the mandate was replaced by that of the trusteeship of the United Nations, Camerons becoming an Associated Territory of the French Union. In 1957 it was established as a State under trusteeship, possessing some degree of internal autonomy: the Prime Minister and his government were responsible to the Legislative Assembly sitting at Yaunde. A High Commissioner dealt with the spheres reserved to France—currency, defence, and public order. The administrative structure includes 21 departments and 60 arrondissements. Municipal administration is inspired by that of metropolitan France. The French government announced at the end of 1958 its intention of renouncing trusteeship and of recognising the independence of the Camerons on 1 Jan. 1960; this decision, after arousing lively opposition in the United Nations Assembly from the Soviet block and certain Afro-Asian states, was carried through and made official on the appointed date.

The economy is predominantly agricultural (coffee, cocoa, vegetable oils, timber, cotton, bananas) with cattle husbandry important in the north. Current industrial development: electrometallurgy at Edea, gold and diamonds in the east, tin in the west, petroleum in the south. Chief towns: the port of Duala (100,000 inhabitants), Yaunde, the capital (300,000), Douala capital of the north (151,000), Marua, Ngoundere, Edea, Nkongsamba, Fumban, Tchang, Kribi, Mblamoyo, and Ebolowa.

The south is almost entirely Christianized: 600,000 Catholics and 300,000 Protestants, with animist survivals, and a tendency toward the formation of syncretistic sects.

Islam has some 600,000 followers in the northern plain, Adamawa and the Bamun massif. It seems to have penetrated the area about the 12th century, coming from the east (Wadai, Bagirmi) and the north-west (Kanem, Bornu), but experienced its period of great expansion only at the beginning of the 19th century, under the influence of the conquering Fulani, successors of Uthman dan Fodio: his son Mohammad Bello and particularly his lieutenant Modibbo Adama (died 1847) who conquered Fumbina and gave it its present name of Adamawa. Adama took the title of Amiru (Amir) and made his capital at Yola (Nigeria) where the limibe (Fulani chiefs) went to receive the investiture until the Franco-British conquest. His work was continued up to the beginning of the 20th century by the Amirs Mohammed Lawal, Sanda and Zubeiru; they were however not able to subdue the Kirdi (beagheens) who took refuge in the mountains of the north.

Since the European conquest, some groups of Muslim immigrants have arisen in the towns of the south, where they are butchers, peddlers, and shoe-
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makers. They are thought to number some 25,000. They do a little proselytising by marriage. But, in addition to the 300,000 Fulani, there are in the north some Hausa, some Kotoko, and some Shua (or black Arab) Muslims of long standing, and Islam tends to spread among the pagan farmers of the plains and the Kirdi who have come down from the mountains. The Bamun of Fumban, long at war with the Fulani, saw their aristocracy converted by agreement or by force in 1937 by Ba Ow Njoya the Great who at this time took the title of Sultan and the name of Ibrahim.

Higher Muslim education is little developed, and the modibbe (or mīlāms) who wish to continue their studies have to go to Nigeria, Chad, or the Sudan.

The Kâdîrîyya sect is the oldest, but not the most numerous; its principal centre is Garua. The Tijdânîyya sect has predominated since the conversion of Mohamman Bello, who received the word of El Hadj Omar about 1840; its adherents probably amount to some 300,000. Mahdism comes next in importance. Local mahdîs appear every four or five years, but their influence is generally short-lived and localized. On the other hand, since the settlement of several thousand Fulani in the Sudan at the time of the British conquest of Nigeria, the Sudanese Mahdiyya has had numerous adherents in the Cameroons.

Wahhâbî influence is slight, exercised chiefly through the medium of former soldiers of the negro guard of King Ibn Sa'îd, nearly all Hausas. The Muslims have long remained aloof from local political trends. Precolonial institutions and hierarchies are more preserved among them than among the peoples of the south. Nevertheless, in contrast to the confessional and political divisions of the South, the westernized âlî of the north have been called on to play an increasingly important role as arbitrators, until, in 1958, a Fulani Muslim of modernist tendencies was appointed Premier of the newly formed State.

BRITISH CAMEROONS. This territory on the West Coast of Africa, between the Cameroon Republic on the west and Nigeria on the east, is that part of the old German colony of Camerun which passed in 1919 into British control, first under a League of Nations mandate and subsequently as a United Nations Trust territory. Following administrative practice, which is to some extent justified by real ethnic and cultural differences, it is convenient to consider it as two distinct units.

The Southern Cameroons [administrative capital Douala] has a total area of 16,581 square miles and a population of some 500,000. Until 1954 this territory was administered as an integral part of the Eastern region of Nigeria but a series of changes since that date have raised it to the status of a self-governing region within the Nigerian federation with its own regional government and a legislative assembly with a majority elected by universal adult suffrage. The political future of the region, which has not been provided economically or politically, is at present uncertain. The United Kingdom has undertaken to separate the administration of the region from that of the Federation of Nigeria by October 1960, the date when the Federation assumes complete independence. A plebiscite is to be held not later than March 1961 to decide between incorporation in Nigeria and reunion with the Cameroons Republic, the latter course being favoured by the present regional government.

The tribal pattern of the territory exhibits a marked degree of political fragmentation. The bulk of its population, speaking a large number of Bantu and semi-Bantu languages, have their nearest affinities with neighbouring peoples in the Cameroons republic. The Tikor and Bali peoples who are dominant in the central grasslands have migrated into this area from the north-east in the last few centuries and their traditional culture is of the pagan Sudanic type. The Christian missions have a continuous history in the area since the establishment of the Baptists at Victoria in 1858. The most reliable figures of missionary adherents show 58,000 Catholics and 65,000 Protestants but the number of those who have been strongly influenced by the missions is much greater. Islam is not numerically important.

There are no known mineral resources of commercial value within the territory and no industry beyond the processing of palm oil and rubber. The country is overwhelmingly rural in character and even the largest towns, Mâmfe and Kumba, have fewer than 10,000 inhabitants. Most of the exported cash crops of bananas, palm-oil, palm kernels and rubber are produced from the plantations administered by a government subsidised agency, the Cameroons Development Corporation. The growth of cash crops, especially cocoa, by individual small farmers is increasing with official encouragement, but the mass of the people in the interior are still engaged in subsistence agriculture as are those of the Northern Cameroons.

The Northern Cameroons, an area of 17,000 square miles with a population probably slightly smaller than the Southern Cameroons, is a narrow strip of territory more than 500 miles long but nowhere more than 80 miles wide, divided into two by a "corridor" of Nigerian territory, some 45 miles wide, on either bank of the Benue. Administratively the territory has been completely integrated with the Northern Region of Nigeria. The greater part falls within the Adamawa Province, but the Dikwa emirate in the north, formerly a part of the old "empire" of Bornu is appropriately incorporated, as a division, in Bornu province and three districts in the south belong to the Benue province. By a plebiscite held under United Nations auspices in November 1959 the people of the territory have postponed the final decision as to whether or not it is to remain with Nigeria after independence. The ruling tribes, Kanuri and Shoa Arabs in Dikwa and Fulani in Adamawa, are strongly Muslim but much of the hill country has never fallen effectively under their influence and remains entirely pagan. There are Catholic and Protestant missions in Adamawa and a few thousand converts to Christianity have been made. [For an account of the religious history see the preceding section on the French Cameroons].

(C. H. JONES)

GAMENIEC [see KAMENKA]

CÂMPÂNE, a ruined city of Gujurat in Western India, Lat. 23° 29' N., long. 73° 32', about 78 miles south-east of Ahmadâbâd, taken by the Gûdjârî sultan Mâhmûd Shâh I 'Begâdâ' on his conquest (889/1484) of the adjoining stronghold
of Pāwagāth, which had successfully resisted Aḥmad Shāh I in 821/1418. The Beggād occupied Čāmpānēr forthwith, building a city wall with bastions and towers (cf. Čāmpānēr, Čāmpānī; inscriptions 1929, 1932, 1933, 1-5), and a citadel (ḥuddār). He renamed the city Māḥmūdābād, and it was his favourite residence until his death in 917/1511; it remained the political capital of Gūdjarāt until the death of Bahādur Shāh in 942/1536. When Gūdjarāt came under the Mughals after 980/1572 Čāmpānēr was the head of a kanāt (q.v.) and also Dardaneli (cf. E. B. Havell, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, 134-43; P. Brown, Indian Architecture (Islamic Period), 58-9. (J. Burton-Page))

ČAMPINA [see KĀNANIYA] ČANAK-KALE BOGHĀZI (Çanak-kale Bogazı) is the name now given in Turkish to the Dārdanellas. This narrow channel, which unites the Marmara and the Aegean Seas, has a length of about 62 km. (Gelibolu-Çardak to Seddiilbahir-Kumkale) and a width ranging from 8 km. down to 1250 m. (Çanak-kale to Kılıtbahir). The strait was known to the ancient Greeks as the Hellespont (δ' ᾨλησπόντος, in Doric δ' Ἡλησπόντος), a name that remained in usage amongst the Byzantines. It is called in some of the mediaeval Western sources and sea-charts Bucca Romaniae, Brachium s. Georgii (a term which denoted the entire channel separating Asia and Europe, i.e., the Limnicus or the Bosphorus as well as the Dardanelles), Bocca d'Avio (Avio, Aveo, the ancient Abydos: Ἀβῦδος) and also Dardanelo (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Hellespontos, and Tomasek, 17). To the Ottomans it was the Ak Deniz Bogazı, Kałe-i Sultāniyye Bogazı and later Çanak-kale Bogazı.

The more notable localities on or near the European shore of the Dardanelles are Bolayir, Gelibolu (i.e., Gallipoli, the ancient Kallipolis), Kiyla (not far from the old Sestos), Ecebad (Eğebağ, formerly Maydos, i.e., the ancient Maydotos), Kılıtbahir (Kılıd al-Bahr) and Seddiilbahir (Sedd al-Bahr). Along the Asiatic shore are situated Çardak, Lapseki (the ancient Lampakaos-Lampsico, Lapsico, Lapso in the mediaeval Western sources), Çanak-kale (near the old Abydos), Erenköy and Kunkmale (Kum Kałe).

Sultan Mehemmed II (855-886/1451-1481), in order to establish a more effective control over the Dardanelles, built new defences on either side of the strait, amongst them a fortress close to the ancient Abydos. This fortress received the name of Kałe-i Sultāniyye (according to Piri Reis (Kilid-i Bahriyye), 86), because a son of Mehemmed II, Sultan Mustafa, was associated with its construction. Cf. also Ibn Kemel, 100 = Transkripsiyon, 101, where it is called Sultāniyye). The town of Kałe-i Sultāniyye counted amongst its inhabitants, during the 17th and 18th centuries, a considerable number of Armenians, Jews and Greeks. As a result of the establishment of the ottoman empire (perhaps ca. 1740) of potemkin, and of its subsequent reputation as a noted centre for the manufacture of earthenware, the town came to be known as Çanak Kalesi (canak = an earthen bowl), the older name falling out of current usage. Çanak Kalesi belonged, in 1876, to the Ottoman wilāyet of Djezair-i Bahri-i Sefid and thereafter to the sandjak of Bigha. It is now the centre of the present province of Çanak-kale. The town suffered much from fire in 1860 and 1865, from the earthquake of August 1912, and from naval bombardment in 1915 during the course of World War I. Çanak-kale, in recent years, has largely regained its former prosperity and was estimated, in 1940, to have 24,600 inhabitants.

The Ottoman Turks absorbed (c. 735-745 C. 1335-1345) into their own territories the state of Karaz (q.v.), and then, after the town had been ruined in the earthquake o f 755/1354, established themselves at Gallipoli [cf. Čehibolu], which served them as a point of departure for their subsequent conquest of Thrace. It was now, for the first time, that a Muslim state held control over the lands on either side of the strait. The Ottoman Sultan Baysaül (791-805/1389-1403) strengthened the defences of Gallipoli (792/1390), further improvements being carried out there in the reigns of Mehemmed I (816-824/1413-1421) and Murad II (824-855/1421-1445). Ottoman control of the Dardanelles was destined, however, to remain insecure, as long as the Sultan had no large and efficient fleet at his command: Christian naval forces sailed into the strait in 765/1366 (the "crusade" of Amedeo of Savoy, which brought about a brief relaxation of Gallipoli to Byzantine rule), in 801/1399 (expedition of the Maréchal Boucicaut to Constantinople), in 899/1416 (the Venetian defeat of the Ottoman naval forces before Gallipoli) and again in 848/1444 (Papal and Venetian squadrons sent to the Dardanelles at the time of the Varna campaign). Sultan Mehmed II (855-886/1451-1481), anxious to secure a more effective control of the Dardanelles, caused new defences to be built where the waters of the strait are at their narrowest, i.e., the fortresses of Kałe-i Sultāniyye on the Asiatic, and of Kılıd al-Bahr on the European shore. The manufacture and use of
fire-arms had now advanced to such a degree that the Sultan was able to furnish these new defences with the Ottomans across the channel. A restoration of the two fortresses was carried out in 958/1551 during the reign of Sultan Sulayman. At this time the region of the Dardanelles was included in the eyalet of Djezârî-Bahr-i Sefid, i.e., it formed, together with some of the islands and coastal areas of the Aegean Sea, the province of the Kapudan Pâghâ and High Admiral of the fleet.

The fortifications along the shores of the Dardanelles fell gradually into disrepair during the late 16th and early 17th centuries. It was not until the Cretan War (1055-1080/1645-1669) that the Porte, under the threat of a Venetian irruption into the strait, initiated new measures of defence. Kafe-i Sultânîyye and Kildâl-Bahr now underwent (1069-1070/1658-1660) a thorough restoration. Moreover, new forts were built at the Aegean mouth of the Dardanelles-Sedd al-Bahr on the European, and Kum Kafe on the Asiatic side of the channel. The danger arising from the presence of a Russian fleet before the Dardanelles during the Ottoman-Russian war of 1182-1188/1768-1774 led to the creation of new forts along the shores of the strait, this task being accomplished by Sultan Mahâmed III, in the name of Sultan Selîm, during the 17th century. A further effort was made to establish a more modern system of fortification in the Dardanelles towards the end of the reign of Selim III (1203-1222/1789-1807). The fact that in 1211/1807 an English fleet under the command of Sir John Duckworth forced a passage into the strait underlined once more the urgent need for a complete modernization of the defences on the Dardanelles. Control of the strait was to become thereafter a matter of more than local concern, the status of the Dardanelles (and also of the Bosphorus) being regulated in a series of international agreements negotiated during the 19th and 20th centuries.

More recent events associated with the Dardanelles it will be sufficient to mention here the Gallipoli campaign of 1915-1916 fought in the course of World War I.

CANDERI — CANKIRI

Candari who set up Medini Ray, Mahmud II’s dismissed minister who had escaped the massacre at Manda [q.e.v.], as governor; from him it was taken by Babor in 934/1528, who restored it to Ahmad Khán, son of Mahmud. Later it passed to the Pürbeya Radğut Pâna Mal, who lost it to Shîr Shâh c. 947/1540 but later retook it and massacred and degraded the Canderdî Muslims, an act which brought retribution from Shîr Shâh in 950/1543 (Briggs’s Ferîqhtâ, ii, 160). After Akbar had gained the sâhe of Mâla, Çendari became the headquarters of a sâkar (A’in-I Akbari, i, 122), when it was said to have been a large city with 14,000 stone houses and over 1200 mosques. Thereafter it passed frequently into Bundel hands, and after the early 18th/18th century remained in Hindu possession.

The city is walled, with 5 gates, one of which is the Kâtîghâli hewn through the rock outcrop; the fort, which stands some 70 metres higher, is dependent for its water supply on a large tank at the foot of the hill, access to which is by a stairway. (Map in Cunningham, ASI, ii, Plate XCVII). The Di’amî Masjîd is similar to that of Manda with its tall domes over the iwan stilted between springing and haunch, supported by ornamental spandrel brackets, a contribution of Gujdarât workmen; two tombs known as the madrasa and the Shâhâzâdi kâ râwda are of excellent workmanship in a similar style; probably somewhat earlier is the Kâkgh Mahâl, a large square building with intersecting passages on each of the remaining four storeys which divide the interior into four quadrants, in the suburb of Fatehâbâd, 3 km. west, identified with the seven-storeyed palace (Sat manzil) whose building was ordered by Mahmud Shâh I in 849/1445. At the western foot of the fort is an unattached gateway, the Bâdal Mahâl darwazâ, a triumphal arch between two tapering buttresses, somewhat over-ornamented.

Bibliography: Cunningham, ASI, ii, gives historical sketch with references to original sources in 404-12 (mainly Ferîqhtâ). Also C. E. Luard, Gwalior State Gazetteer, i, 1908, 209-12. Earliest inscr., 711/1312, in Ramsingh Saksena, Persian Inscriptions in the Gwalior State, in IHQ, i, 1925, 653, there assumed to be from New Persian Inscriptions in the Gwalior State, (1928); ASI Annual Reports, specially 1894-5, 163-4; Sir John Marshall, The monuments of Muslim India, in Cambridge History of India III, 1928, 622 ff. (J. Burton-Page)

Çankırî (earlier also known as Kiangri, Kandri, and popularly as Çangi or Cengiri), the ancient Gangra (in Arabic sources Khândjara or Dinjara), a town in the north of Central Anatolia, 40° 35’ north, 33° 35’ east, at the confluence of the Tatlıkay and the Acdî, a tributary of the Küf Frmak, at an altitude of 235 ft. (730 m.); since 1933, on the Ankara-Zonguldak railway (105 m. (174 km.) from Ankara). The town was once the capital of a sandjak (liewâ) of the eyâlet of Anadolu; after the Tanûmâdî, it became the capital of a sandjak of the wilâyât of Kastamonu; under the Turkish Republic, it is the capital of a wilâyât, united with the cornice Candarî, Çerkeș, and Ilgaz/Kochar). It was known even in antiquity as a fortified place, and was occasionally used by the Byzantines as a place of exile. Later it again gained importance because of its impenetrable fortress in the battles with the Arabs and the Turks. The Umayyads repeatedly advanced as far as Tanûmâdî, and their raids were sometimes even more disastrous.

They did this in 937/1722-12 (al-Tabari, ed. de Goeje, ii, 1236; Ibn al-Athîr, ed. Tornberg, iii, 457; al-Ya’qûbî, ii, 350 who calls the town (Hasal-I Hâdîd), in 1097-228 (al-Ya’qûbî, ii, 395), and in 1147/1732-3 (Bar Hebraeus, Ketâbi de Mešhêbanû Zahdâ, ed. Bruns and Kirsch, ii, 125; compare also al-Tabari, ii, 1561, and Theophanes under the year 6224).

When the Byzantines sacrificed the eastern border provinces as a result of their defeat near Malazgîrd (Manzikert) in 1071, the Sâlûdîs and the Dânishmendîs divided the loot. The former settled after a short intermission in Iznik and Konya, the latter spread over the northern half of Asia Minor from Amasya to Kastamonu. Çankırî is mentioned as being among the conquests of the first Dânishmand in 468/1075-76 (Hasan b. ‘All Tolkîd (?), Ta’rîkh-I Al-Î Dânîmand, in Hasun Husaîn Al-Î, Amasya-tarlâhi, Istanbul 1322, ii, 286 ff.; Hezarfenn, Ta’rîkh al-tawzîrî, in ZDMG, 30, 470). In 1101, an army of crusaders left Constantinople for the region of the Dânishmand-oghlu, in order to rescue Bohemund of Antioch whom these had captured at Malatya and imprisoned in Nîskàr. The army conquered Anadan (Manzikert) in 1134, and the former capital of Salmân (praesidium Gangara), but the attack failed, and shortly afterwards the army was completely routed near Amasya by the united Sâlûdîs and Dânishmandîs (Albert of Aix, i, VIII, c. 8; Ibn al-Athîr, ed. Tornberg, x, 203; cf. ZDMG, 30, 476; Chalandon, Les Compagnes, i, 224 ff.). The Comnine emperor John conquered Çankırî in 1134, with the aid of heavy siege-weapons, after he had attacked it without success in the previous year (Chronicle of Niketas, i, 6, and particularly John Prodromos; see Chalandon, op. cit., ii, 84 ff.); but shortly after the emperor’s departure, the fortress was recaptured by the Dânishmandîs, never to return to Byzantine rule.

Subsequently we find Çankırî in the hands of the Sâlûdîs of Konya (cf. Chalandon, passim). After the collapse of the Rûm Sâlûdî empire, (Anatólia), Çankırî became the residence of the region and the capital of the Sâlûdîs of Kastamonu, and was known as the capital of the Sâlûdîs of Kastamonu (Kandârî). For a short time the town formed part of the empire of the Ottoman Murâd I (this according to ‘Azîz Astarbâdî, Bezm u resm), later it was taken from the Candar-oghlu by Bâyazid I in 795/1392-93 (according to Nefîrî) or in 798/1394-95 (according to Aşikpâşahzâde, and the anonymous chronicles; Sa’d al-din, i, 159), together with the greater part of their possessions.

In 1401, Timûr returned them and finally, in 1422/1439, they were annexed by Meşhêmed I (Aşikpâşahzâde, Istanbul edition, 88 ff.; ed. Giese, 79; Leunclavius, Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum, Frankfurt 1551, col. 475; von Hammer’s statements, GOI, i, 70, are based on a misunderstanding). During the subsequent peaceful period under Ottoman rule, Çankırî is very much in the background. Historians hardly mention it, though Ewîlyâ Çelebi (Seyhâhat-nâmê, iii, 250 f.) and Kâtîb Çelebi (Dişkân-nâmê, 645), have left detailed descriptions of the town.

The first mention by an European visitor dates from the years 1553-55, and is by Dernschwam (in his Tagebuch einer Reise nach Konstantinopel und Kleinasiern, ed. Babiner, Munich 1923, 196). There is an eye-witness description by Ainsworth, almost 300 years later. The town has also been visited and occasionally described by Russian and German travellers in Asia Minor.

The fortress, which had been attacked by Arabs,
Danishmendids, Byzantines and Crusaders, is now in ruins. The only surviving monument is the grave of Karatekin, who was the founder of the first Danishmendid prince, and is now revered as a saint. The prehistoric cisterns on the castle hill, which are described in detail by both Ewliyâ Celebi and Kâtib Celebi, have not yet been closely investigated, nor has the "Megâl Tağî" (Taşh Megdîdî), a monastery of the Mawlawî Dervishes. This has inscriptions, which, according to what Ainsworth was told, date from the time of the Arab Caliphs. Some of the mosques are said to date back to Byzantine times (cf. Cuinet). The main mosque was built by Suleymân I in 996/1589-90.

The extensive salt-mines near Maghâra, 2 hours south-east of Çankîrî (Cuinet, iv, 447, and Mârcrker), were already famous in Byzantine times. Their product was known as rayyap7)v6v <5cXa<; (Nikolaos Myrepsos, at the end of the 13th century, in Du Cange, Glossar. ad scriptores med. et inf. Grac.). Even today this salt is still being mined in the same way (at a rate of 3000 to 5000 tons a year). The great earthquakes which have repeatedly shaken the town (the most recent in February 1944), were already mentioned in mediaeval times. Al-Kazwînî, Āhâr al-Bîlâtî, ed. Wustenfeld, 368, mentions one such catastrophe which destroyed the town in August 1959.

According to Texier, the number of inhabitants in Çankîrî in the middle of the 19th century was 16,000, predominantly Muslim. Amongst the inhabitants there were not more than 40 Greek families. In 1859, Tshihatsheff estimates about 18,000 houses, 40 of them Christian. For the end of the 19th century, Cuinet gives the following figures: 15,632 inhabitants, amongst these 738 Greek and 472 Armenian. The Sâlimâne of Kastamonu gives the number of inhabitants as 11,200, Leonhard (1903) as 25,000 in 5000 houses, J. H. Mordtmann about 30,000 in 5000 houses, amongst these 150 Greek and 50 Armenian families, who probably left after the Second World War. The 1930 census gave the following figures: the town of Çankîrî 14,161, the kasas 11,873, the town of Çankîrî 5000 houses, amongst these 150 Greek and 50 Armenian families, who probably left after the First World War. In the 1950 census the number of inhabitants was 14,161, the houses 11,873. The number of the inhabitants was already mentioned in mediaeval times. Al-Kazwînî, Āhâr al-Bîlâtî, ed. Wustenfeld, 368, mentions one such catastrophe which destroyed the town in August 1959.

Bibliography: (apart from that already mentioned in the article): Ritter, Erdkunde, xviii, 353 ff.; Le Strange, 158; W. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor, London 1890, 258; Pauly-Wissowa, vii, 707 and 1258; W. F. Ainsworth, Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, London 1842, i, 109 ff.; Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, 617; v. Flottwell, Au dem Stromgebiet des Qyzyl-Yrmaq (Halys), in Petermanns Mitteilungen, Suppl. no. 114 (1895), 38 f. and 50 (with a plan of the ruins of the fortress); G. Mârcrker in Zeitschrif der Ges. f. Erdkunde, 34 (1899), 368 f. and 372; R. Leonhard, Paphliagonia, Berlin 1915, 66 and 120 (with illustrations); V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1894, IV, 531 ff.; the yearbooks (Sâlimânes) of the wildyr of Karatekin since 1286/1289-70; IA, iii, 357-359 (Besim Darkot). (J. H. Mordtmann:[Fr. Tarschner])

CANNANORE [see KANNANUR]

ÇAO (Çao Persian transcription of Chinese 仛au), name given to the paper currency that was in circulation in Iran for about two months in the autumn of the year 693/1294. The Çao was introduced at the instigation of the Chief and Finance Minister of the Ilkhan Gaykhatu (1291-95), Şâîr al-Dîn Ahmad b. Ābîd al-Razzâk Khâlid or Zindânî, following the example of China, and was issued for the first time, according to Râshd al-Dîn, on the 19th Shawwât 693/13th September 1294, according to Wâsâfî and others somewhat later, namely in Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da’ 22nd September 1293/12th October at Tabriz and other provincial capitals where it was manufactured and distributed by the so-called Çao-Khânas, specially constructed for the purpose at considerable expense.

This new currency however met with very great resistance and the result was that trade and industry came to a standstill, the towns became depopulated and the country headed towards complete ruin, so that after two months the paper money had to be withdrawn from circulation in favour of the old coins.

The Çao, made of the bark of the mulberry-tree, was oblong in shape and, in addition to some Chinese signs, bore the shahîda. Underneath this was the name "Irînîn tûrûc" (transcription of "Rûn-êen tûrûc" = meaning 'very costly pearl') which had been given to Gaykhatu by the Tibetan Bakshîhs, and, inside a circle, the designation of the value: one (or one half) up to ten dinârâs. Besides this, these "bank-notes"—according to the continuator of the work of Bar Hebraeus—bore the red impression of the state seal in jade (the Altamgâ), granted by the Great Khan to the Îlkâhs. As regards the method of glossing, it may be assumed that this was done by means of wooden blocks.

Bibliography: K. Jahn, Das iranische Papiergeld, AR, x (1938), 308-340; B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, 1955, 88-89, 301-302, and the sources and publications listed in these two works. (K. Jahn)

ÇAPANÂGHULLARI [see Supplement and DEBREÞ]

ÇAPAR (Çâpar), the eldest son of Kâidî [q.v.] and great-grandson of the Mongol Great Khan Ögedey (Uk/gatay: Ñegâna: 1229-41), after his father's death in 700/1301 and his own succession to the throne on the in the spring of 702/1303 (Dîanâmî Kârâhî in W. Barthold, Turkestan, Russian ed. i., 1900, 138), he fought in the beginning continually against the claims of Kubilây's successors upon the Great Khanate, considering it his own prerogative as one of Ögedey's descendents, who were also called as protectors of the genuine Mongol tradition. In August 1303, together with Duwa, the Khan of Câshâs'f's Ulus, he submitted to the Great Khan (the emperor of China) by means of an embassy to Kândalîgîh (Peking). Thereby a plan for a Mongol federation with full freedom of movement for trade was to be realised. In September 1304 negotiations were made from China concerning it with the îlkhânî Ödâyâtî [q.v.]. In fact, the federation did not last: with the aid of Chinese troops Duwa forced Çapar out of his Ulus in West and East Turkestan, and succeeded him there. After Duwa's death (1306-7) Çapar attempted to regain these provinces, but could not hold his own against Duwa's son KebeK (Turkish KepeK = "bran", cf. Ibn Bâjtîjî, ii, 392) and was forced in 1309 to flee to China and the court of the Great Khan. Thereupon a Kurîltay in the summer of 1309 confirmed the almost complete disintegration of Ögedey's Ulus, whose inheritance was for the most part taken over by the Çâshâtsây line (cf. the article Ögedehâ), II, beginning, and III. According to Râshd al-Dîn (ed. Blochet, Dîjâmî al-tawarîhî, ii, 9), Çapar looked "like a Russian or a Circassian", apparently no longer of pure Mongol stock.

CASTILE [see RAGTALA]
CASTOR GYMNANI [see KASR VANI]
CATALDJA (Catalca, ancient Metra), 1. 4° 08' N, 28° 25' E. Thracian capital of the most rural of the 17 ßada's in the wilayet of Istanbul, 56 km. by asphalt road and 71.41 km. by rail (the station lies 2.3 km. NE of town). WNW of Istanbul, Catalca borders the Kara su (ancient Athryas) stream at an altitude of 255 feet near the centre of a range of hills forming the backbone of the fortified "Catalca Lines" extending from the Black Sea at Karaburun to the Marmara at Büyükkemke. Catalca was taken by the Byzantines under the advance to Thessaloniki, in the year 1909. In November 1912 retreating Turkish troops repulsed the Bulgarians at Catalca. The fortifications were reconditioned but saw no action in the 1914-18 and 1939-45 World Wars. Since 1950, Turkish forces have been substantially withdrawn with adverse economic consequences for the district. Some promise of producing oil was found, but a proposed atomic reactor may counteract this trend. In 1955 the population was growing fast with 5,354 in town and 58,988 in the kasas 3 other nahiye's of Büyükkemke, Hadimköy (Boyabak) and Karacaköy, and in its 67 villages. Population pressure on the land area of 1684 sq. km. is causing litigation. The district produces beets, sunflowers, grape, vegetables and cattle. In 1953 there were only four small industries, some 30 shops, 2 elementary and 1 middle schools in Catalca.

2. Catalca is also the name of the city of Pharsala, a town and ßada? in Thessaly 60 km. SE of Trikala, captured in 799/1397 by Bayazid I (Hammer-Purgstall, i, 250). According to Şahms ad-Dîn Sâmi (Kâmus al-Âłam, ii, 1867) it had a population of 5,000 under Ottoman administration and boasted 2 mosques, a madrasa, some shops, 2 elementary and 1 middle schools in Catalca.

3. Catalca is also the name of a village in the ßada? of Nizip (Nisib) in the wilayet of Gazi Anteb (Ghâzî 'Aytâb). The word Çatal or, fork (cf. Türkçesini Tarama Sûrlûgû, i, 1943 ii, 213) figures in 82 names of inhabited places in Turkey (Türkîye'de Mezkûr Yerlerı Kılavuzu, i, Ankara 1946, 240-1).


CASTILE [see RAGTALA]
CASTOR GYMNANI [see KASR VANI]
Catalyja — Cawgan

As follows: "the object is to get the ball through the opposing side's posts, which are at the end of the field," Chardin (approx. 1675) described the game as such.

In the 18th century, after the wars against the Khanate of Khwarizm, a proportion of them was driven off to the north-west of Khiwa, a proportion of them was driven off to the north-west of Khiwa, another proportion was driven off to the south-west of Khiwa, and a third proportion was driven off to the south-east of Khiwa. A proportion of them was driven off to the south-east of Khiwa.

The Turks used it as a synonym for "sawlad[ari]," a word which means a court usher or mace-bearer.

It is found in various literary texts many more could be added, but it suffices to mention the references to Firdawsi (tr. Mohl, v, 274), but in both texts. Omniz is replaced by his father Shähpur. Quatremère's detailed and learned note provides many quotations: from Cinnamus, on the popularity of "spalovoin" in Byzantium (122); from Abu Shama, on its suitability for keeping soldiers and horses in good physical condition; from various other writers (its popularity with the Mongols, Khurasan, and the rulers of Egypt) to an English version (1826-28); from the Persian, to a French and an English translation of the Persian work.

Some 25,000, in the Nukhus area (Austro-Baluchistan). [See: TURKMEN]. (Eo.)

The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction. The game originated in Persia, and was generally played on horseback, though sometimes on foot (cawgan "piyada bazi"); also used for any stick with the end bent back, particularly those for beating drums. The cawgan is not the same as the "mallem," which is a hardwood sledge-hammer. According to Quatremère (Mamluks, i, 123), the "sawladjan," a bent stick, was used for mall (polo), and the "dshkah (cawgan)," with a hollow scooped out of its end, for rackets; but Van Berchem (C.I.A. Jerusalem-ville, publ. FFAO, 1923, 269, n. i) raises the objection that al-Kalbashandi did not make this distinction.

In certain religious sects and orders (e.g., Yazidil and Rifa'i), the title "cawgan" corresponded to a grade in the hierarchy of the sect. There were also "cawgans" in the guilds, where they were responsible for seeing that the rulings of the Guild Council were enforced.


Cawdors (or Daulvdur), a Turco-Mongol tribe, the first settlers of which came to Khwarizm in the 16th and 17th centuries, the bulk following in the 18th century. After the wars against the Khânete of Khiva, a proportion of them was driven off to the Mangälahk peninsula, whence some clans emigrated to the steppes of Stavropol'. Part of the tribe subse-
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CAWGAN — CAY

Tea appears to be mentioned for the first time in an Arabic text by the author of the Aḥkâr al-Ṣin wa'l-Hind (ed. and transl. by J. Sauvaget, 18), under the form sâkîb, whereas al-Birûnî, Nuhbât fî Aḥkâr al-Ṣîn, ed. Krenkow, in MMA, i, 1955, 388, calls it sâkîbât and correctly identifies it as having been introduced into Europe towards the middle of the 16th century by the Dutch East India company; but it is only in the middle of 17th century that its use spread, particularly in England.

In Morocco, the first mention of tea dates back to 1700. It was a French merchant, with business contacts in the Far East, who introduced it to the sultan Moulay Isâlmâ (1672-1727). For a long time this commodity remained rare and expensive. At first the use of tea was known only to the bourgeoisie, but it afterwards spread to all classes of society. In Morocco mint tea has become the national drink. Its properties, and the ceremonies of its preparation and consumption have been the subject of several poems in Arabic and Berber; at the court of the sultans of Morocco a special corps of officials, called mûdîn iṭây, was formed to prepare it.

In Morocco, in Mauretania, and in the departments of Oran and Alger, the name of tea is iṭây. Tunisia and the department of Constantine use tây. In Libya shâhî is found; this perhaps represents the Eastern Arabic shâyi', contaminated, by popular etymology, with the root sh-i-n. The radical šây certainly seems to come from the English 'tea', but with the pronunciation (fei) which this word had until about 1720, when it rhymed in fact with 'obey' and 'pay' (cf. Yule, Hobson-Jobson, 1903, 905). It is known that it was English merchants who introduced the use of tea in Morocco, and that for a long time they kept a virtual monopoly on its importation.

As for the prefix a-, which figures in western Maghribi names, it must represent the Berber definite article in the masculine singular. Indeed, in Morocco and Tlemcen, its presence dispenses with the use of the Arabic definite article. Therefore the word iṭây was probably borrowed through Berber; it is established that in the 17th century the principal centres for importation were Agadir and Mogador, which are situated in Berber-speaking country. (For Cay and Cawgdn in Persia and Central Asia, see Supplement.)

Bibliography: J. L. Millet, Origine et développement de la consommation du thé au Maroc, in Bulletin économique et social du Maroc, xx (1957),
CECENS, name given by the Russians to a Muslim people living in the valleys of the southern tributaries of the Sunja and Terek Rivers in the Central Caucasus (native name = Nakhêlo or Veynakhl).

The Cecens belong to the linguistic family of the Ibero-Caucasian peoples; their language forms with Ingush, Batzbi and Kistin, a special group rather close to that of the Dâghîstân languages.

The Cecens are the descendants of autochthonous Ibero-Caucasian tribes which were driven back and kept in the high mountains, between the pass of Daryal and the valley of Sharo-Argun, by the Alains. Nearly all their history until the 18th century is unknown; we know only that it is in the 16th century that their tribes of shepherds began to emigrate into the piedmont which today forms the whole of their country only from the 17th century, both a little before the arrival of the Russians.

Sunni Islam of the Hanafi school penetrated into their country only from the 17th century, both through Dâghîstân and Crimea, but until the middle of the 18th century it remained rather superficial; it was firmly implanted only at the end of the century thanks to the influence of the Nakshbandis. Among their western neighbours, the Ingush [q.v.], it was implanted still later, in the first half of the 19th century. At the beginning of the 20th century some traces of animism still persisted (cult of the patron spirit of the clan).

At the time when the first Russian detachments appeared, the Cecens were divided into clans, of which some were grouped together in tribes: Mêlk, Ikeri, Aujh, Kist, Nazran, Karabulakh, Ghalbay (this last under another name). The term “Cecn” was applied by the Russians to the whole of these tribes in the middle of the 18th century from the name of the “Cecn” aul on the river Argun where, in 1732, there occurred the first combat between a Russian detachment and the natives. The Russian advance toward the south began in the middle of the 18th century and was accelerated after the annexation of Eastern Georgia in 1801; it was slow and methodical, marked by the construction of fortresses, the establishment of Cossack colonies and the destruction of the villages of the natives, who were driven always back toward the high mountains. The Cecens offered fierce resistance to the Russian advance. A popular movement of the Shâykh Mansûr Vahlurma, burst out in 1785 and was crushed only in 1791. In the first half of the 19th century the Cecen country became the principal bastion of the imâmate of Shamîl (cf. Dâghîstân and Shamîl), and the Russian domination was imposed only in 1859; it was moreover marked by frequent revolts, of which the most important, that of “Albek Aldamov of Simsiri in 1857, lasted a year and spread to all the Cecen country. In 1865, an important group of Cecens, the Aukh, joined into one, the Cecen-Ingush Autonomous Region. On 30 November 1912 upper Cecenya was set up as the Cecen Autonomous Region. On 7 July 1924 the Ingush country situated to the west of Cecenya was, in its turn, transformed into the Ingush Autonomous Region (cf. Ingush).

On 4 November 1929 the lower country with Grozny was included in the Cecen Autonomous Region. In January 1934, the two autonomous regions were joined into one, the Cecen-Ingush Autonomous Region, which was transformed on 5 December 1936 into the Cecen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. On 25 June 1946 a decree of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. abolished the Republic, and Cecen and Ingush peoples were deported to Central Asia (the same decree affected other Caucasian peoples: Balkars, Karâcas [qq.v.]). On 9 January 1957 a new Supreme Soviet decree rehabilitated the deportees and re-established the Cecen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, authorizing the survivors to return to their country between 1957 and 1960.

At present, the Cecen-Ingush A.S.S.R. (area 19,300 sq. km.) has a total population of 700,000 inhabitants (1958), the Cecens representing as yet only a minority.

The census of 1939 counted 407,724 Cecens, of whom roughly 30,000 were in the A.S.S.R. of Dâghîstân and the rest were in their own Republic; the Ingush numbered 92,074 in the western part of the Republic (the high valleys of Asa, Sunja, and Kambileya). The capital Grozny, a big industrial centre (226,000 inhabitants in 1926), is an almost entirely Russian city.

The Cecen-Ingush now form a “nation”, divided into two “nationalities” very closely related to one another. In fact, nothing distinguishes these two peoples except the fact that the Ingush have taken only a negligible part in the Shamîl movement. They speak very similar languages, Ingush being simply a dialect of Cecen. The Cecen language properly speaking is divided into two dialects—Upper Cecen (or Cuberloy), spoken in the mountains, and the Lower Cecen of the plains; this latter, the basis of the written language, is endowed with a Latin alphabet (after a fruitless attempt to transcribe Cecen into Arabic characters). For its part, Ingush was established as a written language in 1923 (based on the Lower Ingush dialect of the plains) and also transcribed into Latin characters. In 1934, after the fusion of the two Autonomous Regions, Cecen and Ingush, the two written languages were unified into a single language “Cecn-Ingush”, written
from 1938 in a Cyrillic alphabet. At present, they are once more officially separated. The new Cecen-Celebi literature has developed only during the Soviet period.

Bibliography: N. E. Yakovlev, Voprost isleniya celenyi tev i inguchey, Grozny 1927; A. R. Berge, Celenyi i celebtsy, Tiflis 1899; and Shamil i Celenyi, in Voyennyi Sbornik, St. Petersburg 1859, ix; D. M. Mal'as'ov, Celenno-Ingushskaya dialektologicheskaya i put' razvit'ia Celenno-Ingushskogo literaturnogo (pol'ennogo) yazyka, Grozny 1941; and Kulturnaya rostov v Celen' i Ingushskii v svyazi s umnyashchit'ia al'farov, Vladikavkaz 1928; A. Dirr, Einführung in das Studium der Kaukaussprachen, Leipzig 1928.

CELEBES, one of the four larger islands in Indonesia. With the exception of the north-eastern peninsula, which was one of the areas of early Christianization, and the south-western peninsula, where Islam also started its penetration in the 16th century, the island remained inaccessible to the influence of foreign religions until the second half of the 19th century. A new Christian community then came into existence in central Celebes, inhabited by the Jo-Radja. It is said that this community suffered a great deal from the military activity of the Där-Aslam mamluks in southern Indonesia became a republic in 1949; reliable information is lacking, however. The Muslim community of the south-western peninsula is not very different from those elsewhere in Indonesia; some details on its history are given under MAKASAR. For a general discussion of Indonesian Islam cf. DJAWA. (C. C. Berg)

CELEBÎ (Turkish), 'writer, poet, reader, sage, of keen common sense' (thus Muhammad Kho'î in Khudâ-i 'Abbâzî, in P. Melioranskiy, Zapischnik Vostochnogo Otdeleniya, xv, 1904, 042; similarly Ahmed Wefîk Pasha in Lelhî-i Ul'umami, i, 1876, 482). It is a term applied to men of the upper classes in Turkey between the end of the 13th and the beginning of the 18th century, as a title given to poets and men of letters, but also to princes trained in administrative work, Woldemar, Frh. von Tiessenhausen in the Zapiski, i, 124; ii, 124; W. Barthold also favours this view (in which case the development would be opposite to that of the Iranian word khvadhai 'lord' > khuda 'god'); 6) Manskuroglu (see bibliography) is undecided, but he does not believe in the foreign origin of the word. — Several of these attempts at a derivation (1, 2, and 4 in particular), seem impossible and far fetched. Though the word is apparently of Anatolian origin, there is no evidence of its Greek descent [as—on the contrary—E fendî]. It seems doubtful whether Ibn Battûta (ed. Defrémery and Sanguinetti, ii, 270), means 'Greek' in his mention of the meaning of the word Celebi 'in the language of Rûmî' (thus W. Barthold), or whether this is merely a reference to its use in Anatolia. To the etymology is by M. Mansuroglu, in the Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, xxvii, 1955, 97/99; E. Rossi in Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı, Belleten 1954, 11/14; K. H. Mevges in Supplement to Word VII, Dec. 1951, 67/70. Concerning the Greek sources of the word, G. Moravcsik, Byzan-
tino-Turcica, Berlin 1958, ii, 311.

(Barthold—[B. Spuler])

CELEBÎ EFENDÎ [see İLAL-EL-DIN, M. MAStA] CELEBÎ-ZADE (or KUCUK CELEBÎ-ZADE) Ismâîl Asîm Efendi, 18th century Ottoman historian, poet and shaykh-al-islâm. His familiar name (labîrah) derives from his father Kucuk Celebi Mehmed Efendi (Sügîl-i Ottalîmî, iv, 205) who was "foreign secretary" (râfî ul-kâtib) for about ten months in 1108-09/1699 (Râşid, Ta'rikh, ed. 1822, ii, 387, 421). He was born in Istanbul, and, from the statement of Müslüm-zade Süleyman Efendi (Tâbî-i Khatîfâmî, Istanbul 1928, 1928, 650) that he was 77 years of age at the time of his death, his birth should be fixed about 1096/1685 about 1096/1685. His contemporary, Sâkîm Efendi (Tâbî-i Khatîfâmî, Istanbul, 1315, 452) says that he was given the grade of muallim by Faqihülâî Efendi in 1108/1666-97, but, as M. C. Baysun suggests (İA, fasc. xxv, 371b), this was...
probably an honorary degree conferred on the boy of twelve out of respect for his father's position—according to a contemporary Simonistic saying "zahhak al-talâm." (cf. Na'mâ, Ta'rîkh, ed. 1280, vi, Supp., 6-7. It is probable that the mustâskilân of Sêlim's text should be corrected to mustâskilân, "in anticipation"). His teaching career, all of which was passed in Istanbul, began in 1120/1708 at the madrasa of Kenân Paşa, from where he advanced to the Dizdâriyye (1125/1715), the Ahmed Paşa in Demir Kapi (1130/1718), the Ārifîyye (1131/1719) and finally (1135/1723) the madrasa founded by his father-in-law, the hâdî 'ashîr 'Omer Efendi, in Mollâ Gürânî (Sâlim, op. cit. and îsmâ'îl 'Âshîm, Ta'rîkh, ed. 1282, 110). On 28 Râmâdân 1135/5 April 1723, he was appointed official historiographer (waâkkîrnu'us) in succession to Râgîb Efendi, which post he filled until about 1143/1730 when his patron, the Grand Vizier İbrahim Paşa, was sacrificed to the rebels and his favourites driven from office (cf. Âhadîm III). In 1145-6/1732-3, he was hâdî of Yeâli Shehr (Larissa in Thessaly); in 1152-53/1738-9, of Bursa; in 1157-58/1744-45, of Medine; and in 1161-62/1748-49, of Istanbul. His next appointment did not come until 1170/1757, when he was made hâdî 'ashîr of Ahi Evranî Efendi, and on 5 Dhu 'l-Ka'ba 1172/30 June 1759, he attained the ultimate dignity of zahhak al-talâm, in which office he died after eight months (28 Dümâdâh II 1173/16 Feb. 1760). He was buried next to his father-in-law, 'Omer Efendi, in the courtyard of Mollâ Gürânî (Hâfiz Huseyn Efendi Ayyânsârîîî, Hâdîkât al-Dîvânîîîî, Istanbul 1921, i, 208).

His history (twice printed as a supplement to that of Râgîb: ç. 1153 and 1252) covers the period 1135-4/1722-29, and although, even by the standards of the official histories, notably superficial and frequently little more than a court chronicle, it has some of the virtue of its defects in being a wholly characteristic expression of the frivolity and complacency of the so-called Tulip Period of Ottoman history. In his verse he uses the poetic signature (mâhkâm) of İbrahim and while his literature as a poet is overshadowed by such great contemporaries as Neddîm, Seyyid Webbi and Neylî, nevertheless, his dîvân (lithographed, Istanbul 1268), with its graceful language and delicate sententiousness, has always been regarded as one of the masterpieces of this period in which Ottoman dîvân poetry finally develops its own recognizably authentic voice. His abilities and range as a prose writer can be better appreciated from his collected letters (Münhekebât: Istanbul 1268) than from his history, where he deliberately models his style on that of Râgîb Efendi. His only other surviving work is a trans-lation from the Persian commissioned by Dâmâd İbrahim Paşa of the Şefîret-nâme-i Cen of Ghiyâh al-Dîn al-Nââkî (Browne, iii, 397; M. F. Köprülü, MTM, ii (1332), 351-68) under the title Jadîdât al-Lahfî (ed. 'Âli Emîrî, Istanbul 1332). A Mawlid risâless attributed to him by Mûstâkim-zâde (op. cit., 651) is otherwise unknown.

Bibliography: The only reliable biographical information is in the notice by M. C. Baysun already referred to (but on 372a, 1, 3, for cemîsîyel-vel ed ed, after Sâlim, Dümâdâh II). Babinger, 293, is not a entirely exact translation of the Sîdîrî-i Oltîmîni, i, 366, which itself contains extracts from Beşâr Efendi, Emir Mânî al-Din, Ayînî-Alârî, Zafrûl (Addâl-i Zuaraâ, Istanbul 1314, 43 and Rif'at Efendi, Dawhat al-Mesâlihâth, Istanbul n.d., 101 derive from Wâsîf, Ta'rîkh, Istanbul 1270, i, 179. In addition to Sâlim, op. cit., Şâhîf Qâdirî, Millet, 'All Emîrî, 1775, 197 and Râmî (Addâl-i Zuaraâ, Millet, 'All Emîrî, 1762), 173 a contemporary opinion of his poetry. Apart from the short article of 'Ali Dînîbî, Haydî, i, no. 20 (1927), 3-5, no study has been made of his dîvân, which, moreover, requires re-editing from the Bâyezîd MS., no. 5644, with marginal corrections in his own hand. Sadeddin Nühet Ergun, Türk Şairleri, i, 108-111, contains extracts from some of the sources mentioned above; references to Fatin, von Hammer, Gibb, etc. may be found in Babinger. (J. R. Walsh)

CELEBI ZADE EFENDI [see Şâfî Efendi] CÊNĐERELI [see MIJANDARIL]

ÇEPNI, an Oghuz tribe, which holds an important place in the political and religious history of Turkey, and in the history of its occupation by the Turks. The most intimate muraşîs of Hâdîjî Bektâşi belonged to this tribe, an important branch of which must therefore have been living in the Kirghiz region in the 13th century. In the second half of this century there was another important group of the Çepni in the Samsun region, who in 696/1297 successfully defended Samsun against the forces of the Emperor of Trebizond, and in the 14th century played the chief part in the conquest of the Dânîk (Ordu-Giresun) district; the Hâdîjî Emîrî principality which controlled the Ordu-Giresun region in the 14th century was probably founded by this tribe. At the beginning of the 16th century the region round Trabzon, especially to the west and south-west, was in their hands and was hence called wîlâyîtÇ Çepni after them. From the 16th century onwards they began to penetrate the region east of Trabzon too, where even in the 18th century the Çepni were waging fierce struggles with the local people. Thus the Çepni played a very important role in the conquest and turcization of the Samsun-Rize area.

Important groups connected with this tribe are found in other parts of Turkey too in the 15th and 16th centuries. The largest lived in the Sivas region and practised agriculture. There was another important group among the Türkmen of Aleppo, one branch of which began to settle in the 'Ayntab area in the 16th century; another, generally called wîlâyîtÇ Çepni after them. From the 16th century onwards they began to penetrate the region east of Trabzon too, where even in the 18th century the Çepni were waging fierce struggles with the local people. Thus the Çepni played a very important role in the conquest and turcization of the Samsun-Rize area.

Importantly connected with this tribe are found in other parts of Turkey too in the 15th and 16th centuries. The largest lived in the Sivas region and practised agriculture. There was another important group among the Türkmen of Aleppo, one branch of which began to settle in the 'Ayntab area in the 16th century; another, generally called wîlâyîtÇ Çepni after them. From the 16th century onwards they began to penetrate the region east of Trabzon too, where even in the 18th century the Çepni were waging fierce struggles with the local people. Thus the Çepni played a very important role in the conquest and turcization of the Samsun-Rize area.


CÊREMİSS [see FAKHKHÂR]

CÊREMİSS (native name Mari), people of the eastern Finnish group, living principally in the basin of the Middle Volga to the north-east of Kazan in
the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of the Maris as well as in the neighbouring territories: A.S.S.R. of Tatarstan and of Bashkiria, regions (oblasti) of Ceremish and of Sverdlovsk of the R.S.F.S.R. The total number of Ceremiss reached 481,300 in 1939; they are divided into three distinct groups by their dialects and their material culture.

The Ceremiss of the plains (lugovye) live on the left bank of the Volga, those of the highlands (gornye) on the right bank, and the eastern Ceremiss emigrated in the 18th century in the valley of the river Belaya in Bashkir country.

The Ceremiss descend from the Finnish-Ugrrian tribes of the Volga, subjugated in the 8th century by the Khazar, then, between the 9th and the 13th century, by the Bulgars. It is through the medium of these latter that the Arabs became acquainted with the Ceremiss (under the name of Skirmis). After the destruction of the Kingdom of Greater Bulgaria, the Ceremiss fell under the domination of the Golden Horde, then of the Khânate of Kazan. The ancestors of the present Ceremiss were never converted to Islam, but they submitted, nevertheless, as early as the high Middle Ages, to the indirect influence which we recognise in our own day in certain ritual terms: payrdm (the feast of spring), keremet designating the spirit of the forests (from karda = miracle).

Conquered by Russia in the 16th century, the Ceremiss were from that period very strongly marked by Russian culture and, in the 19th century, the majority were officially converted to orthodox Christianity. At the end of the 19th century, only the Ceremiss of the eastern group remained Animists (the Ci-marises).

From the outset of 1905 to the October Revolution and even beyond, one notes among the Ceremiss living in contact with the Tatars and the Muslim Bashkirs numerous conversions to Islam. It is unfortunately impossible to judge the new influence of Islam on the Ceremiss because the converts generally adopt the language and customs of the Tatars and “Tatarize” themselves.

Bibliography: I. N. Smirnov, Ceremis, Istoriok-Etnograficheskii ocherk, Kazan 1889; and Ocherki drevnii istorii narodov Srednego Povolz'ya i Prikama, in Materiali i issledovaniya po Arkheologii SSSR, no. 28, Moscow 1952; V. Yalkaev, Materiali diya bibliograficheskogo ukazatelya po marxvdeniyu, 1762-1931, Jishkar-Ola 1934. (Cf. Queiiquejy)

CERIGO [see Öôka 4apasi]

CERKES, The name of Cerkes (in Turkish Čerkas, perhaps from the earlier “kerkête”, indigenous name: Adğhe) is a general designation applied to a group of peoples who form, with the Aqbaq [q.v.], the Aboza (cf. Beskeres Aboza) and the Ubsâh, the north-west of Abasgo-Adğhe branch of the Ebro-Caucasian peoples.

The ancestors of the Cerkes peoples were known among the ancients under the names of Ẕwôl, Ḵpërêdzêl, Ẕyɔwu, Ẕywu, etc., and lived on the shores of the Sea of Azov and the Black Sea and in the plains of the Kuban to the south and the north of this river, extending perhaps to the Don.

In the 10th century, the Russians settled in the peninsula of Taman (the principality of Tmutarakan) and entered into contact with the Cerkes, whom their chronicles designate under the name of Kasag (Georgian name = Kachâk, Kasagi in Ossete). From the 13th to the 15th century, the north-west Caucasus was subjected to the Golden Horde and it is after the collapse of the latter that the eastern Cerkes tribes (the present Kabard) began to play a rôle in the history of the Caucasus.

The Kabard princes maintained in the 16th century friendly relations with the rulers of Moscow (the second wife of Ivan IV was a Cerkes princess). In the 17th century the Kabard tribes led the coalition of Caucasian peoples which halted and repulsed the advance of the Kalmiks and from that era, the Cerkes held supremacy which they lost only after the Russian conquest.

Distribution of the Cerkes Tribes. — Before the Russian conquest in the middle of the 19th century, the Cerkes peoples, numbering more than a million, inhabited the north-west Caucasian (country of the Kuban) and a part of the eastern coast of the Black Sea and the peninsula of Taman up to the neighbourhood of the Abghazi.

The principal tribes were:
- The Natoqhan (Natquadj) in the peninsula of Taman and near the estuary of the Kuban.
- The Shapsug, divided into the “Great Shapsug”, on the left bank of the lower Kuban and along the river Afips, and the “Little Shapsug” on the shores of the Black Sea. These two tribes spoke the same dialect; more to the East, in the basins of the tributaries of the river Belava, Pshish and Psekupe lived the largest of the Adğhe tribes: the Abadzekh.
- Before 1864, these three tribes formed 9/10 of the total of the entire population of Western Adğhe tribes. Among the other Western tribes, the most important were the Mokhos on the river Fursu, the Temirgoy (Kemgui, Cengui) between the Laba and the Kuban; the Bjudukh at the confluence of the rivers Pshish and Psekupe lived the largest of the Adğhe tribes: the Abadzekh. Before 1864, these three tribes formed 9/10 of the total of the entire population of Western Adğhe tribes. Among the other Western tribes, the most important were the Mokhos on the river Fursu, the Temirgoy (Kemgui, Cengui) between the Laba and the Kuban; the Bjudukh at the confluence of the rivers Pshish and Psekupe lived the largest of the Adğhe tribes: the Abadzekh.
- The eastern tribes or Kabards (Kaberdey) (cf. Kabarda) lived from the 18th century in the basin of the upper Terek and some of its tributaries. They were divided into two groups: the tribes of the Great Kabarda, between the rivers Malka and Terek (to the west of the Terek) and those of the Little Kabarda (between the Sunja and the Terek, to the east of the latter river.

To these tribes must be added two others who were of non-Adğhe origin but who were in point of fact assimilated by the Cerkes and whose history is indissolubly bound to that of the latter: the Ubsâh [q.v.] and the Aboza (cf. Beskeres Aboza).

After the conquest of the country by the Russians, the greater part of the western Cerkes emigrated in 1864-65 to Turkey and there remained in Russia only a small fraction of them. The last Soviet census (1939) counted only 164,000 Kabards and 88,000 western Adğhe thus distributed.

1. Kabard: The 152,000 in the Kabard-Balkar A.S.S.R. and 7,000 to 8,000 in the two Autonomous Regions of Adğhe and Karaçay-Cerkes (auls Katkhabli, Blečeps and Khodz’). In addition, the census of 1939 counted as Kabards the 2000 Kabard-speaking Armenians of Armavir (territory of Krasnodar) of the Armenian-Gregorian religion, the 2100 “Cerkes of Mozdok” of the A.S.S.R. of North Ossetia who are Kabards converted to orthodox Christianity, and finally a little group (500 to 600) of Kabard-speaking Jews of the district of Mozdok.

2. The Besleney: about 30,000, of whom 20,000 are in the Autonomous Region of Karaçay-Cerkes (this group adopted the literary language of...
the Kabards and is assimilated by the Kabard nation), and 30,000, in the Autonomous Region of Adigue and near Arnavor, who adopted the literary language of the Adigue.

3. — The Lower Adigue: in number about 55,000, principally in the Autonomous Region of Adigue. After the migration of 1864-65, the tribal differences shaded off rapidly, and the scattered elements of the tribes remaining in Russia solidified in an "Adigue Nation" commune. Only the following tribes still conserve some peculiarities of dialect and custom: the Adabzehk, about 5,000 around the auil Khakurinov (their dialect is on its way to disappearance); the Bjedukh, about 12,000 who populate 38 auils to the south of the Kuba and an auil near Arnavor; finally, the Shapsug to the number of 10,000 on the shores of the Black Sea (14 auils to the north and south of Tuapse) with a little inlet in the peninsula of Taman.

Language: With Abkhaz, Ubakh, and, according to some, Abaza (which others consider a simple Adigue dialect), the Cerkes languages form the north-west branch of the Ibero-Caucasian languages. The Cerkes group is divided into several dialects of which two are now literary languages: 1. — Eastern Adigue ("high Adigue") or Kabard, including the Abkhaz and Adjaks, which are little different from one another. The speech of the Great Kabarda serves as the basis of the Kabard literary language used in the Kabardo-Balkar ASSR. and in the Autonomous Republic of the Karachay-Cerkes, transcribed in the Latin alphabet since 1925 (after a trial of the Arabic alphabet in 1924). In 1938, the Latin alphabet was replaced by the Cyrillic. 2. — Lower Adigue (or "K'mir"), including dialects closely related to one another: Bjedukh, Shapsug, K'emirgoy (or Temirgoy), as well as the rest of the Adabzehk and Khakuci dialects. The Bjedukh and K'emirgoy dialects serve as the basis of the Adigue written language used in the Autonomous Republic of the Adigue. The first attempts to give the Adigue a written language trace back to 1855 (handbook of the Adigue language of "Umar Besney"). In 1865, Atakujin and in 1890 Loparinski aimed toward an Adigue Cyrillic alphabet.

Between 1917 and 1920 there were again attempts to give Adigue a script: Domatov worked out an Arabic alphabet and Saltakov modified Lopatinsky's Cyrillic alphabet. Finally, in 1925, Adigue received a Latin alphabet, replaced in 1935 by Cyrillic. From 1925, the linguistic unity of the Cerkes people was broken and the two written languages, Adigue and Kabard, thereafter developed along different lines, in spite of the vain attempt to reunite them in 1930, at the time of the conference of the Committee on the new Latin alphabet at Moscow.

Halfway between Kabard and Lower Adigue is found the Besleney dialect, which belongs to Lower Adigue but is full of Kabard elements.

The written Kabard and Adigue literatures appeared after the establishment of the Soviet regime. The Cerkes had until then only an oral literature, principally of folk-lore, which included two types in particular: the legends of Nartes (mythological-heroic legends) which the Cerkes share in common with some other Caucasian peoples such as the Ossetes, and the heroic-historical songs which Shora-Bekmurzin Nogmov gathered and published since 1931.

Religion. — The Cerkes are Sunni Muslims of the Hanafi school. Islam was brought in the 17th century, to the western Adigue. Penetration was slow and at first reached only the feudal nobility. It is only at the beginning of the 18th century, thanks to the zeal of the K'ahns of the Crimea and the Turkish pashas of Anapa, that Islam was imposed on all of the people, replacing Christianity (introduced as early as the 6th century by Byzantium and, between the 10th and the 12th centuries, by Georgia) and the ancient pagan religion of which one still finds traces among the western Adigues.

Before their conversion to Islam, the Cerkes worshipped agrarian divinities: Shible, god of storm and thunder, Sozerev, protector of the sowings, Khategnash, god of the gardens, etc. The cult of the god of thunder was linked to the worship of trees and sacred groves where, even recently, were offered sacrifices and prayers. A particular cult was dedicated to Tslepeh, god of the blacksmiths and doctors. The Cerkes had neither temples nor clergy; sacrifices were entrusted to the care of an old man elected for life.

Justice was rendered according to the Adigue-Khabza 'idat, a veritable unwritten code of law which governed all Cerkes life and which was adopted by neighbouring peoples more or less subject to the influence of the Cerkes and Adigue (q.v.), Karachays (q.v.), Balkars (q.v.) and Nogays (q.v.).

Social Structure and Customs. — Until the second half of the 19th century, the Cerkes people maintained a very archaic social structure different according to the tribes. The Kabards had a highly developed feudal system; their society, comprising up to thirteen classes, formed several groups clearly differentiated; and the class system was rigid. The Adigues had a sumptuous but more flexible system, similar to that of the western Adigues, with the addition of the Abadzekh, and the Shapsug, which did not have princes. Among them the work class was weak, while that of the Khabz9 was the most numerous and the strongest.

The same feudal system, less rigorous however, existed also among the Adigues and the lower eastern Cerkes tribes (Besleney, Bjedukh, Khutakay). On the other hand, the western Adigue tribes (Natukhay, Shapsug, Abadzekh) did not have princes. Among them the work class was weak, while that of the Khabz9 was the most numerous and the strongest. They are sometimes called the "democratic Adigue tribes", as opposed to the Kabard "aristocratic tribes".

The reasons for this difference are not known. Some think that the western tribes passed the feudal stage in the 16th century after the long struggle which set the Abadzekh, Shapsug and Natukhay against the princes of Bjedukh (battle of Besnik in 1706), thanks also to the action of Hasan Pasha, s e r a s k y of Anapa, who abolished in 1826 the privileges which the nobles of these three tribes enjoyed.

For others, on the contrary, the social evolution toward feudalism had been retarded by several factors, notably the economic influence of the Greek colonies, then the Italian and Turkish. This last opinion seems nearer the truth, because at the beginning of the 20th century one finds among the western tribes a strongly surviving one of the same feudal, clan system which had disappeared among the eastern Adigue. The clan (limekh) was divided into several groups of great patriarchal families (aflak).
which formed in their turn rural communities (posko), autonomously united and independently administered by the councils of the elders. All the Cerkes tribes maintained some customs characteristic of the patriarchal and feudal stages: 1. — blood vengeance in cases of murder, which was a right and an absolute duty for the whole of the clan; 2. — alaikalat, which consisted of having children raised from birth in the families of strangers, often vassals (boys till 17-18 years). Alakalat created a sort of foster brotherhood which served to tighten the feudal bonds and unite the Cerkes tribes; 3. — diverse traditions concerning hospitality, considered sacred. The guest became, by right of protection, a veritable member of the clan of his host, who put his life and his property at the service of his guest. Hospitality was extended even to the exile (abrek or khadjard). If this latter succeeded in touching with his lips the bosom of the mistress of a strange house, he became a member of the family, and the master of the house had to provide for his safety. Among other customs of the clan stage figured the swearing of brotherhood (kunak) by which a man became a member of another clan; 4. — customs concerning marriage. Exogamy inside the clan or the great patriarchal family was strictly observed especially by the Kabards. The kalym (purchase of the fiancee) was universally practised, and could only be avoided by resorting to abduction, a frequent occurrence, in case of refusal by the parents. The pretence of forcible abduction remains an essential rite in the marriage ceremony.

The Cerkes in the Soviet Union.—It was only at the end of the civil war that the Soviet regime was established in the regions inhabited by the Cerkes. In the spring of 1920, first in the country of the Adighe, then in that of the Kabard. Administratively, the Cerkes were divided into three territorial unities: — The Autonomous Region of the Adighe in the basin of the Kuban and its tributaries belonging to the territory (krai) of Krasnodar, formed 27 July 1922 under the name of the Autonomous Region of Adighe-Cerkes, then, on 13 August 1926, under that of the A.R. of Adighe. This territory has an area of 4400 sq. km. and a population of 270,000 people (in 1956), of whom the Adighe represent only a minority. The capital Maikop is a Russian city. — The Autonomous Region of the Kara-chau-Cerkes in the high valleys of the Great and Little Zelenluk belonging to the territory (krai) of Stavropol, which the Cerkes share with a Turkish people (the Karachay [q.v.]). This territory, formed 12 January 1922, was divided, 26 April 1926, into two administrative unities: the Autonomous Region of the Karachay and the national civil district of the Cerkes, elevated 30 March 1928 to the status of Autonomous Region. In 1944 the Karachay were deported and their Autonomous Region abolished, but after their rehabilitation, the Autonomous Region of the Karachay-Cerkes was re-established 9 January 1957. Its area is 14,200 sq. km., and the population, in 1956, was 214,000 people, in majority Russian and Ukrainian. — The Kabard-Balkar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, in the mountainous part of the Central Caucasus. It was formed 1 September 1921 as the Autonomous Region of the Kabard to which the clan or the great patriarchal family was still attached, thus constituting the Kabard-Balkar Autonomous Region, which became on 5 December 1936 an Autonomous Republic. In 1944, following the deportation of the Balkar, the Republic, with the loss of a part of Balkar territory, was renamed the Kabard A.S.S.R. Finally, on 2 February 1957, the Balkar having been rehabilitated and authorized to return to their territory, the Republic became once more the Kabard-Balkar A.S.S.R. Its territory comprises 12,400 sq. km., and its population, in 1956, was 359,000 inhabitants. In 1939, the Kabard, Balkar and other Muslims represented 60% of the population, living mainly in the mountainous areas; Russians and Ukrainians (40% of the population) constitute the majority of the population of the capital Nal'chik (72,000 inhabitants in 1956) and predominate in the plain of Terek.

Bibliography: A very complete bibliography appears in the article by Ramazan Traho, Literature on Circassians in the Caucasus, in Caucasian Review, no. 1, 1955, Munich, 143-162. It included more than 250 titles of works and articles in Russian, in western languages (French, English, German, Turkish, Hungarian, and Polish) and in Cerkes languages dealing directly or indirectly with the Cerkes people. It is sufficient therefore to note here a few recent works:


Ch. Quekvejaj

II. Mamlik period. The Circassians are designated in Mamlik sources as Dirbas or Dirhakhisa (sing. Dirkasi). There are also alternative spellings: Carkas or Carhisa (sing. Carkasi); Shkars or Sharakhis (sing. Shkarskhi) and less frequently Djibraks. Circassia is variously known as bid al-Dirkas, or simply Dirkas and occasionally as Djbal al-Dirkas. According to al-Kalqashandi the Circassians live in poverty and most of them are Christians (Subh al-A'shd, v, 462, l. 5).

The Circassians, who, since the closing decades of the 8th/14th century and up to the end of the Mamlik sultanate (922/1517), constituted the predominant element of Mamlik military society, were quite important in that sultanate from its very inception in the middle of the 7th/13th century. They occupied a strategic place in the Burjyyiya [q.v.] regiment founded by Sulayn Khal'dun (678-685/1279-1290). Whether the decline of that regiment weakened their power or not, is an open
question. The Kipçağ Turks, the ruling race during the first hundred and thirty years or so of the sultanate’s existence, feared them very much because of their ambitious character, haughtiness and inclination to trouble and discord. As a matter of fact the Kipçağs succeeded in nipping in the bud a dangerous military coup of the Circassians during Ramadan-Shawwal 748/December 1347-January 1348 (Sultan Hasan’s reign). These Circassians were the favourites of Hasan’s immediate predecessor, Sultan Hāджişi (747-8/1346-7), who “brought them from all quarters and wanted to give them precedence over the Atrak” (Nudşım, v, 56, ll. 14-20). Sultan Hāджişi’s reign was apparently too short for his plan to be carried out, and thus the Circassians’ rise to power had been postponed for another 35 to 45 years.

It was Sultan Barkūk, himself a Circassian and a member of the Burdiyya regiment, who brought about the final victory of his own race, by the systematic purchase of increasing numbers of Circassian Mamluks and by drastically cutting at the same time the purchase of Mamluks of other races. He is justly called “the founder of Circassian rule” (al-Karim bi-dawlat al-Diārākisā) (Nudşım v, 362). Though he regretted his action towards the end of his life, as a result of a Circassian attempt to assassinate him (Nudşım, v, 353, 398), it was too late for him to change the situation which he himself had created. His son and successor, Sultan Faradż (809-815/1406-1412), paid with his life for his attempt to break the Circassians’ growing power by means of large-scale massacres. As early a writer as al-Kalkashandī, who completed his book in 815/1412, states: “In our time most of the amirs and army have become Circassians ... The Turk Mamluks of Egypt’s existence, so fed in number that all that is left of them are a few survivors and their children” (Subh al-‘Ashā, iv, 458, ll. 16-19). Sultan al-Mu’ayyad Shaykh (815-824/1406-1412), who is described by Ibn Taghrībirdī as resembling the former Mamluk sultans (muluk al-salaf) in that his criterion for the choice of soldiers was not race, but efficiency and courage (al-Manhal al-Safī, iii, fol. 148b, 1-3), failed in his attempt by drastically curbing the power of the Circassians by strengthening the Kipçağ-Turk element in Mamluk military society. But after his death the Circassians regained their supremacy, which they maintained without any serious challenge till the end of Mamluk rule.

Mamluk sources ascribe the rise of the Circassians at the expense of the Kipçağ-Turks mainly to factors existing within the Mamluk sultanate. Equally important, however, were factors prevailing in the Mamluks’ countries of origin. The decline of the Golden Horde during the latter half of the 8th/14th century and the internal wars that broke out there must have greatly influenced the decision of Egypt’s rulers to transfer the Mamluks’ purchasing centre to the Caucasus.

The writers of the Circassian period held, generally speaking, a very high opinion of the Kipçağ-Turks and harshly criticized the Circassians, to whom they ascribed the sultanate’s decline and misery. Typical in this respect are Ibn Taghrībirdī’s following words: Referring to Taşhtamur al-‘Alī, formerly davuddar and later at-tabak al-asāsī (commander-in-chief), who was removed by amirs Berke and (later Sultan) Barḵūk, he says: “The time of Taşhtamur was a flourishing and plentiful time for the Mamluk sultanate under his wise direction, and that condition prevailed until he was removed from office and thrown into prison. In his place came Barḵūk and Berke, who did things in the sultanate from which the population suffers till this day. Then Barḵūk became sole ruler, and turned the affairs of the realm upside-down, and his successors have maintained his policy down to the present. For he gave precedence to the members of his own race over the others, and gave those of his own Mamluks (adjihat) who were related to him large fiefs and high offices while they were still in their minority. This is the main cause of the decline of the realm. Indeed, is there anything more grave than to set the minor over the senior? This is at variance with the practice of the former sultans; for they did not recognise the superiority of any one race. Whenever they found a man who displayed wisdom and courage, they showed him preference and favour. No-one was given office or rank who was not worthy of it” (Manhal, iii, f. 185b, ll. 14-23).

Though this and other statements of the same kind contain a very substantial element of truth, they certainly should not be taken at their face value. The Circassians might have accelerated the process of the realm’s decline, but many of the factors that brought about that decline had already been quite visible in the closing decades of Kipçağ-Turk rule.

The predominance of the Circassian race in the later Mamluk period was much stronger and much more comprehensive than that of the Kipçağ Turks in the early period. Unlike the Kipçağ Turks, the Circassians were very hostile to the other Mamluk races, whom they relegated to a state of political insignificance. No other Mamluk race was so much imbued with the feeling of racial solidarity and of racial superiority as they were. Under their rule, al-qam, meaning the Race, denoted the Circassian race. Similarly al-baeva, the People, was applied only to the Circassians. Of all Mamluk races the Circassians were the only ones who claimed to trace their origin to an Arab tribe, namely, the Banū Ghassān, who entered Bilād al-Rūm with Djabala b. al-Ayham at the time of Heraclius’ retreat from Syria (Ibn Khaldūn, Kitāb al-tahrir, v, 472, ll. 4-18. Ibn Iyāb, v, 193, 1. 3). This legend was not so successful, but it imbibed with the feeling of racial solidarity and of racial superiority as they were. Under their rule, al-qam, meaning the Race, denoted the Circassian race. Similarly al-baeva, the People, was applied only to the Circassians. Of all Mamluk races the Circassians were the only ones who claimed to trace their origin to an Arab tribe, namely, the Banū Ghassān, who entered Bilād al-Rūm with Djabala b. al-Ayham at the time of Heraclius’ retreat from Syria (Ibn Khaldūn, Kitāb al-tahrir, v, 472, ll. 4-18. Ibn Iyāb, v, 193, 1. 3). This legend was not so successful, but it imbued with the feeling of racial solidarity and of racial superiority as they were. Under their rule, al-qam, meaning the Race, denoted the Circassian race. Similarly al-baeva, the People, was applied only to the Circassians.
Crimean Khans built there fortresses such as Coban-kalca, Nawruz-Kirman. Shad-Kirman and settled in them Noghays to defend the country against the Cossacks (Kazafr) and the Kalmyks. Not infrequently the Cerkes co-operated with the Cossacks, too. In his major efforts to subdue the rebellious Cerkes tribes Sâhih Girây Kâhn made five expeditions in Circassia, the first against Kansâwuk, beg of Zhana in 946/1539, the second and the third against Kabartây (Kabard). He forcibly settled on the upper Uşur the tribes who had taken refuge in the high Baksan valley. Later in 954/1549 he made his last expedition against the Khatukây (Sâhih Girây Ta'rîkhî, Blochet, Cat. Man. Turc. supp., 164). But after his death the Cerkes, especially those of Zhana and Psheduh (Pscheduq) sacked the Taman peninsula, threatened Azak (q.v.) and sought the protection of Ivan IV (see Belleten, no. 46, 1946, 364). At the same period the Cossacks, stationed on the Terek, also became a threat to Crimean-Ottoman influence in Kabartây.

The strengthening of Tatar-Circassian relations resulted in the spread of Islam among the Cerkes. But in 1076/1664-65 Ewliyâ Celebi (vii, 708-738) found that many tribes were still pagans and those professing Islam preserved their old religious beliefs and practices. Mehmed Girây IV induced the islamized Circassian farmers to give up pig-raising. But in 1076/1664-65 Ewliyâ Celebi (vii, 708-738) found that many tribes were still pagans and those professing Islam preserved their old religious beliefs and practices. Mehmed Girây IV induced the islamized Circassian farmers to give up pig-raising.

The Ottoman Sultans recognized Crimean sovereignty over the Cerkes, but this did not prevent their sending orders and granting titles to the Circassian chieftains as vassal begs (see Belleten, no. 46, 399). In 978/1570 Selim II wrote to the Czar not to interfere with the Cerkes, his subjects not to interfere with the Cerkes, his subjects (see Belleten, no. 46, 400). In 1076/1665, on his way from Taman to Albrus, Ewliyâ Celebi (vii, 698-768) found first the Noghays in Coban-eli then Şêkeğh tribe (cf. J. Klaproth, Voyage, i, 238) on the Black Sea coast, Great and Small Zhana tribes at the foot of the Hayko mountains, and further east Khatai, Adam, Takak (?), Bolatay, Bozoduk (Pscheduq), Mamshug (?), Beslet (Beslekey), and Kabartay tribes. He also reported that in this period the Kabartay tribes caused the Cerkes tribes in the Kuban and Kabartay regions to retreat to the inaccessable parts of the mountains, while in the west the Cossacks were pressing hard the Cerkes in the lower Kuban and the Tamam peninsula.

When from the early 18th century onwards Circassia was seriously threatened by Russian expansion they became more and more co-operative with the Ottomans. In 1145/1734 they repulsed the Russian forces on the other side of the Kuban. But with the treaty of Kütük-Kaynardja in 1148/1774 the Ottomans recognized the independence of the Crimean Khânate with its dependencies north to the Kuban which in 1770-1771 were ceded by Russia to the Russians. The Kabartay tribes were already in Russian control in 1885/1774.

In order to form a defence line against the Russians on the Kuban the Ottomans were now much interested in Circassia and built or rebuilt the fortresses of Soghudjuk (Sudûjuk), Gelenджik, Noghay, and Anapa in 1566/1572 and tried to reorganize the Cerkes as well as the newly arrived Tatar immigrants from the Crimea and the Noghays from Dobrudja. Perah (Allâh Pasâh) (1106/1746-1156/1786), an administrator of unusual ability, encouraged his Ottoman soldiers to establish family ties with the Cerkes which strengthened Ottoman influence and furthered the spread of Islam among the Cerkes. Anapa rapidly developed as the chief commercial centre of the area. Meantime Sheykh Mansûr, a forerunner of Sheykh Shâmhî (q.v.) in the Çelebi area found a response among the Cerkes for his preaching of the Holy War against the Russians (for this period see the important account of Mehem Hâşim, the Diwân Kâîb of Ferâ' Allâh Pasâh, MS. in Topkapî, Revân, no. 1504, cf. Djewdet, Ta'rîkh, iii, 165-272). During the Ottoman-Russian war of 1201-1206/1797-1799 a Khânate of Kuban was created with the Tatars under Şâhihâzîr Girây while the Cerkes co-operated with the Ottoman army under Battal Huseyin Pasâh and won some successes. But in the end Anapa, the main Ottoman base, fell (1205/1797-1799). With the peace treaty the Kuban river was fixed as the border line between the Russian and Ottoman empires. After the peace, while the Ottomans neglected the area, the Russians formed a line of fortresses along the border and settled large groups of Cossacks there. At the same time they annexed Georgia and, taking control of the Daryal Pass, encircled Circassia. By the treaty of Adrianopole 1245/1829 the Ottomans had to give up their rights on Circassia in favour of Russia. The Circassians, however, sustained a long and fierce struggle against the invaders until 1281/1864 and, according to an Ottoman report, 595,000 Circassians left their country fleeing to the mountains between 1822 and 1864. These were settled in Anatolia as well as in Kûmelî (see BULGARIA). According to the census of 1845 there were in Turkey 66,692 Circassians still speaking their mother-tongue. Under the Ottomans, especially from the 17th century onwards, Circassian slaves occupied an important place in the Ottoman civil and military system and many of them reached high positions in the state (see Ta'rîkh-i Â'î, vols. Istanbul 1291-1293).

the last Ottoman Chamber and the Ankara National Assembly. All three brothers took leading parts in the nationalist guerrilla movement, Edhem distinguishing himself against the Greeks at Salihli and Anz ürünler’ Kâwâ-yî Mehmâdiyye (summer 1919) and in suppressing the anti-Kemalist revolts at Düzce and Yozgad (spring 1920). As Commander of Mobile Forces (Kâwâ-yî Seyyârê), with his brother Tewfik as deputy) he came into increasingly sharp conflict with the regular army command, especially after Tewfik’s appointment as commander of the Greeks at Gediz (24 October 1920) and the appointment of Ismet [İnönü] as commander-in-chief of the Western front. An ad-hoc commission of the National Assembly failed to resolve the dispute. After a decisive clash with the Turkish regulars (Kütahya, 29 December), Edhem, his brothers, and several hundred Circassian guerrillas fled behind the Greek lines (5 January 1921). The Ankara Assembly denounced the brothers as traitors and expelled Reshîd; later the brothers were among the 150 persons (yıizelliêler) excepted from the amnesty provisions of the Lausanne Treaty of 1923. Edhem and Reshîd went to Greece, Germany, various Arab countries, and eventually to ‘Am’mân. In 1935 they were briefly detained there under suspicion of plotting against Ataturk, and in 1940 Edhem was again in ‘Am’mân. A memorial address of his support of the movement of Rashîd ‘Ali in Iraq. He died of throat cancer in Amman because of his support of Rashîd; later the brothers were among the 150 persons (yıizelliêler) excepted from the amnesty provisions of the Lausanne Treaty of 1923. Edhem and Reshîd returned to Turkey after the Democrat Party victory of 1950 and died in Ankara in 1951. Tewfik spent his exile years in Haifa as an oil refinery watchman and died soon after his return to Turkey in 1938.

Bibliography: Tefiik Buylukoglu, ‘Trabaya’dan milli mücadele, Ankara 1955-6, i. 77, 87; ii. 30 f.; [Çerkes Edhem], Çerkes Ethem hadisesi, ed. Cemal Kutay, i-iii, Istanbul 1956; Yunus Nadi, Çerkes Ethem kuvetlerinin ilaneti (Atatürk Kütûphanesi 16), Istanbul 1955; Ali Fuad Cebesoy, Milli mücadele hatiralan, Istanbul 1953, 403-09, 452, 456-70, 497-509; Kemal [Ataturk], Nusuk, 1953 edn., ii. 9, 27-85; OM, xv. 572; D. A. Rustow in World Politics, xi. 513-552 (1959); private communication from Reshîd’s son Arslan in Manshiyya, Jordan, April 1960, courtesy of Messrs. Waleed and Abdel-Kader Tash.

(D. A. RUSTOW)

ÇERKES [see Muhammad Pasha Çerkes] ÇEHERME, a Persian word meaning “source, fountain” which has passed into Turkish with the same sense. It is the name of a market-town in Turkey Minor with a wide and safe natural harbour on the Mediterranean coast, at the entrance to the Gulf of the same name, at the north-western extremity of the peninsula of Ùrula opposite the island of Chíos, 26° 20’ W., 38° 23’ N. It is the chief town of a haza in the vilayet of İzmir. The town has (1950) 3,766 inhabitants; the haza, 12,337. Originally part of the principality (later sandjak) of Aydı’n, it was Ottoman from the time of Bayazid II. There is a citadel with a mosque of Bayazid II, of 924/1508. The present town, which is quite modern, occupies the site of the ancient harbour of Erthêreæ. There are hot springs at Ihidja.

A Russian fleet of nine ships of the line and a few frigates, divided into three squadrons commanded by Spiridov, Alexîs Orlov and Elphinston, which sailed from Kronstadt to aid the rebel Mânuhû, attacked the Turkish fleet at Çêgêmê. The Turkish fleet consisted of sixteen ships of the line besides frigates and small craft and was commanded by the Kapudân-Pasha Hoûsâm al-Dîn with DjezÎrî, Hasan Pasha and Djîfâr Bey. The Russian and Turkish flagships both caught fire at the same moment and those of the crew who could saved themselves by swimming (11 Rabî’ I 1183/5 July 1770). The remainder of the Turkish fleet was set on fire the following night. This defeat of the Turks at Çêgêmê was the fore-runner of the Peace of Kütîk Kaynarca.


(Ç. HUART-[FR. TAESCHNER])

ÇEHMÎZÂDE, Mustafa Râshîd, Ottoman historian and poet, one of a family of ‘ulamâ’ founded by the Kâdisı’Vasker of Rumelia, Çeheim Mehmed Efendi (d. 1044/1634) a grandson of the Shaykh-i’l-Islâm Mehmed Sâlih Efendi, and the son of a bâîli in the Hijâz, he entered the İ’limiyye profession, and held various legal and teaching posts. After the resignation of the Imperial historiographer Mehmed Hâkîm Efendi [q.v.], he was appointed to this office, which he held for a year and a half. He then returned to his teaching career, which culminated in his appointment as mididdirî at the Dâr al-Hadîth of the Sulaymâniyye. His history, which covers the period 1180-8/1766-68, was used by Wâsîf [q.v.]. The Turkish text was first published by Bekir Kütûkoglu in 1959; but a Swedish translation of his account of the war in Georgia in 1180-2/1766-68, with a brief account of some events in Cyprus, Egypt and Medina, was included by M. Norberg in his Turkhâ Rikets Annaler, v, Hernosand 1822, 1416-1424. He died in Şajbân 1184/Nov. 1770, and was buried at Rumeli Hisari.

Bibliography: B. Kütiîkoglu (ed.), Ceymzadê Tarihî, Istanbul 1959; Sidqîli ‘Othmânî, ii. 389; ‘Othmânîl Mücellifleri, iii. 45; Babinger 302.

(B. LEWIS)

CEUTA [see SABTA] CEYLON, The Muslims constitute only 6.63% of Ceylon’s population—roughly 550,000 out of a total of 8,000,000. Of this community, which is multi-racial in its composition, the Ceylon Moors form the most significant element and count 463,953. The Malays are the next in importance. They number 25,464. Nearly all of the remaining groups are of Indian origin; their ancestors first came to Ceylon after the British occupation of its Maritime Provinces during the 18th century.

As a result of the insufficiency of available evidence and the lack of sustained effort and encouragement in respect of the investigations involved, some require a good knowledge of several languages, each of them with a different background and most of them with distinctive characters, the ethnology of the Ceylon Moors has yet remained an inadequately explored field of research. A scientific and comprehensive treatment of the subject would indeed illumine some of the obscure aspects of Ceylon’s history—e.g., the nature and extent of the contacts the Muslims of Ceylon (Moors) had for several centuries with their brethren in faith in lands far and near; the political relations which Ceylon...
through these Muslims maintained with the Muslim World particularly during its period of glory; and the volume of Ceylon's external and internal trade and its geographical distribution during the early centuries. The Muslims of Ceylon were given the appellation of 'Moors' by the Portuguese who first came to Ceylon in 1505 and encountered these Muslims as their immediate rivals to trade and influence. This name, however, has persisted, having gained currency in Ceylon through its wide use by the Colonial Powers concerned, even though this term 'Moors' had been previously unknown among the Muslims themselves. 'Sonahar' was the name familiar to them, deriving its origin from 'Yavanar', an Indian word connoting foreigners especially Greeks or Arabs.

These Moors were the descendants of Arab settlers whose numbers were later augmented by local converts and immigrant Muslims from South India. With regard to the date of the arrival of the first Arab settlers, Sir Alexander Johnstone holds that it was during the early part of the 2nd/8th century. “The first Mohammedans who settled in Ceylon were, according to the tradition which prevails amongst their descendants, a portion of those Arabs of the house of Hāghīm who were driven from Arabia in the reign of Caliph ‘Abd al-Malak b. Marwān, and who, preceding from the Euphrates southward, made settlements in the Concan, in the southern parts of the peninsula of India, on the island of Ceylon and at Malacca. The division of them which came to Ceylon formed eight considerable settlements along the north-east, north, and western coasts of that island; viz., one at Tripsana, one at Alappu, one at Mantotte and Mannar, one at Coodramalle, one at Putlam, one at Colombo, one at Barberyn, one at Point-de-Galle.”

The presence of these settlers is strikingly corroborated by the accounts found in Muslim sources with regard to the proximate cause of the Arab conquest of Sind, during the time of Caliph al-Walid. His governor, al-Hāǧīmī, garrisoned at Jaffna, initiated this conquest, under the leadership of ‘Imād al-Din Muḥammad b. Kāsim, as a punishment for the plunder of the ships that carried the families of the Arabs who had died in Ceylon, together with presents from the King of Ceylon to the Caliph.

It is reasonable to suppose that during the 2nd/8th century and subsequent centuries these Arabs came in increasing numbers and settled down in Ceylon without entirely losing touch with the areas of their origin. Ceylon exercised a special fascination on these seafaring Arabs as a commercial junction of importance which afforded possibilities of profitable trade in pearls, gems, spices and other valued articles. Settlement was encouraged by the tolerant and friendly attitude of the rulers and people of the island.

After the sack of Baghdad in 1258 A.D., Arab activities in the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean diminished considerably. Muslim influence, however, did not thereby cease entirely. It began to emanate from India where by the 7th/13th century the Muslims had firmly established themselves along the western coast and possessed a virtual monopoly of external trade.

It may therefore be concluded that the Muslims of Ceylon began, as a result, to rely on India for their cultural leadership as well as for their commercial contacts. An Indian element was thus added into the composition of the local Muslim (Moors) community. Despite the racial admixture that took place in consequence and the new manners and customs that they acquired, the identity and the loyalty of the community was preserved on account of the cherished memory of its Arab origin and the emphasis that was placed on Islam as the base of its communal structure.

These Muslims were not treated as aliens, but were favoured for the commercial and political contacts with other countries they gained for Ceylon, for the revenue they brought to the country and the foreign skills they secured, e.g., medicine and weaving. Besides they encouraged local trade by the introduction of new crafts, e.g., gem-cutting and of improved methods of transport, e.g., thavalam-carriage-bullocks. They were therefore allowed to establish their local settlements, e.g., Colombo, Barberyn, with a measure of autonomy and with special privileges. The important seaports of Ceylon were virtually controlled by these Muslims (Moors).

With the advent of the Portuguese in 1505 the Muslims (Moors) suffered a change in their status from which they never again recovered. The Portuguese regarded them as their rivals in trade and enemies in faith. The Dutch who superseded the former as rulers of the sea-board were not prepared to give the Muslims even a small share of their commercial gains and therefore promulgated harsh regulations to keep them down. Deprived of their traditional occupation, many of them were forced to take to agriculture. To this could be mainly attributed the concentrations of Muslim peasantry in areas like Batticaloa.

It was during the Dutch period that many of them came to Ceylon, many of them brought by the Dutch as soldiers to fight for them and some as exiles for political reasons. When the Dutch capitulated to the British, the Malay soldiers joined the British regiments specially formed. On their disbandment the Malays settled down in Ceylon. Their separate identity has been preserved by the Malay language which they still speak in their homes. The British did not follow the Dutch policy of proselytization pursued by the Portuguese. Nor were the British so harsh as the Dutch in their economic exploitation of Ceylon. To that extent, under the new rulers, the Muslims fared better. Yet they could not gain any special favour, on account of their irreconcilable attitude towards the ways and culture of the West which they identified with Christianity. This, no doubt, handicapped the Muslims severely in the political, economic and educational spheres but ensured the preservation of their communal individuality despite the smallness of their numbers and the loss of cultural contacts with the Muslim World. As a result till about the beginning of the current century the Muslims of Ceylon remained culturally isolated, educationally backward and politically insignificant.

The Muslims, however, could not continue to ignore the trend of events taking place in Ceylon and India. Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân, who founded in 1875 the Mohamnedan Anglo-Oriental College, was the leader of the Aligarh Movement in India with its emphasis on educational reforms. Arumuga Navalar, who countered the efforts of the Christian Missionaries in North Ceylon, established in 1872 an English school in Mannar. The Buddhist Theosophical Society established an English school in 1856 which finally developed into the present Ananda College, Colombo. In this
year the Anagarika Dharmapala who was actively associated with the inauguration of this Society resigned his Government post to devote his entire time to Buddhist activities. During this period the Muslims of Ceylon had in M. C. Siddi Lebbe a leader of vision who understood the significance of these changes. He had for several years canvassed the opinion of his co-religionists for a new educational approach but he had not been heeded. It was at this time, in 1883, that 'Urfābī Pāshā [q.v.] came as an exile to Ceylon. He provided a powerful stimulus for a reappraisal on the part of the Muslims of Ceylon in regard to their attitude towards modern education and Western culture. All these together culminated in the establishment in 1892 of Al-Madrasa al-Zahira under the patronage of 'Urfābī Pāshā which has since blossomed into Zahira College, Colombo.

The Ceylon Muslims—apart from isolated instances—belong to the Sha'ī school of Sunnīs. In the realm of Law the following special enactments pertaining to them may be cited—the Mohammedan Code of 1806 relating to matters of succession, inheritance etc., Mohammedan Marriage Registration Ordinance no. 8 of 1886 repealed by Ordinance no. 27 of 1929 and now superseded by the Muslim Marriage and Divorce Act no. 13 of 1951 which confers upon the Kadis appointed by the Government exclusive jurisdiction in respect of marriages and divorces, the status and mutual rights and obligations of the parties; the Muslim Intestate Succession Ordinance no. 10 of 1931 and the Muslim Mosques and Charitable Trusts or Wakfs Act no. 51 of 1936 which provides a separate Government Department with a purely Muslim Executive Board. Of these the Mohammedan Code of 1806 is of special value to students of Islamic Civilization, for it contains many provisions which are in conflict with the principles of Muslim law stated in standard text books on that subject. Wherever such conflict occurs the view has been taken that it is the duty of the courts in Ceylon to give effect to the provisions of the Code, which formed the statute law of this country, although they may do so in conflict with well-established principles of Muslim law.

Tamil is the home-language of the great majority of the Muslims of Ceylon. In the Tamil language as spoken and written by the Muslims of Ceylon and of South India, a number of Arabic words are used, which in many cases have displaced their pure Tamil equivalents. The term Arabic-Tamil has therefore gained currency to indicate the Tamil of the Muslims. At one time Arabic-Tamil was written in the Arabic script, ݁, ݂, ݃, ݄, being improvised to denote four Tamil sounds unknown to Arabic, and ݅ being represented by ݆, ݇ by ݈, ݉ by ݊ and ݋ by ݋. Today Arabic-Tamil is being generally written in the Tamil alphabet with or without diacritical marks. The literature of the Muslims of Ceylon has to be treated as part of the Arabic-Tamil literature of South India. Although Ceylon has produced its quota of poets and writers in Arabic-Tamil none has reached the stature of their well-known South Indian counterparts.

The Muslims of Ceylon received their first political recognition in 1889 a nominated seat was assigned to them in the Legislative Council. This representation was increased to 3 elected members in 1924. The Donoughmore Constitution of 1931 abolished communal representation but the Soulbury Constitution of 1947 envisaged a certain measure of communal representation through territorial electorates specially delimited. In the present House of Representatives, elected in 1956, there are 7 Muslim M.P.s among 95 territorially elected members.


ČEYREK, a corruption of Persian چابرهک (čaḫr), has in Turkish the special meaning of a quarter of an hour, or a coin, also known as the bigha, or five piastre piece, originally the quarter of a medjūdlık, issued in 1520/1544 under the reign of 'Abd al-Majid and issued by the succeeding rulers until the end of the Ottoman Empire. The silver Čeyrek had a fineness of 830, weighed 6.23 grams and measured 24 mm. in diameter. (G. C. Milès)

CHAM [see ČAM]

ČHAT, an ancient town, situated on the bank of the Ghaggar and 14 miles from Ambala (India), is now practically desolate, with the exception of a few huts of Gudjiyars (mill-sellers) and other low-caste people atop a prehistoric mound, still unexcavated. It was a mahdil in the sārkhār of Sirhind, sābah of Dīhil, during the reign of Akbar, with a cultivable area of 125,749 bighās yielding a revenue of 750,994 dāms annually. Its name suggests that it was a settled town of the Moors of Ceylon, or Chaita, i.e., Chatātaris (more accurately Khatātiriyas), a martial Hindu tribe. Apart from being a flourishing town peopleed mainly by the Afghans and the Rājpūts it was, during the early Mughal period, a military station garrisoned by 650 cavalry and 1,100 infantry. Its history is closely connected with that of Bandūr [q.v.] only 4 miles away. During the Sāyīyd and Lōḏī periods, as the vast ruins, the dilapidated but very spacious Dīāmi Masjid of the pre-Mughal period and the extensive grave-yard indicate, it was a town of considerable importance, and became the seat of one of the four branches of the Sāyīyīds of Bāhra, called the Chat-Bānūrī or Chat-rāwīl Sayyīds, of whom Sāyīyd Abu 'l-Faqīl Wāṣīfā was the first to settle in this town (see Čhānī-ī Akbārī, vol. i, transl. Blochmann, 450). In 1722/1729 it was over-run and laid almost completely waste by the Sīkhs under general Banda Bāyrāgī. Shaykh Muhammad Dā'īn, the commandant of Āmbālā, who encountered the Sikh army was defeated and fled in dismay to Lahore. The most wanted cruelties were perpetrated on the inhabitants of Čhāt and Bānūr and very few escaped the sword or forced apostasy. Since then Čhāt has remained a dependency of Pātīlā and has never regained its lost prosperity. Al-Badā'ūnī (Eng. transl. iii 47)
mentions one Shaykh Da3ud of Chatl, but apparently Chatl has been misread for Djuhnl, more accurately Djuhnlwal, once a small town in the
parshas of Multan, and the translator has ob-
48. It is well known that the last
9-10; S. Alamdar Husayn Wastli, Hadith-i Wastisiyya
(Ms. Ričā, Library, Rampūr); Settlement Report
(Bainter Tsiii), Patiala 1904; Patiala State
Gazetteer, s.v.; Hari Ram Gupta, Later Mughal
History of the Panjāb, Lahore 1944, 46; Khā'īf
Khan, Muntakhab al-Tabārith (Bibliotheca Indica),
iil, 664-3; Bibur-nāma (Eng. transl. A. S. Beveridge),
ii, 645 (there it is written as Chiřā).

(A. S. Bazner Ansari)

CHATR, CHATTAR [see MIESA]
CHEEOUEN [see SHAFSHAWAN]
CHERCHELL [see SHARSHAL]
CHESS [see SHATRANJ]
CHINA [see AL-SIN]

CHITRAL (Citṛal), a princely state and a fed-
erated unit of the Republic of Pakistan, situated between 35° 15' and 37° 8' N. and 71° 22' and 74° 6' E. with
an area of about 4,500 sq. miles, and a population
of about 105,000 in 1951, contiguous to Soviet Russia,
Afghanistan and the Peoples' Republic of China.
The state takes its name from the capital city,
Citrl, also known as Kāshkār or Citṛ, two ancient
names still in favour with the people who call
themselves Kāshkārīs. The origin of Kāshkār is not
known; the theory that it is composed of Ki̇k̇̄a
a demon and gādr̄—a cave must be dismissed as
absurd. The Chinese, after their conquest sometime
in the first century B.C.G., called the area Citār, said
to mean a green garden. Babur, in his memoirs,
uses the same word for Citār, which he
subdued by the Chinese in the first century B.C.
Nothing reliable is known thereafter till the 3rd/
roth century when we have archaeological evidence
to prove that Citrl was under the sway of king
Djupal of Kabul in 287/900 and that the people
were Buddhists. Cingiz Khan is also said to have
made incursions into Citrl, but this lacks historical
confirmation.

The founder of the present ruling dynasty was one
Bābā Ayūb, an alleged grandson of Bābūr, who
after the departure of his father, Mīrzā Kāmārān,
to Mecca, wandered into Citrl and took up service
with the ruling monarch, a prince of the Raśisyya
dynasty. His grandson Sangīn ʿAlī is said to have
found favour with the ruler, who appointed him his
first subject. Gradually he assumed great power,
and on his death in 978/1570 his two sons Muhammad
Ričā and Muhammad Bēg succeeded to the offices
he had held. On the death of the Raśisyya prince,
Muhammad Ričā became the virtual ruler, but soon
after he was murdered by his nephews for the
excesses which he had perpetrated against them
and their father, Muhammad Bēg. In 991/1585
Muhtaram Shāh I, one of the sons of Muhammad
Bēg, peacefully dethroned the last Raśisyya ruler
of Citrl, whose descendants he deported to Badakh-
shān, and himself assumed the reins of government.
In 1024/1615 Māhūd b. Nāṣir Raśisyya attacked
Citrl with a large force of Badakhshāni troops,
defeated Muhtaram Shāh I, granted him pardon but
expelled him from Citrl. In 1030/1620 Muhtaram
Shāh I returned to Citrl, after murdering Māhūd
Raśisyya, only to be attacked for the second time
in 1044/1634. Subsequently Muhtaram Shāh I had
to leave the country because of the defection of his

A mountainous country, its ice-caps and glaciers
are a permanent source of water-supply for the lush
green valleys of the Hindū-Kūsh whose off-shoots
circle Citrl into several orographic regions.
Bounded by the unnamed kāhinīs of Dir and Swāt
(qq.v.), the Himalayas and the Karakoram Range
there are many famous passes and peaks in Citrl.
The Dūrāh Pass (14,500 ft.) leads to Badakhshān
(qq.v.) and is open for only three months in the
year. From ancient times it has served as an important
caravan route between Citrl and the Central Asia.
The Bārgūl pass (12,500 ft.) across the Yārkūn
valley connects China and Soviet Russia with
Citrl and caravans from Kāshkār and Khōtān
(qq.v.) were a common sight till recently. The other
important passes are Shandur (12,500 ft.) and
Lowarāt (10,230 ft.) which lead to Gilgit and Dīr
respectively. The Lowarāt pass, the only link
between Citrl and the rest of West Pakistan,
remains snow-bound for at least seven months in
the year, and when open it can only be negotiated by
jeep traffic. During the snow-bound period travellers
cross into Citrl on foot and merchandise is carried
on mules.

The main occupation of the people is agriculture
or cattle-grazing, though the state is rich in mineral
and forest wealth, which awaits large-scale exploi-
tation. There are believed to be considerable deposits
of antimony, iron-ore, lead, sulphur, mica, crystal
and opiment. The Ta'rīkh-i Citrl mentions gold, silver,
lapis-lazuli, topaz and also turquoise among the
rare minerals found.

Communications are a great problem; no roads
worthy of the name exist. However, a good motor
road, mainly for strategic purposes, is under con-
struction across the Lowarāt Pass and is expected
to be completed by the end of 1959. A proposal to
construct an all-weather road, through a tunnel
under the Lowarāt Pass, connecting Pēshāwar with
Citrl, was also mooted but, in view of the huge
cost involved, has been abandoned.

Since her accession to Pakistan in 1947, Citrl
has made rapid progress in almost all spheres of life.
There are now 85 regular schools including two high
schools and two dār al-wūdūm for religious instruc-
tion, as compared to two middle schools and a few
maktabs before accession. Education up to matri-
culation standard is free, and facilities are also
provided for higher education outside the state.
Two well-equipped hospitals and a number of
dispensaries have been opened to provide free
medical aid to the people. Small-scale and cottage
industries have been set up and a fruit-crushing
factory has been established at Dolomus, near
Citrl. Other measures for raising the standard of
living of the people have also been taken.

Very little is known about the early history of
Citrl. The aborigines have been called Pishācas
and described as cannibals. They are said to have
been subdued by the Chinese in the first century B. C.

The founder of the present ruling dynasty was one
Bābā Ayūb, an alleged grandson of Bābūr, who
after the departure of his father, Mīrzā Kāmārān,
to Mecca, wandered into Citrl and took up service
with the ruling monarch, a prince of the Raśisyya
dynasty. His grandson Sangīn ʿAlī is said to have
found favour with the ruler, who appointed him his
first subject. Gradually he assumed great power,
and on his death in 978/1570 his two sons Muhammad
Ričā and Muhammad Bēg succeeded to the offices
he had held. On the death of the Raśisyya prince,
Muhammad Ričā became the virtual ruler, but soon
after he was murdered by his nephews for the
excesses which he had perpetrated against them
and their father, Muhammad Bēg. In 991/1585
Muhtaram Shāh I, one of the sons of Muhammad
Bēg, peacefully dethroned the last Raśisyya ruler
of Citrl, whose descendants he deported to Badakh-
shān, and himself assumed the reins of government.
In 1024/1615 Māhūd b. Nāṣir Raśisyya attacked
Citrl with a large force of Badakhshāni troops,
defeated Muhtaram Shāh I, granted him pardon but
expelled him from Citrl. In 1030/1620 Muhtaram
Shāh I returned to Citrl, after murdering Māhūd
Raśisyya, only to be attacked for the second time
in 1044/1634. Subsequently Muhtaram Shāh I had
to leave the country because of the defection of his
troops. He was driven from pillar to post and was ultimately killed in an encounter with the people of Chitral [q.v.].

In 1215/1799, however, he was severely punished and restored to the throne by Shah Al-Imam who succeeded him in Chitral, for the murder of his father. Sangin 'Alī II, having deserted his lost principality went to Afghanistan, then a province of the Indian Mughal empire.

On the accession of Shah 'Alī Imam Bahādur Shah 1 [see Bahādur Shāh I] to the throne of Delhi, Sangin 'Alī II came down to India and entered in 1215/1799 the seceding in Shah 'Alī Imam who appointed him custodian of the shrine of Ahmad Sirhindī [q.v.]. With the monetary assistance rendered by the Mughal emperor Sangin 'Alī II was able to enrol Swāt levies who helped him reconquer the lost territory. Sangin 'Alī II was murdered in 1158/1745 by some members of the Ra'sīsyya dynasty and was followed by a number of weak and effete rulers. In 1189/1775 Frāzmār Shāh, a nephew of Muhtārām Shāh 1, came to the throne. He was a military adventurer and led a number of campaigns against the neighbouring territories of Gilgit, Nāgar and Kāfīristān. He also attacked Čaghtī Serāy in Afghānistān and occupied it after a fierce battle. He was murdered in 1205/1790 by one of his uncles, Shāh Afdal, who occupied the throne. On his death in 1210/1795 his brother Shah  Fadil succeeded him. Then follows a series of internecine battles, and the picture becomes so confused that it is difficult to follow the events with historical precision.

Shāh Fadil was succeeded in 1213/1798 by Shāh Nawāz Khān, his nephew, who repulsed with heavy losses an attack on Chitral in 1223/1808 by Khayr Allāh Khān b. 'Imārat Allāh Khān, one of his cousins. He was, however, forced to quit the throne but was proclaimed ruler for the third time in 1234/1818. In the meantime Muhtārām Shāh 1, one of the brothers of Shāh Nawāz, had become a prominent figure in state affairs. Chitral was then divided into small units each under a local chieftain, the most powerful of whom was Mulk Aman, the ruler of Chitral proper. On his death in 1249/1833 Muhtārām Shāh 1, entitled Shāh Kā'tūr, assumed power, being acclaimed master of Mulk Aman. After a hectic and picturesque political career of 28 years Muhtārām Shāh 1, burdened with age, died in 1253/1837 and was succeeded by his son Shāh Afdal 1. In 1257/1839 Gahwār Amān, a son of Mulk Amān and ruler of Warshigum (Yāsīn and Maśdīd) unsuccessfully invaded Gilgit whose ruler appealed for help to his over-lord, the British Agent placed him under detention and provisionally recognized Shudjiālī al-Mulk, a boy of 14 years, and a son of Amān al-Mulk as the Mehtar.

The British Political Agent, with a mixed force of 400 native and British troops, had occupied the fort before placing Shudjiālī al-Mulk on the throne. The garrison had attacked the forces of 'Umār Khān and Shāh Afdal but met with little success. Then began the historic siege of Chitral by 'Umār Khān and his confederates which lasted from 3 March 1895 to 19 April 1895, and was finally raised by the entry into Chitral of the advanced guard of the main relief force on 26 April 1895 which had been despatched via Mālakand and Dir. Shāh Afdal fell a prisoner into the hands of the British while 'Umār Khān escaped to Afghanistan. Amir al-Mulk and his leading men were deported to India as a punishment for their complicity in the trouble which necessitated large-scale military operations. Shudjiālī al-Mulk was confirmed as the Mehtar and since then Chitral has enjoyed an unbroken period of peace and progress. During the Afghan War of 1338/1919 the Chitral Scouts fully co-operated with the British. The Mehtar was allowed a sum of 100,000 rupees as his contribution to the expenses of the war, and the same year the title of His Highness, with a personal salute of 11 guns, was conferred on him. In 1343/1926 the Mehtar entered into an agreement with the Government of India for the prevention of smuggling of narcotics through Dir and Swāt, into British India. An enlightened ruler, Shudjiālī al-Mulk introduced modern amenities like electricity, tele-communications and automobiles into the state and constructed roads, forts, grain godowns, irrigation channels and schools. He also built a Dāmī Khāzīn, said to be
the most beautiful and the largest building between Gilgit and Pëghëwar. He is known as the 'Architect' of modern Chítrál.

On his death in 1355/1356 he was succeeded by his son Nàshir al-Mulk. A ruler endowed with literary taste, his Persian poetic work, the Sahifat al-Takwin, a study of the theory of evolution in the light of the Kur'anic teachings, has won him praise and admiration from indigenous scholars. In 1362/1943 his younger brother Mu'izzafar al-Mulk succeeded him. It was he who offered the accession of Chítrál to Pakistan in 1367/1947. He was succeeded by Sayyid Nàshir al-Mulk Nasir, a boy of 3 years of age. The state is now ruled by a Council of Regency presided over by the Political Agent, Malakand Agency through the Wáśiti A'tâm, an officer appointed by the Government of Pakistan.


II. Name, languages and tribes.

Khowar Chétrár, together with corresponding forms in neighbouring languages, goes back to *Kèsřat( Cô ?). Sängešť Sâm-Catrâd, etc. contains an ancient name of N. Chítrál (cf. BSOS, vi, 441f.). Of the 105,529 (1951) inhabitants of Chítrál the great majority (90,000) speak Khowâr, the language of the Kho tribe and of the state. It extends east of the Shandûr pass as far as Ghír in Yasm. Khowâr is an Indo-Aryan language of archaic type, cf., e.g., šron hip, âśru tear, hairds heart, tšpâšur father-in-law, etc. But it contains, apart from more recent borrowings from Pers., Ar. and Hind., also loan-words from the Pamir dialects, as well as a number of words of Middle Indian origin. Some words are borrowed from, or shared withBurugháshi and Şinâ, and several of the most common words are of unknown origin.

Other Indo-Aryan languages are: Kalasà (3,000) spoken, mainly by pagans, in two dialects in the side-valleys of S. Chítrál. Kalašà is closely related to Khowâr. The Kalaš are said to have occupied Chítrál right up to Rešún, and to have been pushed back within the last few hundred years by the Kho, whose original home was in Torikho and Múljkho in N. Chítrál.—Phálurä (Dangärík) (3,000) is spoken in some side valleys of S. E. Chítrál by original immigrants from Cîlas. It is an archaic form of Şinâ. — Gawanâ-Bàti is spoken at Arândû, close to the Afghan border, and also across it. In the same neighbourhood we find Danâek in one village.—Gugjûr (2,000) is spoken by Gugjûr herdsmen who have filtered through from Swàl and Dír.

Kati, a Káfir language, has been introduced into S. Chítrál within the last few generations by settlers from Kândësh and the upper Båshgal valley in Nûristán.

Iranian languages: Persian (Badakhšßî) (1,000) at Madaglaht in the Shïshi Kuh valley.—Pashto (at least 4,000) in the Arândû district.—Wâkhl, spoken by a few settlers in upper Yârkûn. Yîdhâ, an offshoot of Mundji in Mundjin, is spoken by the Yîdh (Idagh, etc.) tribe, settled since long in the upper Lûtûk valley, below the Dèrhâ pass.

At a not too remote date we must suppose that Chítrál was divided between Khoš and Kalašë, and the ancestors of these languages must have been introduced from N.W. India at a very early stage of development. A couple of short Sanskrit inscriptions have been found. Khowar has no written literature, [except a translation of the Gandâ-i Pashto (Calc., 1902, romanized), and a short prayer book in Urdu script (Nime, 1958)]. But the language is rich in songs and popular tales (silogh < šloka).

With the exception of most Kalašë the inhabitants are Muslim, mainly Maulâls. The last pagan Katis were converted in the 1930s. But many traces of pre-Islamic customs and festivals remain. Note also Khowar dâsman priest, probably < Skt. dâksamânt.

The Khoš are divided into three social classes: Adamâdžâs, nobles; or at any rate free-holders; Arbânbâdâs, comparatively well off, being paid for their services to the Mehtar, and on that account with a higher status than the very poor Fâkir Miskin.

Each class contains a number of clans, some of which carry patronymical names, other such indicating foreign origin, while others are difficult to analyse. Also the Kalaš and Yîdh tribes are divided into clans.

The Khoš are dolicho- to mesoecephalic, of middle height, and often with eyes and hair of medium colour, a few are fair-haired and blue-eyed. Kalašë and Kati are more decidedly dolichocephalic, and the Kati also of greater height.

Bibliography: Biddulph, Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh, Calcutta 1880; D. J. T. O'Brien, Grammar and vocabulary of the Khowar dialect, Lahore 1893; Linguistic Survey of India, viii, H. G. Morgenstierne, Report on a linguistic mission to Afghani-

stan, Oslo 1926; idem, Report on a linguistic mission to N.W. India, Oslo 1932; idem, The name Munjan and some other names of places and peoples in the Hindu-Kush, BSOS, vi; idem, Iranian elements in Khowar, in BSOS, vii; idem, Some features of Khowar morphology, Norsk Tidsskrift for Språkvidenskap, xiv; idem, Sanskritic words in Khowar, S. K. Belvalkar Felicitation Volume, Benares 1957; A. Stein, Serindia, i, 26 ff., Oxford 1921.

Anthropology: T. A. Joyce, Serindia, iii, 1957, ff.; B. S. Guha, Census of India 1931, x, x, Delhi 1935; A. Herrlich, in Deutsche im Hindu-

kusch (with bibliography), 170 ff., Berlin 1937.


(G. Morgenstierne)

CHITTAGONG, Tset-ta-gong, Çátigrâma, or Çâtígm is the main sea-port in East Pakistan and the head-quarter of the district bordering on Arakan. The town, which has a population of 294,046 (1951 census) inhabitants, stands on the right bank of the Karnâphûli river, ten miles from the sea, and has a good natural harbour away from the flooded plains of Bengal and the silt-depositing
mouths of the Ganges. Its origin is obscure. The early Arab geographers speak of only Samandar...it was a form of regular taxation imposed on the re'sāyā. In the 10th/16th century Abu 'l-Su'ūd and others attempted to include it among the sharī'ī taxes as kharāj-i muwazzaf.

Married peasants with land amounting to less than half a çift, or possessing no land of their own, were called bennāk [q.v.], and were subject to lower rates, for example 6 or 9 akčas, which were later increased to 9, 12 and 18. In the Kānūn-nāme of Mehemed II the bennāk were supposed to be subject only to three services, the money equivalent of which was 6 or 9 akčas. Lastly the re'sāyā classified as kara re'dāyā, the very poor or bachelors, who possessed no land of their own, paid this tax at the lowest rate of 6 akčas.

Thus çift-resmi can be regarded as the basic unit of a graduated tax system, and even çift-resmi and dönüm-resmi can be included in the same system. Originally the rate of çift-resmi was 22 akčas, but in 862/1458 it was raised to 33 akčas in the sandjak of the eyalet of Anadolu. It was further raised in some parts of Anatolia with additions made in favour of subaskhs [q.v.] and sandjak-begs [q.v.], but under Süleyman I this innovation was abolished as causing confusion. Applied to Syria after its conquest with a higher rate of 40, and in Eastern Anatolia of 50 akčas it remained however, 22 akčas in Rūmeli (see the list in my Osmanlîarda Raiyyet Rusumun, in Belteliten, vol. 92, 1959). Partial or total exemptions from çift-resmi were granted by imperial herāts in return for some public services required from the re'sāyā. But in the 10th/16th century many such exemptions were abolished.

As a rule çift-resmi was included in the timār [q.v.] revenue of the sīphāsī. But it lost its importance when after 590/1582 the akča decreased in value and the naqī [q.v.] became a form of regular taxation imposed on the re'sāyā. (Halil Imacliu)

ÇİFTLIK is the ordinary word for farm in Turkish, but in the Ottoman times it designated, at first, a certain unit of agricultural land in the land-holding system, and then, later on, a large estate. It was formed from çift (pair, especially a pair of oxen) from the Persian dōst with the Turkish suffix, lik. Originally, a çiftlik was thought of as the amount of land that could be ploughed by two oxen. But çiftlik eventually varied with the fertility of the soil. The çiftlik was the basic land unit used in all forms of land-holding, miri, wahī, and mülk or mālkhāne. From the legal point of view, however, the kind of çiftlik varied with the type of tenure.

The ratsiyet çiftlik is which the re'sāyā, Christian and Muslim peasants, possessed, taxpaying, or possessing no land of their own, paid the uṣūl [q.v.] and çift-resmi [q.v.] taxes to the land-holder, made up by far the greater part of the agricultural land. As a rule çiftlik was not to be subdivided because such a situation would, in the judgement of Abu 'l-Su'ūd, make it impossible to collect the taxes imposed on a çiftlik as a whole. In reality, however, during the land surveys, tahār [q.v.], it was found that many çiftlik had lost their original form as a result of sub-division, and the çift-resmi were no longer being collected. In order to preserve the çiftlik, which was essential to the land-holding system of
tendency in the 10th/16th century was to convert all types of military ciftliks into râ'îyyet ciftliks so that the râ'îyyet taxes might be included in the timârs.

With the disruption of the timâr system, this course of development was reversed. During and after the period of confusion between 1003/1595-1018/1609, a great part of the râ'îyyet ciftliks found their way into the hands of the hâshî-huwa and palace favourites, and the old practices such as possession of timârs as mülk or mukāba'ât ciftliks were now widespread. In the same period, moreover, when the peasantry abandoned their lands en masse and scattered throughout Anatolia, which is known in Ottoman history as the Great Flight, the Janissaries and others took possession of the râ'îyyet ciftliks by tâpu. The accumulation of ciftliks in the hands of â'yân [q.v.], rich and influential men in the provinces, however, was mainly due to the mukâba'a system. This again was an old practice but now, with the disorganization of the timâr system, the timâr lands were increasingly rented as mukâba'a to private persons bidding the highest price. In reality however, through administrative abuses, the influential men managed to obtain them. Â'yân and â'yân with large mukâba'a holdings, as a rule, received theAssignment into râ'îyyet ciftliks and assigned as timârs. In the case of the hâshî-huwa, the timâr lands were increasingly cultivated by the â'yân and âlî-i surf, officials, in the provinces. It was on the mukâba'a lands that the power of the great â'yân rested in that century, and from this period on the word ciftlik was used to designate large personal estates. The attempts to break up these ciftliks made by the Tâsun'âdî [q.v.] reformers did not meet with any great success and this became the underlying factor in the peasant uprisings in the Balkans in the 13th/19th century. Under the Turkish Republic a law passed in 1945 (modified in 1950) provided that the large estates were to be broken up and distributed to the peasants in need of land.


CIĞHALA-ZADE (CIĞHALA-ZADE) YUSUF SINÂ PÂSHA (c. 1545-1605), also known as Câğhal (Dişâhâl) oglu, belonged to the Genoese house of Cicala. He was born at Messina in Sicily and received the Christian name Scipione Cicala. His father, the Visconde di Cicala, was, according to Gerlach, a "corsair" in the service of Spain, while his mother is said (cf. L’Ottomanno, of L. Soranzo) to have been "Turca da Castelnuovo". The Visconde and his son, captured at sea by Muslim corsairs in 968/1561 (some of the sources give the year as 967/1560), were taken first to Tripoli in North Africa and then to Istanbul. The father was in due course redeemed from captivity and, after living for some time at Beyoğlu, returned to Messina, where he died in 1564. His son, Scipione, became, however, a Muslim and was trained in the Imperial Palace, rising to the great personal estate of the Bağl. Cîghâla-zâde, through his marriage first to one (980-981/1573) and afterwards (983-984/1576) to another great-grand-daughter of Sultan Sulayman.
Kânûnî, found himself assured of wealth, high office and protection at the Porte.

He became Agha of the Janissaries in 982/1575 and retained this appointment until 986/1578. During the next phase of his career he saw much active service in the long Ottoman-Persian war of 986/1578-998/1590. He was Beglerbeg of Van in 991/1583, assumed command, in the same year, of the great fortress of Erivan—he was now raised to the rank of Vizier—and also had a prominent rôle. Once more as Beglerbeg of Van, in the campaign of 993/1585 against Tabriz. As Beglerbeg of Bagdad, an appointment which he received in 994/1586, Cîghala-zade fought with success in western Persia during the last years of the war, reducing Nîhåwand and Hamadân to Ottoman control.

After the peace of 998/1590 he was made Beglerbeg of Errurum and in 999/1591 became Kapudân Paşa, i.e., High Admiral of the Ottoman fleet—an office that he held until 1003/1595. During the third Grand Vizierate (1000-1003/1593-1595) of Khojdja Sinân Paşa he was advanced to the rank of fourth Vizier. The Ottomans, since 1001/1593, had been at war with Austria. Cîghala-zade, having been appointed third Vizier, accompanied Sultan Mehmed III on the Hungarian campaign of 1004-1005/1595. He tried, but in vain, to relieve the fortress of Khâvân (Hâvân), which was captured by the Habsburgs on 24 February 1005/1596, was present at the successful Ottoman siege of Egri (Erlau) (Muharrem-Safer 1005/September-October 1596) and, at the battle of Mezo-Keresztes (Hâc Ovası) in Rabl I 1005/ October 1596, shared in the final assault that turned an imminent defeat into a notable triumph for the Ottomans. Cîghala-zade, in reward for his service at Mezo-Keresztes, was now made Grand Vizier, but the discontent arising from the measures which he used in a effort to restore discipline amongst the Ottoman forces, the troubles which followed his intervention in the affairs of the Crimean Tatars, and the existence at court of powerful influences eager to restore Dâmad Ibrahim Paşa [q.v.] to the Grand Vizierate, brought about his deposition from this office before he had been in control of the government for little more than a month (Rabl I-Rabl II 1005/ October-December 1596).

Cîghala-zade became Beglerbeg of Şâm (Syria) in Diu̇mâdâ I 1006/December 1597-January 1598 and then, in Shawwâl 1007/May 1599, was made Kapudân Paşa for the second time. He assumed command, in 1013/1604, of the eastern front, where a new war between the Ottomans and the Persians had broken out in the preceding year. His campaign of 1014/ 1605 was unsuccessful, the forces that he led towards Tabriz suffering defeat near the shore of Lake Urmia. Cîghala-zade now withdrew to the fortress of Van and thence in the direction of Diyarbekir. He died, in the course of this retreat, during the month of October-December 1605.

**Cîghala-zade Sinân Paşa — Cilicia**


Geographical outline. Cilicia is wedged
between the Anatolian plateau to the north-west and the Syrian frontier to the south-east. Its southern edge is fringed by the Mediterranean, which is extremely rich in fauna and flora, and is guarded to the north by the Taurus range, over which the Cilician Gates assure communication with the plateau. To the east the Amanian Gates (al-Lukâm) and to the west, a short distance beyond Selindi (ancient Selinunte), begins the province of Pamphylia (region of Adalia). Cilicia has at all times possessed a great strategic importance on account of the Cilician and Amanian Gates. Although the mountains and sea which isolate Cilicia have given it a marked individuality, it has rarely been able to maintain its own independence for long, even when it was the kingdom of Lesser Armenia or the Turcoman principality of the Ramaḏān-oghlu. Most of the time, from the Hittites to the Ottomans, it has been incorporated by conquest into the great empires of the eastern Mediterranean.

Cilicia falls naturally into three geographical regions, Cilicia Trachea, the Cilician Taurus, and the Plain of Cilicia. Cilicia Trachea (lit.: 'rough, rugged') is a mountainous region to the west, its coast dotted with ports where pirates took refuge when chased by Pompey's ships. It is virtually without means of communication to the Turkish interior, and has patches of cultivable land only in a few valleys, such as Gök Su (ancient Cakyadnus) whose waters flow into the sea near Silifke. It is consequently a very poor region, and contains only a few small towns (Silifke, ancient Seleucia, Mut, on the road from Silifke to Karaman and Konya, and in the west Anamur on the coast and Ermenek inland).

The frontier between Cilicia Trachea and the coastal plain on the one hand and the Taurus on the other is the small river Lamos which has its spring in the Taurus. The Cilician Taurus is a strip 300 km. long by only 50 km. wide stretching in a south-west-north-east direction, and including the massifs of Dumbeka, Bulghar Dağ (corruption of Bughā; the Turkish translation of Taurus) and the Ala Dağ, one peak of which rises to 3600 m. The Cilician Gates continues northwards to the Haji Dağ. The Anti-Taurus begins to the east, on the left bank of the Zamanti Su, formerly Karmalas, a tributary of the Shayhān (Saros). Its mountains can easily be crossed, however, as the high waters have cut many valleys through them in forcing their way from the Cappadocian plateau down to the Mediterranean. The Tarsus Cay, ancient Cydnus, in Arabic Baradan, rises in the Bulghar Dağ massif and brings Tarsus its water. Between the Bulghar Dağ and the Ala Dağ are the valleys of the Cahit Su and Körkin Su, the Çaktı being a tributary of the Körkin which in turn is a tributary of the Shayhān. The road called the Cilician Gates climbs over passes and runs through these valleys. On the northern side it connects Tarsus with Ulukhīšla via Bozantlı (ancient Podandos-Budandun) where the narrowest defile, the Cilician Gates properly so called, is at Gükê Boghz, 1160 m. high on the upper reaches of the Tarsus Cay.

The most important part of Cilicia is the plain (Greek Pedias, Turkish Çukurova), a product of the alluvial deposits of its two large rivers, the Shayhān (ancient Saros) and the Diyāhān (ancient Pyramus). Along the left bank of the Diyāhān's lower reaches is a less elevated outcrop of the Taurus range, the Dağal al-Nūr or Diĝal Miṣṣā. Sheltered from the north by the great mountain barrier, the Cilician plain is open to the southern winds, enjoys the climate and flora of Mediterranean regions, and is extremely rich in flints and flint-quartz, which can be grown there, and apart from sugar-cane plantations there is also intensive cultivation of cotton. The main towns of Cilicia were always situated in this area. To the north, at the foot of the Taurus but still Mediterranean in climate, lie Sîs (at the present day Közan) and ʿAyn Zarba (ancient Anazarba), to the south Miṣṣā (Mopsuestia) on the Diyāhān, Adana on the Shayhān, Tarsus, Ayās (ancient Aigai) on the western coast of the gulf of Alexandretta, and Alexandretta on its eastern side. Mersin, to the west of Tarsus, is a relatively recent town, today named İcel.

In the Islamic epoch Cilicia Trachea and Seleucia belonged to the Greeks, the frontier between the two empires being formed by the Lamos (in Arabic Lamiš). Under the Ottomans Cilicia constituted the wilāyet of Adana, and was divided between the sangiāb of İc-I, Adana and Közan in the north, and of Diĝel Bereket around the gulf of Alexandretta.

The main towns of Cilicia are connected by the Aleippo-Fevzipasha-Adana-Uluḫīšla railway, with a branch line running via Tarsus to Marsina.

Cilicia has often been struck by earthquakes; Michael the Syrian (iii, 17) and Tabarl (iii, 68) record the one which occurred on 23 June 803; it blocked the river Diyāhān and partly destroyed the walls of Miṣṣā. Another one occurred in 1114 (see EI i s. v. Miṣṣā). The most recent occurred in 1952.


Historical Outline. When the Arabs had conquered Syria, Heraclius ordered the garrisons of towns between Alexandretta and Tarsus to evacuate their positions (see Miṣṣā). It is probable that part of the civilian population had to do likewise. The Arabs did not immediately take over these towns, but restricted themselves to raids into the region or across it into Anatolia, leaving small garrisons behind them as a security measure. On his return from an expedition in 31/651-652, Muʿāwiya is said to have destroyed all the fortresses as far as Antioch. However, records exist of the Arabs' capture of Tarsus in 53/672-673, which seems to indicate that it had been reoccupied by the Greeks or defended by its inhabitants. In 65/685, furthermore, the army of Constantine Pogonatus advanced as far as Mopsuestia (Miṣṣā). From 84/703 onwards the Arabs began to settle in Miṣṣā, stationing a garrison there during part of the year. They realized the advantage which would accrue in permanently
holding the Cilician positions, and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz abandoned his plan to destroy all the fortresses between Miṣṣaṣa and Amorium, at the fortress of Tarsus. Amorium was captured in 103/721-22. In the first decades of the second century of the hijra it became apparent that the Arabs intended to settle in the area; Miṣṣaṣa was colonized by the Zūt [q.v.] with their buffaloes, and a bridge was built over the Sayḥān to the east of Adana, in order to secure communications across the country. Although the Arab armies had no difficulty in traversing the country by way of the Cilician Gates, its occupation was still precarious. There was as yet no systematic organization of the frontier strongpoints, or ṭughār, still dependent on the ḍiyan of Ḵinnasrīn, which Muʿāwiya or Yazid b. Muʿāwiya had detached from Ḫīṃṣ (cf. Ibn al-Shibḥa, 9). But already the positions had been transformed into ribāt, that is to say posts manned by voluntary defenders of the faith, noted for both their religious and military zeal. Al-Dinawarlī, 345, points out that after his dismissal from office Khalīd al-Ḵaṣrī [q.v.] obtained from the caliph Ḥiyyām permission to go to Tarsus, where he remained for some time marūbitun.

After the 'Abbasīd revolution the Byzantines did not take advantage of the disturbed situation to reconquer Cilicia, but instead concentrated their attention on the territories of Malayta and Ḵīšālāl. After the dynasty had become firmly established, and particularly in al-Mahdī’s reign, the Ābbāsīds undertook to fortify and populate the Cilician positions, above all at Miṣṣaṣa and Tarsus. Hārūn al-Raṣīd was the most vigorous exponent of the frontier policy. In 170/786–787 he detached the frontier strongholds from the Ḫīzaṣa and ḍiyan of Ḵīnaṣrīn and put them under a separate government called al-ʿAwaṣīm [q.v.] (al-Ṭabarl, iii, 604; Ibn al-Shibḥa, 9); Cilicia now became part of the ʿAwāṣīm ḍiyanun. Its reorganization served both defensive and offensive purposes; it helped protect Muslim territory against Byzantine incursions (cf. a poem of Marwān b. Abī Ḥaṣaṣa in Ṭabarī, iii, 742), provided a secure operational base for the Muslim armies which, by tradition, spent two to three each year into Greek territory, and served as a permanent base for volunteer troops and marūbitūn. The fortification of the positions went in hand with the launching of expeditions across the Cilician Gates during the reign of Hārūn al-Raṣīd and his successors. A vital step in the successful execution of these operations was the Muslim capture of Lulun (al-Luḥa`a) in 217/832. Its fortress guarded the northern side of a pass which led over the Cilician Gates from Podandos (Budandūn, present-day Bozant) to Tyana.

A considerable Christian population lived in the strongholds or the countryside around them. The Muslims recruited some of them as guides for their expeditions (see AIEO Alger, xv, 48), but they also sometimes acted as informers for the Byzantines, and it was perhaps as an act of reprisal that al-Raṣīd had all the ṭughār churches destroyed in 191/807 (Ṭabarī, iii, 716-717; Michael the Syrian, iii, 19 ff.).

The small river Lamos, demarcation line between Cilicia, Trachea and Arab Cilicia, was periodically the scene of the exchange of prisoners or their resale to the enemy; historians have left their records of these dealings, in particular al-Muṣṭaddī in Tāmbih, 189–196.

After Muṭṭaṣim’s famous campaign against Amorium in 223/838, which marks the end of the spectacular expeditions into Anatolia, it gradually became the custom to appoint special amirs to govern the region of Cilicia, mostly resident in Tarsus. Although initially dependent on the ʿAwāṣīm governor or the ruler of Syria, they enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy and were responsible for the defence of the country and the organization of annual land and sea expeditions. Some of the amirs of Tarsus became quite famous, e.g., ʿAll al-Armanī, the eunuch Yāzīmān (Greek Esman), Ṣulām Zaraṣā (alias Leo of Tripoli and Ṣalāḥ ‘al-ʿArwādī) Dāmūṣāna, Ṭamāl, Nasr al-Ṭamālī. For some time Cilicia, with its ʿAwāṣīm and ṭughār, passed from the control of the central government and became a dependency of Tūlūnīd Egypt (260/873–286/891). This was a troubled chapter of its history, due to the dispute between the Tūlūnīds and the central power, the intractability of the amirs, and the ravages incurred through Byzantine raids. The return of Luḥa`a (Lulun) to Byzantium in 263/876-77 constituted a serious threat to Cilicia. Nevertheless the ribāt of Tarsus developed during that period, and assumed greater proportions, as is shown by the sources used by Kamāl al-Dīn in the geographical introduction to his Buḥṣyat al-Talāb (see AIEO Alger, xv, 46 ff.) and the descriptions of al-Īṣṭaḥkī (see TARSUS). In particular, the account of Ibn al-Madīmī mentioned great sums on maintaining special units of marūbitun under military and religious leaders. At a time when the spirit of holy war gave a particular character to Cilicia, there flocked to the country a great number of scholars, traditionists, ascetics and fervent religious men, intent on fulfilling the personal obligation of ḏikād, teaching the old traditions and spreading a spirit of purest orthodoxy among the soldiers and the civilian population. The more well-known of them were Ḫibrahīm b. Adhm b. Manṣūr [q.v.], who died some time between 160 and 166 (776-783), and Ḫibrahīm b. Muḥammad al-Fazārī (d. 188/804) Ibn ʿAsākir, ii, 254. Several of these persons are mentioned in the obituaries of al-Dhahābī and Abu ʿl-Maḥāsīn, often carrying the ṭibād of Thaghrī or Tarsūsī (see under 181, 196, 273, 297 etc.). Yāḏ (ii, 526) mentioned their return of Luḥa`a (Lulun) in 252/866, two great numbers (cf. i, 529). It is known that ʿAbd al-Tūlūn was educated at Tarsus. Muslim festivals were celebrated in great brilliance there. Abu ʿl-Maḥāsīn (iii, 60) considered the feast of breaking the fast in Tarsus to be one of the four wonders of Islam.

In the first part of the 4th/10th century Cilicia came under the rule of the Ḫīṣḥīd, the governor of Egypt, who received his investiture from the caliph. After the clash between the Ḫīṣḥīd and the Ḥamdānī amīr Sayf al-Dawla, who won control of northern Syria and Aleppo, the governor of the frontier province submitted to the amīr of Aleppo, and the amīrs of Tarsus henceforth participated in Sayf al-Dawla’s expeditions. But the Tarsus fleet, weakened by the policy of the caliph al-Muṣṭaddī, who had had it destroyed, was only a minor factor in the struggles of the 4th/10th century. In the second half of the century the threat of Byzantium from the north caused constant disturbances and rebellions, and the operations of 852/963–854/965 resulted in the complete reconquest of Cilicia by the Greeks (or Byzantines). It remained Byzantine for more than a century, during which time the outflow of Muslims was accompanied by a considerable inflow of Armenians, stimulated by Byzantine practice of using Armenian officers to administer the country. After the Saljūq raids had driven back those Armenians
who had settled in Cappadocia after the Turkish conquest of Armenia, their number now increased once more, and, the battle of Manzikert in 1071, a virtual Armenian principality was created, stretching from Melitene to Cilicia. Its head was the Armenian Philaretus, a former general of Romanus Diogenes, and he established his capital at Marash (see Chalandon, Alexis Comnène, 95 ff.; J. Laurent, Byzance et les Teyls Seljoucides, 81 ff.; idem, Byzance et Antioche sous le curopealiate Philaretès, in Rev. des Ét. arm., ix (1929), 62 ff.; Grouset, Histoire des Croisades, i, xi, ff.). The Armenian chiefs Oshin of Lampron (present-day Namrun Yayla, northwest of Tarsus) and Ruben of Partzepet (north of Siş) were perhaps his vassals. They retained their feuds when Philaretus departed from the scene, defeated by the Turks. The Turks had ravaged Cilicia even before Manzikert, and shortly before the arrival of the Crusaders (Michael the Syrian, iii, 179) they seized the main towns, though failing to subjugate the Armenian princes in the Taurus. The latter joined forces with the Crusaders in 1097 and helped Baldwin of Boulogne and Tancred to reconquer the Cilician towns. There followed a period in which the towns continually changed hands in the struggle between Byzantium and the Frankish principality of Antioch. Alexis Comnenus recognized the independence of Cilicia, but he was driven by further efforts to lose them once more to the latter's nephew Tancred, who in 1103 handed them over to his uncle upon his release from the imprisonment imposed by the Dânishmand of Malatya. In 1104 they were retaken by the Byzantine general Monestras (Anna Comnena, XI, xi, 6; ed. Leib iii, 49). They remained the scene of dispute until 1108, when Bohemond was forced to sign a treaty acknowledging the authority of Alexis Comnenus over the whole of Cilicia (Anna Comnena, XIII, xii, 21; ed. Leib iii, 134-135). His nephew Tancred however did not abide by the treaty.

The descendants of Ruben continued to consolidate the development of an Armenian state, and sought to bring all of Cilicia under their control. Thoros I, who had moved from his first seat of power at Ruben Ayn Zarba to his new capital of Lampron (Tournebize, Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie, 171; Cahen, La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades, 253; Matthew of Edessa, in Hist. arm. des Croisades, i, 84-85), captured Siş and Anazarba from the Greeks. During the reign of his successor Leo I (1129-1137), Bohemond of Antioch attempted to re-establish his authority in Cilicia, but this brought him to a fatal conflict with another aspirant to Cilicia, the Dânishmand of Cappadocia (Michael, iii, 227). Around 1132 Leo captured Tarsus, Adana and Misûşa from the Greeks (Chalandon, i, 235, ii, 108-109) (or from the Franks, according to Cahen, 354). He followed this up with the seizure of Sarvankar, on the western flank of the Amaranus. This led to a rupture with Raymond of Poitiers, count of Antioch, but the quarrel was patched up shortly afterwards when Leo was faced with a new Byzantine threat from the north, and as a token of reconciliation he ceded the plain of Cilicia to Raymond. John Comnenus invaded Cilicia in 1137, and regained all the towns except Anazara, and in the following year took Leo and his son prisoner. Leo was carried off to Constantinople, where he died in 1142. Out of all Cilicia was Byzantina, and remained so until Leo's son; Thoros, who had escaped from Constantinople after accession of Manuel Comnenus in 1143, regained a foothold in upper Cilicia; Thoros II (1145-1169) retook Ayn Zarba and the other towns in Cilicia in 1151-52, and defended them successfully against Mas'ud, the estâlikid of Konya, who fought at the instigation of Manuel Comnenus. Thoros also sided with Reynald of Châtillon, count of Antioch, in his attack on Byzantine Cyprus. Manuel Comnenus, however, was not willing to allow the situation to deteriorate any further. In 1158 he invaded Cilicia, reoccupied all the towns, and reduced the country once more to a Byzantine province. The emperor's camp was established at Marj-Dîbûdu (Baltolhâdi, north of Missûşa; see Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 121, and Cahen, 152), and Reynald of Châtillon went there to tender his submission. Thoros, who had taken refuge at vakha, north of Siş on the upper Sayhân, subsequently did likewise, and in return the emperor made him governor of Missûşa, Ayn Zarba and vakha, bestowing on him the title of Sebastos. But in 1162, when his brother Sâlefanâ perished in an ambush laid by the Byzantine governor Andronikos Comnenus, Thoros once more raised the standard of revolt, and seized Ayn Zarba together with other Cilician towns. Amâlric, king of Jerusalem, intervened to re-establish peace. In 1164 Thoros sided with the Franks in their conflict with Nur al-Dîn. He died in 1169. His brother Mîleh, whom he (Thoros) had exiled, rallied to the side of Nur al-Dîn, and with the aid of Bohemond of Antioch, he reconquered the rest of Cilicia and obtained official recognition by Manuel Comnenus. He was assassinated in 1175, and his nephew Ruben III succeeded him. The latter was driven by betrayal into the hands of Bohemond III of Antioch, and the price of his release, negotiated by his brother Leo with Hethoum (Het'um, Hajthûm) of Lampron, was the cession of Missûşa, Adana and Tell Hamdûn to Antioch. However, he recaptured them later. In 1187 he abdicated in favour of his brother Leo (1187-1198), who in 1198 became the first king of Armenia-Cilicia when crowned in Tarsus by the Catholicoi and the papal delegate. It was in Leo's reign that Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade arrived in Cilicia. Frederick was drowned in the Câlugadun (Gök Su), and part of his forces returned to Germany. The remainder was speedily defeated by the Byzantines. In 1198 Leo III died, and his son Leo IV was crowned as Leo IV. Leo IV's reign was his constant attempt, after Bohemond's death in 1201, to secure the succession to Antioch for Raymond Ruben. Although Raymond was Bohemond's grandson, he was also the son of Leo's niece Alice, and moreover had been brought up in Armenia. But Raymond had a strong competitor in Bohemond IV, count of Tripoli, who had the support of al-Malik al-Zahir of Aleppo, and Bohemond IV in the end triumphed.

After Leo's death in 1219, Raymond Ruben tried in vain to win possession of Cilicia. He was taken prisoner at a battle near Tarsus by the bailiff of Constantine, of the Lampron family, and died in captivity (1222). Philip, son of Bohemond IV and his wife Isabella (Leo's daughter), was crowned as his successor and was considered too 'Frankish' and not sufficiently Armenian, he was arrested by Constantine and put to death by poison. This act was one of the reasons which provoked an inter-
vention by 'Alâ’ al-dîn Kaykubâd (1219-37). On the instigation of Bohemond IV, he laid waste the region of Upper Cilicia in 1225 and reduced Constantine to subjection. The latter persuaded the Mongols to sell him tallers to give him their stronghold at Seleucia, which they had occupied ever since Leo had handed it over to them in 1210. In 1226 Constantine obtained the succession for his son Hethoum, who married Philip’s widow Isabella.

Hethoum reigned until 1270, and from the bilingual coinage minted under his reign, it is evident that he knew that in the early years of his reign he acknowledged Saldjûkîd suzerainty (de Morgan, Histoire du peuple arménien, 202-3). Other with Muslim and Christian princes he took part in the struggle against Çingiz Khân, but when the Mongol general BâyduÎ conquered the Saldjûkîd Kaykhûrsaw in 1243, he transferred his obedience to the Mongols and surrendered them Kaykhûrsaw’s mother, wife, and daughter. In consequence the Saldjûkîds reacted sharply against Cilicia in 1245, and Hethoum was able to avert defeat only by summoning Mongol assistance. His position as a vassal of the Mongols was formalized on several occasions; in 1247 he dispatched the High Constable Sempad to Mongolia; in 1254 he paid a personal visit to the Mongolian court; he supplied Armenian contingents for the Mongol expedition to Syria, and operated against the economic blockade of Egypt by withholding exports of Cilician timber (see Mas-Latrine, Histoire de Chypre, i, 412; Grousset, iii, 633). From that time onwards the Armeno-Cilician kingdom, or the land of Sis as Arab historians call it, increasingly became subject to the object of Mamluk attacks, as the following examples bear witness: (i) 664/1266, a retaliatory expedition under Baybars captured, pillaged, and burnt down Sis, Missisa, Adana, Ayas and Tarsus; (ii) 673/1275, another expedition by Baybars seized Missisa, Sis, Tarsus and Ayas, and carried out raids into the Taurus; (iii) 682/1283, a campaign under Kalâ’dûn against Alexandreta, Ayas and Tell Hamdûn; (iv) 697/1297, an expedition led by Lajîn against Alexandreta, Tell Hamdûn, Sis, Adana, Missisa, Nudjàyma, etc., during which the stronghold of Sis was occupied and a tax of 500,000 dirhams was imposed; (v) in 703/1303, as the payments had not been made regularly, and as the strongholds were firmly held, a new expedition forced the Armenians to pay the tribute in advance and confirmed the surrender of the strongholds; (vi) 705/1305, as a result of further defaults in payment, a new expedition was launched, in which the Mongols rendered assistance to the Armenians and defeated the Mamlûks; but when Egyptian reinforcements arrived, the king had to pay; (vii) 715/1315, the tribute was raised to one million dirhams; (viii) 720/1320; (ix) 722/1322, Ayas was captured, and to the tribute were added 50% of the revenues from the Ayas customs authority and the sale of salt; (x) 725/1325, a further expedition following a reprisal raid by the populace of Ayas on the merchants of Baghdad; (xi) 737/1337, a new expedition launched by Malik Nâsir Muhammad because payments of the tribute had stopped. It captured Sis (destroying its citadel in the process) and secured surrender of the forts under the name al-Futûhât al-Djâhânîyya (from the Armenian corruption of Djâyhân). They included Missisa, Kawara, Háûûnîyya, Sarvanükûr, Bayûs, Ayas, Nudjàyma, and ëmûnasra. Further raids were carried out in 756/1355 and 760/1359. The frequent raids of Mamlûk incursions indicates that they did not consolidate their occupation of the country after each expedition. Then, in 776/1375, a final expedition brought the end of Sis as an independent kingdom. Sis itself fell to the Mamlûks, and to the Venetians, but it was captured and was not released until 1382. The Armeno-Cilician kingdom became incorporated into the Mamlûk empire (on the above events see the following under relevant dates: al-Mâqûrî, Sulûk, ed. Muftûûa Ziûya, and Quatremerêde’s translation, Hist. des sult. mamli.; Mufa’dîl b. Abî ‘l-Fâdhîl, trans. and ed. Blochet, Pair. Or., xii & xiv; Abî ‘l-Fîdî and his continuator Ibn al-Wardî, Ibn ëlyûs, Ibn Kâhpîr, Bidâya, Abu ‘l-Ma’nûsî. See also note on the expeditions in AIEO Alger, 1939-41, 53-54, with other references, and G. Wiet, L’Egypte arabe, vol. iv of the Histoire de la Nation égyptienne, 417, 425, 449, 466, 475, 483-484. See also Zetterstéen, Beitrâge zur Geschichte der Mamlûken Sultane, indiae; the article on Mîsîsû, Adana, Ayas, sîs. For the relations between the Armenians and the Karamân-oghullarî, see the article KARÂMÂN and F. Taeschner, Al-Umarî’s Bericht über Anatolien, index).

A Mamlûk governor, the Turcoman Yûregirîghûl Rama’dân, who established himself at Adana in 1378, inaugurated the small Rama’dân-oghullarî [g.e.], dynasty nominally vassals of the Mamlûks. In 1467 Cilicia was invaded by Shâhsûwarî, of the Dîo ‘l-Kadr [g.e.] dynasty. Between 1455 and 1489 the Ottomans attempted to conquer Cilicia, but it was not until 1516 that they succeeded in doing so, Sulînîn Selim I capturing it during his expedition to Egypt. The Rama’dân-oghullarî were not removed from power however, and they remained vassals of the Ottomans until the end of the 17th century. Cilicia was then fully integrated into the Ottoman Empire. In 1833 Ibrahim Pâsha, the son of Mehemet Ali who had revolted against the Porte, carried out a victorious campaign in Cilicia, and the province was ceded to his father by the treaty of Kûtahya. To this day traces of the campaign can be seen in the Cilician Gates. Cilicia was returned to Turkey in 1840 and became part of the vilayet of Aleppo. In 1866 a military force was sent from Istanbul to assert the authority of the central government over the local dervishes and tribal chiefs. This prepared the way for extensive agricultural settlement, which was accomplished in part with the help of Muslim migrants and repatriates from the Crimea and from the lost Ottoman territories in Europe and North Africa. (Jewedet Pasha, Mûrûddî, TTEM, no. 1491, (1926), 117 ff.; W. Eberhard, Nomads and Farmers in south eastern Turkey; problems of settlement, Örients, vi (1953), 32-49). It was occupied by French troops from 1918 to 1922, and handed back to Turkey by the Franco-Turkish treaty of Ankara. The plain of Cukurova is now one of the most flourishing agricultural areas in Turkey.

Bibliography: Apart from the works mentioned in the text, see, for the classical period, Weilhuisen, Die Kämpfe der Araber mit den Romäern in der Zeit der Umayyiden, in NKGW Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1901, 414 ff. The texts of Tabari, Yaqûbî, Baladhuri, Kîdûb al-Uyûn, etc., are translated by Brooks, The Arabs in Asia Minor, 641-750, JHS, xviii (1898), 162-206, xix (1899), 19-33, Byzantine and Arabs in the time of the early Abbasids, 750-813, EHR, xv (1900), 728-747, xvi (1901), 84-92. For the following period, until 959, see Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, i, French ed., ii (in Russian); ii, pt. 2, (in French). For the Hamburgh period, M. Canard, Sayal al-Dawla, Recueil de textes, Algiers 1934; idem,
Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdânides, i, Algiers 1951. For the Crusades and the period immediately preceding them, see Grouzet's Histoire des Croisades, 3 vols., 1934-36; Runciman's History of the Crusades, 3 vols., 1951-4; works mentioned in the text above, by Chalandon, N. lorga. Brève histoire de la Petite Arménie-d'Arménie Cilicienne; L. Laurent, de Morgan, Cl. Cahen (index); Michael the Syrian, Chronique, translated and edited by Chabot, Bar Hebraeus, Chronography, translated and edited by W. Budge, and the Recueil des Historiens des Croisades (western, Armenian and oriental historians). See the article ARMINYA, with its map, which includes Cilicia (note that Cydnum and Tarsus have been wrongly located); and K. J. Barmadjian, map of Cilicia, 1:800,000.; also see the articles ADANA, AVAS, AVN ZARBA, MISFIS, Sî, TARSOS, and their respective bibliographies. (M. CANARD)

CILLA [see KHALWA]

ČIMKENT, chief town of the region of South Kazakhstan of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Kazakhstan, situated on the river Badam, which flows into the river Arls, tributary of the Sr-Daryâ. The town is mentioned in the Żafar-nâma of Sharaf al-DIn Yazdi as a “village” near the city of Sayrâm. After its capture by the Kalmâks in 1864, Sayrâm declined to the advantage of Čimkent; but at the time of the Russian conquest (1281/1864) Čimkent was still only a fortified market-town, surrounded by a clay wall and dominated by a small citadel. According to the Russian census carried out a little after the conquest, the town comprised 756 houses.

On the eve of the October Revolution, Čimkent was mainly known as a summer resort frequented by the residents of Tashkent on account of the mildness of its climate and the excellence of its water. It had in 1897 12,500 inhabitants, of whom 800 were Russians and 150 Jews. The environs of Čimkent included at the end of the 19th century numerous prosperous Russian villages and several native villages, of which the most important were Sayrâm, and the Asbijdâ or Asbijdâ of the Arab groupers.

The very rapid development of the city dates from the Soviet period. In 1926 it comprised 21,000 inhabitants, in 1939 74,200 and in 1956 130,000. Čimkent is an important road centre at the junction of the roads which wind their way from Russia (by way of Aktubinsk and Kzy-Korda) and from Siberia (by way of Alma-Ata) towards Tashkent, and is an important railway junction where the Djambul-Arls, Kzy-Korda and Čimkent-Lenger railways intersect.

Before the Revolution Čimkent was an agricultural centre which subsisted principally from the plantations of cotton (introduced in 1897) and from the harvesting of the medicinal plant artémisia cinae from which santonin is prepared.

Since the discovery in 1932 of veins of lead at Aûsây and Karamazor, and of coal at Lenger, Čimkent has become an important industrial city (factories of chemical and pharmaceutical products, combined with non-ferrous metals). The city included in 1956 35 primary and secondary schools, 19 secondary technical schools and two colleges (the Teachers' Institute and the Technological Institute of Building Materials).

The population of the city is very mixed, the Russians now constituting the majority of the inhabitants; the Muslim community includes Kazakhs and some Özbekfs. (CH. QUELVURJAY)

CIN [see al-šın]

CINEMA (šînîmâ). History. Cinema is a newly imported art into the Muslim world; as such, it is a facet of the Western impact of the West, applied and expressing their interest in Western technical achievements and forms of entertainment. Silent films were apparently first imported into Egypt by Italians (1897), attracting considerable interest. Film shows for Allied troops, during World War I, familiarized many Near Easterners with the cinema. The influx of foreign films, the construction of entertainment halls, and the intellectual curiosity of the local intelligentsia made Egypt the centre of film shows and afterwards of local production. Most films shown then in the Near East were comedies or Westerns; in Egypt, mainly the former were emulated. Local production by foreign technicians, with Egyptians starring, started on silent films (1917); despite their mediocrity, they were warmly received. Simultaneously, cinema clubs sprang up, which eagerly discussed film-techniques and published in Arabic short-lived cinematic periodicals. Full-length Egyptian silent films were first produced (1927) by, respectively, the directors Wdâd ʿUrîfî and Lâma Brothers, at a minimum cost. All rather resembled photographed sequences of a play, but were nonetheless welcomed by the public. This success encouraged Yûsuf Wahbî,dots, to experiment with sound film: he took to Paris, for synchronization, an Arab silent film, Awâdâl dhawdt (apparently patterned after Fr. Coppée's Le coupable), in which he himself had starred. Its enthusiastic reception in Egypt assured the future of the Arabic-speaking film. Arabic film production has been speeded up in the last generation. In 1934, the large Studio Misr was founded near Cairo; others followed. Halls were built, chiefly in the towns. Production was encouraged, during World War II, by the lack of Italian and German competition. Commercial success led to quantity predominating over quality; the resulting lower standards were due also to inexperience in direction and photography, and to shortage of technical equipment.

Acting and actors. Most Arab filmstars are in Egypt. Some former theatre actors or singers are idolized, e.g., leadingmen: the late comedians ʿAlî al-Kassâr and Naṣîhîl al-Rihâlî, the living Yûsuf Wahbî, protagonist of the "social" film on local themes. Some leading ladies can act in character roles; most others sing well.

Characteristics and Themes. The Arabic-speaking film has been, until recently, rather imitative of its European or American counterpart, but artistic and technical standards are generally lower. While in recent years the overriding importance of music has somewhat declined, it is still customary to introduce a sub-plot that includes vocal and instrumental Arabic music and dancing. Another drawback to the plot is the somewhat faulty script-writing, due to the limited experience of local actors-authors. While scripts adapted from foreign films, plays or novels (e.g., al-Bu*asa? = Les misérables, with ʿAbbâs Fâris) were usually successful, those frequently composed at the bid of a producer-actor have often resulted in an unimaginative plot. The main types of films are: a. the historical (generally on themes chosen from Arab or Islamic history; in Egypt—also from Pharaonic times), b. the social drama or melodrama (once popular for its tear-jerking appeal, later for its social aims), c. the musical, d. the comedy or slap-stick farce (usually on local background), e. adventure
and detective films. The first two are the best, artistically. Colloquial Arabic (Egyptian dialect) is
long claimed Egypt as their earliest home; hence their English name, and hence too the Spanish
name is still uncertain; one suggestion is that it comes from Cangar or Zingar, said to be the name
of a people formerly dwelling on the banks of the Indus. It is supposed that the Sasanid Bahram V
Gür (420-438 A.D.) first brought the gipsies from India to Persia, and that they spread thence over
the world. In the relevant passages in Firdawsi and Hamza Isphahaní these Indians are called Loll or
Zott [g.v.]. Other names commonly used are Nawar
and elsewhere. In Egypt the name Ghadiar is also in
use, while the gipsies of Egypt are fond of calling them-
selves Baramika (descendants of the Barmakids).
Although the Indian origin of the gipsies is now
generally accepted, various groups of them have long claimed Egypt as their earliest home; hence
their name for themselves in their own language is Romany, the adjective of
rom, 'man'.

As in other countries, the gipsies of the east are
smiths, tinkers, pedlars, jugglers, musicians and
bear-trainers; some are sedentary while others lead
a wandering life. The sedentaries are generally
despised by those who adhere to the old ways.

No reliable statistics about them exist, but they
are certainly quite numerous in Persia and Turkey.
It has been fairly conclusively shown (by G. L.
Lewis; see Bibliography) that one tribe of 'Yuriks'
in western Anatolia is in fact gipsy, and it seems
likely that other Turkish gipsies are similarly hiding
behind this blanket-term.

Some gipsies are nominally Christian, others
nominally Muslim (thus the Geygellis are said to
be 'Alewi but not to intermarry with other
Alevis); in reality they have their own religion and political
organization, which need not be discussed here; a
useful short account will be found in Funk and
Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, s.v.
Romany Folklore.

Bibliography: A. G. Paspati, Études sur les
Tchingians ou Bohémiens de l'Empire Ottoman,
Constantinople 1870; P. Bataillard, Sur les
Origines des Bohémiens ou Tsiganes, Paris 1876;
Mikloshich, Vber die Mundarten und die Wander-
ung der Zigeuner Europas', Vienna 1872-80;
ClNGANE — ClNGIZ-KHAN

P. Anastase in Mashrik 1902; De Goeje, Mémoires d'histoire et de géographie orientales, no. 3 . . . . .;

The Cinganes of the Soviet Union ClNGANE are found in the Crimea, in Aďgharbaydyan and in Central Asia. The census of 1926 gave a number of 4,000 Muslims out of the 61,294 gipsies included in the census, but it is probable that the real figure is higher. S. A. Tokarev (Etatografiya Narevod SSSR, Moscow 1958) estimates the number of Muslim gipsies in Central Asia at 5,000, and that of Aďgharbaydyan as “some thousands”. According to the statistics of 1926, there were at that time 3,710 Muslim gipsies still in Özbekistan, 300 in Turkmenistan, and an indeterminate number, probably quite high, in the region of Kulîb and in the Soviet Socialist Republic of Tagîllistan.

The Cinganes of the Soviet Union comprise several groups, which are fairly distinct from each other by their language and customs. They are known either by local names: “Karači”, “Lülü”, “Mazang”, “Džügi”, “Kavol”, or by names of trades: Zargaran, Kâsâgaran, Margân-furush. They call themselves “lom” or “dom”. The Lül and the Džügi live in Özbekistan and speak mainly Persian (Tagîlliki); a Turkish-speaking minority speak Özbek. The gipsies of Aďgharbaydyan (Karači) and Kulîb (Kavol) speak only Persian. A group from the region of Kulîb still uses a distinctive language of its own which has not yet been studied, and which I. M. Oranskiy (Indyauññaya etnografiya chesaya gruppa “AFGON” v Srednñ Asii, in Sov. Etn., no. 2, 1956, 117-124) considers to be an Indian dialect. Their Tagîllik neighbours call them Afgân, and wrongly confuse them with the latter, who are quite numerous in the southern part of the Kulîb region. According to Oranskiy and Tokarev the Džügi, the Lül, and the Mazang still use a “secret language”. The gipsies of Central Asia and of the Crimea are theoretically Sunnîs and those of Aďgharbaydyan Shiîs.

ClNGIZ-KHAN, the founder of the Mongol world-empire, was born in 1167 A.D. on the right bank of the Onon in the district of Delî’un-Boldok in the present-day Chita Region in eastern Siberia. The ultimate sources for the details of his early life are two Mongol works, the Secret History of the Mongols, composed in 1240 (or perhaps as late as 1252), and the Allan Dehtor or "Golden Book", the official history of the Imperial family. This latter work has not survived in the original, but the greater part of it is reproduced in the Di’amî al-

The Cingane — Cingiz-Khan

The union of a grey wolf and a white doe; and in both authorities the new-born child is represented as clutching in his hand, in token as it were of his future career as a world-conqueror, a clout of blood of the size of a knuckle-bone.

Cingiz-Khan’s father, Yesügi, was the nephew of Kutula, the last khan or ruler of the Mongols proper, who were afterwards to give their name to all the Mongolian-speaking peoples. The Mongols had been the dominant tribe in Eastern Mongolia during the first half of the 12th century but had been forced to yield place to the Tatar, a tribe in the region of the Buir Nor, who in 1161, in alliance with the Chin rulers of Northern China, had inflicted a crushing defeat upon them. Though now leaderless and disorganized the Mongols still continued the struggle against the Tatar, for we find that at the time of Cingiz-Khan’s birth his father had brought in two Tatar chieftains as prisoners of war. One of these was called Temüüjin-Uke and it was after him that Cingiz-Khan received his original name of Temüüjin. The word means “blacksmith” and this gave rise to the legend, already current at the time of William of Rubruck, that the world-conqueror had begun his career at the forge.

When Temüüjin was nine years old his father, following the exogamous practice of the Mongols, took the boy with him upon a journey into the extreme east of Mongolia to find him a bride amongst his mother’s people, the Konkîrat. According to the custom Yesügi left his son to be brought up in the tent of his future father-in-law, whose daughter, the 10-year old Borte, was destined to be the mother and grandmother of Emperors. Upon the homeward journey Yesügi fell in with a party of carousing Tatar. Unable to refuse the invitation to share in their feast he was recognized by his former enemies, who poisoned his food; and he lived only long enough to reach his own encampment and dispatch a messenger to fetch back Temüüjin from the Konkîrat.

With Yesügi’s death his family was deserted by his followers under the instigation of the Tačïłut, a clan with aspirations to the leadership of the tribe. His widow, a woman of spirit, attempted, at first with some success, to rally the people to her; but in the end she and her young children were left to their own resources in the expectation that they would die of starvation. They survived however upon a diet of roots and berries eked out with such fish as Temüüjin and his brothers were able to catch in the Onon and such small prairie birds and animals as they were able to shoot with their bows and arrows. It was in a quarrel over game of this sort that Temüüjin is said to have been involved in the murder of one of his half-brothers.

He had grown almost into manhood when the Tačïlut, learning of the family’s survival, made a raid upon the little encampment with the object of seizing Temüüjin and preventing any possibility of his succeeding to his father’s position. He escaped into the forests and for some days eluded his pursuers. When finally captured he was not put to death but was kept as a perpetual prisoner, the Tačïlut taking him with them from encampment to encampment with a cangue or wooden collar about his neck. One evening, when they were feasting along the bank of the Onon, he made off in the dark and, to avoid detection, submerged himself in the river with only his face above water. When the pursuit started his hiding-place was discovered by a member of a kindred tribe, who however befriended the young
man and saved him from immediate danger by persuading the TaikTut to postpone their search till the morning. In the meanwhile Temüüjijn found his way to the tent of his benefactor, who concealed him once again from his enemies and then provided him with the means of escape.

It was soon after this adventure that Temüüjijn betook himself of the bride awaiting him in Eastern Mongolia and he paid a visit to the Konklärat to lay claim to her. Börte brought him as her entire dowry a black-sable skin, a circumstance worthy of mention, since with this sable Temüüjijn was to lay the foundations of his future fortune. He offered it as a present to Toghril, the ruler of the Kereyti, a Nestorian Christian tribe, whose territory lay along the banks of the Tula in the region of the present-day Ulan Bator. Toghril, better known to history as Ong-Khan (he is the Prester John of Marco Polo), had been the anda or blood-brother of Temüüjijn's father. He expressed his pleasure at the gift and took the young man under his protection. Not long passed before Temüüjijn had need of his patron's assistance. The Merkits, a forest tribe on the southern shores of Lake Baikal in what is to-day the Buryat A.S.S.R., raided Temüüjijn's encampment and carried off his newly married bride. With the aid of Toghril and Djamuka, a young Mongol chieftain who was his own anda, Temüüjijn was able to defeat the Merkites in battle and to recover his wife. For a time, after this campaign, Temüüjijn and Djamuka remained firm friends, pitching their tents and herding their animals side by side; but then an estrangement arose between them and they parted company. The reason for this estrangement is not clear but Barthold's theory, according to which Temüüjijn represented the Mongol aristocracy which Temüüjijn was for a time an exile at the court of the Kara-Khitay. Djamuka, meanwhile, deserted by his followers, had been betrayed into the hands of Cingiz-Khan, who, with the execution of his one-time anda, at last found himself the absolute master of Mongolia. At a kuriltai or assembly of the Mongol princes held near the sources of the Onon in the spring of 1206 he caused himself to be proclaimed supreme ruler of all the Mongol peoples. Having also at this kuriltai reorganized his military forces he was now in a position to embark upon foreign conquests.

Already in 1205 he had attacked the kingdom of the Tangut or Hsi Hsia, a people of Tibetan origin who inhabited the region of the great bend in the Yellow River and were converging from three directions upon Pekin. The Chin Emperor was now invaded and overran the whole area north of the Great Wall, but the Wall itself presented a barrier to further advance. In the following year their cause was promoted by the rising of a Khitan prince in southern Manchuria; and in the summer of 1213 they finally forced their way through the Wall and spread out over the North China plain. By the spring of 1215 they controlled the whole area north of the Yellow River and were converging from three directions upon Pekin. The Chin Emperor was now offered and accepted terms of peace and secured the withdrawal of the Mongol forces by the payment of tribute which consisted, in effect, in the immense dowry of a Chin princess bestowed in marriage upon Cingiz-Khan. Circumstances however led to the Mongols' almost immediate return. Pekin was captured and sacked (summer of 1215), and the Emperor fled to K'ai-feng on the southern banks of the Yellow River. Though the war still continued —and, in fact, the subjugation of North China was not finally completed until 1234, seven years after Cingiz-Khan's death—Cingiz-Khan now left the
command of operations in the hands of one of his generals, Mušali of the Djalayir tribe, and, in the summer of 1216, returned to his headquarters in Mongolia, turning his attention to events in Central and Western Asia.

The accession of Semirechye and Sinkiang to his Empire gave Cingiz-Khan a common frontier with Sultān Muhammad Khārīzm-Shāh. Relations between the two rulers had been established already in 1215, when Cingiz-Khan had received an embassy from the Sultan before Pekin. In 1216, or more probably in 1219, a battle took place, and in the course of which the local population he was captured and put to death.

Kūllūg the Nayman, who had sought refuge with the Kara-Khitay, had dethroned the last of their rulers and made himself master of their territories. In 1218 a Mongol army under the famous general Djebe invaded Semirechye and Sinkiang and pursued Kūllūg from Khashkhar over the Pamirs into Badakhshan, where with the co-operation of the local population he was captured and put to death.

The accession of Semirechye and Sinkiang to his Empire gave Cingiz-Khan a common frontier with Sultān Muhammad Khārīzm-Shāh. Relations between the two rulers had been established already in 1215, when Cingiz-Khan had received an embassy from the Sultan before Pekin. In 1216, or more probably in 1219, a battle took place, and in the course of which the local population he was captured and put to death.

Cingiz-Khan meanwhile had passed the summer of 1220 resting his men and animals in the pastures of the Nakhshab area. In the autumn he captured Tirmidh and then proceeded up the Oxus to spend the winter of 1220-1 in the conduct of operations in the region of the present-day Stallinabad, as also in Badakhshān. Early in 1221 he crossed the Oxus and captured Arizm-Shāh [q.v.]; and when the Sultan himself reached the Oxus, he accomplished with a thoroughness from which the site could be ploughed upon; and that in the execution of vengeance [for the death of a Mongol prince] not even cats and dogs should be left alive. After the capture of Harāt Toluy rejoined his father, who was laying siege to the town of Talāshān between Balikh and Marw ar-Rūd, whilst he himself with the main army reached the present-day Talāshān in the Afghan province of Badakhshān.

The summer of 1221 Cingiz-Khan passed in the mountains to the south of Balikh. In the meantime Djalāl al-Dīn, the son of Sultān Muhammad, had made his way to Ghazna and at Parwān to the N. E. of Čārkār had inflicted a crushing defeat upon the Mongol force dispatched against him, the only reverse suffered by the Mongols during the whole campaign. Cingiz-Khan, upon receiving news of this battle, advanced southwards at great speed in pursuit of Sultān Djalāl al-Dīn, whom he finally overtook on the banks of the Indus. In 1222 he left three sides of his army at the lower reaches of the Oxus, and with the river behind him Djalāl al-Dīn, after offering desperate resistance, plunged into the water and swam to the farther side, surviving to conduct sporadic warfare against the Mongols for three years after Cingiz-Khan's death.

The Battle of the Indus, which took place according to Nasawi on the Shawwal 513/24th November 1221, marks the end of Cingiz-Khan's campaign in the West. He began to prepare for the homeward journey and having explored the possibility of returning through India via Assam and Tibet finally turned back along the route he had been following. He travelled by easy stages, spending the summer of 1222 in mountain pastures on the Hindu-Kush and the following winter in the neighbourhood of Samarqand. The reverse suffered by the Mongols during the whole campaign. Cingiz-Khan, upon receiving news of this battle, advanced southwards at great speed in pursuit of Sultān Djalāl al-Dīn, whom he finally overtook on the banks of the Indus. In 1222 he left three sides of his army at the lower reaches of the Oxus, and with the river behind him Djalāl al-Dīn, after offering desperate resistance, plunged into the water and swam to the farther side, surviving to conduct sporadic warfare against the Mongols for three years after Cingiz-Khan's death.

In the autumn of the following year he was on the upper reaches of the Irtysh; and it was only in the spring of 1225 that he finally reached his headquarters in Mongolia.
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In the autumn of the following year he was on the upper reaches of the Irtysh; and it was only in the spring of 1225 that he finally reached his headquarters in Mongolia.
share in the dismemberment of the Kipchak. Of these, the following succeeded:

c) Ulugh Mehemd (murdered in 850/1446), after his expulsion from the "Great Horde", to the Khânate of Kazan (Russ. Kazan [q.v.]) which his successors (among whom were the princes of Kasimov, see "Kasimov") lost in 960/1552 to the Russians.

d) Ulugh Mehemd's nephew, Hâjîdî Girây (q.v.; d. 870/1466), held last (definitively in 1449) to the Crimea (see Khâm) where his successors, under the dynastic name Girây, ruled as the last descendants of Cingiz Khan in Europe, until the annexation of the Crimea by the Russians in 1783.

e) In the small Tatar principality of Kasimov (q.v.), region of Ryazan, various princes (finally a princess) of the line of Ulugh Mehemd (see "Cingizids") ruled between 856-932/1452-56 and about 902/1681. Some of them (including the last ruler) became converted to Orthodox Christianity and became the forefathers of Russian noble families.

f) Descendants of the branch ruling in Astrakhan (see "B") had fled after the Russian conquest to the Shaybanids in Bukhârâ (see "E a"). One of them, Prince Dîjan b. Yâr Muhammad, married the daughter of the Shaybanid Khân Iskandar (968-991/1560-83). After the extinction of the male line of the Bukhârâ dynasty in 1006/1598, their son Bâî Muhammad assumed the rule of the land. The new dynasty was called "Astrakhanid", "Ashârkhânid" or "Dîânîd" (q.v.), and ruled in Bukhârâ (q.v.) until their displacement in 1200/1785 by the House of Mangit (q.v.).

d) Among the descendants of a further son of Dîjan, Moghol (or Tewal?; P. Pelliot, Notes 52/54 considers "Boa" better), his grandson Nohây (q.v.; Moghol "Nohây" 'dog') played a significant role as major domus for several rulers of the Golden Horde, until he was killed in a civil war in 699/1299. His descendants are known for a further two generations before they disappear. — Apparently the Nohây people (q.v.) is called after him.

e) Finally, the descendants of Dîjan's youngest son Shîban (Arabicized "Shâyban") lived originally in the region southeast of the Urals (somewhere between the basin of the Tobol in the west and the Upper Irtish in the east, modern Kazakhstan) where they preserved their nomadic life. When the inhabitants of Orda's "White Horde" under Toktamish migrated far into the Kipchak Plain, the Shaybanids (q.v.) occupied their territory, and the peoples under their rule came to be called Ozbek (q.v.); Russ. Uzbek). Of Shîban's descendants, the Shaybanids, Abu-i Khâyân (q.v.), i. 135 expelled in 851/1447 the Timûrids (q.v.) from Khwârizm (q.v.) and in the region north of the Srî Darâ (q.v.). He ruled the area from there to the neighbourhood of Tobol'sk, but was weakened by the devastating attacks of the Oirats (q.v.; Kalmuks) into his territory as well as by the struggles with the Kazaks (q.v.) and died in 870/1468. His grandson Muhammad Shaybânî (q.v.) conquered Transoxania in 908/1500, where he finally assumed the rule of the Timûrids, penetrating finally into modern Afghanistan (q.v.) as well as Khûrâsân (q.v.). The founder of the Safavid dynasty (q.v.), Ismâ'il I (q.v.) managed to expel him from there and to defeat him near Marw in 916/1510, where Muhammad Shaybânî was killed. With that move, the power of the Cingizids was restricted to the area north of the Amû Darya, and of this to a frontier zone between Persian Shi'I and Turkish Sunni influence (not without isolated shifts in both directions in the course of time).
The reign of the Shaybanids endured in Transoxania, where they ruled:

a) until 1007/1598 in Bukhara, where the ruling family died out in 1007/1598. The Abū ʿAlāʾ Allāh II (q.v.), i, 46 ff.; 901-1007/1593-98. The Djanids succeeded (see “C f.”).

b) In Khwarizm (q.v.), later called for the most part Khiva, which had fallen in 911-912/1505-06 to Muhammad Shaybânî, the tributary line of the ʿArabshâhid dynasty succeeded in 1001/1592 in the person of Ilbars I (1512-25). To this line belongs the famous āl-Atrak”. The line ruled until 1106-7/1694-95, when the power passed to the erstwhile “Condottieri” (Ināk) of the Kungrat family (q.v.) who after 1219/1804 called themselves “Khan”.

c) A further branch of the Shaybanids under Shāh Rukh I, a descendant of Abu-ʾl-Khayr, established himself in Farghana (q.v.) in 1122/1710. He founded the Khānate of Khokand (q.v.) which was annexed in 1876 by the Russians.

d) Finally in 886/1481 the Shaybanid prince Iblâ (d. 899/1491) was able to wrest the neighbourhood of the town of Tumen (Russ. Tyumen) from the hands of the Khân of Shibir (who was not a Cingizid). In 1253/1545 his grandson Khūmīrī expelled the last Khân of Shibir (q.v.) and put down his successors, though after 1279/1571 he himself oppressed by Russian attacks and gradually pushed out of his territory, until he had to flee to the Nogays after a defeat on the Ob’ in 1007/1598, dying there in 1009/1600. His son Išım Khan managed to hold out on the Upper Tobol’ until about 1635.

e) Kasimov (cf. “C e”).

II) The descendants of the second son Câghâtay (q.v.), d. 640/1242 persisted for almost as long, managing to hold their ground against the descendants of Ögedey (see III) in the 7th/13th century, and to win out against them in 700/1300 (See Čâpâr). After that date inner Asia belonged to their area of rule (Ulus). From then on there were various struggles with the Ilkhâns (q.v.; see also under “IV B”) in Persia, and invasions into India, particularly between 697/1297 and 706/1306.

Câghâtay’s great grandson Barâk (q.v.; usually called by Muslims “Bûrkâ”) and the latter’s son Duwa (about 691/1291 to 706/1306) had with Chinese aid asserted themselves against Kâdü (see III). Duwa’s son Kebek (Köpek) was able in 709/1309 to take possession of the latter’s inheritance. (d. 726/1326) His brother Termashirîn (727-735/1326-34) was converted to Islam, taking with him the dynasty and gradually (though not without setbacks) the territory it ruled into the sphere of Islam. His death was followed by a temporary cleavage in the Ulus of Câghâtay:

a) The branch of the house ruling in Transoxania was converted to Islam.

b) In the eastern part of the Ulus, since called Mogholistan (the land of seven rivers/Djeti suw/ Semirecye); the area round Issyk Kul as well as the western Tarim Basin with Kâşgar) ruled a line under whom Islam only spread slowly.

A renewed unity of the two parts by Tughrûl Temür (q.v.) was finally broken by Timûr’s victory in 765/1363 by which Transoxania came to develop a separate character, where Turkish now definitely attained to leadership. Beside Timûr Câghâtâyids continued to rule in the nominal Khân until 805/1402. The Khâns in Mogholistan could not be eliminated, despite Timûr’s persistent efforts.

Rather after Timûr’s death in 808/1405, they were able gradually to regain influence in Transoxania. In particular, Esen Bogha (833/876-1429-62) proved himself a dangerous opponent of the Timûrids.

Between him, the Kara Khoyunlu (q.v.), the Ak Khoyunlu and finally, the rising Şâfawîlds (q.v.), the Timûrîds (with the exception of the Great Moghuls) were gradually worn down. Their territory fell finally to the Shaybanids (q.v.; see also above “I E”) and to the (eastern) Câghâtâyids from Mogholistan, among whom Yûnus (874-891/1469-86), raised as a hostage in Shârz, took possession in 889/1484 of Şavâ as well as Sayrân (q.v.) and Sayrân (q.v.). His successors maintained themselves there, reaching out at the same time—in opposition to China—towards Hâ-mî and Turfân (q.v.), to whose islamization they decisively contributed. In Transoxania the Câghâtâyids were definitively eliminated in 914-5/1508-09 by the Shaybanids. Only Mogholistan east of Tîn-šan remained in the hands of this dynasty, who were forced to share their power with the clan of Duwa (q.v.), centred at Kâşgär. Living for the most part in harmony, both families took part in the struggle for Hâ-mî and Turfân against China, a struggle which lasted still in the 16th century. Apparently at the end of that century a particular branch of the Câghâtâyids established itself in Turfân, and in 1057/1647 and 1068/1657 sent embassies to the Great Khân in China. By the end of the 16th century Câghâtayid power had split in several parts. It was fully ended in 1089/1678 when Khan Ísmâîl of Kâşgär (q.v.) attempted to get rid of the control of the Khâdja (q.v.) which, divided in two parts, since the end of the 10th/16th century had been the real leaders in that region, which was organised in separate city states in the form of theocracies.

III) Cingiz Khan’s third son Müssîdî (q.v.), in accordance with his father’s will and with the approval of his agnates, succeeded his father as the Great Khân from 627/1230 until 639/1241. His son Göyük (Pers. Gôyûk) too had his honour from 644/1246 to 646/1248. The widows of both, Türegene (Pers. Türêkâna) and Oghul Kaymish, conducted the regency in 659-664/1261-66 and 664-67/1268-71. Under Bâtu’s infuences this son this line was unable to maintain itself in the Great Khânate, which passed to the line of Tolû (see IV). None of the less, Kaydû, a nephew of Gôyûk, held his own in Ögedey’s Ulus on the Imîl, in the Tarbagatay Mountains and in modern Afghanistan. He conducted long wars with the princes of the House of Câghâtay (II), especially Barâk, as well as with the Great Khân Kubîlay, whose “nomadic” rival he was. He adhered to the old Mongolian religious traditions, and died in 1301 on the return march from an assault on Karaşorum (q.v.). His son and successor Câpâr (Capar; q.v.) resumed the struggle against the descendants of Câghâtay and Kûbulay, but had to flee from Kebek (see II) in 1309 to the court of the Mongol Emperor of China. Thereupon the Ulus of Câghâtay ceased to exist.

IV) Cingiz Khan’s youngest son Tolû had a such received as Ulus the territory of the actuals Mongolia. Since his sons Möngü (Pers. Mangû; q.v.) 1251-1259, and Kûbulay (q.v.) 1259-94, were Great Khâns into whose hands until 1280 all of China had fallen, there was a dynastic connexion between Mongolia with its capital Karaşorum and the Middle Kingdom, where the Mongol dynasty was called Yûn. A third brother Arîk (Erik) Bûge, who attempted to establish himself in Mongolia, was forced to surrender in 1264 and died in 1266 in Kûbulay’s custody. His great-grandson Arpa ruled
The numbers and letters of this geneological table correspond with the numbers and letters of the article "ČINGIZIDS".
for a few months in 1335/36 as Ilkhan (see "IV B").

A) Kubilay inclined more and more towards Buddhism, and his successors as emperors of China were completely absorbed in the indigenous culture and in the Chinese religion. The essential cause of this was that after Kubilay's death in 1294 the entire Mongol network collapsed, as the other branches of the house had sooner or later converted to Islam, even the Ilkhans of Iran in 695/1295, who had hitherto particularly cultivated their relations with Khân-balik ("Khân-city"); Peking. The Yuan dynasty, driven out of China in 1368, maintained the rule in Mongolia, where the various branches of the house drifted apart, though having nothing to do with Islam. At the end of the 16th century among the Mongols (as a linguistic community) Buddhism was established in its Tibetan form of "Lamaïsm" of the "Yellow Church". The Kalnukuks (q.v.) too brought this religion to the Volga where they preserved it. After 1649 the Mongols in the Ords region were again subject to Chinese authority.

B) A fourth brother of Kubilay, Hulegui (Pers. Hulâgû; (q.v.) d. 1265) conquered in 635-638/1238-9. Persia, "Irâk and Mesopotamia, and, temporarily, Syria. He destroyed the Abbasid caliphate and founded the empire of the Ilkhans (q.v.). He and his successors were in the beginning more or less indifferent as long as they remained in the position of his ancestors. In 694/1295 were converted to Islam, even the Ilkhans of Iran in 695/1295, who had hitherto particularly cultivated their relations with Khân-balik ("Khân-city"); Peking. The Yuan dynasty, driven out of China in 1368, maintained the rule in Mongolia, where the various branches of the house drifted apart, though having nothing to do with Islam. At the end of the 16th century among the Mongols (as a linguistic community) Buddhism was established in its Tibetan form of "Lamaïsm" of the "Yellow Church". The Kalnukuks (q.v.) too brought this religion to the Volga where they preserved it. After 1649 the Mongols in the Ords region were again subject to Chinese authority.


In addition, see the bibliography for the individual branches of the Cingizids, for the individual members of the family, and for the above-mentioned geographical and town names. 

(B. Spuler)
disciples of Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn Awlīya’. His father Yahyā was born in Lāhore. Later the family settled at Awadh (A’bād-i Aydoğhā), where his father traded in woolen cloth or cotton (paşminā in Khāyār al-Maadīlis, var. panēh in A’kbur 80). It was in Awadh that Mūmūd was born, but he was not yet nine, when his father died. His widowed mother arranged for his education with a distinguished scholar of those days Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Karīm Shārahwānī (Nuzhāt al-Khawādir, ii, 70), with whom he studied up to al-Mārgānīn, Hīdāyāt al-Fīhāt, and Fazadāt Usul; (Brockelmann, i 373, s 1 f 837). When Shārahwānī died the young Mūmūd completed his education in the usual sciences with Mawlānā Iftīhār al-Dīn Muhammad al-Gilānī (Nuzhā, ii, 15). When he was about twenty-five, he renounced the world and for seven years went through a rigorous course of self-discipline and self-mortification, and fought against the passions with prayer and fasting. At forty-three he moved to Dīhīl and became a disciple of Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn Awlīya’, i.e., Muhammad Bādā’ūnī. After this he visited Awadh only occasionally and was mostly attending on his murshid at the Dīmā’at Khānā at Kilkohafi, on the bank of the Diamnā. He resided in Dīhīl in the house of his old friend and fellow-disciple Shaykh Būrhan Dīhīl al-Dīnahīg [q.v.]. Towards the end of 724/1324, or a few months later, his Shaykh, who was then about 94, appointed him his successor in Dīhīl, to carry on his life-work and engaged themselves in teaching and anecdotes about him, were collected by Hamid Kalandar (A’kbur, 109, 86). The work called Khayār al-Maadīlis, begun in 735/1334 and completed in 756/1355, is divided into 100 Madīlis (Assemblies). The Shaykh himself revised this work. A takmila (supplement) was added to it by the author, after the death of the Shaykh. The narrative is given in simple Persian and the account is full and detailed. For quotations from it see A’kbur, 109 f, 83-5. An Urdu translation of it exists (Tarīkh Masayikh Cishتل 16211, 1836). A number of his sayings reveal a learned and illumined personality. For an Arabic verse of his see A’kbur, 97.

The enormous influence which he wielded in Dīhīl and outside it (northern India and Deccan) in his own and the following generations, becomes clear from the lengthy list of his notable disciples and khāfīyas, who are noticed in detail in the A’kbur, 129-140, 141-144, 147-149 and 85, (see also Nuzhāt al-Khawādir, ii, 159), including as it does, among others such names as those of Kādī ‘Abd al-Muktarīd (d. 791/1399; see also Subha, 29, Nuzhāt al-Khawādir, ii, 70), Sayyid Mūhammad b. Yūsuf, usually known as Gūsdārdār (died in Gulbarga in 825/1422, see Fīrīshtā, ii, 748, Rīve, 347), Sayyid Dā’al Bakhārī Mādhūmī-Dīhānīyān (d. 783/1383 in Sindh), Aḥmad Thā’n’esari (died in Kālpī; who won consideration from Aḥmid Tūghluq (A’kbur, 142), Mūthābhar of Kāfā (for whom see the Oriental College Magazine, Lāhore, May 1935, 107-106, Aug. 1935, 48-216, A’kbur, 85 f.), and Mawlānā Khwādīgaṯl (A’kbur 141). To this list may be added the names of Gakh Sirāḏ Parwānā, the Shaykh’s khāliṯa in Bengāl, Huṣām al-Dīn al-Dīnah al-Nawrāhāl (Gūgārāt) (Fīrīshtā, ii, 748, 747), and Mūhammad Muḏīr Waḏḏ al-Dīnah Adｂ, author of the Muṯtaḏ al-Dīmā’at (Rīve, 40 f.). The Shaykh died after a short illness on the 18th Ramḍān 757/17 September 1356, and was buried in his own house (Kirmānī, 247), appointing no successor, and the relics he had received from his Shaykh were buried with him. This symbolised the end of the first series of the great Cīštī Saints in India. A mausoleum was built on his tomb by Sultan Flūrūz Shāh. A tomb close to the Shaykh’s is popularly supposed to be that of Sultan Bahlūl Lūdī (in verse), who visited his master (Kirmanī, 245 f.; Diāmāli 38 b; Dā’al al-Fid’l, 81, 91; Fīrīshtā, ii, 748). Muhammad Mubārak al-Kirmānī, Siyar al-Auliya’, Delhi 1902, 236-247; Dīmā’at, Siyar al-Ārīfūn no. 11, my MS., ff. 136-140, 141 b; Abu ‘l-Fadl, ‘Arīf-i Akhbar (Bib. Ind.) ii, 218; Aḥmad-I Ḥusayn, ‘A′rīf-i Akhbar (Bib. Ind.) ii, 218; Aḥmad-I Rāzī, Haft Ifrīm, Agra 1872, 100 f.; plus, Mūhammad Mubārak al-Kirmānī, Siyar al-Ārīfūn no. 402; ‘Abd al-Haḵḵ, Aḥḵār al-Akbār, Delhi 1309, 80 b, 129 f., 134 f., 139 f., 147-149, 153; Māνdawī, Aḥḵār-i Aḏrār (Urdu version of Gultūḏ al-Aḏrār), Āḏrā 1326, 115; Dārā Shuḵhōn, Safīnāt al-Awliya’h (Lucknow 1872, 100 f.; Hakim ‘Abd al-Ḥayyā Lāḏḵawānī, Nuzhāt al-Khawādir, Ḥaydarābāḏ-Deccan, 1350, ii, 147 f.; Rahmān ‘Ali) Aḥḵār ‘Ulamā’h Hind (Lahore 1914, 1938, 236; Balsk, Oriental Biographical Dictionary, Calcutta 1881, 205; idem, Miṣrīn al-Tawārīḵ, 89; Ghulām Sarwar, Khazīnāt al-Asfīyā’h, Lahore 1283, 340-35; Aḥmad Mahdi Usayn, The Rise and fall of Muḥammad bin Tughluq, London 1938, 209 ff., Muhammad Ḥabīb, Shāhī Naṣīr-al-Dīn Mūmūd, Char’gh-i Dīhīl as a great historical personality, in IC, 552 (1946), 129 ff.; Storey, i, 86-91; i, Kha ḫyār Ahmad

Har taraf dars-hā zar ỉ ṯ u ỉ ṭ hish u ṭ usl, Har taraf Ḹ hirh as Khudawān Rasūl. (Panjab University MS. f. 142)

When Sultan Muhammad Tughluq 725-52/1324-51 adopted a hostile policy against the ulamā’ etc. (for reasons discussed by Mahdi Husayn), they created difficulties for the Shaykh too in various ways. The sultan would take him along with him on his travels and on one occasion he put him in charge of his wardrobe. The Shaykh bore all these troubles and hardships and remained celibate like him. After the death of his Shaykh he guided the people for thirty-two years. Kirmānī (242 ff.) gives several instances of his remarkable power of thought-reading.

He and most of his khāfīyas lived in strict obedience to the shari’a and engaged themselves in teaching religious sciences and the spreading of knowledge (cf. Ghulām ‘All Āzād, Subḥat al-Margānīn, 30). A contemporary fafhīr, Kamāl al-Dīn, the author of Twafq al-Fuṭahāh (in verse), who visited his Ḹ hishānāh, confirms it thus:

“On every side Jurisprudence and its (its) Principles were being taught, on every side God, and the Apostles were being mentioned.”

Har taraf dars-hā zar ỉ ṯ u ỉ ṭ hish u ṭ usl, Har taraf Ḹ hirh as Khudawān Rasūl. (Panjab University MS. f. 142)

When Sultan Muhammad Tughluq 725-52/1324-51 adopted a hostile policy against the ulamā’ etc. (for reasons discussed by Mahdi Husayn), they created difficulties for the Shaykh too in various ways. The sultan would take him along with him on his travels and on one occasion he put him in charge of his wardrobe. The Shaykh bore all these troubles and hardships and remained celibate like him. After the death of his Shaykh he guided the people for thirty-two years. Kirmānī (242 ff.) gives several instances of his remarkable power of thought-reading.

He and most of his khāfīyas lived in strict obedience to the shari’a and engaged themselves in teaching religious sciences and the spreading of knowledge (cf. Ghulām ‘All Āzād, Subḥat al-Margānīn, 30). A contemporary fafhīr, Kamāl al-Dīn, the author of Twafq al-Fuṭahāh (in verse), who visited his Ḹ hishānāh, confirms it thus:

“On every side Jurisprudence and its (its) Principles were being taught, on every side God, and the Apostles were being mentioned.”
CIRAGH-I DIHLI — ClSHTI
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- [see CERKES]
- Bierstedt, Wanderjahre. II-V, 240-241; St. N. Kyriakides, "AvXaTVal MeXsToa," in India, was born in or about 536/1141 in Siijistan. He was in his teens when his father, Sawaiid Ghiyath al-Din, died leaving as legacy a grinding mill and an orchard. The sack of Siijistan at the hands of the Guuzz Turks turned his mind inwards and he developed strong mystical tendencies. He distributed all his assets and took to itineracy. He visited the seminaries of Samarkand and Bulbahra and acquired religious learning at the feet of eminent scholars of his age. While on his way to Irak, he passed through Harvan, a kasaba in the district of Nigashir. Here he met Khwajda Uthman and joined the circle of his disciples. For twenty years he accompanied his mystic teacher on his Wanderjahre. Later on he undertook independent journeys and came in contact with eminent saints and scholars like Shaykh ’Abd al-Kadir Gllani, Shaykh Nadjm al-Din Kubra, Shaykh Nadjib al-Din ’Abd al-Kahir Suhrawardi, Shaykh Abû Sa’id Tabrizi, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Wahid Ghaznavi—all of whom were destined to exercise great influence on contemporary religious thought. He visited nearly all the great centres of Muslim culture in those days—Samarkand, Bulbahra, Bagdad, Nishapir, Tabriz, Awhsh, Isfahan, Sazawir, Mhna, Khirkân, Astarabâd, Balkh and Ghaznî—and acquainted himself with almost every important trend in Muslim religious life in the middle ages. He then turned towards India and, after a brief stay at Lahore, where he spent some time in meditation at the tomb of Shaykh All al-Hudjwiri, reached Adjmêr before its conquest by the Guzz. It was here that he married at an advanced age. According to ’Abd al-Ha King Dihlawi (d. 1642) he took two wives, one of them being the daughter of a Hindu râdj. He had three sons—Shaykh Abû Sa’îd, Shaykh Fâhir al-Din and Shaykh Husâm al-Din—and one daughter, Bibî Djamal, from these wives. Bibî Djamal had strong mystic leanings but his sons were not inclined towards mysticism. Nothing is known about Abû Sa’id; Fâhir al-Din took to farming at Mandal, near Adjmêr; while Husâm al-Din disappeared mysteriously. Mu’in al-Din died at Adjmêr in 633/1236. His tomb is venerated by Hindus and Muslims alike
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and hundreds of thousands of people from all over the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent assemble there on the occasion of his *urs* (death anniversary).

The dargah area contains many buildings—gates, mosques, hospices, langars—constructed by the rulers of Malwa, the Mughal emperors, nobles, merchants and mystics during the past several centuries. Muhammad b. Tughluq (626-752/1225-1351) was the first Sultan of Dhilli who visited his grave (*Futak al-Salatin*, Madras, 406). The Khaldji Sultans of Malwa constructed the tomb of the saint. It was during the reign of Akbar (959-1014/1556-1605) that Adjmer became one of the most important centres of pilgrimage in the country. The Mughal emperors displayed great reverence for the mausoleum of the saint. Akbar undertook a journey on foot to Adjmer, and Shah Djuhan's daughter, Djuhan-Árã, cleansed and swept the tomb with her eyelids.

KhwaÁ‡dja MuÁ‘in al-Din laid the foundations of the Cishti order in India and worked out its principles at Adjmer, the seat of Cawhan power. No authentic details are available about the way he worked in the midst of a population which looked askance at every foreigner. It appears that his stay was disliked by Prithvî Rádji and the caste Hindus but the common people flocked to him in large numbers. He visited Delhi twice during the reign of Iltutmish (1210-1235), but kept himself away from the centre of political power and quietly worked for a cultural revolution in the country. His firm faith in wahdat al-udwádât (Unity of Being) provided the necessary ideological support to his mystic mission to bring about emotional integration of the people amongst whom he lived. Some of his sayings, as preserved in *Siyar al-Awliyá*, reveal him as a man of wide sympathies, catholic views and deep humanism. He interpreted religion in terms of human service and exhorted his disciples "to develop river-like gentleness, sun-like affection and earth-like hospitality". The highest form of devotion (*tadh*), according to him, was "to redress the misery of those in distress; sympathies, catholic views and deep humanism. He provided the necessary wáhdat al-'árifin, a disciple of the saint, compiled by his *al-'Arifin*, a disciple of the saint, compiled by his and tracing the growth of legends round the Khwadja's person; its historical value is, nevertheless, very meagre. For later authorities, Abu 'l-Fadl, Á‡in-i Akbari, Sir Sayyid ed., 209; Ghawwáli, Gulád-i


CISHTIYYA, one of the most popular and influential mystic orders of India. It derives its name from Cîst, a village near Harat (marked as Khwâwâdá ‘i Cîst on some maps), where the real founder of the order, Khwâwâdá Abú Íshâk of Syria (Mir Khúrud, *Siyar al-Áªlwiyá?, Delhi 1302, 39-40; Dári, *Nafáhát al-Ums*, Nawal Kishore 1915, 206) settled at the instance of his spiritual mentor, Khwâwâdá Mûmâhd ‘Ulâm dinawâr (a place in Kuhistán, between Hamadán and Baghdad). The sîtsila is traced back to the Prophet as follows: Abú Íshâk Mûmâhêd ‘Ulâm dinawâr, Amlán al-Din Abú Hubayrát al-Áªrã, Sadid al-Din Huzayýfát al-Mar'áqshí, Íbráhim Adham al-Bálqíjí, Abu 'l-Fayyád Fuqâyá b. Íyád, Abu 'l-Fadl 'Abd al-Wâhid b. Zayd, Hasan al-Áªrã, ‘Ali b. Abí Tálíb, the Prophet Muhammad. Sháh Wâlt Allah (d. 1763) has doubted the validity of the tradition which makes Hasan al-Áªrã a spiritual successor of 'All (Al-Ísháb Í Saláís-í Alwiyá? Allâh, Delhi 1911, 18), but his views have been criticised by Sháh Faqîr al-Din Dhillawli (d. 1784) in his *Fakhr al-Hasân* (commentary on this, by Mawláwân Ahsan al-Zâmán, *Al-Kawal al-Mustakhyín fi Fakhr al-Hasân*, Haydarâbâd 1312). The pre-Indian history of the Cîshítl order cannot be reconstructed on the basis of any authentic historical data. Khwâdja MuÁ‘in al-Din Sîdijí Cîshít (see preceding article) brought the sîtsila to India in the 12th century and established a Cîshítl mystic centre at Adjmer, whence the order spread far and wide in India and became a force in the spiritual life of the Indian Muslims. Khwâdja MuÁ‘in al-Din was connected with the founder of the sîtsila by the following chain of spiritual ancestors: MuÁ‘in al-Din Hasan, Uhmánh Harváni, Hâdji Sháhír Zámdânt, Mawaíd Cîshít, Abí Ýúsuf, Abí Muhammad b. Âhmâd, Abí Âhmâd b. Fárasana, Abú Íshâk. (The earliest lists of the great Cîshítl saints in the order of their spiritual succession are given in *Futak al-Salátin*, Madras, 7-8; *Khâyir al-Madädínt*, Aligarh, 7-8; *Siyar al-Awliyá?, Delhi, 124-145; Ahsan al-Áªrãh, MS personal collection).
Shaykhs (circa 597/1200 to 757/1356), (ii) Era of the Provincial Khatamaks (8th/14th & 9th/15th centuries), (iii) Rise of the Ṣabirīyya Branch (9th/15th century onwards), and (iv) Revival of the Niẓāmiyya Branch 12th/18th century onwards.

The saints of the first cycle established their ḳhānakhs mainly in Radżputāna, U.P. and the Pandjāb. Some of them, like Ḥamīd al-Dīn Shīrī, worked out the Cishtī mystic principles in the rural areas; others lived in kābars and towns but scrupulously avoided identification with the centre of political power. They refused to accept diwārs and government services; did not perpetuate spiritual succession in their own families and looked upon ‘learning’ as an essential qualification for spiritual work. Under Shaykh Fārid Gandj-i Shāhak and Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā, the influence of the order was extended to the whole of India, and people flocked to their hospices from distant parts of the country. The silsilā possessed during this period a highly integrated central structure which controlled and guided the activities of those associated with it. Muhammad b. Tughluk’s policy (1325-1351) of forcing the saints to settle in the various provinces of India. Some of them had taken up their residence in provincial towns at the instance of their master; others were forced by Muhammad b. Tughluk to settle there. It is significant that the arrival of these saints in provincial towns coincided with the rise of provincial kingdoms. In these circumstances many of these saints could not keep themselves away from the provincial courts. The traditions of the saints of the first cycle were consequently discarded and the comfortable theory was expounded that mystics should consort with kings and high officers in order to influence them for the good. State endowments were accepted and, in return, spiritual blessings and moral support was given to the founders of the new provincial dynasties. The principle of hereditary succession was also introduced in the silsilā.

Shaykh Sirādī al-Dīn, popularly known as Akhlī Sirādī, introduced the silsilā in Bengal. His disciple Shaykh ‘Alī al-Dīn b. Aṣāīd was fortunate in having two eminent disciples—Sayyid Nur Kūṭī ‘Alam and Sayyid Ashraf Ḍihāṅgīr Simnānī—who played a very important role in popularising the Cishtī silsilā in Bengal, Bihar and eastern U.P. When Rādī Kāns established his power in Bengal, Sayyid Nur Kūṭī ‘Alam organized public opinion against him and persuaded Sultan Ibrāhīm Shākht of Dhavnūr (1402-1440) to invade Bengal. Nūr Kūṭī ‘Alam and his descendants had a share in creating that religious stir which ultimately led to the rise of the Bhakti movement in Bengal and Bihār.

The Čishtīyya order was introduced in the Deccan by Shaykh Burhān al-Dīn Qāhirī who settled at Dāwalītābād and propagated the Cishtī mystic principles. The city of Burhānpūr was named after him. His disciple, Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn, was the spiritual master of ‘Alī al-Dīn Hasan Shāh (1347-1359), the founder of the Bahmani kingdom. Later

(i) ERA OF THE GREAT SHAYKHS:

Muḥīn al-Dīn Hasan (d. 1236) (Adīmī)

| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Shaykh Nasīr al-Dīn Cirāgh (d. 757/1356) (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Mawlahā Muwāyyid al-Dīn (d. circa 726/1325) (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Shams al-Dīn Yābīya (d. circa 747/1346) (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Kāḍī Muḥīf al-Dīn Kāshānī (d. circa 719/1319) (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Fakhr al-Dīn Ṣarrādī (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Rukn al-Dīn Mas‘ūd Bakk (d. 836/1432) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā (d. 726/1325) (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Djamāl al-Dīn Mutawakkil (d. 670/1271) (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | ‘Alī al-Dīn b. Ahmad Shābir (Kalyar) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Shīhāb al-Dīn ‘Ishāk (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Badr al-Dīn Ghazawī (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Imām al-Dīn Abdal (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Shīhāb al-Dīn ‘Ishāk (Dīhī) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Hamīd al-Dīn Shīrī (d. 642/1244) (Nagawr) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Ḥamīd al-Dīn Shīrī (d. 642/1244) (Nagawr) |
| Muḥīn al-Dīn | Fārid al-Dīn Gandj-i Shāhak (d. 644/1265) (Pakpatan) |
(ii) ERA OF THE PROVINCIAL KHĀNAKĀHS:

Sirādī al-Dīn
Akhl Sirādī
(d. 759/1357)
(Gawf, Bengal)

Zayn al-Dīn

Sayyid Muhammad
Gsū Darās
(d. 826/1422)
(Gulbarga)

Mūḥammad b. Sayyid
Yād Allāh
(d. 849/1445)

Shāh Barak Allāh
(Yūsuf
(d. circa 729/1328)

Kamāl al-Dīn
Mawlānā
Khwādīgī
(Nalpī)

Wādíjī al-Dīn
(Yūsuf
(d. circa 729/1328)

Mabhīth al-Dīn
(Udíj playn)

Ulūn

Kamāl al-Dīn
Allāma
(Gudjarāt)

Nūr al-Dīn
Taḏī al-Dīn Shīr
Sūwār (d. circa 784/1382)
(Narnawī)

Sayyid Asghaf
Džāhāngīr
Simnānī (d. 808/1405)
(Kaḥān)

Kāḏī ʿAbd al-Muḫtadīr
(Dihḷī)

Sayyid Muhammad
Muḥammad
(d. 900/1494), (Mālwa, near Kanawdī)

Sayyid ʿAbd al-Hākīm
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Hākīm Muḥaddīj
(Dihḷīwī)

Shāh Kallm Allāḥ
Diahanābādī
(Dihḷī)

∗Alāʾ al-Dīn b.
Asaq Lāḥurf
Bengali
(d. 807/1308)
(Pandwa)

Nūr al-Dīn

Zayn al-Dīn

Sayyid Ashraf
Tādī al-Dīn Shīr
Sūwār (d. circa 784/1382)
(Narnawī)

‘Alāʾ al-Dīn b.
Asaq Lāḥurf
Bengali
(d. 807/1308)
(Pandwa)

Nūr al-Dīn

Zayn al-Dīn

Sayyid Ashraf
Džāhāngīr
Simnānī (d. 808/1405)
(Kaḥān)

Kāḏī ʿAbd al-Muḫtadīr
(Dihḷī)

Sayyid Muhammad
Muḥammad
(d. 900/1494), (Mālwa, near Kanawdī)

Sayyid ʿAbd al-Hākīm
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Hākīm Muḥaddīj
(Dihḷīwī)

Shāh Kallm Allāḥ
Diahanābādī
(Dihḷī)

∗Alāʾ al-Dīn b.
Asaq Lāḥurf
Bengali
(d. 807/1308)
(Pandwa)

Nūr al-Dīn

Zayn al-Dīn

Sayyid Ashraf
Džāhāngīr
Simnānī (d. 808/1405)
(Kaḥān)

Kāḏī ʿAbd al-Muḫtadīr
(Dihḷī)

Sayyid Muhammad
Muḥammad
(d. 900/1494), (Mālwa, near Kanawdī)

Sayyid ʿAbd al-Hākīm
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Hākīm Muḥaddīj
(Dihḷīwī)

Shāh Kallm Allāḥ
Diahanābādī
(Dihḷī)

∗Alāʾ al-Dīn b.
Asaq Lāḥurf
Bengali
(d. 807/1308)
(Pandwa)

Nūr al-Dīn

Zayn al-Dīn

Sayyid Ashraf
Džāhāngīr
Simnānī (d. 808/1405)
(Kaḥān)

Kāḏī ʿAbd al-Muḫtadīr
(Dihḷī)

Sayyid Muhammad
Muḥammad
(d. 900/1494), (Mālwa, near Kanawdī)

Sayyid ʿAbd al-Hākīm
Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Hākīm Muḥaddīj
(Dihḷīwī)

Shāh Kallm Allāḥ
Diahanābādī
(Dihḷī)
(iii) RISE OF THE ŞABIRIYYA BRANCH:

Shaykh 'Ala’ al-Din 'Ali b. Ahmad Sabir (d. 691/1291) (Kalyar)

Shams al-Din Turk (Panipat)

Djalal al-Din Mahmoud (Panipat)

Ahmad 'Abd al-Hak̀k (d. 838/1434) (Radawl)

Shaykh 'Arif (Radawl)

Shaykh Muhammad

'Abd al-Kuddús (d. 944/1537) (Gangû)

Djalal al-Din Faruki (Thanesar) (d. 990/1582)

Nizam al-Din Fârûqî (Balakh) (d. circa 1056/1646)

Abû Sa‘îd (Gangû)

Muhammad Sadik

Muhammad Dâ‘îd

Shâh Abûl-Ma‘âli (d. 1112/1700)

Muhammad Sa‘îd

Sayyid Muhammad Sâlim (d. 1175/1761)

Sayyid Muhammad ‘Azam (d. 1227/1812)

Hâfiz Mûsâ Manikpuri (d. 1280/1863)

Sayyid Amânat ‘Ali (d. 1280/1863)

Hâfiz Muhammad Husayn (author of Anwâr al-‘Arîfîn)

Hâdji Imâd Allâh of Thânâ Bharawn (d. 1317/1899) (Mecca)

Muhammad Kâsim Nanawtawi (d. 1295/1878) (founder of the madrasa of Deoband)

Ashraf ‘Ali (Thânâ Bharawn) (d. 1905) (Gangû) (founder of the madrasa of Deoband)

Rashid Ahmad (Gangû) (d. 1905) (Gangû) (founder of the madrasa of Deoband)

Ahmad Hasân Muâddith (d. 1911) (Amroha)

Muhammad Hasan, Shaykh al-Hind (d. 1920) (Deoband)

Husayn Ahmad Madani (d. 1957) (Deoband)

Khâli‘ Ahmad Anbethawi (d. 1927) (Medina)

Muhammad Ilyâs Kandhlawi (d. 1944) (Dîhlî)
on, a disciple of Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṣirāgh, Sayyid Muhammad Gūsā Darāz, set up a Čishtī centre at Gulbarga. He was a prolific writer and a scholar of several languages. Through him the āliya spread in the Deccan and Gujūrāt.

In Gujūrāt, the āliya was introduced by two less known disciples of Khwāja Kuṭb al-Dīn—Shaykh Mahmūd and Shaykh Hamīd al-Dīn. Later on, three disciples of Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn Awlīyā—Sayyid Ḥasan, Shaykh Ḥusām al-Dīn Muṁtānī and Shaykh Barak Allāh reached there. But the work of organizing it on effective lines was undertaken by ʿAllāma Kamāl al-Dīn, a nephew of Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Čirāgh. His son, Sirāḏ al-Dīn, refused to leave India. Dara Shukoh had great respect for and passing through Thanesar. Djiāhangīr forced him to leave India. Dara Shukoh had great respect for and carried on correspondence with Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh, but Awrangzhīb was very critical of his religious views. Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʻRahīm joined the movement of Sayyid Ahmad Shahīd and died fighting at Balakot in 1830. Hādī Imdād Allāh migrated from India in 1857 and settled at Mecca. He attracted a very large number of externalist scholars to his mystic fold. Many of the outstanding Indo-Muslim

Very little is known about the founder the Sabirīyya branch, which came into prominence in the 9th/15th century when Shaykh Ahmad ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm set up a great mystic centre at Rudwālī. The main centres of this branch of the Čishtī āliya were Kalyār (near Roorkee in the Saharanpur district of U.P.), Panipat, Rudwālī (38 miles from Bārā Bankī in Awadh), Gāngū (23 miles u.c. of Saharanpur, in U.P.), Thanesar (near Panipat), Dhān-gāhnā (in Muṣaffārānagar district, U.P.) Allāhābād, Amroha (in the Murādābād district of U.P.) Deoband (in Saharanpur district, U.P.); Thāna Bhawān (in Muṣaffārānagar district, U.P.) and Nānawātī (in Saharanpur district). Shaykh ʿAbd al-Kuddūs was the greatest figure of the Šabirīyya branch. He left Rudwālī in 1491, at the suggestion of the famous Afghān noble, Ṣāmīr Khān, and settled at Shahābābād, near Dīhlī. In 1526, when Bābur sacked Shahābābād, he went to Gūnghū and settled there. His epistolary collection, Maktūbat-i Kuddūsī, contains letters addressed to Sikandār Lūdī (1488-1517), Bābur (1526-1530) Humāyūn (1530-1556) and a number of Afghān and Mughal nobles. The relations of the Šabirīyya saints with the Mughal emperors were not always very cordial. Akbār (1556-1605) no doubt paid a visit to a šaykh Djiālāl-al-Dīn Fārūkī at Thanesar, but Djiāhangīr (1605-1627) became hostile towards his disciple, Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn Fārūkī, because he had met the rebel prince, Khwāsūr, when he was passing through Thanesar. Djiāhangīr forced him to leave India. Dārā Shukōh had great respect for and carried on correspondence with Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh, but Awrangzhīb was very critical of his religious views. Shaykh ʿAbd al-ʻRahīm joined the movement of Sayyid Ahmad Shahīd and died fighting at Balākot in 1830. Ḥādī Imdād Allāh migrated from India in 1857 and settled at Mecca. He attracted a very large number of externalist scholars to his mystic fold. Many of the outstanding Indo-Muslim

(iv) REVIVAL OF THE NIZĀMIYYA BRANCH:

Shāh Kalīm Allāh Djiāhānābādī (d. 1142/1729) (Dīhlī)
Shāh Nizām al-Dīn (d. 1142/1729) (Dīhlī)
Shāh Fakhr al-Dīn (d. 1199/1784) (Dīhlī)
Nūr Muḥammad (d. 1205/1790) (Mahārān, in Bahawalpur)
Muḥammad ʿAṣīl (d. 1229/1813) (Caṭrān, Panḍāb)
Hāfīz Djiāmāl (d. 1226/1812) (Mūłtān)
Gul Muḥammad Ahmādpūrī (d. 1243/1827) (author of Takhmīlāt-i Siyār al-Āliya)
Khudā Bakhsh (Mūltān)
Allāh Bakhsh (d. 1901) (Taunsa)
Hāfīz Muṣā (d. 1906) (Taunsa)
Mihr ʿAlī Shāh (Gūlūr, Panḍāb)
Ghulūm Ḥāydar ʿAlī Shāh (d. 1906) (Djalālpūr, Panḍāb)
Hākīm Muḥammad Ḥasan (d. 1904) (Amroha)
Shāh Niyāz Muḥammad (d. 1250/1834) (Bareilly)
Sayyid Nizām al-Dīn (Bareilly)
Shāh Muhīy al-Dīn (Bareilly)
Sayyid Muḥammād Sulaymān (d. 1267/1850) (Taunsa, near Dera Ḥafiz Khān)
Muḥammād ʿAllāh (d. 1267/1850) (Khiyārābād, U.P.)
Ḥādī Nādīm al-Dīn (d. 1287/1870) (Fathpur, near Dhiānghūnū, Rādīputnā)
of the post-1857 period, like Mawlana Rashid Ahmad Muhaddith of Gangu, Mawlana Muhammad Kāsim Nanawātī, Mawlana Aghraf Ali Thānawi, Mawlana Māhmed al-Hasan Deobandī, Sayyid Aḥmad Muhaddith Amrohī, Shaikh Mīrāt Ahmad Madani, Mawlana Khaļīf Ahmad, Mawlana Muhammād Ilyās Kandhīwāl, Mawlana Ahmad Ḥasan Muḥaddīth Amrohī, may be counted amongst his spiritual descendants. Almost all the great ulama of Deoband (q.v.) are spiritually associated with the Cīshṭīyya silsilah through him.

The Niẓāmiyya branch of the Cīshṭīyya silsilah was revitalised by Shaikh Kallīr Mawlānā Ḥājmānbādī. He belonged to that famous family of architects which had built the Tādīr Mahall of Agra and the Diwāni Masjīd of Dīhī, but he dedicated himself to spiritual work and infused new life into the almost defunct Cīshṭī organization. After Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Cīrāgh, he was the greatest Cīshṭī saint who revived the old traditions and strove to build up a central organization of the silsilah. His disciples spread in the distant south also. His chief Ḥāfiṣa, Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn, worked in Awarangābād. The latter's son, Shāh Fakhr al-Dīn, came to Dīhī and set up a mystic centre there. It was through his two Ḥāfiṣās, Shāh Nūr Muhammad of Māhrān and Shāh Niẓām Ahmad of Bareilly, that the Khalīfahs of Shāh Nur Muhammad of Māhrān and of Deoband [q.v.] are spiritually associated with the Cīshṭīyya silsilah at the following places in the Pandjab: Taunsa, Cārān, Kāt Mithān, Ahmādpur, Mūlān, Sīyāl, Gulra, and Dīsālāpur. Shāh Niẓām Ahmad worked mainly in Dīhī and U.P.

B: Ideology

The early Cīshṭī mystics of India had adopted the Šaurūrī or Maʿārīf of Shaykh Šīhāb al-Dīn Suhrawardī as their chief guide book. On it was based the organisation of the silsilah. His disciples spread in the distant south also. His chief Ḥāfiṣa, Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn, worked in Awarangābād. The latter's son, Shāh Fakhr al-Dīn, came to Dīhī and set up a mystic centre there. It was through his two Ḥāfiṣās, Shāh Nūr Muhammad of Māhrān and Shāh Niẓām Ahmad of Bareilly, that the Khalīfahs of Shāh Nur Muhammad of Māhrān and of Deoband [q.v.] are spiritually associated with the Cīshṭīyya silsilah at the following places in the Pandjab: Taunsa, Cārān, Kāt Mithān, Ahmādpur, Mūlān, Sīyāl, Gulra, and Dīsālāpur. Shāh Niẓām Ahmad worked mainly in Dīhī and U.P.

The early Cīshṭī saints, however, did not write anything about wakhdāt al-wudjuḍ. Māḥfūẓ Bakkī's Mīrāt al-Arīfīn and his dīwān, Nūr al-Aʿlyn, gave currency to these ideas and his works became a popular study in the Cīshṭī khānaḏahs. Later on, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Kaddūs wrote a commentary on Ibn al-ʿArībī's books and he was followed by Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn Thānesarī, who wrote two commentaries on Firaqī's Lāmāʿūd. One of his ʿHaflas, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Karīm Lūhāy, wrote a Persian commentary on the Fausq al-Ikhtāl. Shaykh Muhīb Allāh of Allāhābād was a very powerful exponent of the ideology of wakhdāt al-wudjuḍ. Awarangābād, who was more influenced by the school of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī, ordered his books to be burnt. (ii) The Cīshṭīs looked down upon possession of private property as a negation of faith in God. They rejected all worldly goods and material attractions (urūs tī dunyā) and lived on futāh, which were not demanded as charity. (iii) They

believed in pacifism and non-violence and considered retaliation and revenge as laws of the animal world. They lived and worked for a healthy social order—free from all dissensions and discriminations. (iv) In no form was contact with the state permitted. "There are two abuses among the mystics", says an early Cīshṭī mystic, "dírārat and muballāt. Muballāt is one who has no master; dírārat is one who visits kings and their courts and asks people for money". (v) The summum bonum of a mystic's life, according to Cīshṭis, is to live for the Lord alone. He should neither hope for Heaven nor fear Hell. Man's Love towards God may be of three kinds: (a) mahabbat-i Ḥaṣṣ, i.e., love which is the result of cosmic emotion. A mystic should develop the last one. (ii) The Cīshṭi mystics did not demand formal conversion to Islam as a pre-requisite to initiation in mystic discipline. Formal conversion, they said, should not precede but follow a change in emotional life. The Cīshṭī attitude contrasted sharply with the Suhrawardī principles in this respect.

C: Practices

The following practices were adopted by the Cīshṭīs in order to harness all feelings and emotions in establishing communion with Allāh: (i) Dīkhī Ḥāfez, reciting the names of Allāh loudly, sitting in the prescribed posture at prescribed times; (ii) Dīkhī Ḥaft, reciting the names of Allāh silently; (iii) Pār-i Afnās, regulating the breath; (iv) Murābā, absorption in mystic contemplation; (v) Cīlā, forty days of spiritual confinement in a lonely corner or cell for prayer and contemplation. The efficacy of audition parties (sama ʿi) was also emphasised. Some Cīshṭī mystics believed in Cīlā-i ṭakāts ("inverted Cīlā") also. One who practiced it tied a rope to his feet and had his body lowered into a well, and offered prayers in this posture for forty nights.

The literature of the Cīshṭīyya has been considered under five heads: (a) maḥfaẓāt (translations) of the saints, (b) maktūbāt (letters) of the saints (c) works on mystic ideology and practices, (d) biographical accounts of saints and (e) poetical works. Only major and representative works have been indicated here.

(a) Maḥfaẓāt: The maḥfaẓāt literature of the Cīshṭī saints throws valuable light on their thought and activities. The art of maḥfaẓāt-writing was introduced in India by Aḥmad Ḥasan Siddīqī, who compiled the conversations of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn Awliya ʿ in his Fawwūd al-Fuʿāda, Nawal Kishore 1302. Other important collections of maḥfaẓāt are the following: Khayr al-Mahdīūs, conversations of Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Cīrāgh, compiled by Ḥamīd Kalandar (ed. K. A. Nizami, Aligarh); Surūr al-Ṣūdār, conversations of Shaykh Ḥamīd al-Dīn Sūfī, compiled by his grandson (MSS Habībqandī) and personal collection; see Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, Nagpur Session, 1950, 167-169; Aḥsan al-ʿAbūd, conversations of Shaykh Ḥuraḥ al-Dīn Ghāfīrī, compiled by Mawlānā Ḥamīd Nāẓīmī, MG (MS personal collection, see J. Pak. Hist., vol. iii Part I, 40-41).
conversations of Gisu-Daraz, compiled by Sayyid Muhammad Akbar Husaynl (Uthmangandj); ... to Rumeli; he became Shaykh al-Islam in the same year, and died in office (28 Dium. I 995/6 May 1587).

Lahore 1301; [27x133]Mirzdt al-Faridi, [27x133]Shamd'il-i Ankiyya (MS As. Soc. of Bengal); [27x29]bayn, [27x46]collection); Muhammad Husayn, [27x90]Iktibds al-Anwar, [27x116]Ma'dridi al-Mandfrib al-Mafybu (MSS, Storey 3, [27x125]AII Asghar Cishti, [27x142]personal collection); [27x142]Diawdhir-i Takmila to the Delhi 1312.

Delhi 1315; [27x98]Barnawl, (MSS., Storey 1008); [27x159](MS personal collection); [27x159]Risdla Delhi 1311; Nizam al-Din Yamam, [27x177]Siyar al-'Arifin, [28x263]Awrangabadl, (Delhi 1309); Fakhr Nizam al-Kulub [28x287]imad, [28x314]c [28x314]Abd al-Kuddus by Rukn al-Dln, Delhi [29x399]letters of [29x426]Agra 1348, are steeped in Cishti ideology.

Biography: Besides works cited in the article, see: [29x513]tudes: The two earliest Cishti works on mystic tendencies of the period. Mas'ud Bakk's [29x616]Khawdrik-i Hddwiyya, [227x219]Ciwi Ilyas of Menteshe (d. 900/1494-5).


Crit [see gahshiy] Cwii-żade, Ottoman family of scholars, two of whom held the office of Shaykh al-Islam in the roth/16th century; they take their name from the mudarris Ciwi Ilyas of Mentesh (d. 900/1494-5).

1. Muhyi al-Din Shaykh Muhammad (‘Kodja Ciwiżade’), the son of Ciwi Ilyas, b. 896/1491-2, was appointed Kadi of Cairo in 923/1517, and Kadi ‘asker of Andanolu in 944, and Shaykh al-Islam (on the death of Sa’dd Ef.) in Shawwal 945/Feb. 1539. He was dismissed (the first Shaykh al-Islam not to hold office for life) in Radjab 948 (1549). On the pretext that he had given an unsound (Lutfi Paşa, Ta’rīh, 390): the real reason was probably his hostility to tasawwuf (Shahbât [Megjid], 446, and cf. H. Kh. [Fligel], iv. 429). In 952/1545 he replaced Abu ’l-Su’d, now Shaykh al-Islam, as Kadi‘asker of Rumeli, in which office he died (Shab’ân 954/ Sept. 1547).

His brother ‘Abdî Celebi, who trained the young Feridûn [g.o.], was Bashi-Defterdar from 945/1547 (cf. L. Forrer, Russiem Pascha, 145) until his death in 960, and his son-in-law Hâmid Ef. was Shaykh al-Islam from 982/1574 to 985.

2. Muhammad, son of the above, b. 937/1531, was successively Kadi of Damascus (977/1569), Cairo, Bursa, Edirne and Istanbul, then Kadi ‘asker of Andanolu (983/1575) and of Rumeli (985), in which posts he won a great reputation for uprightness. Having incurred the enmity of Sokollu Mehmed Paşa, he was dismissed, but in 989/1581 he was re-appointed to Rumeli; he became Shaykh al-Islam in the same year, and died in office (28 Dium. 1 995/5/5 May 1597).
His son Muhammad Ef. (d. 1061/1651) and his grandson 'Abd-Allah Ef. (d. 1138/1725) both rose to be Kadi-fu'sh al-Fattakhs. 

COLOMB-BÉCHAR, chief town of the department of the Saoura (Organisation Commune des Régions Sahariennes), created by a decree of 7 August 1957.

This town is quite recent; before the French occupation, which dates from 13 November 1903, a few villages, with no historical importance, had been built unevenly along the banks of the Oued Bechar (Wadi Bashghar), which sustained a scanty group of palm-trees. From 1857 the region had been explored by Captain de Colomb, whose name has been used for the new town; to this has been joined the name Bechar which, according to local tradition, derives from the fact that a Muslim sent to explore the region by a Turkish sultan (?) of the 12th century, brought back a flask of clear water; hence the epithet, taken from the root بشر (to bring good news), which would be given to him and to the region from which he came.

The French occupation, following on Franco-Moroccan talks, was designed to protect southern Oran against incursions of Berber tribes from Tafilalet and neighbouring regions. At first a military post, Colomb-Béchar became in 1905 the terminal of a railway line from Oran Tell, and an important caravan centre, then in 1919 the main town of a mixed commune and in 1930 the main town of the territory of Ain Sefra (‘Ayn Šafra’) (territories of southern Algeria). At the time of the Second World War, the coal mines which had been discovered in 1917 in the neighbourhood of the town were fully exploited, from 1941; at the same time the decision was made to build the railway from the Mediterranean to the Niger, which gave a new stimulus to the town. Since the war the output from the surrounding coal basin has remained at roughly 300,000 tons a year; in 1956 plans were made to build a thermo-electric power station, and important mineral deposits were discovered in the region. Finally the French government has installed at Colomb-Béchar and in the surrounding district an important practice centre for guided missiles. The result of this is that the population has risen from 750 inhabitants in 1906, to more than 16,500 in 1954, 3,350 of whom are Europeans (according to the census of 1954).

Bibliography:


COLUMN [see ‘AMÔD]
COMMERCE [see TIHĂRA]
COMMUNICATIONS [see BARID, TARİK, ULAN, etc.]
COMORS [see KUMR]
COMPANIONS [see ŞAHABA]
CONAKRY [see KONAKRY].

Works: Besides the recorded works of Mubiy al-Dîn (H. Kh. [Flügel] nos. 5990, 8721 [fi'ālāt = GAL II, 569, to which add MS. Esad Ef. 958] and 11585; GAL S II 642, S III 1304) and Muhammad (H. Kh. nos. 274 [MS. Nur-î 0sm. 2061, which is now lost] and 8055 [MS. Nur-î 0sm. 1959, Ist. Un. Lib. AY 610/3]; GAL II 573 [where the Nur-î 0sm. reference should read 2060]), there are in the various collections in the Süleymaniye Library of Istanbul several risâlas, attributed simply to ‘Qivizade’.

Bibliography: The main sources are, for Mubiy al-Dîn, Shâhâb-ı [Medjîdî], 446; for Muhammad, ‘Atâ’î’s Daylî to the Shâhâb-ı, 292; and for both, Talî-î al-Dîn al-Tabâkî, I-tanîyya fi tardjim al-Banâftiya (in MS.). Further references in IA, s.v. Ciwîzade [M. Cavid Baysun]; detailed biographies of these and other members of the family in the unpublished thesis Ciwâzade ailesi by Şerâfettin Tuncây (Istanbul Univ. Lib., Tez 1872). (V. L. MêNâGë)

CLAN [see ġiN]
COFFEE [see ŞAHWA]
COIMBRA [see KULUMRIYA]
ÇOKA [see şUMAS]
CONGO, River and Country in Africa. The river forms the sole outlet of the great Central African basin, which is limited on the east by the western flanks of the Great Rift, on the north by the Monga mountains, on the west by the Cristal range, and on the south by the Lunda plateau. Since its tributaries drain areas both to the north and to the south of the Equator, the Congo maintains a relatively constant flow. Its waterways are broken here and there by cataracts, especially between Stanley Pool and the sea, but they nevertheless provide long navigable stretches which have permitted a certain amount of movement, both of people and of trade, through an otherwise impenetrable forest region. In the recesses of the great forests Africa's most primitive people, the pygmies, have maintained to this day a distinctive way of life based mainly on hunting and gathering. Along or near the rivers, and nowadays increasingly along the roads which are beginning to traverse the forest region, live negroid tribes, most of whom speak languages of the Bantu family, and all of whom use iron tools and are to some degree cultivators as well as hunters and fishermen. Doubtless on account of their relative inaccessibility, the forest tribes have in general remained the most backward of the Bantu peoples.

It is only the central part of the Congo basin, however, which is densely forested. The higher country all round its periphery is mostly covered with the light forest known as "orchard bush", in which grain crops can be grown by the simple "slash and burn" system of shifting cultivation. In the east and in the west there are even considerable stretches of open savannah grasslands suitable for cattle-raising. Above all, these peripheral regions have been relatively open to the influences of migration and conquest, and it is consequently in these regions that the indigenous peoples have achieved their most significant political groupings. To the north of the forest on the Nile-Congo watershed the multiple states of the Zande are the result of seventeenth and eighteenth century colonization and conquest from the southern fringes of the Sudan. To the east of the forest, in the highlands of the Western Rift, the Kingdoms of Ruanda and Urundi and the states on the east of the forest are the creations of conquering immigrants from the Nilotic Sudan or South-West Ethiopia, who appear to have been in the area since the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries. To the west of the forest, in the highlands of light bush and open savannah separating the Congo basin from the Atlantic seaboard, the important kingdom of the Bakongo, with which the Portuguese entered into relations towards the end of the fifteenth century, and which then extended its influence in some sense from the Gaboon to Angola, had been built by another immigrant minority, stemming perhaps from the direction of Lake Chad. The Congo kingdom had many southward offshoots, among them certainly the kingdom of the Bakuba on the upper Kasai. The Luba-Lunda states of the Congo-Zambezi watershed, were equally founded by immigrants, but whether these came from the west or the east of the forest is not yet established.

The ideas diffused into western Bantu Africa by these movements were essentially remnants from the ancient world of the Nile Valley. They came from the still unislamized southern fringes of the Sudan. Meanwhile, for nearly four hundred years, from the late fifteenth century to the mid-nineteenth, European influences played remotely on a Congo basin whose inhabitants were still solidly pagan and animist. The dominant European interest in the region was the slave-trade, which soon undermined and killed off the early attempts at Christian evangelization. Musulman mulatto traders, called pombeiros, operating from Loanda and other ports in Angola during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, penetrated deeply into the southern periphery of the Congo basin, and it is likely that in the copper-bearing region of the Katanga they occasionally encountered traders from the Swahili ports on the East African coast, who were probably no more seriously Muslims than the pombeiros were Christian. The indications are, indeed, that such early long-distance trade as there was in eastern Bantu Africa before the sixteenth century was conducted more by Africans from such interior tribes as the Nyanwezi and the Bisa than by coastmen whether Arab or Swahili.

It was not, therefore, until the nineteenth century, with the penetration of the southern Sudan by slave and ivory traders from Egypt, and still more with the penetration of East Africa by subjects of the Bāṣā'īdī dynasty of Zanzibar, that Muslims began in any numbers to reach the borders of the Congo basin. The Arab settlement at Ujiji, from which dhows crossed to the Congolese shore of the Tanganyika Lake, was founded within a few years of 1840. It was from then until the partition and occupation of tropical Africa by the European powers in the late 'eighties and early 'nineties of the century that the serious commercial exploitation of the eastern and central parts of the Congo Basin by Muslim Arabs and Swahili mainly took place. The foundation by King Leopold II of the Belgians of the Congo Independent State resulted in the suppression of the slave-trade and in the elimination of the Arab and Swahili war-lords whose activities had been so vividly described by Livingstone, Stanley and other explorers. But many of the Arabs and their East African followers settled permanently in the Congo under its new colonial administration, and, as in so many other parts of Africa, the transition from freebooting exploitation to a more settled form of petty commerce marked an intensification of religious proselytism.

The great majority of the Congo Muslims, who number to-day about 200,000, are Ṣạffī 'i and belong to the Kādirī tariqa. There are a few hundred Ḳhodjas [q.v.], mainly in Ruanda-Urundi and in the eastern part of the Kivu Province, also in Stanleyville and Kasongo; they are active in trade, and are well-organized and well instructed. The Almadīyya [q.v.], number only a few dozens, but are active in propaganda by distributing books and literature.

In the Eastern Province, the Kivu Province and Ruanda-Urundi there are at least 175 recognized mosques. There are Kurānic schools at Rumungwe, Lake Nyanza, Stanleyville, Ponthierville, Kirundu and Kindu. The great centre of attraction, however, is Ujiji, where there is an important madrasa, attended by young people who desire a little instruction in Arabic.

Islamized villages have a mosque, a brotherhood banner (drapeau de confrérie), a mu'allimu and an imām. Unlike the Zanzibaris, the Muslims of the eastern Congo are not well instructed. There are some who read al-Damlal or al-Suyutl. But in general their reading matter is limited to popular devotional books of the Kādirīyya. The initiation to the tariqa, in the form known as murādī, which is widespread in Sénégal too, is also highly esteemed.
by the negro, who finds membership both dignified and authoritative. The mosques...which is spoken as a mother tongue by the people of the Zanzibar coast. The negro Muslims who have started to enter the western Congo from the north, from the Middle Congo Republic and Chad, sometimes have a much higher cultural standard. Many of them are merchants, who sell books of devotion and talismans inscribed in Arabic. The Muslim customary courts are becoming increasingly subject to a Shafi'ite version of the sharī'a.

The limited cultural level to which black Muslims attain, leaves them with too little Arabic and even with too little Swahili to understand the Islamic propaganda broadcast by radio. Among the books currently in favour one finds, besides the Kur'ān, the Mū`addab of al-Dardir, a work by a Zanzibar Shaykh called Hasan b. Amir al-Şhrāzī; al-Iḥkām al-ṣāliḥāt Mawlid al-Diilānī; the Kitāb Dala'il al-Khayrāt, enriched with numerous accessory texts such as the Ḥiyāt al-Bār, the Ḥiyāt al-Bār, the Ḥiyāt al-Numr of al-Shāhīlīlīlī, etc. To this should be added the full or partial Swahili translation of the Kur'ān, published by the Ahmadiyya Society of Lahore, the sūrat Yāsin in Swahili, a treatise on Mirathī (inheritance) by Shaykh al-Şhrāzī, and a very popular treatise on prayer called "Sula nami Mannisho Yake".


CONSTANTINE [see KUSTANTINA]

CONSTANTINOPLE [see ISTANBUL]

CONSTANTINUS AFRICANUS (Constantine the African), who first introduced Arab medicine into Europe, was born in Tunis in the early 5th/11th century (1010 or 1015 A.D.), and died at Monte Cassino in 1087.

His arrival in Salerno marked the beginning of what historians have labelled the 'golden age' of its famous medical school. But about the life of the man himself singularly little is known, and the details can only be sketched in conjecturally.

Various facts relating to him are to be found in the works of Petrus Diaconus who entered Monte Cassino in 509/1115, less than 30 years after Con-
stantine's death. But they were adapted to suit the purposes of a story rather than set down objectively for their own sake. Like most other science historians, Petrus Diaconus traces Constantine's place of birth to Carthage (he probably means Tunis). By the age of 39 or 40, after many adventures, he had found his way to Italy. Petrus asserts that beforehand he had travelled to Egypt, Baghdad, India and Ethiopia, learning on the way the Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldean, Greek, Ethiopians and even 'Indian'. His great talents roused such jealousy upon his return to Tunisia that, in order to avoid any harmful consequences, he left the country for Sicily. Karl Sudhoff is at variance with Petrus, and maintains that he journeyed to Italy as a merchant. It is there that he is said to have become acquainted with the reigning prince's brother, who was a doctor. His experiences and observations were recorded in the forty medical literature in Latin, and he returned to study medicine for three years in Tunisia; then, having collected together several treatises on Arab medicine, he departed, with his precious treasure, for southern Italy. The ship ran into a storm off the coast of Lucania, outside the gulf of Policastro, and the manuscripts were badly damaged. Constantine managed to salvage some of them, and when he arrived in Salerno he became a Christian convert.

It is not yet possible to establish the exact date of these events. But it is certain that he translated into Latin the best works on Arab medicine which had appeared up to the 5th/11th century, albeit omitting to acknowledge the names of their authors and thus earning the reputation of a plagiarist. He adapted the writings to the conditions of his new homeland, Italy. Many passages which he considered prolix were condensed, and other parts where the meaning remained obscure were simply translated literally. Nevertheless, Constantine's work infused new life into the medical school of Salerno, and indeed into the teaching of medicine in Europe for centuries to come. The most important translations are: (i) works of Greek origin which had been translated into Arabic, especially by Ibn al-Isḥāk and his followers: maxims, prognoses and diet in the severe illnesses of Hippocrates, together with...
notes by Galen, the Great Therapeutics of Galen (megatechne) and the Small Therapeutics to Glaucon (microtechne), and pseudo-Galenian works; Ḥunayn b. Iṣḥāq’s edition of Galen’s introduction to therapeutics, with notes by ‘All b. Ṭūlūn (an Egyptian doctor of the 5th/11th century) (ii) works by Arab authors: the Oculistics (al-‘ażār maḥḍālāt fī ‘l-sayn) of Ḥunayn b. Iṣḥāq (Constantini liber de oculis); the works of Iṣḥāq b. Sulaymān al-ʿIṣrāʾīlī (about 286/900) on the elements, urine, fever and diet; the Žād al-Musāfīr of Ibn al-Dīzāz̄, translated under the title De Melanchole; the medical encyclopedia Kāmil al-Ṣind̄a al-Tibbiyya of ‘All b. al-ʿAbbās al-Maḍjīṣ̄ (Persian, 4th/10th century) translated under the title Panteche; Constantine’s book De Melanchole was originally the Kitāb al-Malāḥāqiyād of Ḥunayn b. ʾĪmrān (late 9th-early 10th century). Finally, Constantine translated and claimed the authorship of several less important works by al-Rāzī and others unknown by name.

The works were poorly translated into Latin and full of technical Arab expressions which had simply been transcribed. Constantine was nevertheless responsible for extending the knowledge of classical medicine as it existed in Europe at the beginning of the Middle Ages, and bringing into circulation many important Greek and Arab works.


CONSTANZA [see KÜSTENDES]

CONSUL (Arab. Kunṣul; Pers. Kunṣul; Turk. Konsolos), consuls as representatives of the interests of foreign states in Islamic countries (and similarly in Byzantium). The institution of the consul was formed in the 12th and 13th centuries in the Italian merchant republics. The Genoese put their possessions in the Crimea (see KHLIM; since 1266), nominally subject to the Kāhan of the Golden Horde, in the charge of a consul (B. Spuler: Die Goldene Horde, Leipzig 1943, 392-8, with further bibl.; E. S. Zevakin and N. A. Penčko: Očerki po istorii genuezskikh koloniy . . ., (‘Sketches on the History of the Genoese Colonies’) in Istorikoskiye Zapiski, 3, 1938, 72-229). For the most part called Balo [see BALYS] until the 15th century, these representatives of foreign states in Islamic countries (for the first time in 1238, when Venice had a representative in Egypt) were occupied above all with the protection of the merchants of their nations, the adjustment of difficulties among them, and the regulation of all questions having to do with trade. It was only when Ottoman hegemony extended over the entire east and south coasts of the Mediterranean as well as the Balkan peninsula, that it became necessary to grant to the ambassadors of the individual powers at Constantinople consuls in other places. For the first time in 1528, France obtained the right to provide its own consul in Alexandria, recently become Ottoman. He was able in all circumstances to negotiate directly on behalf of his countrymen with the local authorities, to adjust internal difficulties and to regulate financial conditions (including questions of inheritance). He might import his personal needs free of customs, and ships dispatched by him were not subject to distraint or injury. The right to maintain a consul was extended to other cities in the treaty between the Porte and France in 1535, thus granting the latter a considerable extension of its influence in the Levant, Naples and the Syrian-Lebanese coast as well as in Asia Minor (a consulate in Aleppo since 1557; cf. the maps of the French Consulates in 1715 in P. Masson, Histoire du Commerce Français . . ., Paris 1856, p. xxxviii of the appendix). In 1580 England received corresponding rights. Between 1606-15 the German Emperor followed and later in the 17th century Venice, the Netherlands and Sweden. Only after the Peace of Kūký Kāyনrdā [g.v.] in 1774, could Russia establish consulates (in particular in the Balkans and the Holy Land). Persia followed in 1839. All consuls, as well as ambassadors, were regarded as hostages to guarantee the behaviour of their home powers, and were repeatedly arrested and otherwise impeded.

Out of the consular rights the "Capitulations" developed, confirmed for the first time specifically in a treaty with France in 1740 (though in fact existing already in the 16th century). They conceded to the consuls extensive juridical and civil rights, and released foreign subjects more and more from local jurisdiction (for details see TÜRKİYE, History). Beside these, local Honorary Consuls appeared in growing intensity against the distortion of this
privilege, and a considerable limitation of the abuses was attained. After the gradual abrogation of the Capitulations combined with the renunciation of them by foreign states, the consuls in the Islamic world assumed the same position which they occupy internationally today.

In her own behalf Turkey first appointed consuls in foreign lands in 1802 (Turk. Şehkâhendâr; or, rarely at first, Konsolas), frequently from among Greeks and Levantines in the first decades.
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**Capitulations:** F. A. Belin, Des capitulations et des traités de la France en Orient, Paris 1870; N. Sousa, The capitulatory régime of Turkey. Its history, origin and nature, Baltimore 1933; O. Nebioglu, Die Auswirkungen der Kapitulationen auf die türk. Wirtschaft, Jena 1941; Habib Abi Châlha, L’extension des capitulations en Turquie et dans les régions arabes, Paris 1924.

**Juridical:** G. Aristarchi Bey, Législation Ottomane, 7 vols, Constantinople 1873-86 (esp. ii, 403-9).
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(B. Spuler) **ÇOPAN-ATA** (Turkish "Father-Shepherd"), the name of a row of hills ½ mile long on the southern bank of the Zarafshân [q.v.], close by the city walls of Samarkand [q.v.]. There is no written evidence for this name before the 13th century; up to the 18th century, it was referred to in written sources (Persian) as Kûhak ("little mountain"); and the Zarafshân (only known as such in the written language since the 18th century) also sometimes carried this name. Under the name of Kûhak, the range is mentioned in İstakhrî (BGA I, 318), and it contained quarries and clay pits for Samarkand.

There is an etiological legend which gives the following explanation: "well over a thousand years before Muhammad" there was an enemy besieging Samarkand. The inhabitants of the town prayed fervently for deliverance, and in answer a mountain came and buried the attackers, having been transplanted from Syria, complete with a shepherd on it. Çopan-Ata is also regarded as a Muslim saint, and the shrine to him, which is on the summit of the hill, is attributed to Timûr (thus in al-Kândiyya, partly edited by W. Barthold, Turkistan, MSS. I, St. Petersburg 1900, 481f). Upon the Çopan-Ata the troops of the Khân of Bukhârâ made a vain attempt to oppose the advancing Russians under general Konstantin Petrovîc von Kaufmann on May 13th (new style) 1868. The latter succeeded in occupying Samarkand the following day, and since then it has belonged to Russia.

**Bibliography:** W. Barthold, Turkistan, 86; Le Strange, 404.—On individual aspects: V. Vyatkin, in the Spravoctze knâzhi Samarkand-skoy obstas vi-vii, Samarkand 1893/1901; Abû Tâhir Khodja, Samariyya, Persian ed. by N. Veselevskiy, St. Petersburg 1904. —Illustrations: G. Pankrat'yev, Al'bom istoricheskikh pamyatnikov goroda Samarkanda, no. 31 and 38 (Shrine and remains of a mediaeval bridge). (W. Barthold—B. Spuler)

**COPTS** [see KIRT]

**CORAN** [see KUR'AN]

**CORBADJİ** (literally: soup-provider). (1) The title applied among the Janissaries to the commanders of the ortas and the ağa bülükleri, though in official Ottoman terminology the commanders of the djemât ortalari were known as Serpiyâdîn or (the Turkish equivalent of this Persian term) Yayabâgzi, while the commanders of the ağa bülükleri were called Odabâgzi.

As the roî djemât ortalari were prior in foundation to the 61 ağa bülükleri, the Çorbadîjs of the former had certain privileges over those of the latter: on frontier duty they kept the keys of the fortresses; they could ride on horseback in the presence of their superiors; they wore yellow gaiters and shoes. In the ağa bülükleri, on the other hand, yellow gaiters and shoes were the prerogative of the Odâbâgzi Kethâbîdî and the Muẖšir Ağa, the other Çorbadîjs wearing red.

The crested headdress generally worn on ceremonial occasions by the Çorbadîjs was called kalâfat or çorbadî kalâesi. The crest of the Yayabâgzi's kalâfât was of cranes' feathers, whereas that of the Çorbadîjs of the other bülükleri was of herons' feathers. The ordinary headdress of all Çorbadîjs was a red kalâfat narrow at the bottom and broad at the top. The Çorbadîj applied the bastinado to minor offenders among his men. His aide was known as the Çorbadîjs Yamagîj.

Sometimes the Çorbadîjs were entrusted with police duties, thus performing the function of the Sâbâtî. At the Cardak, the customs station by the Yemîgh quay in Istanbul, there was a Çarbak Çorbadîjî, who commanded the 56th Janissary orta, assisted the bâdî of Istanbul who supervised the city's food-supply, and was responsible for maintaining public order in this locality. Yayabâgzi was appointed to collect the davûrîme boys who were recruited into the "adâmî Odâbâgzi" from the provinces. The Çorbadîjs of the "Adâmî Odâbâgzi" were under the orders of its commander, the Istanbul Ağaštî.

(2) The title of Çorbadîjî was also given to the village notables called Muẖƛâr and Aẖ-sâhâli, who entertained travellers. Later, until a half-century ago, it became an appellation of merchants and rich Christians. In colloquial Turkish it is still used for 'bosse', 'skipper'.

**Bibliography:** Kawâ'nîn-i Yeniteriyân; I. H. Uzuncârslî, Kâpsülêri ocahlârî, Ankara 1943; idem, Tarîh Luke; Dîwâdî Paşa, Ta'rîhâ-ı
The Ivory Coast became a self-governing colony in 1893, then, in 1900, it became part of the Government-General of French West Africa. According to the 1950 census, the population was 2,500,000, including 12,000 non-Africans.

The village of Elvancelebi, some 20 km. east of Corum, belongs to the Kaza Mecitözü in the Corum district. There are the Tekye (mentioned by Kâtip Celebi, Djihdnnumd, 625, 1. 20, as Sheykh 'Ulwan Tekyesi, and also by Ewliya Celebi, Seyhâhat-nâmê, ii, 410, l. 8), turbe and mosque of Elvan Celebi, the son of the famous poet 'Ashîkh Pasha (died in 733/1333, [q.v.]), and descendant of Baba Ilyás, the founder of the Dervish Order of the Baba'îyya [see BABA'ÎYYA].

In some kadî's of the wilâyet of Corum there are famous Hittite excavations, particularly Boğazköy (Hattušaş) in the kadî of Sungurlu, and also Alaca Hüyük in the kadî of Alaca.

**COROMANDEL** [see ALI PASHA]

**COSTUME** [see LİBAŞ]

CÔTE D'IVOIRE, the usual name of the Ivory Coast, a Republic, and member of the French Community. It is situated on the coast of the Gulf of Guinea, adjoins Ghana to the east, Liberia and the Republic of Guinea to the west, and the French Sudan and the Upper Volta to the north. It extends over 519,000 square kilometres and has a population of 2,500,000, including 12,000 non-Africans.

Although the first French settlements on the coast were founded at the end of the seventeenth century, colonization dates only from the end of the nineteenth century. The Ivory Coast became a self-governing colony in 1893, then, in 1900, it became part of the Government-General of French
West Africa. In 1957 it enjoyed a semi-autonomous domestic régime within the group of territories, with its Territorial Assembly and Government Council. But its administrative organization is that of the rest of French West Africa: circles, subdivisions and communes. After the referendum of 1958 the Ivory Coast, with its new status of autonomous Republic, refused to federate with the new state of Mali (formed by the union of Senegal with the French Soudan), and formed with the former territories of Upper Volta, Dahomey and Niger the Benin-Sahil Alliance.

From south to north, it covers a narrow belt of lagoons, a densely forested belt about 300 kilometres wide, and, finally, a belt of Sudan type savanna. In the south, the population belongs to the Guinean and Apollonian groups, and, in the North, to the Sudanese and Voltaic groups.

The economy is based on agriculture (coffee, timber, bananas, cocoa, oil, cotton) with a little livestock-rearing and fishing. Industrialization has hardly been tackled, although some prospecting has been undertaken with a view to mining. The chief towns are: Abidjan, the capital and port (130,000), Bouaké (25,000), Grand-Bassam, Bondoukou.

The influence of Christianity is widespread in the south, with 160,000 Catholics, 65,000 Protestants, and syncretistic sects.

The number of Muslims is about 450,000, found mainly in the north, especially among the Malinké or Mandé tribes. But at the same time Islam seems to be making rapid inroads among the animist tribes of the Savannas and among the town immigrants.

The first Islamic settlement on the Ivory Coast must go back to the thirteenth century, at the height of the Mali ascendency throughout the north of the Savannas. The chief towns were Touba, Kong, Bondoukou, Odienné and Seguèla. Muslim influence seems to have reseeded after the collapse of the Malinké power (15th century). It had a reflux of strength during the first half of the nineteenth century, when the influence of El Hadj Omar Tall made itself felt throughout the whole of western Sudan. At the end of the century, Samory Touré lent his authority to proselytizing, and forcibly—at other times by the mediation of Shaykhs—directed the attention of the Senoufo animists of the North. But, at the same time, he massacred the Malinké Muslims that resisted his conquest, and, above all, annihilated, in 1897, the kingdom of Kong which had remained the main seat of Islamic culture in the region. After the defeat of Samory, Islam fell into another temporary decline, from which it recovered fairly quickly, thanks to the sociological conjuncture that arose out of colonization.

It was spread by the influence of the Dioula, Malinké, or sometimes Hausa, traders, who had settled along the great trade routes and dealt chiefly in cola with the farmers from the forest region. Every year it made further progress towards the South, and eventually converted courts even among the coastal population. In addition to the traditional centres are found to-day important centres at Man, Bouaké, Gagnoa, Bouna, Doloa, Samatéguela and Boundiala, as well as Abidjan.

The chief brotherhood is the Tidjaniyya, which forms the majority everywhere except at Man. Its adherents are divided more or less equally between the "twelve grains" who owe obedience to El Hadj Omar, and the "eleven grains" or Hamallists, followers of Shaykh Mama Allih. Hamallism has, in addition, given rise to a new way, known as Ya'kūbite after its founder, Yakouba Sylla, whose teaching is reminiscent of that of the Senegalese Mourns of Ahmadou Bamba (work of the Ibad Ibn El Hadj on the behalf of the Shaykh, importance of economic activity).

The Kādiriyya brotherhood exists in all regions, but is as important as the Tidjāniyya only in the Man district. It is considered favourable to the interests of the Wahhābīs, whose importance has developed considerably since 1946 under the influence of rich Mecca pilgrims and of karamoko (scholars) educated in Egypt or Arabia. The chief Wahhābī centre is Bouaké.

Occasional Mahdísts are to be found—these seem to be under Wahhābī influence. And, on the coast, is a small Ahmādiyya community, formed around natives of Ghana and Nigeria. Certain dissident sects of the coastal region show Christian, Muslim and animist influences.

The level of Islamic teaching has never recovered from the massacres of Samory Touré, in spite of the recent endeavours of the young Wahhābīs and of certain Hamallists.


COWDORS [see CAWDORS]
CRAC [see KERAK]
CRAC DES CHEVALIERS [see HIŠN AL-ARKĀD]
CREATION [see HIĐAṬ, İBBĀ']
CREED [see 'AṢĪBA']
CRETE [see 'İRİŞTAN]
CRIMEA [see KIRM]
CROJA [see KROVO]
CRUSADES. Originally applied to military and religious expeditions organized in Western Europe and intended to take back from and defend against Islam the Holy Places of Palestine and nearby Syria, the term was later extended to all wars waged against "infidels" and even to any undertaking carried out in the name of a worthy or supposed worthy cause; naturally these extensions of meaning are not part of our present concern.

The first Crusade (1096-99), following on from expeditions against the Muslims in the West, led to the establishment around Jerusalem, Tripoli, Antioch and Edessa of four States constituting (and later including Cyprus, then the Latin Empire of Constantinople) the Latin East, which from then on until the recapture of its last citadel Acre by the Muslims in 1291 was an essential factor in the history of the Middle East. The second Crusade started by the fall of Edessa bore no concrete results; the third, started by the fall of Jerusalem, ensured the maintenance of "Frankish" possessions on the Syro-Palestinian coast; the fourth was only concerned with Constantinople, the fifth failed at Damietta in Egypt, the sixth was more of a diplomatic journey by Frederick II and brought about the temporary restitution of Jerusalem to the Franks, the seventh led by St. Louis after the loss once more of the Holy City ended in another disaster at Damietta and the eighth, which brought the same king to Tunis, ended with his death. One might add to this traditional number of Crusades other less important ones and later Crusades against the Ottomans (Nicopolis, Varna, etc.). The Crusades...
in Syria-Palestine alone had a lasting effect on the history of Muslim countries, in view of the Frankish dominance in the East, uninterrupted for nearly two centuries, which was initiated by the first Crusade and maintained by those that followed.

In an encyclopaedia of Islam there can of course be no question of giving the history even of only these Crusades in its entirety; it would even be somewhat odd to speak of them at all, were it not that the Crusades when considered in terms of Islam give rise to certain problems which alone will be discussed here.

The specific character of the Crusades was not and could not be understood by Muslims. The very term, ḥarb al-salībīyya, used to designate them in modern Arab literature, was unknown to ancient authors, who referred to Crusaders by the plain ethnic term “Franks”, and seems to have made its appearance during the Ottoman period in Christian circles of the East influenced by French culture. The theory of the Crusade, a war for the defence or liberation of oppressed co-religionists, differs from the theory of the dhīhd, a war for the expansion of Islam; but in practice almost the very reverse appears to have obtained at the time of the first Crusade, dhīhd in the majority of Muslim countries being no more than a memory and Christendom from the time of Charlemagne onwards having elaborated campaigns for the expansion of Christianity by force of arms. No doubt, in one sense the Crusades appear as a reaction, which had gradually been desired and made possible, against the humiliation of four centuries caused by the Muslim conquest of half the Mediterranean basin; but the example of Spain and Sicily proves that the Christian West did not need any deterioration in the generally reasonable treatment of Christians in Muslim countries as a spur to move onto the offensive or counter-offensive. In the East it is true that the Turkoman invasion of Asia Minor revived amongst a particular social group the tradition of Muslim Holy War in the form of ghazwa, bringing disaster to Byzantine Christendom; but in the old Muslim countries and particularly in Palestine the forming of the Saljuq Empire brought no fundamental change to the lot of autochthonous Christians, save that of the presence of pilgrims: the precise motivation of crusading, however sincere it was, could not therefore occur to the Muslim mind. Muslims obviously saw that they were dealing with Christian warriors who as such were attacking Islam, but apart from the distance from which they came they saw in them roughly the equivalent of the Byzantines whose Christian-inspired attacks and counter-attacks they had been sustaining for two centuries.

The Crusaders’ conquests only affected territory which was incompletely Islamized, relatively small and quickly reduced by gradual Muslim reconquest, and even in Syria-Palestine did not reach any of the large Muslim centres. Nevertheless, the constant menace to vital sea and land routes between Muslim countries in the Middle East, the knowledge of Muslim abasement under Frankish rule, above all the repetition of Crusades, the non-assimilation of Franks into the native milīt and the permanence of a state of at least “cold” war finally conferred indisputable importance on the Crusades and the existence of the so-called “Latin” East in the history of Middle Eastern Islam. It would be interesting to examine more thoroughly than has hitherto been the case how Muslims, according to time and place, reacted to this phenomenon.

The Crusades found the Muslim Middle East in a state of division and dissension which alone made their initial success possible. Preceding generations had seen many examples of Islamo-Christian co-operation in Syria even against the Franks or Muslims. Although the Frankish invasion brought death or exile to many Muslims in Syria-Palestine, minor chieftains and certain isolated populations apparently at first assumed that it would be possible to adapt themselves to a state of small-scale war alternating with periods of peace, such as the former lord of Ṣhayzar, Usama b. Munjīkh, by drawing on his early memories, was able to depurate for us in his Memoirs. Soon, however, more directly threatened or more intensely Muslim communities, angered by the disgraceful indifference to the Frankish danger of Muslims beyond Syria-Palestine, attempted to rouse them from it by for example demonstrating in Baghda. Although individual volunteers, subsides (particularly for prisoners’ ransoms) and exhortations were sometimes forthcoming even in the rest of the Muslim world, the backbone of resistance came really from the immediate neighbours of the Franks. A necessary condition for that, and this was bound to be one consequence of the Crusades, was some degree of rapprochement between various Muslim elements which only recently had been suspicious of each other: Arabs from the plains and the towns, Turks from the official armies that had come into being under the Saljuqid regime, Turkomans lacking discipline but ready for ghazwa, warlike Kurds joining up with the Turkish armies that shortly before they had been fighting and so on. Dżazra constituted the hinterland, a source of manpower, such as Syria with its meagre resources could never be, and there followed a process of political unification between the two regions (remaining however somewhat incomplete in Dżazra). From a religious point of view, the Frankish menace certainly contributed without being its sole cause to the progress of Sunnism, which was already developed in the Saljuqid domains of Irano-Mesopotamia, but until then scarcely of any importance in Syria. For one thing, insinuating elements denounced the heterodox as accomplices of the Franks and were therefore the misfortunes of Islam more important, however, moderate Şhīfs and even sometimes the Fātimids, no longer sustained by unanimous Isma'īlism, in the face of common enemies rallied to the Sunni Turkish princes; the only group to remain outside this alliance were the Assassins, violent and irreconcilable enemies of Sunni orthodoxy, who were massacred by the Muslim majority and who sometimes collaborated with the Franks from their frontier strongholds. Naturally, the anti-Crusade movement never affected the whole of the Muslim population even amongst the neighbours of the Franks; devout Muslims lamented the fact that some of their brethren, who were subjects or neighbours of the Franks, found it less dangerous to come to terms with them than to fight them and minor princes were hesitant about involving themselves in coalitions which could only serve to increase the authority of the more important. The ability of Zengl, Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin lay in realizing, each in his own manner, that the struggle against the Franks, by necessitating and favouring the unification of Muslims, played into the hands of anyone able to lead such a movement, although it is not possible for us of course, any more no doubt than it was for them, to say how far they were prompted by ardent con-
viction and how far by self-interest. This policy appeared to reach its final objective when after Jerusalem Saladin conquered almost the whole of the Latin East.

It would be interesting to know whether in the Muslim States concerned the war against the Franks or their neighbours brought about any deeper or broader changes than this partial "moral rearmament". The period of the Crusades certainly coincides with a remarkable rise of inland Syria, starting with Damascus, then of Egypt which replaced Bagdad, linked too closely with the Iranian States, as the liveliest area of Arab Islam 5 could hardly contemplate further aggrandisement. The ancient themes of *djihad* were rediscovered, the old accounts (pseudo-Wakidi) of the Conquests and anti-Byzantine verse were taken out and developed, emphasis was laid on devotion to the holy places of Jerusalem: but there was nothing really new and it must be admitted that the struggle against the Crusaders did not give rise to any doctrinal study of holy war or any popular works comparable with the epics about the Conquests or anti-Byzantine wars.

Furthermore, diplomatically, whereas Saladin in particular took the part of Westerners and Byzantines against each other, no unity comparable with the unity, however slight, of Western Christendom against Islam was ever achieved between the East and West of the Muslim world, for each part was involved in its own struggles with neighbouring Christians. Even in the East, leaving aside the Iranians who were far away and shaken by successive crises, the Turks of Asia Minor, after involuntarily setting the Crusades in motion by their invasion, practically restricted their efforts to attacks against Byzantium and, showing little interest in Syria, only took some part in the struggle against the Crusaders in the first century of the Latin East, when the latter crossed their territory. The Caliphate itself does not appear to have taken a very deep interest in the anti-Frankish struggle.

Furthermore, at the end of Saladin's reign, the very seriousness of the Frankish defeat stirred the union, however slight, of Western Christendom against Islam, whereas before his death in spite of all efforts he had to resign himself to certain losses, and to the maintenance of a Frankish seaboard, emphasizing the extent of material sacrifices made practically in vain. Whence arose under the Ayyubids the desire for a new policy which, recognizing both the presence of the Franks in the peripheral zone to Syria-Palestine and the lessening of the Frankish menace, now that, left to their own devices, the Eastern Franks could hardly contemplate further aggrandisement, sought to set up a *modus vivendi* economically favourable to both sides. This policy, compromised by the Crusading policy of the West, continued a fairly successful existence for half a century, finding its most spectacular and in the eyes of the devout its most scandalous expression when, with certain reservations, Al-Kamil restored Jerusalem to Frederick II. Could such a policy have been kept up for a long time? The unleashing of the Mongol conquest made it in any case impracticable. That invasion, much more dangerous for the time being than the Crusades could ever be, produced in the Mamluk State, established in Egypt and Syria as the final redoubt of Muslim resistance, an uncompromising tension of all forces and the unquestionable predominance of an intransigent army. Some of the Franks had come to terms with the barbarians: their extermination or expulsion became a matter of supreme urgency and this time Europe did not prevent it.

With the exception of the Armenians in the North, native Christians had remained practically outside the Crusades; Muslims therefore did not at first change their attitude to local Christians and even occasionally supported members of the Greek Church who had serious grounds for complaint against Latin dominance, as well as the Jews. Tolerance of this kind contrasted with the treatment of Muslims under Frankish rule who, except in some special localities, had neither mosque nor *kadi* and were frequently considered as virtual enemies or spies. The over-quoted passage of Ibn Djibayr, shaming his co-religionists for Muslim satisfaction with good Frankish administration in the rich district of Tyre, cannot outweigh many cases where the opposite applied nor can it the legal status of Muslims: because of its warlike spirit, the Latin East was backward compared with the understanding which the Norman sovereigns of Sicily and the Spaniards were showing at the same time. In the long run the presence of Franks eventually jeopardized the native Christians of Muslim countries as well. For the lack of any future possibility of triumphing by the force of arms the Franks had to try to establish relations with Christians of Muslim states. It was inevitable that such a move should give rise to at least some suspicion amongst the Muslims. The most unfortunate individual case was that of the Maronites. This purely Lebanese minority living entirely within Frankish territory had rallied to the discipline of the Church of Rome and to a certain extent, in the coastal towns at least, had become intermingled with the Franks. Muslim reconquest did not wipe out the danger of Frankish attacks on the Syrian coast and, to prevent any Maronite complicity, the Mamluks had many of the Maronite districts along the coasts evacuated. The fortunes of the Armenians, who had been the Mongols' quartermasters and were linked politically with the Christian West, were even less happy; in the fourteenth century their Cilician kingdom was destroyed and its population decimated. Generally speaking, the hardening of the Muslim attitude was bound to undermine the position of Christians and it is necessary to realise that the Crusades alone must bear, if not the sole responsibility, at least the greater part of it, for a development completely opposite to their avowed object.

Did they at least help to increase the interpenetration of peoples, the knowledge of Islam in the
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West, or of the West in Muslim countries? It would of course be paradoxical to contend that among the members of the two geographically close populations there was no exchange of knowledge. But examination of institutions in the Latin East shows fewer borrowings from the Muslim past and less social intermingling than in the Christian States of Sicily and Spain. Similarly, from a cultural point of view, objective comparison leads to the categorical conclusion that where the West has acquired knowledge of Muslim civilization it has done so mainly through Spain or Sicily and not through Western settlements in the East or Crusaders from the West; moreover, Islam as such nearly always remained misunderstood and the few accurate ideas about it that the West finally acquired are due to the efforts of missionaries, in other words to work undertaken in an entirely different spirit from the spirit of the Crusades. As for the Muslims, although some showed a certain curiosity about the Franks in the East or about a Western leader as exceptional as Frederick II, it must be acknowledged that their historians, geographers and anti-Christian polemists still had after the Crusades the same few notions about the European West, gleaned from their collectivist-west, that they had had before. Therefore, and contrary to current opinion, it seems to me an anachronism to repeat with those who have worked on the cultural or political influence, indeed a very real one, of modern France in the East, or written within that context, that the Crusades laid their foundations; if in their own way they bore witness to the beginning of a process of interpenetration, the atmosphere they created proved subsequently more of a hindrance than a help.

**Bibliography:** The Arabic sources of the history of the Crusades are catalogued in C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'époque des Croisades*, 1940, 33-94, without however certain elucidations which may be found particularly in (besides a forthcoming work by N. Elie'sef on Nūr al-Dīn) H. A. R. Gibb, *The Arabic sources for the life of Sa'id al-Dīn al-Murasli (1233-1292)*; B. Lewis, *The sources for the history of the Syrian Assassins*, cited, xxvii (1953); H. Gottschalk, *al-Malik al-Kāmil*, 1958, Introduction. The five volumes of *Histoires Arabyes* in the *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades* published by the Académie des Inscriptions suffer from lack of method in the choice of extracts and insufficient care in the establishment and translation of texts (not to mention their inconvenient format); they have still not yet however been replaced by editions or above all, for those who need them, by better translations. Since 1940 have appeared—and we quote only the essential—a French translation by R. Le Tourneau of Ibn al-Kalānī's *The Damascus chronicle* (*Damai* de 1075 à 1154, 1954, French Institute in Damascus, 1952), vol. i of a new and this time good edition of Abū Shāma's *K. al-Rawdatayn* by M. A. Hilmi (Cairo 1957), as well as an edition of his *Dhayl* (Cairo 1947); the first two volumes, less important than those to follow, of a good edition of Ibn Wāṣīlī's *Mujarrād al-Kurāb* by Šāhyāl (Cairo 1953 and 1957); an edition of the *Ayyūbīd* part of *Makān b. 'Amid*’s chronicle by C. Cahen (in *BEO*, Damascus, xv, 1953-57); the edition of part of Ibn ʿAbd al-Ṣāhib’s *Life of Betha* by the same editor (C. Cahen and F. Sadeque, Oxford and Dacca 1956; the first two volumes out of the three of the excellent edition of *Kamāl al-Dīn* Ibn al-ʿAdīm’s *Zubđa* by Šāmy Dāhān (Fr. Inst. Damascus, 1953 and 54) and, by the same editor, the part on Damascus of Ibn Shaddād, 2 vols. 1954-55, of the part of *Yūnīl* covering the years 1646-670; and finally for the years 689-698 an analysis of Dājari by J. Sauvaget, 1949. None of these authors of course deals specifically with the Crusades. A good number of selected and translated texts, together with useful introductions, has been given by Fr. Gabrieli, *Storici Arabi delle Crociate*, 1957.


(C. CAHEN)
In 776, the Karuk [q.v.] occupied the valley of the Cu and that of the Taraz (Talas), and the area along both sides of the Alexander Mountains. The Tughidi also settled there (Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, 300; Barthold, Vorl., 75). Suīyāb [q.v.] was the capital of the Cu valley (Kāshgarī, iii, 305; Huṣain-Cuang, ed. St. Julien, Paris 1857-8): the residence of the ruler of this area was usually in Kūz Ordu (Balasāghūn; [q.v.]). Judging from the traces of settlements found, the valley was well populated at that time. The inhabitants developed a particular multi-coloured form of ornamental Kufic writing. There was a marked distinction between them and the other Transoxians (Bernstamm, 157, 161/66).

Islamic armies reached the western part of the Cu valley only once, in 958/10 (battle against Kūlān, cf. Ibn al-Athir, vi, 104), and the name of the river is not mentioned in Muslim sources of pre-Mongol times, although there is mention of some of the places in the region (Ibn Khurramoddībībī [BGA VI, 29]; Kūdāmā, K. al-Khārājī [BGA], 206). Islam reached the population only in the 4th/10th century, and even around the year 672/682, only a part of the inhabitants of Taraz and Nawēḵaḵād became Muslims (Hudūd al-ʿĀlam, 119, no. 93; 338, with mention of individual places); Nestorian Christianity was widespread for a considerably longer time. The rule of the Karā Khādīyī [q.v.] followed that of the Karūks in 1353/1414. Thus there was a renewed influence of Chinese cultural elements (Nephrīt, Sung porcelain) in the area, and these mixed again with those of Transoxania (Bernstamm, 168, 171 f.). Meanwhile, the numerous wars of the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries resulted in a decrease of the population of the Cu valley. Where the Chinese traveller Cang Cūn still met several towns and villages in 61/1221, and crossed the Cu by a wooden bridge (E. Bretschneider, Med. Researches, i, London 1888, 71 f., 129 f.; A. Waley, The Travels of an Alchemist, London 1931), many ruins are reported already in 678/1253. At that time (651/1253), the region formed the border line between the areas of influence of the two Mongol Khāns Batu [q.v.] and Mongke (Mangü [q.v.]). Sihibar (Shaybān), the founder of the “Blue” (White) Horde (see Bārtoʿids) had his winter quarters here. But the main cause of virtual de-population of the area, was war amongst the Mongols in the 8th/14th century (see Āqāhātāy), plague (according to epitaphs of 739/1338), and the campaigns of Timūr [q.v.]. Our sources for these last already fail to mention any place-names in the Cu valley. The Nestorian settlements near Pīshpek and Tomaḵ (q.v.), of which we have epitaphs of the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, also seem to have perished at this time. Muhammad Ḥaydar Dughlāt, Taʾrīkh-i Raḵštī, ed. N. Elias and E. D. Ross, London 1895-98, 364 f., ca. 1546, mentions only ruins with a minaret rising above them. The modern name Burana for a tower in the ancient Tomāḵ also derives from Mandara (according to Perovskiy in the Zap. Vost. Otd., viii, 352).

Later the Cu valley occasionally came under the Kalmuks and the (Kara-) Kirghiz. Then it came under the rule of the Khāns of Khokand, who founded the fortresses of Pīshpek (in the Khokand historians’ writings: Pīshke) and Tomāḵ on the Cu. These came into Russian hands in 1860. Since then the Cu valley has belonged to Russia, and has become a target of eastern Slav settlement (cf. Herrmann, Atlas, 66-67). The upper course is in the Kirgiz S.S.R., the middle and lower reaches in the Kazak S.S.R. Since 1932, a great agricultural combine (hemp and other fibre plants) has developed in the area of the middle Cu. Two arms of the “Great Cu Canal” have been under construction since 1941; these should irrigate a further area. The Turkish railway crosses the river near the station of Cu, thus opening it up to traffic.

Shira of the Sulduz tribe who had once saved the life of Cingiz Khan. The most notable members of this family were:

1. Amir Čuban. An able and experienced military commander, Amir Čuban, according to Hamd Allâh Mustawfi, fought his first battle in Rabî’ II 688/ April-May 1289 (Târîh-i Guṣûda (GMS), 588); thereafter he served with distinction under the Ilkhâns Arghun, Gâykhâtû, Čâhân and Udîjâtû [q.v.]. He was appointed āmîr al-usrû in by Abu Sa’îd in 717/1317, and married the latter’s sister Sâ’îd, who succeeded Udîjâtû at the age of twelve, Amir Čuban acquired great power in the affairs of state; in addition, all the important provinces of the Ilkhânî empire were governed by his sons. In Râdjab 719/Aug.-Sept. 1319 a group of amîrs plotted to assassinate Amir Čuban, but the latter, supported by Abu Sa’îd, crushed the revolt with great severity.

After the death of Dûldê, Amir Čuban married Abu Sa’îd’s other sister, Sâ’îd Beg (719/1319). In 725/1325 Amir Čuban prevented Abu Sa’îd from marrying his daughter Bâghdât Khûtûn [q.v.], who was at that time the wife of Shaykh Ḥasan Buzurg Bûzûrj-i Khârâ. Abu Sa’îd determined to break the power of the Čubânis and, two years later, when Amir Čuban was absent in Khurâsân, he put to death Amir Čuban’s son Dimashk Khwâjâ and issued orders for the execution of Amir Čuban at Harât and of his family throughout the Ilkhânî dominions. Amir Čuban, forewarned, advanced as far as Ravy and attempted to negotiate with Abu Sa’îd, but without success. Deserted by most of his troops, he fled back to Harât and took refuge with Malik Ghiyât al-Dîn al-Dinî in the Kurd. A few months later (Oct.-Nov. 1327, or perhaps in Muharram 728, which began on 17 Nov. 1327), the rewards offered by Abu Sa’îd induced Malik Ghiyât al-Dinî to put to death Amir Čuban and his son Dîljâl Khân. Their bodies were taken to Medina for burial.

2. Dimashk Khwâjâ. The third son of Amir Čuban, Dimashk Khwâjâ remained at court in Râdjab 726/1326 when his father left to defend Khurâsân against the Mongols of the house of Câhâtây, and became the virtual ruler of the Ilkhânî empire. His dissolute nature provided Abu Sa’îd with the excuse for destroying the Čubânis and which began on 17 Nov. 1327), the rewards offered by Abu Sa’îd induced Malik Ghiyât al-Dinî to put to death Amir Čuban and his son Dîljâl Khân. Their bodies were taken to Medina for burial.

(2) Dimashk Khwâjâ. The third son of Amir Čuban, Dimashk Khwâjâ remained at court in Râdjab 726/1326 when his father left to defend Khurâsân against the Mongols of the house of Câhâtây, and became the virtual ruler of the Ilkhânî empire. His dissolute nature provided Abu Sa’îd with the excuse for destroying the Čubânis and which began on 17 Nov. 1327), the rewards offered by Abu Sa’îd induced Malik Ghiyât al-Dinî to put to death Amir Čuban and his son Dîljâl Khân. Their bodies were taken to Medina for burial.

3. Timûrţâsh. The second son of Amir Čuban. He had acted as wâli to Udîjâtû. In 716/1316 he was appointed by Abu Sa’îd governor of Rûm, and for the first time carried Mongol arms to the shores of the Mediterranean. In 721/1321-2 he rebelled; he minted coinage in his own name, had his name included in the Khutbâ, and styled himself the Mahdi. His father Amir Čuban took him a prisoner to Abu Sa’îd, but the latter pardoned him for the sake of Amir Čuban. After the execution of his brother Dimashk Khwâjâ, he submitted to the Sultan Tûnûlû. At first this Mamûlûk served Al-Nâşir Muhammad treated him with great honour, but the intrigues of enemies of the Čubâni family, and Abu Sa’îd’s repeated demands for the extradition of Timûrţâsh, were a source of embarrassment to the Mamûlûk sultan, who eventually decided to put him to death on 13 Shawwâl 728/21 August 1328.

(4) Hasan b. Timûrţâsh, known as Hasan Kučûk to distinguish him from his rival Shaykh Ḥasan Buzurg the Dîjlâirîd. After the death of Abu Sa’îd in 730/1330, he gained the support of his father’s followers in Rûm by a ruse, and in Dhu’l-Hijjâd 738/July 1338 he defeated Hasan Buzurg near Nakhjûwân. He then gave his allegiance to the princess Sâ’îd Beg, the widow of Amir Čuban and Arpa Khân, at Tabrîz (739/1338-9), and came to terms with Hasan Buzurg. The following year he transferred his allegiance to a descendant of Huleyû, Sulaymân Khân, to whom he married Sâ’îd Beg. For some years he continued to wage war on his rival Hasan Buzurg and the various puppet khâns nominated by the latter, but on 27 Râdjab 744/15 December 1343, he was murdered at Tabrîz by his wife ‘Izzat Malik. See further the article Čubâniš.”


CUENCA [see KUNKA]

ÇUKA [see KUMAGI]

ČUKUROVA [see GLICIA]

ČULIM. The term ‘Tatars of Čulim’ (in Russian ‘Culimt’sel’, a word invented by Radiolf, Aus Sibirien, i, 211) includes several small Turkish-speaking groups of Central Siberia whose ancestors would have been Selkups of the Ob and Ketes of the Yenisei brought under Turkish influence by the Altaic tribes originating in the south and by the Tatars of Baraba [q.v.] and of Tobol’ [q.v.] originating in the west. The Tatars of Čulim form three principal blocks: 1. On the river Kiya, tributary of the Čulim, in the oblast of Kemerovo who were formerly called ‘Ketz’ (to the south of the town of Marinzh) and ‘Kûer’k (to the north of that town). 2. On the Central Čulim in the district of Aţinz in the Kerc of Krasnoyarsk, whom ancient ethnographers called ‘Tatars of Meletzk’. 3. On the lower Čulim and the Ob, in the districts of Asino and Ziryan of the oblast of Tomsk, formerly known as ‘Tatars of Tomsk’.

The present number of the Tatars of Čulim is unknown. The Russian census of 1897 counted 11,123. The censuses of 1926 and 1939 included them with the ‘Tatars of the Volga’. S. A. Tokarev, Etnografiya narodov SSSR, Moscow 1958, 428-429, estimates their number at 11,000. They speak a Turkish dialect akin to the Kızıl speech of the Hakas, but strongly Russianized.

Previously Shâmanists, the Tatars of Čulim officially adopted orthodox Christianity in the 18th century. Sunnî Islam of the Hanafi school was brought to them in the 19th century by the Tatars of Kazan, but it has made no appreciable progress.

Nowadays the Tatars of Čulim are dispersed among the Russian villages and are exposed to Russian cultural influence; they adopt Russian as their chief language, and merge fairly quickly into the Russian masses.

Bibliography: Ivanov, Tatari Čulimskie, in Trudi Tomskogo oblastono Muzeya, ii, Tomsk 1929;
Though the verbs kii-, kiiidez-, kuzet- etc. were in general use in Old Turkish with the meaning of 'protect' 'guard', it is clear that they had not yet acquired the meaning of 'tend animals'; cf., e.g., koyug ked kudezip yon (KB 1413); kuzu ked Mdezgil 'guard the sheep well'. The fact that there is no general word for 'shepherd' in Turkish can be explained in the light of the historical development of Turkish society: in the economic life of the nomadic Turks stock-raising was the main activity of the whole tribe, and thus the idea of the herding of beasts as a distinct occupation had not developed. When later, with the increasing complexity of society, the occupation came into existence this task must have been delegated by the Turks, who formed the governing class, to non-Turks, as the Iranian origin of the word indicates.

Among the Kazan Turks the word kiiü (kiiü, Ott. güü; kiiü = Ott. sara, but Ott. sariçü has developed with a different meaning) is used; from which no doubt comes the Cuvash kiiüt or kiiüt pdxaka. Among the Kazak and the Kirghiz, for whom stock-raising still constitutes the main activity, the words malts (< mal-ti) and bañits are generally used instead of coban, or, if greater precision is required, the expressions köyül, gülü (gülık), syyrük, tüyel etc. are employed. The examples given by W. Barthold in ETI for the use of the word coban for the inferior classes and for the ruling members of society are not of general application: the first belongs to a very late period, while the name of the Amir Coban, who was viceroy in Iran in the reign of Abd al-Salām (1316-1327), is more probably connected with the word çoban, defined by Māḥmūd Kāshgarī as 'village headman's assistant'.

In Turkish languages in which the word coban is used, it is found not only in the derivatives cobanlı, cobanlı, but in a number of compounds, chiefly for 'villager-name' (many of them no doubt calques from Persian), e.g., coban değneği (layağ, tarāğ) 'knotgrass', ç. tıskulı 'lex aquilum, holly', ç. düdüklu 'hazel', ç. dağğölük 'a creeper', ç. kaltüran 'lychnis calcedonica', ç. kalhân 'caltrop', ç. iğnès 'cranesbill'; ç. képnī, 'sheepdog', ç. kulu 'a bird like a sparrow', and especially coban aldatan (ç. aldatış, ç. aldatşī, ç. aldatšī, cf. TTS IV).

The expression of particular interest for cultural history is coban yıldız 'the planet Venus', in which one sees the mutual influence of T. colban and P. classicum. Colban (Çagh. Ott. Tar. Ö.T.), colbon (Kur.), colban (Kazan), solban, sulban (Kaz.), solmon (Tel.), solmon (Alt.), solban (Shor), solbon (Tob. Leb.) and tolbam (colban, colman, colban) (Mong.). Colban (ç. yıldız (or yıldızas), tah solmonu thi solmonu 'morning- and evening-star') has in this case presumably been identified with coban.

With Coban-Ata, the name of a line of hills on the S. bank of the Zarafshān near Samarkand (which derives, according to W. Barthold in ETI, from a legend of a shepherd seen on the hills, or from the name of a Muslim saint) cf. Kirghiz Colban-Ata 'the guardian of the sheep' and hence 'sheep', Kaman-Ata 'guardian of the horses', Colpan-Ata 'guardian of the goats', Oysul-Ata 'guardian of the camels' (and hence 'horses', 'goats', 'cames' respectively).

(Pr. Rahmeti Arat)

ČUPAN-ATA [see čopan-ata]

ČUVASH (Čavas), native name Čavas), is a Turkish-speaking people of the Middle Volga, numbering (in 1939), 1,569,000, who form the Soviet Socialist republic of the Čuvash (18,300 square kilometres, 1,095,000 inhabitants in 1956), situated on the southern bank of the Volga, to the west of the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of the Tatars. The Čuvash also inhabit the neighbouring regions: the Autonomous Republics of Tatarstan and Bashkiria, the oblasts of Ulianovsk, Kuybyshev, Saratov, and of Western Siberia.

The name Čuvash only appears in its present form in Russian chronicles of later than the 15th century, and is not found in such Arabic writers as Ibn Faḍlan, al-Mukaddasi, Yākût, etc., yet the Čuvash are according to general opinion, one of the oldest established peoples in the Volga region. Their origin is still the subject of controversy. According to a theory which has now been abandoned, the Čuvash were descendants of the Khazars (Hunfalvy, Die Ungern Magyaren, 1881; Fuks, Zapatki o Cuvashkh i teremisakh Kazanskoy Gubernii, Kazan 1840). Other writers trace their descent to the Būrūs [qv] or the Huns (for example W. Barthold, Sovereigns of 1111 sostenoyanie i bilâšyje tezdi sâzâniyati istoriyi tureç- shish narodos, Moscow 1926, 5). More popular and more likely is the theory that they are of Bulghar origin, which is based, among other things, on the analogy between the present-day Cuvash language and the burial inscriptions found in the ruins of the town of Bulghar and on the Danube. Several historians and linguists have defended this theory and it still has many supporters: Husein Feizkhanov, II'minkiy, O fonetischenkh otnosheniyakh mel'du čuvashskim i türkismi yazikami, in Izv. Arkh. Obshč. v, (1962) 80-84. N. I. Ašmarin, Bolgari i Čuvash, St. Petersburg 1902, Howorth, etc.; A. P. Kovalevskiy, Čuvash i Bulgar po dannym Čavasam
ibn Fadlana, Čeboksar 1954, and P. N. Tretyakov, Vopros o proizkhozdenii Čuvashskogo naroda v svete arkeologičeskikh dannikh, in SE, iii, 1950, 44-53. trace the descent of the Čuvash from the Bulgār tribe of the Savak (or Savaz) who, contrary to the Bulgārs properly so-called, refused to adopt Islam and remained animists.

Finally, according to a new theory, based on the existence of a pre-Turkish Finno-Ugrian substratum in the Čuvash language which has been recognized for some time by the majority of Soviet ethnologists, the ancestors of the Čuvash were Finno-Ugrian tribes who were influenced by Turkish culture through various Turkish tribes originating in the south or the south-east, before the arrival of the Bulgārs on the Middle Volga in the 7th century.

The infiltration of Turkish culture among the Finno-Ugrians continued during the Bulgār era until the 17th century or even later, under the Golden Horde and the Khanate of Kazan. Whatever their racial origins may be, the Čuvash, a Turkish-speaking people, but animists (they were converted to Christianity in the 13th and 19th centuries) were exposed to the influence of Islam by contact with the Muslims, the Bulgārs, and then the Tatars; this influence is be found particularly in certain terms such as "psemelle", the word by which prayers begin, "pikhampar" (payghambar), 'wolf-god', 'kiremet', 'spirit'. Other Čuvash, placed in immediate contact with the Tatars of Kazan, were converted to Islam. This phenomenon, which began at the time of the Khanate of Kazan, continued almost to the present day. It is impossible to appreciate its extent, for the Čuvash who were converted to Islam adopted the language of the Tatars, at the same time as their religion, and were "Tatarized". Tokarev, Etnografija narodov SSSR, Moscow 1958, considers that at the beginning of the 19th century the Čuvash were three times as numerous as the Tatars in the "government" of Kazan, while in the census of 1897, their number was twice as small as that of the Tatars. According to him, this decrease is due to the fact of "Tatarization" alone. Finally among the Čuvash who are animists or Christians, and the Muslim Čuvash there were still to be found at the beginning of the 20th century several semi-Muslim groups, such as, for example, the Nerekhdžeme Krayasen of the district of Kaybyzaz of the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Tataristan, who are semi-islamized animists, or again the Čuvash group of the region of Ulianovsk, who were considered before 1917 as Christians of the Orthodox church, while still observing the Muslim festivals and the fast of Ramađan.


CYPRUS [see KUBRUS]

GYRENAICA [see BARKA]

AL-DABARAN [see NUDJUM].

DABB, the thorn-tail lizard (Uromastix spinipes). Cognate synonyms exist in other Semitic languages.

The animal, found in abundance in the homeland of the Arabs, is often mentioned and described in ancient poetry and proverbs. Much of the information on the animal derives from just these sources which are freely quoted in later zoological works. The dabb was eaten by the ancient Arabs who relished it as tasty food; still it is reported that the tribe of Tamīn, who were especially fond of eating it, were ridiculed on that account by other Arabs. In Islamic times, the lawfulness of its use as human food was expressly pointed out by some hadiths. Bedouin eat it to the present day.

The dabb is described as clever but forgetful; it may even not find its way back to its hole, wherefore it chooses a conspicuous place for its habitation. It digs its hole in solid ground—whereby its claws become blunt—lest it collapse under the tread of hoofed animals. It does not brood over the eggs but lays them in a small cavity of the soil and then covers them with earth. The young hatch after forty days and are able to take care of themselves (autophagous). The dabb lays seventy eggs and more, which resemble the eggs of the pigeon. Its tail is jointed. It has such great strength in its tail that it can split a snake with it. If it is killed and left for one night and then is brought near a fire, it will move again. It devours its young when hungry and eats its vomit again; yet it is highly capable of enduring hunger, being second, in this respect, only to the snake. It likes eating dates. Its teeth are all kind has two tongues. The dabb drinks little or does not drink at all and voids one drop of urine in every forty days.

Some of the fabulous accounts have their origin in ancient popular tradition, mainly laid down in poetry and proverbs, as pointed out in the zoological works themselves.

Various medicinal properties were ascribed to the heart, spleen, skin, blood, fat and dung of the dabb. Its significance when seen in dreams has been
treated by Damīrī in special works on that subject.

**Bibliography:** Abd al-Ghanī al-Nabulusī, *Taʾtrib al-Anām*, Cairo 1354, ii, 58; Damīrī, s.v. (transl. Kopf, 59); Labīd, no. 16, 41-42; Antara in *Six Poets*, ed. Ahlwardt, no. 7, 19). Some years later al-Aswād, 71


**DABBā, (plur. DAWBBā), any living creature which keeps its body horizontal as it moves, generally quadruped. In particular, beast of burden or pack-animal: horse, donkey, mule, camel (cf. Lane, s.v.).**

Burāk, the legendary steed ridden by the Prophet at his ascension (*miʿrddi*) is given the name DABBā by al-Ghitlī and in the commentaries. The word acquired a particular significance from its use in the Kurān, XXVII, 82 in the sense of the archetypal “Beast,” equivalent to the term θῆρον in the Apocalypse of St. John. The text is laconinc and gives no explanation: “And when the final word has been spoken against them (cf. XXVII, 83), we shall call forth before them the Beast spring from the earth, that shall tell them that mankind had no faith in our signs”. The formula is no doubt based purely on recollections of the Apocalypse: καὶ έπον ἄλον θήρον πνευματίου ἐκ τῆς γῆς . . . (Rev., xiii, 11). Exegesis carried out in the course of time has derived from the text, which has been reconsidered in respect of certain images relating to the Day of Judgement. Commentaries by al-Tabārī, al-Zamakhshari, al-Rāzi, and al-Baydawī repeat each other. The key point is, apparently, a *hadīth* which has been traced back to the Prophet (al-Tabārī): “I said: Oh Prophet of God, where will it (the Beast) appear? He answered: from the greatest of mosques, a thing sanctified by God. While Jesus shall perform the *Tawwil* in the House of God, and with him the Muslims, the Earth shall tremble beneath their feet at the movements of the vast Beast. And Saḥā shall be torn apart at the place where it will appear”. The Beast will emerge at Ṣafā. The forefront of its head will have a hairy mark, and its ears will be entirely covered with hair. Those who try to capture it will not succeed, nor will those who take to flight escape from it. It will speak Arabic. It will name people as either “believers” or “ungodly”. The believers it will leave, their faces gleaming like stars, and between their eyes it will inscribe the word “believer”; as for the ungodly, it will set between their eyes the black mark of the ungodly.

Other traditions have extended this last part: it is with Moses’ rod that the Beast will mark the believer with a white spot, which will expand until its gigantic size: “only its head will appear, which will reach the clouds in the sky” (al-Zamakhshari; Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī), a conception which seems to be influenced by the description of the appearance of Gehenna recorded in the Ps. Ghazzall, *al-Durrā al-fıkhira*, Brockelmann, i, 538, no. 6; 51, 746, no. 6; cf. comm. on Kurān, XVIII, 100). Abd al-Hurayra (al-Rāzī) says that the horns on its bull-like head are a parasang apart. It will appear three times. Al-Zamakhshari makes it travel in turn through the Maghrib, the East, Syria and the Yemen, proclaiming the vanity of all religions foreign to Islam. Al-Rāzī speaks of a long period of hiding in the mosque at Mecca between its second and third appearances.

All these descriptions which, one after another, betray the influence of vague notions deriving from the Scriptures, popular and apocalyptic accounts, are of late date. Al-Rāzī stresses that “out of all this there is nothing authentic in the Book, unless the words attributed to the Prophet are genuine”. In any case, it is not the Beast of the Apocalypse since it arrives after judgement has been pronounced (al-Rāzī states that the **marrās** interpret the words “and when the final word has been spoken against them” in this sense). This is confirmed by traditions which depict it denouncing the futility of sinners seeking too late to be converted, after the time when, according to the Kurān, repentance will no longer avail. This explains the confusion with the idea of Gehenna in the Ps. Ghazzall. (A. ABEL)

**DABBā b. UDD b. TABBĪA b. AL-YĀS (KHINDĪF) b. MUḌRĀ b. NIṢĀR b. MAʿADD** was the eponymous hero of the well known Arab tribe of that name. With their “nephews” Ukl b. Awfī, Taymī, Adī, and Tjawr b. Abī Manābīt b. Udd, Dabbā formed a confederacy called al-Ribāb. The Ribāb were in alliance with Saʿd b. Zayd Manāt, the greatest clan of Tamīm. This alliance has never been broken by the other confederates. These, indeed, were formations of rather moderate size, whereas the Dabbā by means of their power sometimes were able to follow their own policy. Of the three clans of Dabbā, Shuraym had in the course of the 7th/13th century shrunk to a small number of families. But the second, Bakr, had vastly increased, thus leaving the once powerful Banū Ṣulamī far behind.

From the second half of the 6th/12th century onwards, the domiciles of al-Ribāb were in the region al-Shurayf between the right bank of Wādī Taṣrīr and the depression al-Sīr. In the spring they used to migrate to (Bāṭnī) Fājdī and to the sands of the Dāhnā by way of Tiṣḥār (= Kayjiyya?) or Wādī al-Ṣḥāf farther south. But as their spring pastures lay as late as the eighties far in the N.W., in regions held in other seasons by Asād [q.v.] and Dhūbyān, we may conclude that their domiciles before this time were farther in the west than they were later on.

We find al-Ribāb mentioned for the first time in the *Dawān* of Abīd b. al-Abraš (no. 17, 12) as fighting against Asād (not later than 540). In the eighties Dabbā and Tamīm stood their ground in a long battle against the Kilāb (b. Rabīʿa b. Amīr b. Saʿṣaʿa [q.v.]) and Abs (yawn al-Kurnatayn = al-Subān, Aws b. Ḥadīr, no. 1, 9; 16; 30, 3-15; Labīd, no. 16, 41-12; Antara in *Sūr Post*, ed. Ahlwardt, no. 7, 19). Some years later al-Aswād,
brother to al-Nu'man III of al-Hira, began to restore by several campaigns in Arabia the lost prestige of the dynasty. The Ribâb hesitated to surrender until al-Aswad set on them Asad and Dhubyân. Next year Asad and Dabba again defeated the Kilâb and other ʿAmir b. Saʿaḍa (al-Aʾṣâḥ, ed. R. Geyer, no. 1, 62-74; The Naḥâṣ of Dârâr and al-Faraḍâd, ed. Bevan, 240, 18-19; Yâlūt, 1, 229; The Muʿaddalîyyah, ed. Lyall, no. 96, 8-19; 99, 9). Their last feat in the Diṭhilîyya was the murder of Bistâm b. Khayr, the hero of the Shaybân (of Bakr b. Wâli [g.n.]), who were driving away their herds (E. Bräunlich, Bistam Ibn Qais, Leipzig 1923).

There is hardly any information on their conversion to Islam. In the first division of the population of al-Kûfâ Dabba seem to be missing. Mentioned are only "the remaining Ribâb". That is to say, Dabba together with Bakr and Tayyâr formed a version to Islam. In the first division of the population of Dabba.

Abbasid times, e.g., Abu Hatim but a number of soldiers, judges and administrators of Dabba. In the quarter missing in the enumeration Tabarl, mentioned are only "the remaining Ribâb". That is to say, that Dabba together with Bakr and Tayyâr formed a version told by al-Shabushti conflicts with this (K. al-Diyardî, Baghdad 1951, 149).

In the Ayyubid era pilgrims visited a monument called makâm Dâwûd on Mt. Barâsâyân near Dabîb. The spot today has the name Nabi Dawûd.

Dabîb is known above all for the decisive battle which was fought there on 15 Rabîʿa 292/24 August 1516 between the armies of the sultan Kanshâh al-Qaher and the Ottoman sultan Selîm I. The Ottoman artillery proved superior, the bravest elements of the Mamlûk cavalry were decimated, and Kanshâh himself was killed. The Ottoman victory paved the way for their occupation of Syria and Egypt.

DABÎB, a locality in the ʿAzâz region of northern Syria. It lies on the road from Manbîdî to Anṭâkîya (Tabari, iii, 1103) upstream from Aleppo on the river Nahr Kuwayk. In Assyrian times its name was Dabûg, to become Dabekhî in Greek. It lies on the edge of the vast plain of Mârj Dabîb where, under the Umayyads and ʿAbbâsids, troops were stationed prior to being sent on operations against Byzantine territory. The Umayyad caliph Sulaymân b. ʿAbd al-Malik lived in Dabîb for some time, and after his death and burial there in Safar 99/Sept. 717 his successor ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz was appointed caliph. According to al-Masʿûdî, his tomb was descereated by the ʿAbbâsids, but the version told by al-Shubshtî conflicts with this (K. al-Diyaṣârî, Baghdad 1951, 149).

In the Ayyubid era pilgrims visited a monument called makâm Dâwûd on Mt. Barâsâyân near Dabîb. The spot today has the name Nabi Dawûd.

Dabîb is known above all for the decisive battle which was fought there on 15 Rabîʿa 292/24 August 1516 between the armies of the sultan Kanshâh al-Qaher and the Ottoman sultan Selîm I. The Ottoman artillery proved superior, the bravest elements of the Mamlûk cavalry were decimated, and Kanshâh himself was killed. The Ottoman victory paved the way for their occupation of Syria and Egypt.

DABÎB, ABDU DJAFAR AHMED B. YAHYA B. AHMED B. ʿAMIRA, an Andalusian scholar of the 6th/12th century. According to the information that he gives us in his works concerning himself and his family, he was born at Velez, to the west of Lorca, and he began his studies in Lorca. He travelled in North Africa (Ceuta, Marrakûsh, Bougie) and even reached Alexandria, but he appears to have spent the greater part of his life at Murcia. He died at the end of Rabi I 599/beginning of 1203. Of his writings only a biographical dictionary of Andalusian scholars is preserved, preceded by a short survey of his history of Muslim Spain which continues and completes the introduction of ʿAbd al-Wâhid al-Marrakûshî (Histoire des Almohades, ed. Dozy). In addition al-Dabîb was closely connected with the Diṭhilîyya al-maktabîs al-Humaydî, which goes as far as 450/1058, and which he completed with the help of later biographical works. His collection of biographies, entitled Bughyat al-multamis fi Taʾrîṣh Rîḍîl Aḥî al-Andalus, was edited in 1885 by Codera and Ribera (vol. iii of the Bíbl. Arabico-Hispana).

Bibliography: Maḥṣuf, Analectes, ii, 714; Amari, Bíbl. ar. sec., i, 437; Wüstenfeld, Geschicht- schreiber, no. 282; Pons Boygues, Ensayo, no. 212; Brockelmann, S I, 580. (C. F. Seyerbold*)

DABIK, (variant forms Dabba and Dabbi), was a locality in the outer suburbs of Damietta, noted for the manufacture of high quality woven material, which it exported to the whole of the Muslim empire. The location of Dabîk cannot be fixed more exactly. It is found mentioned along with other cities that have disappeared, such as Shatâ, Tinnûs, or Tûnâ, which were probably on the islands of Lake Menzâleh.

Fine cloths embossed with gold were made there, and, during the Fāṭimid period, turbans of multicoloured linen. These textiles were so sumptuous that dabîk soon became known, and its fame grew to such an extent that the word came to designate a type of cloth that could be manufactured more or less everywhere, at Tinnûs and at Damietta, in the Delta, at Asyût, in Upper Egypt, and even in Persia, at Kâzîrûn. The quality of the cloth made at Dabîk must have dropped, because, according to al-Iдрîsî, although these materials were very fine, they could not be compared with those of Tinnûs and Damietta, and this fact can already be deduced from the customs tariff of Dcheda, given by al-Muʿâṣâdî.
At the present moment, three fragments of material are known—one Abbasid and two of Dablk. The place name is not mentioned by Ibn Mannamat, who, however, mentions the dabbl.

Ibn Duksam (v, 89) and Ibn Djoftan (76; ‘Abd al-Latif, Relation de l’Egypte, 638) mention a place called Dablk in the province of Gharblya, but this cannot be the town in the Damietta neighbourhood, which these two writers treat separately (Ibn Duksam, v, 76; Ibn Djoftan, 62 and ‘Abd al-Latif, 639).

For the same reason of distance, one could not possibly identify the old Dablk with the modern Dablj, twelve kilometres south of Sinballawayn, which could, on the other hand, well be the Dablk of Ibn Duksam and Ibn Djoftan.

**Bibliography:** Ya’külb-Wiet, 194-195; Ibn Khurradadbih, 85; Idrisi, Maghrib 186-187; Naizi Kusraw, 241; Mukaddasi, 54, 104, 193, 443; Ibn Mannamat, 81; Mafriz, ed. Wiet, ii, 84; iii, 200, 215; iv, 82 (with a long bibliograpy), 247; Le Strange, 294; Salmon, Introduction à l’histoire de Bagdad, 156, 158, 140; J. Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l’Egypte, 178; R. B. Serjeant, Islamic Textiles, in Ars Islamica, xiii, 89, 94, 97, 98, 100; xv, 76; Wiet, Tissus et Tapisseries, in Syria, xvi, 282-283; Kühnel, Dated Tissu Fabrics, 107; RCEA iii., 902; vi, 2033, 2175. (G. Wiet)

**DABBL [see dwn]**

**DABIR, SALAMAT ʿALI,** an Urdu poet, who devoted himself to writing and reciting highly devotional elegies on the death of the martyrs of Karbalā. He was a son of Mirzā Ghulām Husayn, who is claimed to be a grandson of Muīla Ḥākim Shīrāzī (a brother of the famous Ahlī Shīrāz, d. 934/1529-30). Salamat ʿAli was born in Ballimārān, Dihlī on 11 Dhu’l-Mahādī 1218/29 August 1803; he accompanied his father as a child to Lucknow and there received a good education. He studied all the usual Persian and Arabic texts on religious and foreign sciences (manbūl wa maṣāḥīl) from well-known ‘ulamā of the city. He had finished his studies by the time he was 18. He began composing poetry at the age of 20 (c. 1231/1813-14, 1232) and continued doing so along with his studies, under the guidance of Mir Muṭṭaffar Husayn Dāmlī of Gūrgān. He soon acquired fame and won the appreciation of the rulers of Awadh, members of their family and the noblemen of the Court. For about 60 years of his life he wrote marthiyas (elegiac poems).

Towards the end of his life he became almost blind. He, therefore, gladly accepted the suggestion of Wājidī ʿAll Shāh, then living in Calcutta in exile, that he should go there for treatment; he reached there about Pahul ‘U-Sudīnah 1290/1874. A successful operation by a German eye-specialist, who was staying with Wājidī ʿAll Shāh in Calcutta, restored his sight. He returned to Lucknow, where he had spent the major part of his life, and which he had only left for short periods in the disturbances of 1857 he had moved to Sitapur for a while; about 1858 he went to Kānpūr and in 1859 to ʿAzmābād; he visited ʿAzmābād again in 1292/1875 and died there on 30 Muharram 1292/8 March 1875, he was buried in his own house in a lane which is now known as Kāmār ʿAdbīr, after him. In his old age he suffered much tribulation on account of his loss of sight, and he was grieved by the death of a grown-up son and of a brother.

Dablr is described as a pious, ascetic, generous, hospitable and serious-minded person. As a poet he was extremely prolific, and had the gift of composing good verses quickly. His compositions consisted mostly of marthiyas, Salāms (for them see al-Misān, 485) and rubā’īs (Hayāt-ī Dablr, i, 272). His rival in this genre of poetry was his contemporary Mir Anīs, who appeared in Lucknow long after Dablr had established his fame as a poet. Their rivalry divided their admirers into two rival groups called Dablris and Anīsās and a considerable literature was produced on their comparative merits and failings (see, for example, Shihbū Ṣuḥāna, Mawṣulān ud Dablr, Āgra 1907; Sayyid Nāṣir al-Fāwak Ṣawādī, al-Misān, ‘Allgaḥ n.d.; ‘Abd al-Ḥaẓīr Khān Ṣaṣālā, Iṭīḥād-i Nabi 1879; Mir Muḥammad Ṣaḏā Ṣawī, Taḥīr al-Awṣādī; Mir Ḥafiz Jī ‘All Dāw, ‘Radd al-Muwāṣāta, etc. etc.).

While Anīs is usually praised for the simplicity of his style, easy flow of his verse, and his relatively eloquent (fasīḥ) descriptions, Dablr is eulogized for his brevity, freshness of his poetical ideas (maḏālim) and frequent and full use of rhetorical figures, and his touching laments and wailings (Urdu: bāyān). As an Arabic and Persian scholar he drew freely on the literatures of these languages, incorporating in his poems materials taken from the Kurān, Ḥadīth and the works on Maṣūli, etc. (cf. a comparative view quoted in Hay. Dab., i, 290: The Mir is eloquent and sweet [fasīḥ wa namakẖul]. The fact remains that it was due to the efforts of these two poets that marthiya attained such an important position in Urdu Poetry.

**Works:** Most of Dablr’s poems have been lithographed, though some are still unpublished. These editions are marred by interpolations, e.g., (1) an edition of marthiyas in 2 vols. (Hay. Dab., i, 624); (2) Daftar-i Māmāt, 20 vols. Lucknow 1897. For an analysis of the contents see Hay. Dab., i, 376 ff. These marthiyas etc. were lost in the disturbances of 1957 and after, and were collected again later; (3) Marthiya-i Dablr, 2 vols. (ibid. i, 490, 493; (4) Marthiya-i Mirzā Dablr, 2 vols., Lucknow 1875-76 (several editions in the following years), Kānpūr 1890-99 (several editions in the following years); (5) Marthiya-ī-yī Mirzā Dablr, Lucknow 1882 (several editions in the following years)); (6) ‘Abū al-Maṣāḥīh, a prose work, relating to the story of Joseph, compared to the story of the martyrs of Karbalā, Dihlī (Hay. Dab., i, 280); (7) Rubā’īyāt Mirzā Dablr, Lucknow n.d., containing 197 rubā’īs. A smaller collection of these was also published along with those of Anīs in Āgra.

In his younger days the Mirzā also composed three dīvāns of ghasābī, but later destroyed, lost or withdrawn them.


(Mohammad Shafī)
DABISTAN AL-MADHAHIB, "The school of religions", a work in Persian describing the different religions of and in particular the religious situation in Hindustan in the 11th/12th century; it is the most complete account in the Persian language, later than the Bayān al-adāyān (6th/12th century), which is accurate but concise, and than the Taḥṣīrāt al-ṣawāmīm (7th/11th century), written from the Shi‘ī point of view. The sources of the Dabistān derive partly from the sacred books of the different religious persuasions, partly from verbal information given to the author, and partly from personal observations. In many chapters he also makes use of the earlier Arabic literature concerning these matters. First of all the religion of the Parsis is examined extensively; for a long time Muḥsin Fānī was thought (mistakenly) to be the author of this work; in some manuscripts he is mentioned solely in his capacity as the author of a work (which is called Dabistān, i.e., a school or school of manners, in Persian manuscripts). (J. HOROVITZ-[H. MASSE])

Bibliography: Dabistān al-madhdhib (Calcutta 1822/1809; other editions from Tehran, Bombay, Lucknow; The Dabistan or school of manners, trans. David Shea and Anthony Troyer, Paris 1843, 3 vols. (not always accurate); J.A., vi, (1845) 406-11; Rieu, Cat. Persian MSS. of the British Museum, i, 141 & 147; 1067/1657. (Other catalogues of manuscripts and to old translations of isolated chapters): Ţēţē, Cat. of the Persian MSS. of the India Office Library, i, no. 1369 (useful references to other catalogues of manuscripts). (J. HOROVITZ-[H. MASSE] in Persian, and acquired some knowledge of the west and south of India. The Dabistān was finished no doubt between 1064 and 1067/1654-57.

DABISTAN AL-MADHAHIB — DABOYA

DABISTAN AL-MADHAHIB, "The school of religions", a work in Persian describing the different religions of and in particular the religious situation in Hindustan in the 11th/12th century; it is the most complete account in the Persian language, later than the Bayān al-adāyān (6th/12th century), which is accurate but concise, and than the Taḥṣīrāt al-ṣawāmīm (7th/11th century), written from the Shi‘ī point of view. The sources of the Dabistān derive partly from the sacred books of the different religious persuasions, partly from verbal information given to the author, and partly from personal observations. In many chapters he also makes use of the earlier Arabic literature concerning these matters. First of all the religion of the Parsis is examined extensively; for a long time Muḥsin Fānī was thought (mistakenly) to be the author of this work; in some manuscripts he is mentioned solely in his capacity as the author of a work (which is called Dabistān, i.e., a school or school of manners, in Persian manuscripts). (J. HOROVITZ-[H. MASSE])

Bibliography: Dabistān al-madhdhib (Calcutta 1822/1809; other editions from Tehran, Bombay, Lucknow; The Dabistan or school of manners, trans. David Shea and Anthony Troyer, Paris 1843, 3 vols. (not always accurate); J.A., vi, (1845) 406-11; Rieu, Cat. Persian MSS. of the British Museum, i, 141 & 147; 1067/1657. (Other catalogues of manuscripts and to old translations of isolated chapters): Ţēţē, Cat. of the Persian MSS. of the India Office Library, i, no. 1369 (useful references to other catalogues of manuscripts). (J. HOROVITZ-[H. MASSE])

DABIT, in Turkish zabīyye, a late Ottoman term for the police and gendarmerie. Police duties, formerly under the control of various janissary officers, were placed under the jurisdiction of the Serasker (q.v.) see also Bāb-ı Serasker in 1241/1826, and in 1262/1846 became a separate administration, the Zabīyye Memluk-i İmam (Lufti vilī 27-8). At about the same time a council of police (meğli-i zabīyye) was established, which was later abolished and replaced by two quasi-judicial bodies, the diwān-i zabīyye and meğli-i lâkkīb. After several further changes the mukhtariyyet became a ministry (nezaret) of police in 1286/1870. On 17 July 1909 the name ministry of Zabīyye was abolished and replaced by a department of public security (Emniyyet-i Umamiyye) under the Ministry of the Interior. Bibliography: "Oğmân Nûr, Meğli-i Umârı Beldeleyiyye, i, Istanbul 1338/1924, 934 ff. Laws and regulations on police matters will be found in the Destür (French translations in G. Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman, Oxford 1905-6, and G. Aristarchi, Législation ottomane, Constantinople 1873-85. See further Karakol, Şurta, Persia, and V. A. Gibb and Bowen, i, 259, and Dozy, Suppl. s.v.). By the 12th/18th century the term was already in common use in this sense (e.g. Resmi, Khulāṣat al-Fīhār, 5, "rizāq-ı zabīyye") and documents cited by Diewdet (i, 350; vi, 367 etc.). From the time of the westernizing reforms onwards it becomes the standard Ottoman equivalent of the European term 'officer'. In the Turkish republic it has been replaced by subay, but it remains current in the Arab successor states of the Ottoman Empire. (B. LEWIS)

DABT, assessment of taxable land by measurement, applied under the later Dihll sultanate and the Mughals; land so measured is called dabt. See DABISTAN AL-MADHAHIB — DABOYA

DABTIYYA, in Turkish zabīyye, a late Ottoman term for the police and gendarmerie. Police duties, formerly under the control of various janissary officers, were placed under the jurisdiction of the Serasker (q.v.) see also Bāb-ı Serasker in 1241/1826, and in 1262/1846 became a separate administration, the Zabīyye Memluk-i İmam (Lufti vilī 27-8). At about the same time a council of police (meğli-i zabīyye) was established, which was later abolished and replaced by two quasi-judicial bodies, the diwān-i zabīyye and meğli-i lâkkīb. After several further changes the mukhtariyyet became a ministry (nezaret) of police in 1286/1870. On 17 July 1909 the name ministry of Zabīyye was abolished and replaced by a department of public security (Emniyyet-i Umamiyye) under the Ministry of the Interior. Bibliography: "Oğmân Nûr, Meğli-i Umârı Beldeleyiyye, i, Istanbul 1338/1924, 934 ff. Laws and regulations on police matters will be found in the Destür (French translations in G. Young, Corps de Droit Ottoman, Oxford 1905-6, and G. Aristarchi, Législation ottomane, Constantinople 1873-85. See further Karakol, Şurta, Persia, and V. A. Gibb and Bowen, i, 259, and Dozy, Suppl. s.v.). By the 12th/18th century the term was already in common use in this sense (e.g. Resmi, Khulāṣat al-Fīhār, 5, "rizāq-ı zabīyye") and documents cited by Diewdet (i, 350; vi, 367 etc.). From the time of the westernizing reforms onwards it becomes the standard Ottoman equivalent of the European term 'officer'. In the Turkish republic it has been replaced by subay, but it remains current in the Arab successor states of the Ottoman Empire. (B. LEWIS)

DABUYID, the founder of the Dabuyid dynasty in Gīlân (q.v.). The tribe claimed to be of Sāsānid extraction through Dabuya's father, Gil Gāwbāra. Their residence was the town of Fūman (q.v.). The dynasty clung to Zoroastrianism for a long time, and repeatedly defended the land against the Arabs, until the last ruler, Khurshīd II (758/60, 141 or 142 A.H.) had to flee before the superior force of the 'Abbāsids, and put an end to his own life in Daylam (Tabari, iii, 139 f.). One of his daughters, whose name is unknown, became the wife of the Calif al-Mansūr.

The names of the members of the dynasty are as follows: Dāboč, 40 to 36/660-1 to 676.—His brother Khurshīd I, 56 to 90/676 to 709.—His son Farrukhan, 709 to 721-22, 90 to 103 A.H., who took the title Işıpbâbd (q.v.) (“leader of the army”), and warded off an Arab assault in 717.—His son Dābdūrzmehr (Dābdūrzmehr), 103 to 116/721-22 to 734.—His brother Sārūyâ (Sārūyā), for a few months in 116/721-22.—Khurshīd II, the son of Dābdūrzmehr (Dābdūrzmehr), 116 to 141 or 142 to 147/721-22 to 750-55 (see above). A dynasty descended from Dabuya's brother Fādūspān (title), ruled until 15/637 and 1576 respectively (from 1453 in two branches) in Kūyān (q.v.) and some neighbouring districts.

The most probable is: voiced lateralized velarized interdental fricative (see J. Cantineau, Consonantisme, in Semitica, iv, 84-5). According to the Arab grammatical tradition: rigaika maqhiura mutbaka. For the makhari, the daghiriyya of al-Khalil (al-Zamakhshari, Mufassal, 2nd ed. J. P. Broch, 190, line 20) is difficult to define exactly (see De Sacy, Gr. Ar., i, 26, n. 1; M. Bravmann, Materialien, 49 and 51). The most plausible meaning for shidr is 'commissure of the lips' according to al-Khalil’s own explanation (Le Monde Oriental, 1920, 45, line 8): masfaraj al-fam (repeated in Mufassal, ibid.; Radi al-Din al-Astarabadi, Sharh al-Shafi’iya, iii, 254, line 6); d is thus in the lateral position.

Sibawayh represents d as a lateral simply, and thus describes the makhradi; between the beginning of the edge of the tongue and the neighbouring molars' (Sibawayh, Paris edition, ii, 453, lines 8-9): a retracted lateral, for this beginning is to be taken as starting from the root of the tongue, and lam follows d (ibid., lines 9-11; Mufassal, 188, line 19). This does not indicate, for the peculiarity of sisida of d, a great extent for the place of articulation but rather a dwelling on it, a special prolongation of it. In modern Arabic dialects the passage from d to f is known (Landberg, Hadramout, 637), but the almost universal treatment of d is its confusion with z (voiced emphatic interdental fricative), whose evolution it shares [see z][7]. One is thus led to include in the articulation of d an activity of the tip of the tongue in the region of the teeth similar to the corresponding lateralized articulation in the Semitic languages (Mehri, Shihwari, but not the lateralized occlusive of Sohotri), whence the definition proposed above.

A lateral character is to be claimed for d, as N. Youshmanov, G. S. Colin, J. Cantineau, and others have done (J. Cantineau, Consonantisme, 84). The d phoneme of Classical Arabic continues an autonomous phoneme of common Semitic which is even more difficult to define precisely. M. Cohen sees in it a consonant 'of the dental region of which the articulation was doubtless lateral: d [conventional transcription]. As an emphatic, this consonant may anciently have formed one of a lateral series (triad?) (Essai comparatif, 149). In Classical Arabic d is isolated.

In ancient Semitic, the South Arabian inscriptions assign a special character (of unknown pronunciation) to the phoneme corresponding with the d of Classical Arabic. Gee does the same, but in the traditional nunciation it is a z; j in South Ethiopic. It is represented in Akkadian, Hebrew, and Ugaritic, by s, but in Aramaic by h in the oldest texts (preserved in Mandaean), then by s, a special evolution which represents a thorny problem. See the Table of correspondences in W. Leslau, Manual of Phonetics, 128.

For the phonological oppositions of the d phoneme in Classical Arabic see J. Cantineau, Essisse, in BSL (No. 126), 96, 71; for the incompatibles, ibid., 134. In view of the latter, J. Cantineau would see in d a lateralized rather than a lateral consonant (ibid., 130).

D undergoes few assimilations in Classical Arabic (see J. Cantineau, Cours, 69).

The Arabs saw in d one of the khiyds ‘special features’ of their language (Ibn Djinni, Sirr ṣnda’a, i, 222; Al-Suyūṭī, Muṣḥir, i, 326) and boasted of it (see the line of al-Mutanabbi quoted by Ibn Djinni, ibid.). But Sibawayh (ii, 452, lines 14-5, 17 f.) already registers a corrupt pronunciation: al-dād al-da’dha (M. Bravmann, Materialien, 53). In fact the articulation of dād has disappeared in the modern dialects and Kurānīc recitation and either (voiced velarized interdental fricative) or d (voiced velarized dental plosive) is used, according to the treatment of the phoneme in dialect.

In Persian and in Urdu, dād is a voiced alveolar fricative, and no differentiation is made in pronunciation between dh, z, and ẓ. Bibliography: in the text and s.v. Hurof al-Hidrî (H. Fleisch)

DADALOGHULU, ṢÎR MÛṢÂ-OĞLU WELT, 19th century Turkish folk poet (1797-1870?), was a member of the Afşar tribe which lived in the Taurus Mountains in S. Anatolia. His father was also a poet and took his makhris from the same family name. It is said that for a time Dadaloglu acted as imām in the villages and as secretary to the tribal chiefs. As a result of government action against his tribe, which rebelled because it was unwilling to undergo conscription or taxation, he was transported with the rest of the Afshars to the village of Sindel near Ažiziyeye in the province of Siwās (1866-8). It is difficult to establish how well founded are reports that at the end of his life he returned to the Cukurova region and recited his poems in the bazaars of Adana. His poems were not collected during his lifetime. Among them are to be found the chief forms of folk poetry such as türkî, koşmâ, semai, warsagh, and destân. He embellished and enriched the story of Genç Oğmân in a number of poems with a local setting. His poetry is harsh and emotional in manner and shows the pure and sincere odyssey of a bold, daring, upright, and sensitive tribesman. From passages in his poems one can understand the warlike psychology and nomadism of the society in which he lived. He was one of the last powerful representatives of epic, lyric, and pastoral Turkish folk poetry and story-telling which had continued ever since the composition of Dede Korkut and which Körküşlu and Karadja oğlan are the leading examples.

**DADJADJA**, the domestic fowl. The word is a noun of unity which, according to Arab lexicographers, may be applied to both the male and the female. Alternative pronunciations are *dadjadja* and *dadjidadja*. In more recent local usage (cf. Jayakar, Malouf), *dadjadat al-bahr* and *dadjadat al-kubba* denote certain kinds of fish, just as the corresponding Hebrew भें.

The animal, which is not mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, was known to the Arabs from pre-Islamic times. *Džiž* reports (II, 277 f.) that it was given to poets as a reward for their literary achievements. Although it eats dung, it is permitted as human food by Islamic law because the Prophet was seen partaking of it.

The ample information on the fowl and its eggs, which is given in Arabic zoological writings, can partly be traced back to Aristotle's *Historia Animalium*. The fowl has no fear of beasts of prey except the jackal, an inherent enmity existing between the two. It is fearful at night and therefore seeks an elevated sleeping place. It shares the characteristics of both birds of prey and seed-feeding birds, since it eats flesh as well as grains. The hen lays, mostly one egg a day, throughout the year, except in the two winter months (in Egypt, according to Nuwayrî, all the year round without interruption); if she lays twice a day it is a portent of her approaching death.

The chicken is produced from the white of the egg, while the yolk provides the nourishment for the embryo. From elongated eggs female chickens are born and males from round ones. Two chickens are produced from double-yolked eggs. If the hen while sitting hears thunder, the eggs are spoiled; if she is old and weak, the eggs have no yolk and produce no chickens. She also lays eggs without being covered by the cock (wind-eggs), but such eggs produce no chickens. When hens become fat they no longer lay, just as fat women do not become pregnant.

The sources mention and describe several kinds of *dadjadja*, some of them reaching the size of a goose. Numerous medicinal uses of eggs, fat, bile, gizzard, dung, etc. are mentioned by Arab zoologists and pharmacologists, partly from classical sources. The meat was considered a wholesome food, although its continuous eating was said to cause gout and piles. Half-cooked eggs were credited with special efficacy as an aphrodisiac. The significance of fowl when seen in dreams has been treated in pertinent works.

The Arab astronomers give the name *al-Dadjadja* to the constellation of the Swan, which is also called *al-Ta'dir*. The sources mention and describe several kinds of *dadjadja*, some of them reaching the size of a goose. Numerous medicinal uses of eggs, fat, bile, gizzard, dung, etc. are mentioned by Arab zoologists and pharmacologists, partly from classical sources. The meat was considered a wholesome food, although its continuous eating was said to cause gout and piles. Half-cooked eggs were credited with special efficacy as an aphrodisiac. The significance of fowl when seen in dreams has been treated in pertinent works.

The Arab astronomers give the name *al-Dadjadja* to the constellation of the Swan, which is also called *al-Ta'dir*. The sources mention and describe several kinds of *dadjadja*, some of them reaching the size of a goose. Numerous medicinal uses of eggs, fat, bile, gizzard, dung, etc. are mentioned by Arab zoologists and pharmacologists, partly from classical sources. The meat was considered a wholesome food, although its continuous eating was said to cause gout and piles. Half-cooked eggs were credited with special efficacy as an aphrodisiac. The significance of fowl when seen in dreams has been treated in pertinent works.
episode of the righteous men denouncing him. The apocalypse of Sibylla believes that the decisive proof of his imposture is his inability to raise up the dead.

In considering these eschatological documents it appears that, from the 11th century at least until the 16th century, Judeo-Christian traditions regarding Daḍīdjał remained alive and formed an indispensable element in descriptions of the period preceding the Judgment. Conflating two traditions, the apocalyptic of Sibylla believes that the decisive proof of his imposture is his inability to raise up the dead; the apocalypse of Abd al-Kahir al-Baghdadi, K. al-Farq bayan al-Firaq (Cairo 1930, 266 and 332-333) regards him as the ultimate term of comparison to describe false doctrine and going astray—though his sedition is only to last 40 days—and recalls that Christians believed that he would perish at the hands of Jesus who, in that way, would be converted to Islam after killing pigs, scattering wine and taking his place for prayer at the Ka‘ba.

The body of legend about Daḍīdjał is completed by statements about his origin. Apocalyptic texts make him come from the most remote regions. In St. Ephraem and the apocalypse of Abd al-Kahir (Ms. Paris, 2539), he comes from Khurāsān (cf. Ibn al-Wardī, al-Bīrūnī). According to Ps. Kāb al-Abharār and the Şayḥat al-Būm (Ms. ar. Paris, 2502), he must come from the West. Geographers and travelers of the classical period state that he dwelt in the countries which the “Agīḏah al-Hind” habitually populated with extraordinary beings, following the traditions of the Alexander Romance. Generally it was the East Indies which were the chosen place, from the time of Ibn Khurram al-Bihāb and al-Maṣūḏī to Ibn Iyās. A giant, false prophet, king of the Jews, representations of him vary according to the degree of literary information available or the predominating prejudices. It is interesting to note the allusion to the legend of Frometheus which makes him live chained to a mountain on an island in the sea (Muḥāṭasar al-Aḍīdah, 130; Al-Maṣūḏī, Muruḍī, iv, 28) where demons bring him his food. (A. ABEI)

DADFAR, an important, purely nomadic camel-breeding Sunni (Mālīk) tribe of south-western ʿIrāq, whose dīra has been for the last 150 years in the steppe of the Gerāb-Ezarān and ShaʿArān from the neighbourhood of Zubayr to that of Samawa. Their immigration into ʿIrāq, dating from about 1220/1805, was caused by bad relations with the then powerful and fanatical rule of Ibna Saʿūd, who forcibly demanded their obedience. Their earlier history traces legendary origins in Naḍlīd and even in the ʿIbidjār; but in fact the modern tribe represents evidently a conglomerate of various badw elements from many parts of Arabia, more or less unified by the ruling family of Ibn Suwaiy. Tribal traditions record many wars and raids of the usual Arab type, with the Muṣṭafī, Banī Ḥāšid, Shammar and others. They were, while still in Naḍlīd, occasionally tributary to the Shammar, the Shaykh of Kuwait, and the family of Ibn Saʿūd. Administratively, the Daffar are now grouped under the Īnid headquarters of Baṣrah, but move seasonally into Kuwait territory or that of Saʿūd Arabia. Their relations with the Turkish and ʿIrāq Governments since the early 13th/19th century have been fairly good, with lapses especially when they habitually looted caravans on the Naḍlī-Hāʾī road; and they have now lost much of their wild and inaccessible, though not their nodrīmic, character. Varieties of traditions have been maintained with the Muntāfik, their eastern and riverain neighbours; bad, with the Muṣṭafī and Shammar and Ḍānīza. The tribe was heavily involved in the serious raiding into ʿIrāk by Saʿūd (chiefly Muṣṭafī) forces in the period 1340/1344 (1921/25).


(S. H. Longrigg)

DADFAR, a stitched or bound booklet, or register, more especially an account or letter-book used in administrative offices. The word derives ultimately from the Greek diaphora "difference," and hence prepared for writing. It was already used in ancient Greek in the sense of parchment or, more generally, writing materials. In the 5th century B.C. Herodotus (v, 58) remarks that the Ionians, like certain Barbarians of his own day, had formerly written on skins, and still applied the term ἰδίβερα for papyrus rolls; in the 4th Ctesias (in Dietericus Siculus, ii, 32; cf. A. Christensen, Heideludina und Festiattinlitteratur hos Imamene i Oldtiden, Copenhagen 1935, 69 ff.) claimed, somewhat unconvincingly, to have based his stories on the βασιλέως διαβερα—presumably the royal archives—of Persia. The word also occurs in pre-Islamic and even pre-Christian Jewish Aramaic texts (V. Gardthausen, Griechische Paläographie, Leipzig 1911, 91 f.; M. Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, de'ar, New York 1926, 304. Attempts to derive it from an Iranian root meaning to write (also found in ḏābur, ḏaʿw) are unconvincing; on the other hand, in view of the testimony of the Arab authors, it is probable that the word reached Arabic via Persian.

I. The Classical Period

In early Islamic times dafar seems to have been used to denote the codex form of book or booklet, as opposed to rolls and loose sheets. It was at first applied to quires and notebooks, especially those said to have been kept by some collectors of traditions as an aid to their memories; later, when sizable manuscript books come into existence, it was applied to them also (N. Abbott, Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri, i, Chicago 1957, 21-24; cf. Goldzieher, Mah. St., iii, 50-52 and 180 ff). Stories of personal libraries and record collections in the first century A.H. must be treated with caution, cf. the comments of J. Schacht on the spurious tradition of the archives of Kurayb, On Musd b. ʿUba's Kitāb al-Maghāzī, AO, 1953, xxxi, 296-7. On the earliest Arabic papyrus quires see A. Grohmann, The Value of Arabic Papyri, Proc. of the Royal Soc. of Hist. Studies, i, Cairo 1931, 43 ff.).

The creation of the first Islamic record office is usually ascribed to the Caliph ʿUmar, who instituted the muster-rolls and pay-rolls of the fighting-men (see ḏīʿān). The initial form of these is not known, but before long they were probably kept on papyrus, which after the conquest of Egypt became the usual writing material in the administrative offices of the Caliphate. The papyri show that records of land, population, and taxes were kept in Egypt; surviving documents include quires as well as rolls and loose sheets, though the latter seem to have been the usual form, and no quire in Arabic appears until a comparatively late date (see A. Grohmann, New Discoveries in Arabic Papyri. An Arabic Tax-Account Book, BIE, xxii, 1951, 159-170). In general, the Umayyad Caliphs seem to have followed Byzantine bureaucratic practices, and kept their records on papyrus. This did not lend itself to the codex form. There was, however, also another bureaucratic tradition. The Sāsānīds clearly could not have relied on supplies of imported Egyptian papyrus for
their administration, and made use of a variety of prepared skins as writing materials (cf. Ibn al-Nadim, Fihrist, 90). According to Ḥasan ibn Ḫumm, quoting Ḥamadānī on the authority of al-Maḥmūd (Ṭabarî’s K̲h̲amm 180), the Sāsānīd Emperor K̲h̲obād kept a land-tax office at Ḥuwān; this is indirectly confirmed by Yaḥyā’s story (Ṭaʿrīḥ, ii, 258) of the procuring, in Muʿāwiyah’s time, of lists of Sāsānīd domain lands from Ḥuwān (A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant in Persia, London 1933, 15 n. 1). It is possible that some of the army lists of the earlier period, at least in the ex-Persian provinces, were already in codex form. Balādhūrī (Futūḥ 459; ed. Cairo 1901, 455) has ‘Umar say to the Banū ‘Adī ‘if the daftar is closed (yudḥāb on you), and explains it as meaning “if you are registered last”’. Abū Muslim is said to have prepared a pay-roll called daftar instead of the usual dawān of his followers in Khūrāsān in 293/707-8 (Ṭabarî, ii, 1957, 1969; see further N. Fries, Das Heerwesen der Araber zu Zeiten der Omaiyaden, 1921, 9; W. Hoenerbach, Zur Heeresverwaltung der Abbāsiden, Isi., xxix, 1949-50, 263). These may, of course, be no more than a projection backwards, by later historians, of a term common in their own time, though it is significant that the first example comes from the East.

According to the bureaucratic tradition, it was Khalīd ibn al-Ashwād who, during the reign of al-Ḥārūn, introduced the codex or register into the central administration. Until that time, says Ḥajāshīvārī (fol. 45 b; ed. Cairo 89) the records of the dāwān were kept on ṣuḥūj; Khalīd was the first to keep them in daftars. Makrīzī (Khitat, i, 91) goes further and says that the ṣuḥūj muṭārā (7 papyrus rolls, cf. Khalqashādib, Ṣuh, i, 433—aldrāṣī min ḥaṣāb dāftar) which had hitherto been used were replaced by ḥaffāfī min al-gīlādī—parchment codices. In the time of Hārūn al-Rashīd, Khalīd’s grandson, Dīyār b. Yāḥyā al-Barmakī, was responsible, it is said, for the introduction of paper. In this story there is some element of exaggeration. An incident told by Ḥajāshīvārī (fol. 79 b; ed. Cairo 138) shows that under Muḥāṣṣar papyrus was still in use—a fact which had hitherto been unknown—and that supply from Egypt was simply redirected; shows the debts owed by individual persons, according to the Kāmān, and the instalments paid until they are settled. (On Alwulūd see V. Minorsky in his edition of Taḍḍikirāt al-Muṣul, London 1943, 144; to be modified in the light of W. Hinze, Rechnungswesen, 120 ff.).

(4) Al-Ruṣnma—a day-book; the daily record of payments and receipts.

(5) Al-Khāṣmathe statement of income and expenditure presented monthly by the Dīyāshī.

(6) Al-Taṣrīḍ—an annual register, showing the entries in the previous register, and the instalments paid and received.

(7) Al-ʿArda—a subtraction register, for those categories where the difference between two figures needs to be shown. It is arranged in three columns, with the result in the third. Such is the ʿArda showing the difference between the original and the revised figures, the latter being usually smaller, (that is, presumably, the estimates and the amounts actually received). It seems to be the meaning of asl and istikhrādī, rather than income and expenditure, as assumed by Cevedt and Uzunçarşı. On istikhrādī in the sense of revision cf. Uzunçarşı, Medhal, 278 and Hinze, Rechnungswesen 18. On Al ʿasl cf. Mawardi, al-ʿAṣl al-Ṣulṭāniyya, ed. Enger 373, ed. Cairo 209. The expression dafṣīrī al-ʿasl wa istikhrādī occurs in a text from Sālāţūk Anatolios—O. Turan, Türkei Selçuklu kahrba Resmi Vehsiklar, Ankara 1958, text xxvi). These are itemized in the first and second columns, with the differences between them in the third column. Grand totals are shown at the foot of each of the three columns.

(8) Al-Barāʿi—a receipt given by the Dīyāshī or Kuṭāin[.][1] to taxpayers. (It is not clear whether Khāriṯīzī lists a register of copies and receipts, or is merely naming the barāʿa as a kind of document).

(9) Al-Muṣāqaba wa Iqīsām—the annual statement.

(10) Al-Diʾardīr al-Uṣāda—presumably a comprehensive account, showing the names of the soldiers, their pay, and the instalments paid and received.

(11) Al-Qalʿat al-Dāhīn—records of the soldiers, their wages, and the instalments paid and received.

(12) Al-Muḥāṣṣar wa Iṣbīṣī—which need to be seen in context. Those categories where the difference between two figures needs to be shown. It is arranged in three columns, with the result in the third. Such is the ʿArda showing the difference between the original and the revised figures, the latter being usually smaller, or in which the estimates and the amounts actually received. The word seems to be the meaning of asl and istikhrādī, rather than income and expenditure, as assumed by Cevedt and Uzunçarşı. On istikhrādī in the sense of revision cf. Uzunçarşı, Medhal, 278 and Hinze, Rechnungswesen, 18. On Al ʿasl cf. Mawardi, al-ʿAṣl al-Ṣulṭāniyya, ed. Enger 373, ed. Cairo 209. The expression dafṣīrī al-ʿasl wa istikhrādī occurs in a text from Sālāţūk Anatolios—O. Turan, Türkei Selçuklu kahrba Resmi Vehsiklar, Ankara 1958, text xxvi). These are itemized in the first and second columns, with the differences between them in the third column. Grand totals are shown at the foot of each of the three columns.

(12) Al-Barāʿi—a receipt given by the Dīyāshī or Kuṭāin[.][1] to taxpayers. (It is not clear whether Khāriṯīzī lists a register of copies and receipts, or is merely naming the barāʿa as a kind of document).

(13) Al-Muṣāqaba wa Iqīsām—the annual statement.

(14) Al-Diʾardīr al-Uṣāda—presumably a comprehensive account, showing the names of the soldiers, their pay, and the instalments paid and received.

(15) Al-Qalʿat al-Dāhīn—records of the soldiers, their wages, and the instalments paid and received.
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(12) Radfa— a requisition (hisâb) issued by the paymaster (mu'min) for certain troops stationed in outlying areas, for one issue of pay (lama') on receipt of the order.

(12) Al-Radfa al-Dîâmi'a— a global requisition issued by the head of the army office for each general issue (lama') of army pay, rations, etc.

(13) Al-Šâh— an inventory ('amal—cf. Dozy, Suppl. ii, 175) required for every fama showing the names of the payees, with numbers and amounts, and bearing the signed authority to pay of the sultan. The Şâh is also required for the hire of muleteers and camel-drivers.

(14) Al-Mu'âmar— an inventory of orders issued during the period of the fama, bearing at its end a signed authorization (igunga) by the sultan. A similar mu'âmar is prepared by every diwân.

(15) Al-Isbîâr— an inventory of the supplies remaining in hand after issues and payments have been made.

(16) Al-Muâdaqâ— a list ('amal) showing the circumstances and causes of any changes occurring, i.e., transfers, dismissals, deaths, promotions, etc.

(17) Al-Dîjiradâ al-Muadigjlâla— the sealed register. The Sadjil (seal) is the letter given to an envoy or messenger, authorizing him, on arrival, to recover the expenses of his journey from any 'Amil. The Sadjil is also the judicial verdict (mafradar) prepared by a kâli.

(18) Al-Fezîrist— a repertory of the inventories and registers in the diwân.

(19) Al-Dastûr— a copy of the djama' made from the draft.

Finally, Khârîzmi gives the names of three registers (daftar) used by the scribes of Irâk. They are (as given in the edition) (1) al-dârûn (2) al-âlûn (3) al-adârûn

The third is explained as a register of the land measurement survey (misâha). Khârîzmi, Majâ'îr al-Ulam, ed. Van Vloten, 54-8, cf. Mez, Renaissance, 103, Eng. tr. 109, where however Mez's meaning is not very clearly rendered. An abridged Turkish paraphrase of Khârîzmi's text was made, in the light of Ottoman bureaucratic experience, by M. Cevdet, Defter, 88-91; there is also a rather more rapid Turkish summary by I. H. Uzungarsili, Osmanli Devleti Tezkireti Medhal, Istanbul 1947, 479-480. This last has been translated into German by B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 33â n. 1.

It is probable that Khârîzmi's account refers to Samanid rather than 'Abbâsid offices in this first instance. It is, however, almost certainly applicable in great part to 'Abbâsid administration, and much of what he says is attested by passing references in the historians of Irâk and Persia.

Khârîzmi's registers fall into two main groups, the former being in the diwân, the latter in the land-tax office, and may now be considered separately.

Fiscal Registers.

The most important register of the tax-office is the Kânûn, the survey of land and taxable crops, (this would seem to be the meaning of the term kânûn in Mawardî, Al-Akbâm al-Suljâniyya, ed. Enger 370, ed. Cairo 207).

This served as the basis for the assessment and collection of the land-tax and was thus the main instrument and authority for the department's activities. The term Kânûn, already recognized by Khârîzmi as arabicized Greek (yânâniyya mu'arrabah), was employed chiefly in Irâk and the East, and was made, in use in the 9th and 10th centuries, when it designated a kind of cadastral and fiscal survey (M. Minovi and V. Minorsky, Nasîr al-Dîn Tûst on Finance, BSOAS, x, 1940, 761, 773, 781; Hinz, Rechnungswesen, 134 ff.). In later times the term kânûn in this sense seems to have fallen out of use, and was replaced by others. In Egypt the term mukhâlafe was used to designate the land survey registers, which were prepared by a mâshîk and arranged by villages (Grohmann, New Discoveries . . ., 163). According to Makrizi, Khâlîl, i, 82, a new survey was made in Egypt every thirty years. (For specimens of land-tax registers from Egypt, on papyrus rolls, see A. Dietrich, Arabische Papyri, Leipzig 1937, 81 ff. (see further DAFTAR-I KHâSANI, MISâBA, RAWK, TAHRîR and TAPo).

The Rûznâmâdi or Rûznâmî is mentioned in an anecdote attributed to the time of Yâhâyâ b. Khâlîd al-Barmâkî. A Persian taunts an Arab with the dependence of Arabic on Persian for terms and nomenclature, "even in your cookery, your drinks, and your diwân", and cites the word Rûznâmâdi, as an example in the last-named group. (Muhammad b. Yâhâyâ al-Sûtî, Abû al-Kîdîb, Cairo 1431, 193). A passage in thickest light on how the Rûznâmâdi was kept, in the treasury, in early 4th/10th century Baghdad. In 515/927, he tells us, the wazir 'Ali b. 'Isâ relied on 'Ibrâhîm b. Ayyûb (a Christian treasury official, appointed head of the Diwân al-Dîahbadh in the following year—Aarb, Tab. Cont. 135; on him see also Sûtî, Abû al-Kâdîb 199; Hûlîl al-Sûtî, Wuzurâ', 136, 279, 290) to report to him on financial matters, to instruct the Treasurer (Sâkhît bayt al-mâdî) concerning his daily disbursements, and to require of him the weekly presentation of the Rûznâmâdî, so that he might quickly know what had been paid out, what received, and what the deficit was (mâ hâla wa-mâ habâda wa-mâ bâbîya). The previous practice in making up the account (khâima) had been to present a monthly statement due to the diwân; the new method reduced this to a"mid month". (Taghîris al-Umân, ed. Amedroz, i, 157-2).

Two other passages in the same work indicate that the functionary in the treasury whose task it was to prepare the khâima was the Dîahbadh [q.v.] (ibid., 155 and 164. The rendering of these passages in the English translation of Miskawayh by D. S. Margoliouth does not bring out their technical significance). Two documents of the time of al-Mukta'dî, quoted in the Tarîkh-i Kûmm, shows how the Rûznâmâdi functioned in Kûmm and Fârs. Here the writer (Kâtil) of the Rûznâmâdi is distinct from the diwân of the Kûmm, and is a government official. His task is to register the sums received in taxes and issue receipts, called Barâ'a [q.v.], and to act as a kind of auditor on the operations of the Dîahbadh (Tarîkh-i Kûmm, 149 ft.; cf. Ann K. S. Lambton, An Account of the Tarikhi Qumm, BSOAS, xii, 1948, 555; C. Cahen, Quelques problèmes économiques et fiscaux de l'Iraq Buyide ... AIEO, x, 1952, 355. On the Rûznâmâdi see further F. Lekkegaard, Islamic Taxation in the Classic Period, Copenhagen 1950, 149 and 159). In Ayyûbîd Egypt Ibn Mammât still includes the preparation of the Rûznâmâdi and the Khâima among the duties of the Dîahbadh (Kitâb Kawdân al-Da'wûnî, ed. A. S. Atiya, Cairo 1943, 304; Persia; of the Land-tax from Egypt see Grohmann, New Discoveries . . .; for a discussion of the systems of accountancy they reveal, C. Leyerer,
Die Verrechnung und Verwaltung. See further HISAB and MUIIASABA. Many scattered references to the daftars kept in ‘Abbâsid offices will be found in the writings of Miskawayh, Hilâl, and others especially interested in administrative affairs. Some idea of the scale and presentation of the accounts of the state may be gathered from a few individual balance sheets of imperial revenue and expenditure that have been preserved by the historians. The earliest, dating from the time of Harûn al-Râshîd, is preserved by Dibajjâyîrî (fol. 179a-182b; ed. 281-5) and in a variant version, by Ibn Khaldûn (Mubî i, 321-4 = Rosenthal), i, 361-5. See further R. Levy, The Social Structure of Islam, Cambridge 1957, 317-320. A budget for 306/908 is given by Hilâl, Wusârâ, i, 31-22, and was analysed, together with other sources, by A. von Kremer, Über das Einnahmebudget des Abbassiden-Reiches, Denkschrift d. Phil. hist. Kl. d. Wiener Ak., xxxvi, 1888, 283-362. A statement of the revenues of the privy purse (Bayât mûl al-Khâssâ) in the 4th/10th century is given by Miskawayh (Mez 115-6. See further BAYT AL-MÂL.

Military Registers.
The muster-rolls of fighting-men date back to the beginnings of the tribal state. These were, however, of quite a different character from the regular army lists described by Khârîzî. It may be that Abû Muslim was the first to introduce the daftar of soldiers; certainly the practice became general under the ‘Abbâsids. Besides Khârîzî’s notes, we have a fuller description of the army lists kept in the dîwân al-Ǧâyâh in Khûdâma’s treatise on the land-tax, and in a late anonymous treatise on tactics (Tr. Wiistenfeld, in Das Heerwesen der Muhammedaner, Göttingen 1880, 1-7. Both are examined, with other evidence, by W. Hoenerbach, Zur Heeresverwaltung ... 269 ff. See further *al-tâkhîl.*

Similar lists were kept in the dîwân al-Ǧâyâh and dîwân al-rasâîl (army office and pay office) of the Fâtimidoh in Egypt (Kâlkašândî, *Ṣabîh*, vi, 492-3 = Wüstenfeld, Die Geographie und Verwaltung von Ägypten, Göttingen 1879, 240-1). The common term for the army lists was *Diwârâ.*

Diplomatic Registers. *Khârîzî*’s description is confined to financial and statistical registers—to accounts, inventories and the like in the tax and pay offices. Besides these there were also letter-books and other diplomatic registers, used in the chancery offices. A description of those kept in the Fâtimid chancery (dîwân al-rasâîl) is given by the Egyptian scribe Ibn al-Sâyrafi (463-542/1070-1147). In the 12th chapter of his *Kâfûn Dîwân al-Rasâîl* (ed. ‘All Bahjat, Cairo 1905, 137-141, Fr. trans. by H. Massé in BIFAO, xi, 1914, 104-8; cf. Kâlkašândî, *Ṣabîh*, i, 133-5, where they are given in a slightly different order, and Björkman, Beiträge, 24-5), he considers the registers (daftar) and memorandum (lajûhîrâ; Massé translates ‘bulletin’) which should be kept in this office, and the qualities of their keeper. This, he says is one of the most important tasks in the dîwân. The registrar must be reliable, long-suffering, painstaking, and work-loving, and should keep the following memorandum and registers.

(1) Memoranda (lajûhîrâ) of important matters (muhîmmî ‘al-mârîr) which have been dealt with in correspondence, and to which it may be necessary to refer. These memoranda (lajûhîrî) are much easier for reference than papers in bundles (aqâfîr; Massé translates ‘dossier’). All letters received must therefore, after being answered, be passed to the registrar, who will consider them and record what is needed in his memorandum, together with any reply sent. He will assign a number of sheets (awrâh) in his memorandum to each transaction (jafta), with an appropriate heading. He will then register incoming letters, noting their provenance, date of arrival and contents, together with a note of the reply sent or, if such be the case, of the fact that no reply was sent. He will continue this to the end of the year, when he will start a new section of his memorandum. In the year 575/1179, the Fâtimid registers at Cairo were, however, of quite a different character from East Asian examples (see for example Diuwaynî, i, 24-5 = Boyle, i, 33-4, and Râshîd al-Dîn, *Dâsam al-Tawârîbh*, ed. Blouchet, 39-40, 56-7; cf. ibid. 483 on the *daftars* of Pekin), but this whole question is still in need of further investigation.

Despite the evidence of reorganization under the Great Tâlûq, the registrars and book-keepers of the Sultanate, as well as of Sâlúqûdân Anatolia and Ayyûbiq Egypt, seem to have continued many of...
the practices of the preceding period. What development there is seems to be in technical matters, especially in the collection and presentation of statistical data. Some idea of bureaucratic practice in the Sultanate of Rum can be obtained from Ibn Bibi, Al-Asāmīr al-`Alāʾīyya, facsimile ed. Ankara 1956 (ed. N. Lugul and A. S. Erzi, part 1; Ankara 1937; abridgment. Houtsma, Recueil, ii; German trans. H. W. Duda, Copenhagen 1959; Turkish adaptation by Yazidiélugu `Alī, Houtsma, Recueil, iii). Registers were kept at the Dīwān-i `Aḍāʾ, and dealt with land and tax matters. As new territories were acquired or recovered, new surveys were conducted (Ibn Bibi, 146, Antalya; 153-4, Sinop; 428, Akhīāt). An addition by Yazidiélugu (Recueil, iii 105—not in Ibn Bibi) tells that during the reign of Izz al-Dīn Kaykāwūs the office of Sāḥīb-i Dīwān in the care of the finance registers (emva’dī al-falāḥ) were entrusted to Khāṣa Badr al- Din Khurāsānī, who was unequaled in the lands of Rūm in his knowledge of khatt, balīqba, ingād, siyyāb, and ḥisdb [qq.v.]. At the same time Khāṣa Fakhr al-Dīn `Ālī Tabrīzī was put in charge of ingād and maktuṣbāḥ, and each of the 12 dafṭars in the dīwān-i waṣrāṭ entrusted to a competent master (ustāḍ). On another occasion the office of amir-i ārād was entrusted to Ṣahm al-Dīn, also a specialist in ingād and siyyāb (Ibn Bibi 127), Yazidiélugu (Recueil, iii 105) explains how this office involved the control of the military registers (lerı seri) Recueil, iii, 109. For similar appointments to the dīwān al- ārād by Sandjār see K. `Atabat al-Kutub, edd. Muḥ. Kāzawānī and `Abbās Ibkāl, Tehran 1329, 39-40, 72-3). Another passage in the same work (Recueil, iii, 210 speaks of 24 registrars, 12 in the dīwān-i waṣrāṭ dealing with land and taxes, and 12 in the dīwān-i ārād dealing with the lists of soldiers, pay and fees. A poem cited by Yazidiélugu (254-5) repeats these figures, but awakens doubt of their authenticity by linking them with the recurring figure 12 in the Oghuz legend. The same poem claims complete coverage in the registration of lands (Cevdet 91-3).

From the 11th-12th period we have, for the first time, detailed treatises on public accounting. Two important works, the Safadat-nāma of Farak al-`Alāʾī Tabrīzī (compiled 707/1307) and the Risāla-f-i Fakahiyya of `Abd Allah b. Muḥammad b. Kiyā al-Māzandarānī (ca. 767/1363) were discovered and analysed by Zeki Velidi Togan (Moğollar devrinde Anadolu’nun İktisadi Vaziyeti, TİTH, i, 1931, 1-42). A Timūrid manual, written in Herāt ca. 845/1441, was discovered by Adnan Erzi (W. Hinz, Ein orientalisches Handelsunternehmen im 15 Jahrhundert, Welt des Orients, 1949, 313-40) and a complete budget (Djami al-Ḥisdb) of 738/1337-8 found by Z. V. Togan. The first two were studied in great detail by W. Hinz (Das Rechnungswesen), to which the annual financial reports were prepared.

(6) Djamî al-Ḥisdb—the master-ledger, from which the annual financial reports were prepared.

(7) Khâṣa—the survey and assessment book, or Domedly Book of the Empire.

(For a full discussion of these registers, and of the variations in usage and nomenclature, see Hinz, Rechnungswesen, 113-137).

III. The Post-Mongol States.

As in so many other respects, the Muslim states of the post-Mongol period seem to have followed, to a very large extent, the bureaucratic practices of the Il-Khâns, some of which can be recognized as far afield as Mamluk Cairo, Ottoman Istanbul and Mughal Delhi. Of these states only one, the Ottoman Empire, has left a collection of registers that has survived to the present day, though individual dafṭars have come to light in other parts. The Ottoman dafṭars have been discussed elsewhere (see RASVEKALET ARSIVÎ, DAFṬAR-I KHÂNÂNÎ, DIPLOMATIC, MUHİMME DEFTERÎ, SİLHÎ, etc.), and need not, therefore, be described here. Numbers of Ottoman registers have also come to light in the ex-Ottoman territories in Europe, Asia and Africa. For a description of their material form see L. Fekete, Die Siyaqat-Schrift, 1, 70 ff.

villages and towns of the Empire, giving, by the side of their names and the names of their fathers, their legal status, their obligations and privileges according to the economic and social class to which they belonged, and the extent of the lands which they possessed.

These registers also contain a great deal of information on the way in which the land was used (fields, orchards, vineyards, rice-fields, etc.), on the number of mills, on sheep and bee-hives, with an indication of their approximate fiscal value in aspers.

Nevertheless the fiscal information contained in the registers is not confined to this agricultural inventory. They also refer to fisheries and mines as well as to the proceeds from customs, fairs, markets and weighhouses, with their locations, their regulations and the volume of the transactions carried out.

We can also, by referring to the daftar-i ḫākānī, obtain an exact idea of the distribution of the revenues of the country as between the imperial domain, the military fiefs, waḵfs and private properties (mulk). These registers in fact constitute a survey showing the form of ownership of each estate with a summary of the successive changes which it underwent.

The compilation of the registers arose from the administrative organization of the Empire. The great majority of Ottoman officials, both civil and military, did not draw salaries from the budget of the central government but were allowed, in return for their services, to levy taxes on a given region on their own account. Thus at the beginning of the 10th/16th century the possessors of timars alone, whose numbers had risen to about 35,000, appropriated more than half of the taxes levied on the territory of the Empire. This proportion moreover went on increasing throughout the 17th century together with the number of timariots.

In order for this system to operate successfully it was essential to know every detail of the different sources of the Empire's revenues, and to follow their modifications step by step through a given period. In this way it was possible to examine whether the emoluments, whose amounts were entered in the registers, and the deeds of grant (berād [q.v.]) issued to the beneficiaries, tallied with the taxes they actually levied. During the period of expansion, when the population and the resources of the Empire were constantly increasing, the frequent surveys always disclosed new surpluses in the State revenues.

But from the 11th/17th century onwards the central power, as a result of the anarchic mismanagement of State affairs, did not possess the authority necessary to carry out these surveys. The disorganization of the institution of timars moreover rendered the value of these measures illusory.

In addition to these “detailed registers” (daftar-i muwaṣṣal) in which were listed the results of the surveys, auxiliary registers were also required, in which were noted, as they occurred, changes in the distribution of the timars, thus avoiding the additions and corrections which would otherwise have had to be made in the “detailed registers”. For the system in force at the beginning of the 10th/16th century two or even three kinds of auxiliary books were used:

1. Daftar-i ʾidjmāl or “synoptic inventory”. This register was a summary based on the detailed register, omitting the names of the inhabitants and giving the revenues only as lump sums for each unit.

2. Daftar-i derdest or “book of changes”. This register was a list of the villages or towns constituting the nucleus of the military fiefs. It showed the successive changes which each fief had undergone and the authorities could, on consulting it, easily determine the fiefs escheated or without possessors.

3. Daftar-i rūznāme or “daybook”, into which were copied as they occurred the deeds of grant (berād) issued to new fief-holders.

Each time a new survey was made, the old registers were replaced by new and consigned to the archives of the register-office (daftarḵhāne). The greater part of the old registers were lost or destroyed during their removal from one repository to another. There remain nevertheless over a thousand in the Başvekalet Arşivi [q.v.] at Istanbul as well as a few in certain Turkish and foreign archives and libraries. Among these registers are some which date from the time of Murād II (824-55/1421-51) and of Meḥmed II the Conqueror (855-56/1451-82), and which allude to still earlier surveys.

The archives section of the survey and land register office, at Ankara, includes a complete collection of the registers relating to the last surveys made during the reigns of the sultans Selṭm II (974-82/1566-74) and Murād III (982-1003/1574-95). To these registers have been added the results of the surveys made in such provinces as Crete, conquered after this date, or the Morea, recaptured from the Venetians. Even today this collection is, on rare occasions, consulted in lawsuits.

In this collection the “detailed registers” number 254, the “synoptic inventories” (ʾidjmāl) 116, the “books of changes” (derdest) 169, and the “daybooks” (rūznāme) 1363 volumes. The “detailed registers” contain about 300 pages, 15 cms. across and 42 cms. down.

During the period of more than three centuries which has elapsed since the last survey, these records have been brought up to date each time it has been necessary to register the modifications which have occurred in the legal status of certain lands upon the creation of new waḵfs. The fact that certain judgments made in favour of privileged individuals and relating to law-suits concerning the boundaries of villages and pastures have been entered in these registers only increases their value. Nevertheless it would be wrong to believe that all the transactions carried out by the registry office have found a place in these documents.

Certain writers have suggested that the daftar-i ḫākānī constitute a land-register. But in the system of domain-lands (arādā-i mīriyye), the peasant has never been the owner of the land which happens to be in his possession, and he could not therefore dispose of the title-deed. He could indeed transfer the possession of the land which he occupied, but this act, which took place under the control and with the approval of the local lord (ṣṭūḥā), was not made the subject of an entry in the imperial registers. Only from the second half of the 19th century onwards was a land register, in the modern sense of the word, established in Turkey.

Bibliography: O. L. Barkan, Les grands recensements de la population et du territoire de l'Empire Ottoman, in Revue de la Faculté des
Sciences Economiques de l'Université d'Istanbul, 12, 1940, 21-34, 165-79; idem, Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensements dans l'Empire Ottoman (XVIIIe siècle), JESHO, i, i, 1957; B. Lewis, The Ottoman Archives as a Source for the History of the Arab lands, JRAS, 1951, 139-155; idem, Studies in the Ottoman Archives I, BSOAS, vi, 3, 1954, 469-503; I. Inalci, Hicri 835 tarihteki Sıvet-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arvam, Ankara 1954; I. H. Uzuncaşılı, Osmanlı defterlerinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilatı, Ankara 1948, 95-111; P. Reketa, Die Siyâsqât-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung, Budapest 1955. See further BAYSKELET ARSIVI, DAFTAR, TAHRIR, TAPU.

(Ö. L. BARKAN)

DAFTAR-DAR, in Turkish defterdar, keeper of the deftar [q.v.], an Ottoman term for the chief financial officer, corresponding to the Mustafa [q.v.] in the eastern Islamic world. According to Kalkanlı (Subh, iii, 485, 494, 525, 526), the title Şahib al-Dafar already existed in the Fatimid administration, for the official in charge of the Dafar al-Madjís, that is, of accounts and audits. The title Dafarbhân—Defter-reader—appears in the time of Saladin (B. Lewis, Three Biographies from Kamal ad-Din, in Fuad Körprüli Armâna, Istanbul 1953, 343), and reappears in the Muslim West (Mağşarî, Analectes, i, 660). The title Dafardar origins with the liyân-nejâhs, who appointed a defterdar-i divân-i mamlûk or defterdar-i mamlûk to make and keep the registers (Uzuncaşılı, Medhal, 229-30; Körprüli, Bismans 204-5; Hammer, Geschichte der Goldenen Horde, Pest 1840, 497-501).

The Ottoman kânûnnames, from the 9th/15th century onwards, show the development of the office of defterdar in the Ottoman Empire. In the Kanûnname of Mehmed II, the chief Defterdar is already a high ranking official who, under the general supervision of the Grand Vezir, is the officer responsible (wekîl) for the Sultan's finances (Kânûnname-i Âl-i 'Othmân, TOEM suppl. Istanbul 1330, 10). He is named immediately after the Grand Vezir, and is comparable with him in status. At the Divân he sits immediately after the Grand Vezir and the two Kâddîsikars, and shares with them the right to issue ferman on matters within his jurisdiction. He has the right of personal access to the Sultan, who rises to greet him (ibid., 10-11, 16-17, 23-5). His duties include the presentation of an annual report or balance sheet of income and expenditure, for which he is rewarded with a robe of honour. His emoluments may be an appanage (right [q.v.]) worth 600,000 aspers, or a Treasury stipend (sâyâde) of from 150,000 to 240,000 aspers a year. In addition, the Defterdar or başdefterdar (headdefterdar) presided over a hierarchy of lesser financial officers; first the ordinary finance officers (Mîl defterdarî), then, under them, their adjutants (Defterdar hâkûbdâsî), and under them the registrars of timârs (Timar Defterdarî), all with a recognized and established ladder of promotion. From the time of Bayezid II the Başdefterdar was based at Rumelia, and was also known as Rumeli Defterdarî. A second Defterdarî, the Anadolu Defterdarî, was appointed to deal with the revenues of Anatolia. In the early 16th/16th century a further defterdar's office was set up in Aleppo, to look after the remoter provinces of the Levant. This office was later subdivided, with separate offices in Diyarbakr, Damascus, Erzurum, Aleppo, Tripoli, and elsewhere. In the mid-16th century a separate office for Istanbul was established, and at the end of the century yet another for the Danubian provinces. This last was of short duration. The three main offices came to be known as the first, second, and third divisions (şikbi-i ewvel, ûlûnî, ûlûhî) corresponding to Rumelia, Anatolia, and the remoter provinces. A fourth division was set up by Selim III to deal with the budget of the new style army (see İZAM-İ DERE). It was abolished with the latter. In 1833/1838 the office of the Defterdar was renamed Ministry of Finance (Maliyye [q.v.]), but the term Defterdar remained in use for provincial directors of finances.

Bibliography: Mehmed Zeki, Teghâlât-i 'Atîbah Defterdar, TTEM, 135th year, 1952, 96-102, 234-244; Körprüli's. 1 Muhaserelerin ertesi hakkinda bir Mülke, HTHM, i, 1931, 201-5 (= M. Fuad Körprüli, Alcune Osservazioni intorno all'influenza delle istituzioni della contabilità turcha, Rome 1953, 44-8); Pakaln, s.v.; Gibb-Bowen, index; Hammer-Purgstall, index; IA s.v. (by I. H. Uzuncaşılı). (B. LEWIS)

DÂGH, the tâlkâlius of Nawwâb Mirzâ Khân (originally called Ibrâhîm, Âlînâ Dâgh), one of the most distinguished Urdu poets of modern times. He was a son of Nawwâb Shâms al-Dîn Khân, ruler of Firûzpur Dihlî, and Wazir Begam (usually called Chôtî Begam). Nawwâb Mirzâ was born in Cânînâ Cawk, Dihlî on 12 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1246/25 May 1831 (cf. his horoscope in Dâluâ-i Dâgh, 9). When Shâms al-Dîn Khân was hanged (Oct. 1835) for his part in the murder of Mr. W. Fraser, Resident of Dihlî, Nawwâb Mirzâ Khân's mother remarried, and he went and lived in Râmpûr in 1844, because of the influence of his aunt, Umdâ Khanam, a member of the karm of Nawwâb Yûsuf 'Ali Khân. There he studied Persian with Mawlâ Ghiyâth al-Dîn. His mother, in the meanwhile (1844), entered the karmîn of Mirzâ Muhammad Sulûn Fath al-Mulk (Mirzâ Faîhrî), a son and the heir-apparent of Abû Zafar Bahâdur Shâh. Nawwâb Mirzâ (then 13 or 14 years old) also came to the Dîlî Fort and received his regular education there. He studied the usual Persian texts, learned calligraphy from Sayyid Muhammad Amir Panjâ Kâsh (d. 1857, Ghulâm Muhammad, Tadbîrîn Khwânsavâsîn, Calcutta 1920, 71 f.) and Mirzâ İbâd Allâh Bâg (ibid., p. 73); he also learned horsemanship and the use of various arms. But above all his sojourn in the Fort brought him into contact with the famous poets of the day, who assembled in the Fort for the mughâbaras (poetical contests). This environment developed his latent aptitude for writing poetry. He began to write ghâsâsî in Urdu at an early age and when Shahî Muhammad Ibrâhîm Dhwâk adopted him as his pupil, his genius blossomed fully. The tutelage of Dhwâk lasted from 1844 to 1854 and in this period Dâgh took part in the mughâbaras both of the Fort and the City. But Fath al-Mulk's death (10 July 1856) forced him to leave the Fort. About ten months later followed the upheaval of 1857, after which Dâgh once again went to his aunt in Râmpûr but
occasionally visited Dihll and sometimes stayed there. When Kalb 'Ali Khan succeeded Nawwab Yusuf 'Ali Khan (d. 21 April 1865) as Nawwab of Rampur, Dagh had the honour of becoming his companion (14 April 1866). He was also appointed Superintendent (daragha) of the stables and carpet stores (fardkhana) at Rs. 70 p.m. Towards the end of the same year he had the privilege of accompanying the Nawwab to Calcutta and a few years later (1289/1872-3) of performing the hadjdi in the retinue of the Nawwab. Rampur in this period was a rendezvous of distinguished poets, such as Amir, Djalal, etc. His pleasant personality, with a fine sense of humour, and an intense love of music, made his appeal direct and vehement. His command of language is remarkable. He uses idiomatic phrases frequently and with masterly aptness (cf. Wall Ahmad Khan, Mukhawar-i Dagh, Dihll 1944). In 1312/1894 he received from the Nahwab the titles of "Bubuli Hindustan, Dijdin al-Mulk, Nawwab Mirza Khan Bahadur". He appears to have been signing his name only as Fasih al-Mulk Dagh Dihlawi (see Nurf opp. 12). His only son died at Rampur; he adopted relatives to Asaf Djah VI.

In 1312/1894 he received from the Nizam the titles of "Bulbuli Hindustan, Dijdin al-Mulk, Nawwab Mirza Khan Bahadur". He appears to have been signing his name only as Fasih al-Mulk Dagh Dihlawi (see Nurf opp. 12). His only son died at Rampur; he adopted relatives to Asaf Djah VI.

In 1312/1894 he received from the Nizam the titles of "Bulbuli Hindustan, Dijdin al-Mulk, Nawwab Mirza Khan Bahadur". He appears to have been signing his name only as Fasih al-Mulk Dagh Dihlawi (see Nurf opp. 12). His only son died at Rampur; he adopted relatives to Asaf Djah VI.
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the three religions each had their adherents, and finally the country of the Christian prince of Sarir (which corresponds to present-day Avaristan), who bore the title of Filângâhâr or Kilângâhâr. According to Ibn Rusta, only the inhabitants of the royal castle, built on a high mountain, were Christian; the prince's other subjects were pagan. According to al-Iṣṭâkhri, Sarir's frontier was only two farsâkh away from the seashore town of Samandar. Governed by a Jewish prince related to the king of the Khazars, Samandar lay four days' march from Derbend according to al-Iṣṭâkhri, eight days' march according to al-Masûdî. The town of Sarir is situated in the northern part of the coastal region where the town of Târkhâr or Târkûn was later built. It is described as a flourishing city where there were, some say, 4,000, others, 40,000 vineyards; there the Muslims had their mosques, the Christians their churches, and the Jews their synagogues. On the west the country of Samandar bordered the land of the Alans. The Muslims seem to have given the name of Lâzk (Lezgians) to the people of southern Dâghîstân, whose geographical position they do not elsewhere indicate with any precision. According to al-Balâdûri (De Goeje ed., 208), the land of the Lâzk lay in the plain which stretched from Samur to the town of Shâberân, south of present-day Dâghîstân. According to al-Masûdî (Munâjât, ii, 3), on the other hand, the Lâzk people dwelt in the highest mountains of the region. Among these were the "infidels" who were not subject to the prince of Shirwân. "Strange stories" went round about their family life and customs. The mention of Shirwân shows that they were still not subject to Islam. According to al-Shirwân (Munâjât, ii, 3), the Lâzk people were the "infidels" who were not subject to the prince of Shirwân. "Strange stories" went round about their family life and customs. The mention of Shirwân shows that they were still not subject to Islam.

During the succeeding centuries, Islam seems to have made but slow progress in Dâghîstân. In 354/965, the power of the Khazars was shattered by the Russians. The southern part of this state itself suffered the ravages of war. It was the Christian Alans who, it seems, profited from this upheaval, for their territory, at the time of the Mongol conquest, stretched farther to the east than in the 4th/10th century. At the time of their first incursion into these countries, according to Ibn al-Athîr (xii, 252), the Mongols encountered north of Derbend first the people of the Lâzk who then included "Muslims and infidels", further north some other half-Muslim tribes—ancestors of the Avars—and lastly the Alans. According to William of Rubrub who visited these countries in November 1254, the mountains were inhabited by Christian Alans; "between the mountains and the sea" lived the Saracen Lâzgians (Lesgi), that is to say Muslims; however Rubrub himself gave the name of "castellum Alanorum" to a fortress situated only one day's march north of Derbend. The Mongols at that time had still not succeeded in subjugating these tribes. It was necessary to assign to special detachments the defence of the passes leading from the mountains to the plain, in order to defend the herds grazing on the steppe against the raids of the highlanders (cf. Fr. M. Schmidt, Rubrub's Reise, Berlin 1885, 84 ff.).

In the 13th and 14th centuries, the region which stretched to the pass of Derbend, and partially the territories situated to the south of this town also, formed part of the empire of the Golden Horde. It is in the history of the campaigns of Timur (797-798/1395-1396) that the names of the two chief peoples of Dâghîstân, the Kaytâk (or Kaytâkh) and the Kâzî-Kûmûk (now Lâks) appear for the first time in their modern forms. The territory of the Kaytâk, next to the pass of Derbend, belonged to the empire of Tokhtamish. Sharaf al-Din Yazdî (Zafar-nâmâ, India ed. i, 742 sqq.) describes the Kaytâk as people "without religion" (bi-dîn) or of "bad faith" (bad hâsî) which shows that they were still not subject to Islam. According to Barbaro (Ramusio, Viaggi, ii, 109-a), there were among the Kaytâk even in the 15th century many Greek, Armenian or Roman Catholic Christians. On the other hand, the prince of the Kaytâk (Khâali Beg), mentioned by Afanasîd Nikîtin in his account of the voyage (1466), bore a Muslim name.

The Kâzî-Kûmûk were Muslim and were regarded as the champions of Islam against the pagan peoples around them. Their prince was called Shawkal. North of the Kâzî-Kûmûk lived the Ashkûdja (modern Darghins), who had not yet become Muslim. The account of Timur's campaigns also mentions the town of Târkhâr. Between the Kâzî-Kûmûk and the Kaytâk, and therefore in the land of the present-day Kâbêlî, dwelt the Zîrîgharân who had retained their ancient fame as smiths and who offered to the conqueror coats-of-mail of their own making.

The Timurîd conquest and the Ottoman occupation (from 865-1015/1461-1605) marked the further advance of Islam into Dâghîstân. By the beginning of the 10th/16th century, the Muslim faith won over the infidel populations in Dâghîstân, often by recourse to force. From this period dates the somewhat superficial conversion to Islam of the Darghins (Ashkûdja) people and the permanent conversion of the Kaytâk. The Avars as well were gradually brought over to Islam, but Christianity survived amongst them throughout the 15th century, whilst the Andîs and the Didos peoples remained firmly pagan. The Zîrîgharân (Kubâcis), converted to Islam in the 15th century, preserved traces of Christianity until the end of the 18th century. The Lezgians were also superficially converted after the Timurîd period.

The Islamic conversion is not the only aspect of the historical evolution of Dâghîstân at this time, in which we must include the formation of the feudal principalities which provided Dâghîstân with the political structure which remained until the 19th century. The feudal principalities which appeared or developed at that time claimed ancestry from the Arab conquest, but these fanciful allegations are today strongly disputed.

The account of Timur's campaigns shows decisively that the situation in which the Ottomans found Dâghîstân during their short domination dates from the 9th-15th to 10th/16th centuries only. Nevertheless this situation has been carried back to the first centuries of the hidjra by a historical tradition only invented during this era. Just as the Jews, perhaps before the Arab conquest, had located in Dâghîstân certain events in their legends and history (cf. Marquart, Streifzüge, 29), just as today those called Dâgh-Cufût or "mountain Jews" still claim that their ancestors were formerly led into these regions by the conquering Assyrians or Babylonians, so also did the Muslim peoples all claim to have been converted to Islam by Abû Muslim and the princes all claim to have been descended from the Arab governors whom he left in Dâghîstân. The title of Ma'âsîm, borne by the prince of Tâbarsarân, was
identified with the Arabic word *ma'sum*. Likewise, Arabic etymologies were invented for the Kaytak title of *usmi* ("renowned", from *usm* "name") and for the Kazl-Kumuk, claimed to derive from Sham = Syria. The word *shdmkhdl* was alleged to derive from *shdmkhdl* or *shawkal* as in *shawkal* "name") = "name") = “name”). The word *shdmkhdl* was considered a “great audacity" (şawkal or *shawkal*) as in Sharaf al-Din Yazdi. The influence of the etymology described above. The subjects of the *shdmkhdl*, the Kazl-Kumuk, claimed to have been distinguished under Abü Muslim as defenders of the faith and to have won at that time from the Arabs the title of “*Ghái*" or victors.

Three great feudal principalities dominated Daghistan in the 9th-10th/15th-16th centuries: the the *Shâmhâlat* Kazl-Kumuk, the Usmilat of Kaytak and the Ma'sumât of Tabarsaran.

The first historical Kaytak prince who bore the title of *usmi* seems to have been Aşmad Khân, who died in 996/1587-88. He is credited with having founded the village of Madjlâs, where the representatives of the people assembled to discuss their affairs. He is supposed to have ordered the bringing together of the statutes of the popular law in a code to which the judges or *kâdis* had to conform, a measure which was considered a "great audacity" (dişdarat-i *zâsima*) by Mirzâ Hasan Efendi, the author of *Aṭhar-i Daghistan*, (65).

Towards the middle of the eleventh century (1050/1640), a number of the Kaytak separated from their compatriots and proceeded to the regions south of Daghistan. Husayn Khân, leader of these emigrants, succeeded in setting up a new principality at Sâlyân and Kôba. The Ottoman traveller Ewliya Celebi (Sîyihat-nâma, ii, 292 ff.) met these Kaytak emigrants in 1051/1641 between Shâki (today Nühe) and the Caspian. The glance of Ewliya Celebi proves that the Kaytak did not then, as today, speak Lezgian but Mongol.

The *shâmhâlîs* of the Kazl-Kumuk (today the Laks) extended their domination little by little beyond their mountains north-east as far as the coast, into Turkish country (Kumik). In the 10th/11th century, these princes used to spend the winter at Bûynâk, a village on the coastal plain, and the summer at Kumukh in the mountains. In 986/1578 at Bûynâk died the *shâmhâlî* Cûbhân, whose possessions were then divided among his sons. These divisions naturally weakened the power of the dynasty. The Kazl-Kumuk who stayed in the mountains slowly proceeded to make themselves entirely independent of their ruling house. After the death of the *shâmhâlî* Sûrkhây-Mirzâ, in 1049/1639-40, the *shâmhâlîs* only ruled the coastal region, at Bûnûk or Târkî (Träk). None of the later *shâmhâlîs* ever returned to Kumukh, where the tombs of the first princes are still to be seen.

It was at this time that the Russians revived their efforts to seize, after Astrâkhân, the countries of the northern Caucasus, among them Daghistan. In 1594 a Russian detachment commanded by Prince Muşâev occupied and proceeded in taking Târkî and in constructing a fortress on the Koi-Su or Sulak. It was not long, however, before the Russians suffered defeat by the sons of the *shâmhâlî* and were compelled to withdraw over the Sulâk. A fresh attack in 1604, directed by Buturlin and Flegiöev against Târkî, was still less successful.

The period between the Ottoman occupation and the Russian conquest is distinguished in Daghistan by the flowering of the Arab culture which attained its zenith in the period of Şâmîl. During the 17th century a galaxy of Daghistan scholars gathered round Şâyây Şâhîl-Al-Valami (born in 1637—died at Mecca in 1696): his most famous disciple was Muhammad Esmail of Madjlâs, who disseminated his teachings in Daghistan and died in Aleppo in 1708. In the 18th century parties of Daghistan scholars went to Damascus and Aleppo to learn there the Arab language and the şarîa. This period of cultural renascence was also a period of juridical organization—a codification illustrated by the Code of Umma Khân, the Avar, and the laws of Rustum Khân, *usmi* of Kaytak.

With this flowering of Islamic culture in the Arabic language there coincided on the political level an anarchic dispersion when Daghistan, divided into manifold clans and rival kingdoms, wavered between Turkish and Persian influence, passing alternately from one to the other. This political dispersion confirmed the weakness of Daghistan and inevitably provoked a foreign confrontation.

Towards the middle of the eleventh century (1050/1640), a number of the Kaytak separated from their compatriots and proceeded to the regions south of Daghistan. The native princes allied themselves now with one, now with another, of these three powers. Not until the 19th century was the contest finally terminated, to Russia's advantage. After 1867/1578 the prince of Tabarsaran, following the example of the *shâmhâlî* and of the *usmi*, made his submission to the Sultan. When, in 1058/1648, Şâh Abbâs restored Persian power in these regions, the *usmi* joined with him, whilst the *shâmhâlî* remained loyal to the Turks. One of the clauses of the peace treaty concluded in 1021/1612 stipulated that the *shâmhâlî* and the other princes loyal to the Porte would not suffer any reprisals on the part of Persia. The *usmi* Rustam-Khân having crossed over to the Turks in 1048/1638, his rival the prince of Tabarsaran submitted in favour of the Şâh, who confirmed him in his honours. He had moreover already received a similar investiture from the Tsar Michael (*Aṭhar-i Daghistan*, 81).

When, under the feeble government of the Shah Husayn, the Saâvîd empire fell into decline, Daghistan itself became the stage for a movement directed against Persian domination. At the head of this movement there was Cûlak-Sûrkhây-Khân who had just founded a new principality in the land of the Kazl-Kumuk. Allied with the *usmi* and the *mudârîs* Hâddîl Dâwîd, the leader of a popular movement, he succeeded in taking Şâmâhî in 1124/1712. Then the allies sent to Constantinople an embassy which obtained for them robes of honour from the Sultan, titles and diplomas and the favour of being received into the number of the subjects of the Porte. It was then that the intervention of Russia altered the course of events. Three hundred Russian merchants had been killed at Şâmâhî, and Peter the Great seized this as a pretext for intervention. He directed an expedition against Persia and occupied Derbend in 1722. Soon afterwards the other provinces on the west coast of the Caspian sea had themselves to submit to Russia. By the treaty of partition of 1724, Russia's rights over this coast were likewise recognized by the Persian government.

The Russian occupation was not at that time of...
very long duration. Nadir Shah succeeded in restoring the unity of the Persian empire, and Russia gave back to him, by the treaty of 1732, all the countries of the South of the Kura, and also, by the treaty of 1735, the territory contained between the Kura and the Sulak. When the Russians had contrived to defeat an expedition of Tatars from the Crimea into Daghistan, the Porte likewise gave up its claims. As for the native population, it opposed the new Shah with unyielding resistance, especially in the mountains. It was only on the coast that Nadir Shah succeeded in establishing his power in any lasting fashion. In 1735, Adil Giray had taken an oath of loyalty to Peter the Great and had aided him in his campaign of 1722; as, however, he later revolted against the Russians, he had been deported to Lapland in 1725 and the dignity of shāhmāl had been abolished. Nadir Shah restored this dignity and conferred it on Khas Fūlākh-Khan, the son of 'Adīl Giray. The people of the mountains remained independent, owing to persistent attacks, particularly those of 1742 and 1744.

After the murder of Nadir Shah in 1160/1747, Persia was for half a century without a government strong enough to maintain its power in this frontier region. The provinces of the empire themselves could not be defended against the incursions of the princes of Daghistan. In this way the town of Ardabil was sacked by the 'āsim Amir Ḥamza. In turn the Russians, in spite of the treaty of 1735, began to wield influence in Daghistan once more. The traveller Gmelin was captured in the country of the 'āsim and put to death in 1774, and in 1775 a Russian detachment commanded by Madem came and devastated the region. In 1784 the shāhmāl Murtaḍa 'All once more joined Russia. In 1785 the establishment of the post of governor of the Caucasus consolidated Russian domination over these countries. A religious movement instigated by Turkey and directed by Shaykh Mansūr affected Daghistan only superficially; most of the princes refused to support the movement.

The Kādārs, when they had succeeded in reuniting all the Persian provinces in one empire, strove once more to annex the lands of the Caucasus. But this time Russia was not disposed to give up her position in the struggle, and the Russians were aided by Nadir Shah. The war began in the last year of the reign of Catherine II, in 1796, Derbend was occupied by the Russians but soon after evacuated by command of the Emperor Paul. In 1806 the town was recaptured, and this put an end to Persian domination in Daghistan. It was, however, only by the peace treaty of Gulistān, in 1813, that Persia finally renounced her claim to sovereignty over the country.

The resistance offered to the Russians by the native princes and by their peoples in particular continued longer. In 1818 nearly all the princes of Daghistan, with the exception of the shāhmāl, formed an alliance against the Russians. This rebellion was not put down by the Governor Yermolov without difficulty. The title of 'āsim of the Kāyāl was abolished in 1819, that of muš'in of Tabarsarān in 1828. After 1830 the princes who were allowed to retain their independence were espoused by the Russians and had to accept the rule of Russian doctors and teachers. The Avars resisted the Russians but soon after evacuated by command of the Emperor Paul. In 1806 the town was recaptured, and this put an end to Persian domination in Daghistan. It was, however, only by the peace treaty of Gulistān, in 1813, that Persia finally renounced her claims over the country.
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languages are not set down in writing, and form with them one sole Avar “nation”.

(b) The Darghino-Lak group (cf. Darghin, Lak, Kaytak, Kubachi) which numbered 150,000 in 1959 in the west-central part of mountainous Daghستان, and which contain the Darghins (formerly Aškūdja), the Lak(s) (formerly Kāzī-Kūmūgh) and two small peoples, Kaytak and Kubachi (formerly Zirlgärān).

The Darghin and the Lak possess literary languages; the Kaytak and the Kubachi are without these and have merged into the Lak and in the Khinalug main language.

(c) The Samurian group in southern Daghستان (cf. Lezg, Taškurt, Rutul, Tabarsarān and Shād-Dāgh peoples), 270,000 strong in 1959, contain two nations with a literary language, the Lezgians (223,000) and the Tabarsarān (35,000), and three small peoples destined to merge into the Lezg nation: Agul (8,000), Rutul (7,000) and Taškurt (6,000). To this group are connected the five peoples of Shah-Dāgh (numbering about 15,000) in northern Ādharbaydān (Djek, Kūf, Khaputq, Budukh and Khinalug), who have been greatly influenced by Turkish and who are merging into the Ādharī nation.

II. The Turks are represented in Daghستان by the Ādharīs in the plain round Derbend and in the low valley of the Samur; by the Kūnmlq [q.v.] who numbered 135,000 in 1959 in the cis-Caspian plains north of the Derbend and by the Nogays [q.v.] (41,000 in 1959) in the steppes between the Tereq and the Kuma. The Kūmlq and the Nogays, like the Ādharīs, possess literary languages.

III. The Iranophone peoples are represented by the Tāts [q.v.] who numbered several thousands around Derbend, and the mountain Jews or Dāgh-Cufut (about 12,000) in the villages of the plain, Jewish in religion but speaking Tātī.

Daghستان is a multi-national republic, the only one in the Soviet Union which was not founded on one nation or one dominant nationality (narodnost’). In the terms of the Constitution (art. 78), she possesses ten official literary languages: Avar, Darghin, Lak, Lezg, Tabarsarān, Kūmlq, Nogay, Adari, Tāt (in its Jewish form used by the Dāgh-Cufut) and Russian. These languages are used as teaching languages in the primary schools, but of these four nations are destined to become poles of attraction and that in the end they will absorb one in the Soviet Union which was not founded on Jewish in religion but speaking Tātī.

Cufut (about 12,000) in the villages of the plain, who numbered several thousands that these four nations are destined to become poles of attraction and that in the end they will absorb one in the Soviet Union which was not founded on Jewish in religion but speaking Tātī.

Languages are not set down in writing, and form with them one sole Avar “nation”. After that, Ībāyḍ Allah had him recognized in Damascus as well.

In this way, it was possible for Marwān to lead al-Dāḥ;kāh and al-Dāḥ;kāh — together with the governors of Hims and Khinnasān — went over to the side of the rival caliph ʿAbd Allāh b. Khālid b. Ṭasdī, but deposed him again in 58. In 60/660, Muʾawiyah was dying, and made al-Dāḥ;kāh and Muslim b. ʿUqba joint regents; he dictated his last will to them, charging them to give it to the hands of his successor Yazīd, who was away from Damascus at the time. Al-Dāḥ;kāh led the prayer for the dead, and worked for the succession of Yazīd, being recognized by him as governor. During his illness, Muʾawiyah II had chosen him to lead the prayers in Damascus until such time as a new Caliph should be elected.

During the time of general strife and intrigue after the death of Muʾawiyah II in 64/668, al-Dāḥ;kāh — together with the governors of Hims and Khinnasān — went over to the side of the rival caliph ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. At first he did this secretly, but later openly. Ibn al-Zubayr then made him governor of Syria, putting under him the other governors with pro-Zubayri leanings. Marwān b. al-Hakam, who had attended Muʾawiyah II’s funeral, and was at that time the oldest and most respected of the Umayyads, considered the position so hopeless that he left for Mecca, to pay homage to Ibn al-Zubayr, and to intercede for an amnesty for the Umayyads. On the way, however, he met ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād in Aḍhrāʾ. The latter was on his way from ʿIrāk to Damascus, and reproached him severely, finally deciding him to turn back, which he did, going first to the Tātīs, but on the autochthonous languages only Avar, Darghin, Lak and Kūmlq have newspapers. It thus appears that these four nations are destined to become poles of attraction and that in the end they will absorb the other groups.

Bibliography: As well as general works on the Caucasus, there is a rich literature on Daghستان in Russian. A bibliography (134 titles of works and articles) will be found in A. Bennigsen and H. Carrère d’Encausse, Une République soviétique musulmane: le Daghستان, aperçu démographique, in REI 1955, 5-76, and another more complete version appended to the work Narodi Duguastana, Moscow, Acad. Sc., 1955 (137 titles of which 79 are of pre-revolutionary works and titles and 58 later than 1918); Turkish sources in JA s.v. (by Mirza Bala). For further details see the bibliographies of the articles on the peoples mentioned in the text. [W. BARTHOLO—A. BENNIGSEN]

AL-DAḤ;kāh b. ʿUakās (or Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Raʿāf, son of a blood-letters (baghdām, Ibn Rusta, BGA vii, 215), head of the house of al-Dāḥ;kāh). He is reported to have been of a vacillating character (dijāʿaʾa yakuddimus ridāʾa wa-yuʾaḥkhkhiru uhrā, Aghānī xvii, 177) and this is
the warriors assembled in al-Djabiya, and all his followers from Damascus, against al-Dahhak. In 649/1253, a momentous battle took place near Marghi Râbit, lasting for 20 days and ending with a victory of the Kalb over the Kays. Al-Dahhak himself was killed in battle and his followers fled. His son Abd al-Rahmân b. al-Dahhak, however, became governor of Medina under Yazid b. 'Abd al-Malik. Ibn 'Asâkir still knew the house and the beautiful bath of al-Dahhak near the city wall of Damascus (Ta'rikh Madinat Dimashk, ed. Ş. Munadîdîd, iii, Damascus 1954, 140), and even al-Dahhak (died 981/1573) tells of a mosque, supposedly that of al-Dahhak b. Kays, on the southern side of the citadel (H. Sauvage, in JA, 9e sér., tome vi, 1895, 442, and vii, 1896, 386).

The course of events following the death of MuÂ«awiyâ II is by no means as clear cut as might appear from the above: accounts vary considerably, but Ibn Sa'd's report is, for factual reasons, the most acceptable on the whole.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, v, 27-30, vi, 13, 35; Tabarî, i, 3283, 3447, iv, 170, 172, 181, 188, 197, 202, 203, 438-74, 477-9, 482; Ibn al-Athîr, iii, 317, 416, 426, iv, 5, 120-5; idem, Usd al-ghâba, Bûlak 1286, 37 f.; Ya'qûbî, ii, 223, 283 f., 304 f.; Dinawarî, al-A'zâbîr b. Tâsi'î (ed. Guirgâss), 164, 183 f., 192, 239 f.; Ibn Kûtabiya, Ma'ârifî (ed. Wiistenfeld), 33, 179, 210; idem, al-Dahhak wa 'l-Siyâsa, Cairo 1356, i, 174, 177 f.; Mas'ûdî, Murûdî, v, 198, 201; idem, Tanbîh, 307-9; Ibn Abî Hâtim al-Râzî, al-Dâjîr wa 'l-Tâdîl, i, (Haydarabad 1952, 457, no. 201; Ibn Hibbân, Ma'âshir al-Âmâr al-usmâr (Bibliotheca Islamica 22, no. 369; Ibn Hâjar, Isbâ'a (Cairo 1358) ii, 199; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Isfahân (printed together with the Isbâ'a) ii, 197 f.; Dâhib, al-Da'îyân wa 'l-tâbîyîn ii (ed. Hârûn), 131 f.; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, Ibl, Cairo 1367-82, iii, 308, iv, 87 f., 362, 369, 372-4, 391-7; Agdânî, iv, 44, 46, 34, xvii, 111; Ibn Rusta, 209, 215; Wellhausen, Das arabisch-Reich, 107-112; Buhl, ZA, 21, (1927), 50-64; Caetani, Chronographia, 394 f., 442 f., 586, 598, 608, 636, 654, 735, 737; Lammens, MFOB. iv (1920), 237, v (1913), 210; idem, Études sur le siècle des Omayyades, 203 f., 207 f.; idem, L'âvenûment des Marwânides et le califat de Marwân Ier (MFOB. xii, 1927, fasc. 2 passim, see index).

(A. Dîtrich)

AL-DÂHâHAK b. KAYS AL-SHAYBÂNÎ, Khârijîte leader, opponent of Marwân b. Muhammâd (= Marwân II). During the disturbances which followed the murder of the Caliph al-Walîd II, the Khârijîtes resumed their campaign in Dîzîra and pushed forward into Irâk, their leader at first being the Hârûrî Sa'id b. Bahdal, and, after his death of the plague, al-Dâhâhak b. Kays al-Shaybânî, an adherent of the above-mentioned Ibn Bahdal. Several thousand fighters assembled under the standard of al-Dâhâhak; there were even among them Sufrîtes from Shahrazûr, who, at that time, according to al-Baladhurî, Fawqâ, 209, were contesting, with Marwân, the possession of Armenia and Æthiopie, and there were also old women who, dressed in male armour, fought bravely in his ranks. For some months in Irâk, two governors had been at war with each other; one of them, 'Abd Allâh, son of 'Umar II [q.v.], represented the Caliph Yazîd b. al-Walîd (= Yazîd II) and was supported by the Yemenites, and the other, al-Nâdîr b. Sa'id al-Hârâshî, was the nominee of Marwân b. Muhammâd, and had the support of the Mu'âshirites. When the Khârijîtes advanced, these two governors joined forces against the threat. In spite of their joint efforts, they were beaten in the month of Radjab 127/July-August 745, and al-Kûfa was evacuated. Ibn al-Harashi returned to the domain of Marwân, and Ibn 'Umar withdrew into the fortress of Wâsît, but in the month of Shahân of the same year, he was besieged there by al-Dâhâhak. After a few combats he ceased all resistance (Shawwâl 127/July-August 745), and, although a Kurayji and a member of the ruling family, paid homage to Ibn Kathîr, obviously struck by the enormity of this, diminishes its seriousness; he says that Ibn 'Umar pressed the Khârijîte to oppose Marwân, promising to follow him if he killed the latter. Al-Dâhâhak, now master of al-Kûfa, did not delay there; invited by the inhabitants of al-Mawshîl, he entered that town and expelled the government officials (according to Ibn Kathîr, he marched against Marwân, and, on the way, he seized al-Mawshîl, at the invitation of the inhabitants). It is certain that he was popular. The sources imply that people flocked to his banner because he paid extremely well, but the real reason must have been that those of the Khârijîtes filled the masses with enthusiasm; the movement had acquired towards the end of the Umayyad dynasty a scope and an intensity that it had never known. Al-Dâhâhak's army is said to have numbered 120,000 men. Even the Umayyad Sulaymân, son of the Caliph Hishâm, took his place alongside the Khârijîtes, with his mawllî and his soldiers, although he had been proclaimed Caliph Marwân, then busy besieging Hims, asked his son 'Abd Allâh, whom he had left at Harrân, to march against al-Dâhâhak, but 'Abd Allâh, beaten, retreated into Nisibîn and was besieged there by the Khârijîte. Finally Marwân, who had meanwhile seized Hims, himself marched against al-Dâhâhak. The battle took place at al-Qa'llah on the territory of Kafartughî (al-Mas'ûdî, Murûdî, vi, 62; between Kafartughî and Ra'â al-Ayn) towards the end of 128/Aug.-Sept. 746. Al-Dâhâhak fell in a fray, and his body was not discovered by Marwân's men until the following month. His success in having numbered 120,000 men. Even the Umayyad Sulaymân, son of the Caliph Hishâm, took his place alongside the Khârijîtes, with his mawllî and his soldiers, although he had been proclaimed Caliph Marwân, then busy besieging Hims, asked his son 'Abd Allâh, whom he had left at Harrân, to march against al-Dâhâhak, but 'Abd Allâh, beaten, retreated into Nisibîn and was besieged there by the Khârijîte. Finally Marwân, who had meanwhile seized Hims, himself marched against al-Dâhâhak. The battle took place at al-Qa'llah on the territory of Kafartughî (al-Mas'ûdî, Murûdî, vi, 62; between Kafartughî and Ra'â al-Ayn) towards the end of 128/Aug.-Sept. 746. Al-Dâhâhak fell in a fray, and his body was not discovered by Marwân's men until the following month. His success in having numbered 120,000


(L. VECCHIA VAGLIERI)

DAHISTÂN, erroneous spelling of DHIUSTÁN [q.v.]

DAHLAK ISLANDS, a group of islands off the west coast of the Red Sea, opposite Musawwa' (Eritrea), with their centre about 40° 15' E., 15° 45' N. They represent an Ethiopian base with an admixture of Arabs, Danakil, Somalis and Sudanis. The islands
afford miserable grazing for goats and camels, with some humble sea-trading, fishing, recovery of oil... extending from al-Nafud generally south-eastward (see DJA-ZIRAT AL-£ARAB, esp. p. 5361). According to tribal affiliations in the 19th century. The most successful of his controversial topical questions, and became the active as an author. He not only covered the traditional subjects but also wrote many recovered documents and elegant Kufic inscriptions testifying. Allied at times with (or menaced by) the Mamluks of Egypt, and with claims to rule part of the neighbouring mainland including Mrusawwa, the Dahlan amirs (called “kings”) by Maktirim still fell intermittently under Egyptian or Yemeni suzerainty. The Amir ruling when the Portuguese appeared in 910/1513 was Ahmad b. Isma’il, whose opposition to the newcomers was punished by a devastation of his islands; but he was later restored as a Portuguese vassal. Adhesion to the cause of the Muslim conqueror and liberator Ahmad Grañ against the Portuguese led, after temporary success and the appointment of Ahmad Isma’il’s successor as Governor of Harkiko, to a second devastation and a mass evacuation of the islanders. Reoccupied, the islands fell easily to the Turkish fleets later in the century, and their fortunes were thereafter those of rarely-asserted Turkish suzerainty, actual or nominal dependence on Mrusawwa, and temporary Egyptian Government in the second half of the 13th/19th century. When the Italians colonized Eritrea in 1885, the Dahlan Islands had long since ceased to offer any claims to interest. They became a Vice-Residency, with headquarters at Nokra, in the Commissariato of Bassopiano Orientale. This was abolished as a separate administrative unit under British occupation of Eritrea (1896-1941-52) and that of Ethiopia from 1936/1952 onwards. Bibliography: C. Conti Rossini, Storia d’Etiopia, Milan 1928, Vol. 1; Issel, Viaggio nel Mar Rosso, Milan 1889; R. Basset, Les Inscriptions de l’Ille de Dahlab, in JA, Paris 1893; A. Pollera, Le Popolazioni indigene dell’Eritrea, Bologna 1935; G. Wiet, Rotelets de Dahlab, in BIE, 1952, 89-95. (S. H. LONGRIDGE)

DILGHAN, SAYYID AHMAD B. ZAYNI, born in Mecca towards the beginning of the 19th century, from 1288/1871 Muttif of the Sha’i and Shaykh al-Ulama (head of the corporation of scholars and therefore of the body of teachers in the Hijrah) in his native city. When the Grand Shaykh ‘Awn al-Rafik, because of a dispute with the Ottoman Governor Uthman Pasha, removed himself to Madina, Dahlan followed him there but died soon afterwards from the fatigue of the journey in 1304/1886. Particularly in his later years, Dahlan was very active as an author. He not only covered the traditional Islamic sciences which were studied in Mecca in his time, but produced a number of treatises on contemporary affairs, who were often printed. His al-Durar al-Saniyya fi ‘l-Radd ‘ala l-Wahhabsya provoked a chain of pro-Wahhabi replies and counter-replies. His polemics against Sulaymân Effendi, one of two rival Turkish Shaykhs of the Nakshibandî turbiya in Mecca, who competed for the leadership of the Nakshibandîs in Indonesia, and against the learned Shaykh Muhammad Hasab Allah of Mecca, whose scholarly reputation equalled his own were not free of personal interest. Of his works on history, al-Futuhât al-Islamiyya, a history of the Islamic conquests until the time of the author, is remarkable for the light it throws on his attitude to the contemporary Mahdist rising in the Sudan, and his history of Mecca, Khulüsât al-Kalâm fi Bayân Umard al-Balad al-Harîm, until the year 1093/1684 a short extract from the chronicle of al-Singîrî (Brockelmann, II, 502), is a most valuable source for the events in Mecca during the following two centuries, including the rise of the Wahhabi, their first rule over the Hijaz, the fight of the Sharifs against them, the restitution of Ottoman rule by Muhammad ʿAlli, and the disorders in Djidda of 1274/1858. Being a friend of the family of the ruling Sharifs, Dahîn had access to the best written and oral information. The giving of fatwas formed, of course, an important part of his activities, and some of his decisions were incorporated in the contemporary handbooks of Sha’i doctrine; in his last years, however, he handed over this routine work to his assistant or amîn al-fatawâ, Sayyid Muhammad Sa’îd Bâbasîl (Brockelmann, II, 650, S II, 811). Snouck Hurgronje has drawn a detailed picture, based on close acquaintance, of his person and background. Bibliography: Snouck Hurgronje, Verspr. Geschr., iii, 65-122 (with two extracts from the Khulüsât al-Kalâm); Brockelmann, II, 640 f., S II, 810 f.; ʿAbd al-Hâyy al-Kattâni, Fihrist al-Fahâris, i, 290-2; Sarkis, Muṣājîm al-Muṣâjîm, 990-2. (J. SCHACHT)

AL-DÂHNA—in Sa’dî’s Arabia—a long, narrow arch of nafud or dune desert, varying in width from 10 to 75 km., extending around an eastward curve for a total length of over 1,000 km., connecting the Great Nafud of the northwest with the Empty Quarter (al-Rub’ al-Khali [q.d.]) of the south, lacking in natural water sources except along the fringes, but furnishing a favourite area of pasturing. In the past separating the interior area of al-Yamâma from the coastal region of al-Bahrayn, al-Dâhna today serves as an informal boundary between the Province of Najd and the Eastern Province (until 1953 the Province of al-Ahsâ’), its western edge formed a major sector of the westerly boundary of the petroleum concession granted in 1933 to American interests, although an area of potential priority extended still farther west. Beginning with the first well in 1957, an oil field has been discovered in the sand belt itself and adjacent easterly thereunto—the Khurays field, some 120 km. west of the immense Ghawâr field and ca. 150 km. west of al-Hulûf (in the oasis of al-Hasa). Al-Dâhna is the easterly and much more continuous of two parallel strips of sand desert extending from al-Nafud generally south-eastward (see DJA-ZIRAT AL-ÂRAB, esp. p. 536). According to tribal
The excellence and amplitude of the pastureland of al-Dahna are described by Yākūt, who says that it has been mentioned by many poets, especially Dhu ‘l-Rumma. Groups now pasturing regularly in al-Dahna are of the following tribes: in the north, from al-Nafūd to the wells of al-Bushūk, Shammar, and from al-Bushūk to Wādī al-Adrāji and the sabābīr of al-Sayyāriyya, Harb; thence from Darb al-Mubayhis, Muṭyar; thence to the crossings of the main north-south motor track and Darb al-Aʿaraf, Subay4 (with also some of Subul); thence through all the remaining portion of al-Dahna4 and through ‘Urūk al-Rumayla, al-Dawāsiṣ, Groups of al-Uḏajmān and of Kahtān also range in the southern part of the pasture area of Subay4 and the northern part of that of al-Dawāsiṣ—i.e., east of the waves of Ḥaḍar al-ʿAṯk, Ramūḥ and al-Rumbiyya, and Ramlān, al-Ṭajīfyya, and Siḍī. In addition, some of al-Ṣulaba range in the northerly area of al-Dahna4.

There is little use in attempting to identify the "mountains" or "swords" of sand in al-Dahna4 as mentioned by various sources, especially Yākūt. The names have changed too much. Likewise, there is no profit in belabouring the question of the origin and meaning of the name al-Dahna4 itself. The name has often been explained as meaning "red". For the root DHN, there persists the sense of paucity of moisture (as in dhāhn al-matar al-ard), from which has been derived the senses connected with ointment and oil, including cooking-fat and in modern times, oil-base paints. The people use 'tabl (or ar āfā)—which grows widely in al-Dahna—for tanning, but the resulting colour is expressed by HMR, not by DHN, which is reserved to the application of fat to make the leather pliable and soft. One association of redness in the language of the people concerning this desert may be found in the occasionally heard
expression *ṣad maḍhīna, which is explained as distinguishing the sands of al-Dahna3, as of a brownish or a duller red, from those of al-Nafud, which are said to be of a lighter shade of red. At the same time, the people also equate *dahnadīn with *ard madhuna, land only lightly or superficially moistened by rain.

Yākūt, in both the Muṣṭafī and the Muḥāṣarī, lists several other places and topographical features under the name *al-Dahna3 or *al-Dahna.
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copper to form layers. Its colour is compared to that of the chrysolith ( zabāriyyād), although it does appear in different shades: dark green, veined, the shade of peacock’s feathers, and pale green, with all intermediate shades. Frequently all the shades appear in one piece, as it developed in the earth, layer by layer. The stone is a soft one, and therefore loses its gloss with the years. *Ṭifṣāḥī, following *Ballānās (Apollonius of Tyana), explains how the very best copper is gained from it. There is new malachite and old, from Egypt, Kirmān, and Ḫūrāsān. The very best kind is the old Kirmānī. The stone has been found in Egypt, Kirmān, and Ḫūrāsān, usually in the form of amulets (scarabs), statuettes, and cut stones. Our detailed description of malachite comes from al-Rāzī, who also treats of the following: 1) its calcination (i.e., its decomposition and the burning up of sulphur and oils which it contains), which can take place in 4 different ways; 2) its curation, due to salts and borax, each again in 4 different ways; 3) its composition; 4) its use in medicine, etc.

Taken in powder form and with vinegar, it is regarded as a powerful antidote to poison; on the other hand, it will harm a person who has not been poisoned, and then causes serious inflammations. If rubbed on the sting of a scorpion or a bee, it will reduce pain; it has also been used against leprosy and to cure diseases of the eye. Evidence in poetry can be found in al-Ḥammāmī (L.A., s.v. *dahma). Bibliography: Rasʾīl Iḥwān al-Safī (ed. Bombay), ii, 82; *Ṭifṣāḥī, *ʾAbhūr al-ʾAjhār (new edition of the translation by C. Raineri Biscia, Bologna 1906, 94); Kazwīnī, *ʾAḏībāʾ al-ʿIṣbāʾ (Cosmography ed. Wustenfeld), i, 224; Ibn al-Baytār (ed. Būlāq 1291), ii, 117 f. (= Leclerc, *Traité des Simples, ii, 132); Clément-Millet, in JA, 6e série, tome xi (1868), 185 f.; Steinschneider, WZKM, xii (1898), 83; Rusta, *Das Steinbuch aus der Kosmographie des Al-Qazwīnī (Beilage zum Jahresbericht 1895/96 der prov. Oberrealschule in Heidelberg), 22; idem, *Das Steinbuch des Aristoteles 103 f., 145-147; idem, *Al-Rāzī’s Buch Geheimnis der Geheimnisse, 44, 86, 149 f., 197 f., 197 f.; Barhebraeus, *Muntakḥab Kitāb Dīmān al-mufraddat il-ʾAhmad . . . al-Ṣadīqī (ed. Meyerhof and Sobhy) i/3, Cairo 1938, 117 (Arab.), 530 (Engl.); Wiedemann, *Beiträge xxx, 227 (SBD, xliv, 1912) after Ibn al-Baytār, in *Nakīb al-Ḍhakhāhirī. (A. DIETRICH)

DAHOMEY, a corridor 418 miles long by 125 miles wide, between Togoland and the Nigeria of the Gulf of Guinea. The coast is low-lying, fringed with lagoons, while the central zone is formed of table-land and isolated mountains; the northern part is higher, slanted across by the mountains of Atacora, which rise to about 800 metres. In the south especially, the humidity is high and the temperature fairly constant although there are two rainy and two dry seasons.

The population of Dahomey, nearly two million inhabitants, is chiefly composed of Fon (central region), Goun and Yoruba (south-east region), Adja (south-west), Bariba, Somba, and Fulani (northern region).

The principal town is Cotonou (87,000 inhabitants), although Porto-Novo has always been the administrative capital.

In contact with Europeans since the seventeenth century, Dahomey was particularly affected by the slave trade, which helped also to increase the wealth of certain of its kingdoms, notably that of Abomey.
It was this last which put up the longest and fiercest resistance to French penetration (1894).

Dahomey, which entered the federation of French West Africa in 1895, played a great part in its development, through the agency of its elites who had emigrated to the various other territories. Together with Senegal, it was one of the first to form political movements, which demonstrated their strength well before the second world war.

Dahomey, like most of its neighbours on the Gulf of Guinea who have been influenced by the Benin cultures, has retained the strong animistic foundation upon which rests the life of its civilization.

The social and religious organization of the country, where animism was the state religion, forbade the introduction of any foreign doctrine and it was not until the fall of the kingdom of Abomey that Christianity began to spread.

Islam could nowhere take root very deeply nor bring about large conversions as the chiefs and the local princedoms were better than the end of the nineteenth century never willing to renounce their beliefs, neither among the archaic clan societies of north-west Dahomey called Somba, nor in the feudal Bariba societies of the north-east region which was still crossed by the caravan routes marked out by the Islamic caravanserais, nor in the kingdoms of the south, absolute monarchies where the king was the all-powerful repository of the ancestral traditions which he revived each year in honour of his predecessors.

The Muslim penetration probably began from the north-east; a little commercial colony of the Mali Empire was set up in the thirteenth century in the region which is today Sokoto: the travellers of the time called it Guangara. It was from there that the waves of caravans departed for present-day Ghana, land of the kola. Salt, slaves and other products from the north, sometimes even from Libya, came down to the south-west while kola nuts passed up to the Nigerian and the Hausa lands, crossing North Dahomey. Thus there were quickly established little Muslim colonies called Wanga or Maro (in Dahomey) which soon blossomed into important centres like Parakou, Djougou or Kandi.

These foreign settlements remained near the local chiefs, whose domains were crossed by the caravan routes; they founded families and so introduced Islam, which slowly developed, by the simple device of local marriages.

Later on, the conquest of the Songhai empire by the Moroccans, at the beginning of the 17th century, brought about the withdrawal towards the Niger of a group of Muslim Songhai called Dendi. These established themselves probably in the extreme north of modern Dahomey and formed the second wave of the Islamic influence. The third wave corresponded to the immigration of the Fulani shepherds, who spread out during the 18th century over the whole of the northern half of Dahomey. Although their religion was still tinged with traces of animism, it formed none the less an Islamic centre which converted a great many of the former slaves or Gando, with whom they maintained permanent contact.

At length, in the last years of the eighteenth century, Islam also entered by the south-east and Porto-Novo, the present capital of Dahomey, soon contained some Muslim Yoruba merchants, who had come from Ilorin and from the west of modern Nigeria. They quickly increased, converted certain Yoruba families of Dahomey and also some descendants of the slaves who had returned from Brazil bearing Portuguese names.

Although it is difficult to draw up statistics, we can reckon that, of a total Dahomey population of 1,800,000 inhabitants, between 230 and 240 thousand are Muslim, of whom only 100,000 are practising devotees.

The greater part of them are Tidjâni; some, particularly among the older people, belong to the Kâdiriya order. There are a few Hamallists in the north. In spite of this near-unity of sect, a difference of belief set some Muslims, Yoruba in origin, against the natives of the northern regions (Hausa-Zerman-Fulani-Dendi), who claimed to practise their religion with greater orthodoxy. These two aspects of Islamic Dahomey are to be met chiefly at Porto-Novo (Islamic Yoruba) and at Parakou (the Islamic north), which were soon called upon to become the two great Muslim capitals, Djougou having slowly to give place to its neighbour Parakou, where some conversion movements had already been born and where there were established some of the masters of the Kurân who possessed a new and more dynamic conception of their religion.

It is probable that, in the years to come, the religious leaders and the imâm will be chosen more and more from among the most educated notables and no longer, according to heredity, from the families connected with the animist chiefs. This explains the rise today of the schools of the Kurân in North Dahomey in particular, where religious learning is always an object of prestige.


(J. Lombard)
DAHR — DAHRYYA

The word has as yet no philosophical specification; it is used in one sense only in LXXVI, generally called the dahr, a Kur'anic word meaning a long period of time. In certain editions of the Kur'an it occurs in connexion with the infinities, or rather the ungodly, erring and blinded, who believe in the eternity of the cosmos, as opposed to those who attribute to it a creator and a cause.

In the Mutakallimun in general, the Judeo-Arab theologian Sa'adya (d. 942) calls them the azhaliyya, those who believe in the eternity of the cosmos, as opposed to those who attribute to it a creator and a cause.

In this respect the Mutakallimun are opposed to them, affirming the beginning in time and bodies of the world created by God, and to this adding an affirmation of the divine attributes, God being alone eternal and alone powerful (ibid, Bombay 35-40 and Beirut 456). Like the azaliyya, the existence of angels and demons, the significance of fire and the powers of sorcerers, are independent of pre-Islamic Arab sources (cf. al-Dihiz, Kitaab al-Hayawdn, ed. M. Pococke, Cairo 1325-6/1906-7) in which, in an over-wide generalization no doubt made under the influence of the first literary use of the word has been noted, in the Kitaab al-Hayawdn by al-Djahib (Cairo 1325-6/1906-7) in which, in an over-wide generalization no doubt made under the influence of the first literary use of the word has been noted, in the Kitaab al-Hayawdn by al-Djahib (Cairo 1325-6/1906-7).

The dahr is defined in the Mutafath al-ulsam (ed. Van Vloten, Leyden 1805, 35) as "those who believe in the eternity of the course of time"; the dahryya (dahr yamurru) is called them the azhaliyya, those who believe in the eternity of the cosmos, as opposed to those who attribute to it a creator and a cause.

In this respect the Mutakallimun in general, the Judeo-Arab theologian Sa'adya (d. 942) calls them the azhaliyya, those who believe in the eternity of the cosmos, as opposed to those who attribute to it a creator and a cause.

In this context the Mutakallimun are opposed to them, affirming the beginning in time and bodies of the world created by God, and to this adding an affirmation of the divine attributes, God being alone eternal and alone powerful (ibid, Bombay 35-40 and Beirut 456). Like the Mutakallimun in general, the Judeo-Arab theologian Sa'adya (d. 942) refuses their doctrine, first in his commentary on Seter Ye'asher (ed. Lambert, Paris 1892), and later in the first book of his Kitaab al-Amannit wa-l-'Ithdahai (ed. Landauer, Leyden 1880), in three pages (63-5) on the doctrine known by the name al-dahr, which regards not only matter as eternal but the beings of the world which we cannot observe; this sect limits knowledge to the perceptible: "no knowledge save of what is accessible to the senses" (64, l. 13). Its trans-
Al-Ghazâlî for his part also looked on the dahrîyya rather as an order of philosophers who throughout the centuries expressed a certain current of thought which was never without some representative. He does not always regard them in the same way. In the Mu'khtâr al-Dalâ'il (ch. III, Cairo 1925, 96-97), he speaks of them as forming the first category (sâyiţ) in chronological order. They were then a "sect (fāsîţa) of the ancients", denying a Creator who governs the world and the existence of a future world, professing that the world has always been what it is, of itself, and that it will be so eternally. He likens them to the sanâdîcks, who also included another, and more numerous, branch, the tabî'îyyun, naturalists. The dahrîyya seem to make the perennity of the world the centre of their doctrine, whilst the fâsîyya insist upon the properties of temperaments and deny, not creation but paradise, hell, resurrection and judgement. Against these two categories there stands a third, the deiîts, iâhîyyun, who came later and included Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. They refuted the errors of the first two groups, but they were not always followed by the Muslim philosophers, such as Ibn Sînâ and al-Fârâbî. Both were particularly singled out in the Tahdîfut al-Falâsîfîa by al-Ghazâlî (ed. Bouyges, Beirut 1927, 9) who with reference to them demonstrates the "Incoherence of the philosophers" (according to the translation preferred by M. Bouyges to " Destruction" of the philosophers), at the same time proving the incapacity (ta'dîqîz) of the adversaries. For the two Muslims strove against those who ascribed the Divinity, though not without avowing theologies which led them to be classed by al-Ghazâlî among the dahrîyya. To the latter, who are also given the name dahrîyyun, are attributed the following theses: they deny a Cause which might be "causative of causes" (65, 1. 3-4); the world is eternal and has neither cause nor creator; new things alone have a cause (133, 1. 6 and 206, 1. 5). Here there are only two groups of philosophers and not three, that of the "followers of truth" (âbi al-bakhî) and one other, that of the dahrîyya (133, 1. 6). Now there are philosophers who believe that the world is eternal and, nevertheless, demonstrate that it is the work of a Creator (jâmî'), a reasoning which al-Ghazâlî declares to be contradictory (133, 1. 6 ff.). In fact, Ibn Sînâ returns to this subject on many occasions, and he was clearly persuaded of the forces of the opinion (sîrîz) which in the dahrîyya is devoted to "those who say that the world is eternal", with the four elements on one hand, on the other the fifth, incorruptible element which forms the celestial bodies; all of these are reasons for al-Ghazâlî to hold the theses of the dahrîyya (206, 1. 5 ff.). In the Tahdîfut al-Tahdîfut (ed. Bouyges 1930), Ibn Rûshd does not make the same strictures as al-Ghazâlî; he does not name the dahrîyya (see Index, 654) who only appear under this denomination in the summary of al-Ghazâlî's theses (414, 1. 3), but he uses dahr not only in the original sense of "period of time" (95, 1. 1 and 120, 1. 3) but also in the sense of the well-known philosophical doctrine wrongly attributed to the falsâfîs (415).

The dahrîyya appear as a sect, properly speaking, in the definitions of Ibn Hazm and al-Shahrastânî. The former ascribes to the dahrîyya the doctrine of the eternity of the world, and the corollary that nothing rules it, whilst all the other groups think that there was a beginning and that it was created, mukhâdath (Kitâb al-Fisal, Cairo 1317, 1. 9). He starts by giving the five arguments of the dahrîyya who are called (11, 1. 9) "those who profess the dahr", al-âhîlân bi 'l-dahr. These may be summed up as follows: 1. "We have seen nothing which was newly produced (hadaţîga) unless it arose from a thing or in a thing". — 2. What produces (mukhîd) bodies is, incontestably, substances and accidents, that is to say, everything that exists in the world — 3. If there exists a mukhîd of bodies, it is either totally similar to them or totally different, or similar in certain respects and different in others. Now a total difference is inconceivable, since nothing can produce something contrary or opposite to itself, thus fire does not produce cold. — 4. If the world had a Creator (âfîl), he would act with a view to obtaining some benefit, of redressing some wrong, which is to act like the beings of this world, or else by nature, which would render his act eternal. — 5. If bodies were created, it would be necessary that their mukhîd, before producing them, should act in order to negate them, negation which itself would be either a body or an accident, which implies that bodies and accidents are eternal (10-11). After refuting these arguments in turn, Ibn Hazm gives five counter-arguments of his own, continuing the discussion (11-23) into the following chapter which is devoted to "those who say that the world is eternal and that, nevertheless, it has an eternal Creator".

Al-Shahrastânî begins the second part of his Kitâb al-Milal wa 'l-Nihal in which the philosophical sects are enumerated, with those who "are not of the opinion" that there is "a world beyond the perceptible world", al-labîsîyyun al-dahrîyyun, "the naturalists who believe in dahr, who do not expound an intelligible [world]", lâ yuṭûbûn maḥbûl, this last word being in the singular (ed. Cureton, 202, 1. 2). A second passage, "sometimes, on the other hand, . . . they also admit the intelligible, (ed. Cureton, 202, 1. 5-9) seems to apply to these two philosophers who, for their part, strenuously affirm that an intelligible world exists. Thus the dahrîyya, while having features in common, on the one hand with the naturalists, and on the other with the philosophers, could not be identified with
either. The passage, however, remains obscure. In the Kitáb Nihyát al-ifradd (ed. Guillaume, Oxford 1932, with partial translation) al-Shahrastání records several discussions between the dahriyya (trans. materialists) and their critics. In a famous episode (l. 137, l. 123, l. 10, 126, l. 9), on the origin of the world, including the theory of atoms moving about in primal disorder. The mode of reasoning of the dahriyya appears sophistical, but the refuters who rely on the movements of Saturn aduce no proof. The origin of the world through the fortuitous encounter of atoms wandering in space is an opinion also attributed to the dahriyya by Djàmlàl al-Din al-Kazwini, Muṣfaḍ al-ulām wa-mubtād al-humām, Cairo 1310, 37.

The 19th century brought definition to a word that for so long had been somewhat loosely used. European natural sciences, penetrating the East, gave rise to a stream of very simplified but materialistic ideas which were the source of unexpected problems in Islam. (For an Ottoman ferman of 1798, refuting the Dahri doctrines of the French Revolution, see Amir Abdù, 'Abduh and first published (ist. ed. Beirut 1303/1885) €...)
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While materialism was spreading, particularly in Islam, where the term was evidently used by the early Mu Hazílites [q.v.], later to be a University, combining English culture with the study of Muslim theology. Deeply impressed by the concepts of conscience and nature, he took the laws of nature as criteria of religious values. This new conception spread, giving, with the Arabic termination, the qualifying word naturi, which became nayárí, plural nayáríyin, from transcription of the English pronunciation; in Persian naye'riréyi. It was presented as a sort of new religion, appearing in the Census of India, where its followers were called nelari. These events exercised considerable influence on the whole of India, and made it necessary for orthodox Islam to take position.

Djàmlàl al-Din al-Afghàni [q.v.] wrote a violent reply in Persian, as early as 1298/1878, with his Refutation of the Materialists, the translation of which into Urdu was lithographed in Calcutta in 1883; it was translated into Arabic by Muhammad 'Abdul and first published (1st. ed. Beirut 1303/1885) under the title Risàla fi bid'a màsh'áh al-dahriyyin wa-bayân màsh'áhdihih wa-tábdîl anna 'l-din as-sul al-nadvíyya wa 'l-khàrîj fàsàd al-'umrân, then (2nd. ed., Cairo 1312, 3rd ed., Cairo 1320/1902) under the title al-Radd 'alâ 'l-dahriyyin (French translation A.-M. Goichon, Paris 1942), while the original title included al-nayıgáriyín, clearly denoting the meaning given to dahri which is therefore the translation of naturalistic-materialistic. In this short work Djàmlàl al-Din traces back this doctrine to the Greek philosophers in terms recalling those of al-Ghazâlì; he traces its history, such as he represents it, in the first chapter; it finishes with Darwin. His refutation is, throughout, superficial.

While materialism was spreading, particularly through Arabic translations of European works like Büchner's Kraft und Stoff, translated by Shibil Shumayyl (Alexandria 1854), a contrary movement was taking shape. The history of this struggle between two irreconcilable conceptions is far from finished; considerable research, but has no place here. In the various works mentioned above, the terms maddiyya and maddîyyáin have, in fact, always been used as synonyms of dahriyya and dahriyyin; these latter finally disappeared, replaced by the more exact term. They no longer occur in the Arab press in this sense. So long as the doctrine of the naturalists was accepted (information supplied by R. F. Jomier) and, without being in a position to make the same observation in respect of other countries, we cannot nevertheless remark that they are no longer found in certain publications in Muslim India. Bibilography: in the text; see also W. L. Schneider, Über den Fatastizmus der osmanischen Araber, Bonn 1875, 12-22; M. Horten, Die philosophischen Systeme der spätislamischen Theologen im Islam, Bonn 1932, index s.v. Dahriten.

Recent bibliography: I. Goldziher-A. M. Goichon) (G. Wiæt)
al-da'il, at the head of all official religious matters, seems to have been on a level with the waqir, if not united with him in one person, the da'is in other lands often had adventurous lives and sometimes ended bloody. Many served as military leaders, particularly before the Fātimid state was established (for instance, the Karmātīn leaders; and Abū Ḥābid Allāh al-Shīrāzī, who led Berber tribesmen in the revolt which established al-Mahdī in the Maghrib). Later, they still had to have a gift for political intrigue (some tried to convert the leading figures at the local court, or even the amīr himself; thus al-Mu'tayyid fi 'l-Dīn al-Shīrāzī at the Bāyūr court), for they were not only preachers but agents of the Fātimid state. Nevertheless, the da'is were often independent scholars; vigorous theological and philosophical controversies were carried on among them, and the chief Ismā'īlī books seem to have been written by da'īs, many of the most important by those labouring in hostile Iran.

In the parallelism drawn between the Ismā'īlī hudūd, religious ranks, and the principles of cosmic emanation from the One, the dā'ī was sometimes associated with "time" or with the kha'yāl, "fantasy". For such purposes, the hudūdīa formed a separate rank between the dā'ī and the imām, as did the bāb (q.v.).

The title dā'ī came to mean something different in each of the sects which issued from the classical Fātimid Ismā'īlīsm. Among the first Druzes, the da'īs performed similar functions, but formed a rank directly dependent on the fifth of the great hudūd, the tālī (Bahā' al-Dīn); cosically, they embodied the dīdī ("effort"). Subsequently they became superfluous. The Nizarīs ("Assassins") inherited the Ismā'īlī organization in the Sādīqūkī domains, which seems to have been headed by the dā'ī of Ḥaṣānān; dā'ī became the ordinary title for the chief of the sect, resident from the time of Ḥaṣān-i Ṣabāh at Al-Amūn (in the name of an unknown imām), until in 559/1164 the then dā'ī proclaimed himself the actual imām. (Ḥaṣān-i Ṣabāḥ was evidently also regarded as dādīa in a special sense). The Ṣayyībī dā'īa of the Yaman separated from the Ismā'īlī organization under a dā'ī mulājah, an "absolute" or sovereign dā'ī, who claimed to be the representative of the true line of imāms, themselves in sā'tr, occultation. The dā'ī had full authority over the community, and the Ṣayyībīs split more than once over his person; in the mid-twentieth century there are two main rival dā'īs, one seated traditionally in the Yaman (Ṣulaymān) and one seated in Bombay (Dā'ūddī).

For bibliography, see ismā'īlīs.

DA'Ī, AHMAD B. IBRĀHĪM, Turkish poet of the end of the 8th/14th and the beginning of the 9th/15th century. The scanty information about his life is scattered in his works and in tādīkhīrīs. A bādī by profession, he began to gain prominence as a poet at the court of the Gerīmān in Kūṭahya under princes Sulaymān and Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd Allāh. He seems to have travelled a great deal in Anatolia and in the Balkans. During the chaotic years of struggle between the sons of Bāyızīd I after the battle of Ankara (804/1402), he entered the service of one of them, ṣamīr Sulaymān in Edirne, whose court had become a gathering place for many famous men of letters of the period such as Ahmadī, his brother Ḥanżawāl and Sulaymān Cebelī. He continued to flourish at court under Muhemed I (818/1413-824/1421) and became tutor to his son, the future Mūrūd II. The sources do not agree on the date of Dā'ī’s death; Ḥādīdī Khallīs gives the year 820/1417, but there is evidence that he might still have been living during the first years of Mūrūd II (824/1421-848/1444) (I. H. Uzunparisi, Kūṭahya Şehrı, Istanbul 1932, 213). With the exception of Sehī Tēđḵ̣hire (50) who has a short but appreciative note on him, until recently both Ottoman and modern scholars have considered Dā'ī a minor poet as but a few of his works were known. Since many of his works, especially an incomplete copy of his dīwān and his remarkable muḥaṣṣaṣ Cēnḡ-nāme, have come to light (Ahmed ʿAtīq, Türk Dīvān ve Edediyatsı Dergesti, 3-4, 172-4) Dā'ī has proved to be an outstanding poet of his period, without doubt superior in richness of inspiration, originality, mastery of technique and fluency of style to many of his contemporaries.

Apart from various religious treatises (I. H. Ertaylan, Ahmed-ī Dāʾī, Istanbul 1952) Dā'ī is the author of: (i) Dīwān; the only known copy is in Būrdur Wākî Library no. 735; it is incomplete and not arranged alphabetically, containing his later poems: six hasīdas two of which are dedicated to Muhemed I and 199 ḡazāls. (ii) Cēnḡ-nāme, called wrongly Dinḵ̣ānānume by some sources (Gīb, Ottoman Poetry, i, 256) and confused with Sharḵhūgūl’s Fārābānḵ̣ānā (Kūṭahyaḵ̣ānā-nume) by others (ʿAll, Khūn al-ʿAbbār and Būrsah Muhemed Tābīr, Ṣehīl Mūttaqīlān, 1-2); is maḥnawī, dedicated to Ṣubūrī Sulaymān in 808/1405. In this allegory, the human soul is symbolized by the harp, whose heavenly music is a sign of its divine origin and which seeks the mystical paths of return to oneness with God. In a cheerful play on a flower-strewed lawn in spring, the poet asks the harp why it is so sad yet plays joyful melodies. Thereupon the four parts of the instrument tell him their stories: the silk of the strings came from worms which fed on the flesh of Job before eating the leaves of mulberry trees; the wood of the frame was a beautiful cyprus; the parchment covering the wood a gentle gazelle which was cruelly killed by hunters, and the hairs of the key were from the tail of a magnificent horse killed by the Tatars. This maḥnawī full of vivid descriptive imagery, told in a moving and colourful style of unusual fluency compares favourably with the best contemporary narratives and even with those of the classical period. (iii) Taḵrās, a letter-writer which became a classic and long remained a popular hand-book (Sehī, Tēdīḵ̣īre, 50); (iv) Muḥyī, a small book of 12 light poems; (v) Wāsiyyīl-ī Nāẓurmān-ī ʿĀṭīr, a short didactic maḥnawī, probably translated from the Persian; (vi) ʿUḥd al-Dīnḵ̣āhīr, a short Persian rhyming vocabulary, written for the use of his princely pupil, the future Mūrūd II; (vii) Persian Dīwān, autograph copy written in 816/1413 is in Bursa, Orhan Library no. 66; it is dedicated to Khayr al-Dīn Ḥādīdī Khallīs Bey; (viii) Taṣfīr, translation of Abu 'l-Layth al-Samarkandi’s Kurān commentary, with an introduction in verse, both in simple language and unadorned style, dedicated to Ummay Bey b. Timūr-ḵ̣aṣ (Université Library T. Y. 8248); (ix) also attributed to Dā'ī, a translation of the Taḏḥīḥat al-Awliyā, ʿĀṭīr’s well known biographies and sayings of Muslim mystics.

Bibliography: The Tēdīḵ̣īrīs of Sehī, Latīfī, Khnālīzāde Ḥaṣān Cebelī, and the biographical section in ʿAll’s Khūn al-ʿAbbār, s.v.; Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. d. Osman. Dichkunst, i, 72; Gīb, Ottoman Poetry, i, 256 ff.; I. H. Ertaylan, Ahmed-ī Dāʾī, Istanbul 1952, a voluminous collection where
fascimile editions of the Turkish Dickinson and the Ceng-nâme and extracts from other works have been put together with all available data from sources; A. Bombaci, Storia della letteratura turca, Milan 1910, 49, 55 (Fahn 12)

DAFIF (see Al-Dijair wa'ta'â'il).

DAKHLIYYA, name of an Egyptian province in the eastern region of the Delta. It owes its name, which is an Arabicized form of the Coptic Tkheli, to the town called Daqahla which was situated between Damira and Damietta, a little closer to the latter than the former. At one time famous for its paper mills, it is now but an insignificant village.

The province was created at the end of the 15th/16th century and it has survived till today with some changes in its boundaries. At present it extends along the eastern bank of the Damietta branch of the Nile, which marks its western boundary, and ends on the south-east at the province of Sharqiyya. Its chief town is now Mamura.

Bibliography: Ibn Khurrazad ad-Dhibi, 82; Ku'dama, 48; 'Ali Pasha, xi, 17; Maspero and Wiet, Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l'Égypte, 90, 186-91. (G. Wiet)

DAKAR [see Supplement].

DAKAN (DECCAN). This word is derived from the Sanskrit word dâkána 'right (hand)'; hence 'south', since the compass points were determined with reference to the rising sun. The conventional line dividing north India from the south is formed by the south-western spurs of the Vindhyas along with their continuation called the Satpurâs; peninsular India to the south of this line is usually further divided into (i) Deccan proper, extending up to the Tungabhadra, and (ii) south India extending right up to the southernmost tip of the peninsula. Physically also these two parts form two distinct units. For, while the Deccan plateau is formed by the great lavaic upland slowly rising from a point a few miles west of the deltas of the Godavâri and the Krishna ending abruptly in the Western Ghâfs, the country lying to the south of the Tungabhadra and touching the port of Goa has a distinct crystalline character. The Deccan proper, therefore, may be said to consist of five sections, viz., (i) the western section enclosed by the sea and the Western Ghâfs, called the déth, the original home of the Marâshâs; this has extended beyond the Ghâfs to include the whole territory with Ahmadnagar and Poona as its principal towns; (ii) the area known as Berar during the Middle Ages and which is now known according to the ancient appellation of Vidarbha, with Nagpur as its principal town; (iii) Marathâwada, the Marâshâ-speaking part of the old Haydarâbâd State with its centre at Awrangâbâd; (iv) Tâlangâna where Telugu is the mother-tongue of a large part of the population, with Hâydarâbâd as its historical and cultural capital; (v) the south-western portion populated mainly by the Kannadigâs, with Bijeâpur as its chief town.

Even if we disregard the legendary war between Râma and Râvana, the Aranyization of the Deccan up to the far south must have been complete by the end of the Mawrya rule. There is little to relate between the fall of the Mawryas and rise of the Andhras who ruled practically the whole of the Deccan plateau for five hundred years. We also know of the Ikshvakus of Nagardjunakonda, the Vâkañjas of Berar, the Western Çâlukyas of Badâmi and Kâlyani, the Râkhratukâs of Malkhed, the Eastern Çâlukyas of Vengi, the Yâdavas of Deogiri and the Kâkatiyas of Warangal, who ruled in different parts of the Deccan during the centuries preceding the Muslim conquest.

The first contact of the Deccan with the Muslims of the north was in 693/1294 when 'Allâ al-Dîn, nephew of Sultan Djâli al-Dîn Firuz Khâlidî of Dihîl, marched to Deogiri (see DÂLÂTABÃD) and forced the Yâdava Râja Râmaçandra to pay tribute. It was, however, not till 718/1318 that this kingdom, which extended to most of the Marâshâ country, was annexed to the Dihîl Empire. Sultan Muhammad b. Tughluq did not merely secure the dominion of the Balufs of Warangal to his Empire but annexed a large portion of south India as well, making Deogiri his second capital and renaming it Dâlatabâd [q.v.]. But he could not control his far-flung empire effectively, and in 740/1345 his Deccan nobles, the amirân-i sadâh, revolted and chose Ismâ'îl Mûgh as the first independent Muslim ruler of the Deccan. He was replaced by Zafar Khán as king, with the title of Alâ' al-Dîn Hasân Bihârân Khân in 748/1347, who thus became the founder of the Bahmanî kingdom [see Bahmanids]. The Bahmanids spread their Empire over the whole of the Deccan from sea to sea and ruled it first from Ahsanâbâd-Gulgarga [see Gulgarga] and then from Muhammadâbâd-Bîdar [see Bîdar]. Towards the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th centuries the governors of the Bahmanid provinces became first autonomous and then independent, and the Deccan was finally divided into five kingdoms of Ahmadnagar, Bidjâpur, Berâr, Bîdar and Golkânda under the Nizâmshâhs, 'Adîshîhâ, 'Imâdshâhâ, Barîdshâhâ and Kûthshâhâ dynasties respectively. Berâr and Bîdar were soon absorbed into Ahmadnagar which was itself annexed to the Mughul Empire during the reign of Shah Dâhân in 1043/1633. The turn of the extinction of Bidjapur and Golkonda did not come till 1097/1686 and 1098/1687 when the Emperor Awrangâbî 'Alâmîr annexed these two kingdoms to his vast Empire. But the Mughul authority in the Deccan was undermined by the continuous raids of the Marâshâs who established a separate kingdom under Shahvâdî in 1083/1674 and which forced the Emperor to direct his strategy from Awrangâbâd where he died in 1115/1707. The next important date in the history of the Deccan is the capture of Nilgiri by the Nizâm al-Mulk 'Asaf Dîjâ [q.v.] defeated Mubâriz Khân at Shahkarkhera and established his hegemony over the whole of the Deccan. The dynasty of the 'Asafjâhâs ruled the Deccan first from Awrangâbâd and then from Hâydarâbâd [q.v.]. Immediately有效 1948 when the Hâydarâbâd State was integrated into the Indian Union. The Nizâm, Sir Mir 'Uthmân 'All Khân, 'Asâf Dîjâ VII, was appointed Râkhratukâs of the Deccan under the Nizâm, 'All Khân, 'Asâf Dîjâ VIII, for constitutional head of the state by the President of the Indian Union and acted as such till 1956 when the Hâydarâbâd State was partitioned between Andhra Pradesh, Bombay State and Mysore State more or less according to linguistic affinities.

Dakhani — al-Dakkan

Dakhani [see urdu], Al-Dakkhil [see 'Abd al-Rahman].

Dakkhil. The dictionaries (LA, TA, etc.) give a general meaning, “interior, inward, intimate,” and two particular derived meanings, (1) guest, it, whom protection should be assured, and (2) stranger, passing traveller, person of another race. The first of the particular meanings relates to an institution of nomadic common law which guarantees protection, in traditional ways, to whoever requests it. Although the concept has at all times existed, it has never been incorporated into Islamic law, which has no technical term corresponding to it. In its practical application, the institution combines elements of the complex system of ties of hospitality to which general opinion seems to assimilate the rights of the dakkhil and of a very old law of refuge in private households which is attested all over the Semitic world (cf. QRWAR). See in particular the detailed analysis by A. Jaussen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Mosai, Paris 1948, 202-20, and Burckhardt’s notes on the same subject in Notes on the Beduins, London 1831, i, 329-338; also Layard, Narrative of a second expedition to Assyria, London 1867, ch. VI, 139-62, and Caskel, apud Oppenheim, Die Beduinen, Leipzig 1939, i, 29.

From this last meaning, several meanings of the word as a technical term in philology, regarded as “late” by the lexicographers, have been derived, notably (1) “a foreign word borrowed by the Arabic language”, “aarkam”, and (2) metrical term denoting the consonant preceding the rhyming consonant, the dakkhil itself being preceded by an aif (cf. a'rud).

Dakhlja wa Khardja [see Al-Warati].

Dakhni [see urdu].

Dakki, ‘Abd Mansur Muhammad b. Ahmad (or Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Ahmad), the poet to whom we owe the oldest known text of the national epic in the Persian language. His place of birth is uncertain (Tus, Bukhara, Balkh or Samarqand); he was born between 318 and 329/930 and 940, for he was at least twenty years old when he began this work, at the behest of the amir Nuh. b. Mansur, 366-387/976-997; Dakki therefore himself in one of his poems, epic in style and metre, scattered the deeds of Zaridt (Zoroaster), and the war against their Chionite enemies.

The Zoroastrian faith of Dakki seems to assert itself in one of his ruba‘is and in other of his poems, in spite of his Muslim names. Did he remain Zoroastrian at heart? If he had been sincerely attached to Islam, would he, in undertaking the composition of the Shdh-nama on the order of the Samanid amir (a strictly orthodox Muslim), have straightforward extolled the rise of Zoroastrianism and the war which it provoked? Howbeit, it is very probable, if not certain, that he chose this episode because he had at his disposal a copy of the Memorial of Zaridt (Ayatkahr-i Zaridt), a text from the Sasanid period in Pahlawi verse (as E. Benveniste has shown) from which he drew direct inspiration. It may be that he had also put into verse other episodes from the Shdh-nama, if we take into consideration some of his poems, epic in style and metre, scattered through the anthologies (tadhghira).

What remains of Dakki’s lyrical poems shows his remarkable ability to vary his inspiration according to the descriptive, bacchic or amorous styles; quotations from his verse, numerous in the Persian anthologies and dictionaries, give proof of the lasting fame he enjoyed after his too-short career. Indeed his collaboration in the Shdh-nama is important for its own value as for the light it throws on the sources of the great national poem of Iran.


(C. Huart-H. Massé)

Al-Dakka, ‘Abd ‘Abd Allah, Moroccan saint born at Sidjilmassa. He and a certain ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Umar al-Ashamm who was assassinated in 542/1147-8 belonged to one of the small circles of Sufis generally disapproved of by authority. This Abu ‘Abd Allah had already been imprisoned at Fez at the same time as some of his companions, among whom one was al-Dakka, who on the orders of Tashshufin b. ‘Ali the Almoravid was afterwards released.

No one knows the date of birth of this saint, nor that of his death. All the same, one can be sure that towards the middle of the 6th/12th century he had become known as a disciple of Sufism at Fez, where his akhawat had aroused the kindly sympathy of Ibn al-Arif and Ibn Barradjas, both of whom died in 396/1104.

If we may believe al-Tadidi, al-Dakka went to and fro between Sidjilmassa and Fez. It was in Fez that he met Abu Madyan at a time when the latter, seeking instruction, was studying the Rihya of al-Muhasibi under the direction of Abu ‘l-Hasan b. Hizirihim and the Sunan of al-Tirmidhi with Ibn Ghalib. Al-Dakka and a person of the name of Abu ‘l-Salawi initiated him into Sufism (Tashawwur, 319). It is because he was one of the masters of Abu Madyan that al-Dakka has not sunk into obscurity.

He led a life of renunciation, and was, it seems, before all else, a disciple of Sufism rather than a scholar. His manner of claiming sanctity and the satisfaction which he felt when it was acknowledged has something displeasing about it. He died at Fez, most probably, according to A. Bel, at the latest in the last quarter of the 6th/12th century. He is buried in the cemetery of Bab al-Gisa.

DALÎL (or Dâkû), a small town in the Djazira province of the Abbasid empire, some 25 miles S.E. of Kirkuk on the Mosul-Baghdad trunk road, was known to the later Arab geographers and perhaps emerged into urban status, though never eminence, in the 5th/11th century. Some medieval brickwork and a minaret survive. The later and present name (from 9th/15th century, or earlier) was Tâwûk or Tâûk. The town, on flat ground immediately west of the foothills, stands healthy and well provided with bathrooms. The Chay, a trickle in summer but a formidable flood after winter rains: this now flows into the Azaim river, and thence to the Tigris, but passed into the great Nahrawân canal when that existed. In modern 'Irák Tâûk, with some 2,000 Kurdish and Turkish-speaking inhabitants, is today a nakhûya head-quarters, partially modernized, and an agricultural and market centre for the surrounding Kurdish tribesmen (Dâ'dyâla and Kâka?) and Turkoman villages. The 'Irák Railways line, and the main road, cross the Tâbûk Chay by modern bridges. A well-known shrine of Zayn al-Âbidin b. Âhuyan is 1.5 miles distant. Bibliography: Le Strange, 92, and the Arab authorities there noted. Abd al-Razzâk al-Âssânî, al-'Irâk Kâtîmî, Sîdî, 1367/1946, 197. Undersigned's own observations. (H. LONGRIGG)

DALÌ, 8th letter of the Arabic alphabet, transcribed $d$; numerical value 4, in accordance with the order of the letters in the Syriac (and Canaanite) alphabet, where $d$ is the fourth letter [see ARBAB]. It continues a $d$ of common Semitic.

Definition: voiced dental occlusive; according to the Arabic grammatical tradition: nāâdâ, madhâra. For the makhrajj, nâfiyya according to al-Kâhîl (al-Zamakhshari, Mufassal, 2nd ed. J. P. Broch, 191, line 1), who places the point of articulation at the anterior part of the hard palate, 'its stripped part' (Ibn Ya'âqîb, 1460, line 19) and so: prepalatal. This articulation has left traces in modern dialects (Lebanon, Syria: M. Brahmânn, Malâsîm, 69; H. F. Le Strange, 92, 1924, 555-84; idem, The Sindhi recusatives . . ., BSOS, xxii/2, 1924, 301-15; Mohiuddin Qadri, Hindustani Phonetics, Paris n.d. (1937?) — also the articles Pâstû, Sînâv, Urûdî, (J. BURTON-PAGE)).

DALÎL, (Gr. σημείον) is an ambiguous term; it can mean sign or indication, every proof through the inference of a cause from its effect or the inference of the universal from the particular in opposition to the proof from a strictly deductive syllogism in which the particular is deduced from the universal; and finally it is used as synonymous with proof, ḥudûs, ābûrān generally. Aristotle treats the "proof from a sign" in the last chapter of his Analytica Priora. According to him "proof from a sign" is an enthymeme, i.e., a syllogism in which one premis is suppressed ($δ̄v ṣ̄m̄avaş̄, ḥiyyâs idâmûrî or ḥiyyâs lâdûtî) in which from a fact another fact, anterior or posterior in time, is inferred (although Aristotle says "anterior or posterior", the example he gives infers an anterior fact and for the Arab philosophers the inference is always the inference of a cause from its effect). He gives as an example that from a woman having milk it is inferred that she has conceived. He states that this enthymeme can be fully expressed in the following way: all women who have milk have conceived, this woman has milk; therefore she has conceived. This would seem to imply that for the type of reasoning the enthymeme is not a necessary condition and that the conclusion provides absolute evidence, although a "sign", according to Aristotle, is always an accident and there is no necessary proof for the accidental. We find in Avicenna the same definition and the same example (Nâzîdî, p. 92) and he adds that dalîl can mean both the middle term of the syllogism (in this case "having milk") and the enthymeme itself. This type of reasoning is the only one for which Aristotle reserves the name of "proof from a sign". The Arab philosophers, however, give the term a wider meaning, based on the distinction made by Aristotle in his Analytica Posteriora between the proof that a thing is, dÎtâ, burhân anna and the proof why a thing is, the proof of its cause or reason, dÎâtâ, burhân lima. The proof why a thing is is preceded by the proof that a thing is, for one can ask only why a thing is, when one knows that it is. The proof that a thing is starts from the particular, the fact, the effect perceived, and infers the cause from its effect, and it is for this reason that the Arab philosophers call it a dalîl; on the other hand the
proof why a thing is starts from the universal, the cause, and deduces the particular effect from its cause. The distinction is confused through the ambiguity of the term "cause" which in Aristotelian philosophy can mean both the logical reason of a thing's being such and such, its formal cause, e.g., the reason that Socrates is mortal is that he is a man, and the ontological cause of a thing's becoming, e.g., this fire is the cause of the burning of this wood. I cannot discuss this here in extenso, but will give only Avicenna's examples from his Nadjât (103, 105) which show clearly the confusion between the logical and the ontological, so usual in Aristotle. As an example of the burhân lima he gives: a great heat has changed this wood, everything a great heat has changed is burnt, therefore this wood is burnt; and as an example of the burhân anna: this wood is burnt, therefore a great heat has burnt it. According to Avicenna the difference between the two syllogisms is that in the former the middle term (i.e., a great heat) is both the cause (i.e., the logical reason) of our conviction of the truth of the conclusion and the cause (i.e., the ontological cause) of the major term (i.e., the being burnt) in reality, whereas the latter gives us only the subjective conviction of the truth of the conclusion. That is to say in the burhân anna we can, purely logically, infer from the particular effect to its cause, for being burnt implies the act of burning, and since being burnt is but the actualisation of the potentiality of heat, heat and the fact of being burnt are practically identical; in the burhân lima the ontological cause and the logical reason are identified.

The Arab philosophers hold also with Aristotle (Anal. Prior., ii, 23) that through a syllogism based on a perfect induction of particular facts, that is the enumeration of all the particular cases, we can arrive at a universal proposition (cf. e.g., Avicenna, De demonstratione [from his Shifâ], 31-2).

There is still another type of reasoning mentioned by Aristotle (Anal. Prior., ii, 24) in which from a particular case a general principle may be inferred, reasoning by example, e.g., avâdâla, mahlâl. Avicenna gives in his Nadjât, 90-91, as an example an argument of the middle term produced in time, because it is composed of parts, therefore it is like a building; now the building is produced in time, therefore the world is produced in time.

Aristotle had neglected in his logic the hypothetical and disjunctive syllogisms which were studied in his school by Theophrastus and Eudemus, but the Stoics for whom all argument is based on the inference of an event from another event, on the inference of the posterior from the anterior (or the reverse in prognostics), on the inference of a particular cause from a particular effect, that is on the inference from signs or symptoms, στῦματα, a concept which becomes one of the most important elements of their logic, are chiefly concerned with the study of the hypothetical and disjunctive syllogisms and, indeed, inferences from actual events which imply a time-element, find an easier expression in a hypothetical than in a categorical syllogism. The example of στῦματον given by Aristotle, becomes in Stoic logic a stock example in their syllogism: if this woman has milk, she has conceived, now she has milk, therefore she has conceived, and Avicenna in his Ishârât, 84-5, gives an example of the difference between burhân lima and the burhân anna in a hypothetical form. Reasoning by example, regarded by Aristotle as a categorical syllogism, or as de al-dallâl that the Stoics call it reasoning by analogy (âyâs), takes in their logic a hypothetical form and becomes one of their principal arguments, since according to them all knowledge transcending the evidence of the senses proceeds by way of analogical inference. The analogical syllogism was the first one the Arabs became acquainted with (it may well be that because of this the term âyâs becomes later the general name for syllogism, just as the term dâlî becomes the general term for proof), the Mu'tazilis, the rationalistic theologians in Islam, called by their adversaries ahî al-âyâs, used analogical reasoning for their interpretation of the Kûrân and as a basis for criticizing traditions, and Schâtî was aware that âyâs is based on signs, dâlî and examples, mîthâl (cf. J. Schacht, The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, London 1950, 124 and 128). Ghazzâlî in his logical works emphasizes the importance of the hypothetical syllogism in all juridical matters and the Ash'aris, nominalists like the Stoics and who with them deny the existence of Aristotle's forms and formal causes, base their arguments on analogical reasoning or as Averroës says (Tâhâjût al-Tâhâjût, Bouyges, p. 522) on what they call "sign".

Bibliography: in the text.

DALLÂL (ar.) "broker", "agent". Dâlî, literally "guide"; is the popular Arabic word for a man skilled in business dealing, for being the person who arranges the purchase and sale by bringing the seller against his customer. Their profession which, since the time of the Mamluks, the 2% and the account given by C. H. Becker in Hisâl, 106, i, was invested with an official character, was known as dâlîla. The word al-dâlî occurs in early times as a surname (Tâdâl- al-Ârâş). Under the Fâtimids, certain articles could only be sold through the intermediary of dâlîl (al-Ârâshaddast, 215). In the time of the Mamlûks, the 3/4 commission which from the earliest days had been paid to these brokers was made subject to a charge, as a result of which the dâlîl had to give up half his profits in taxes: the loss, naturally enough, he speedily passed on to his clients. This operation was known as nâsîf al-sâmsara (Makrizi, Khâfat, i, 894). A somewhat similar custom was to be found in northern Syria (cf. Soverheim in the Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum, ii, no 55 and the account given by C. H. Becker in Hisâl, i, 100). The principal transactions were concluded in the maritime customs offices. There the dâlîl acted at the same time as interpreters when any dealings with the Franks were required. Commercial treaties fixed precisely what fees were due to these agents and interpreters (Amari, Diplomii Arabi, 106, 203). Heyd, Leaenethandel, i, gives a wide range of details about this kind of transaction. For the Western Mediterranean one should consult de Mas Latrie, Traité de passe de commerce, Paris 1866, 189. Later it was the West which monopolized
questions of brokerage (cf. Schaub, Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Volker des Mittelmeergebietes, 761).

It was, however, not only for their transactions with merchants, but also for taking on themselves, that the Eastern peoples made use of the dalāls (see, for example, the notes on Ottoman brokerage dues in B. Lewis, Studies in the Ottoman Archives, I, BSOAS, xvi, 1954, 455 ff.). Furthermore, the latter also acted as independent traders, selling, for example, old clothes on their own account (Descripción de Egipto, État moderne, xviii/II, 321). The name dalāl was also applied to the hawkers auctioning goods in the secondhand clothing market and, still more frequently, to the small intermediary and agent. The way of life of these agents has been well described by Lane, Manners and Customs of the modern Egyptians, ii, 13. Women are also found taking the part of agents. Known as dalāla, they act as intermediaries for harem's of a superior sort (Lane, op. cit. I, 200, 239, 242). For other meanings of the word dalāl cf. Dozy, Supplement, s.v.

(C. H. Becker*)

II. — In the Muslim West, the dalāl is exclusively an intermediary who, in return for remuneration, sells by public auction objects entrusted to him by third parties. In the large towns the dalāls are grouped in specialized guilds, supervised by a syndic (amin) who compels them to give a guarantee of good faith (damāl), and, as chiefly merchants themselves, to merchandise with manufactured goods sold by artisans to the shopkeepers: slippers, locally woven fabrics, carpets, jewellery etc.; industrial raw materials such as hides (green or tanned), wool (untreated or yarn); commodities sold in bulk, such as oil, butter, honey, local soap, henna, eggs, fruit and vegetables; live-stock, animals for both riding and baggage; furniture, books and old clothes. Before the French Protectorate was established in Morocco they were also engaged in the sale of slaves of both sexes.

The word has passed into Persian and Turkish (telli) and, from the latter, into various Balkan languages (modern Greek telīdē). Besides dalāl (delli in Granada), Spanish Arabic used sawēd.

In the Muslim West today dalāl is quite distinct from bāddar, "towncrier" and from simār (s.v.) "broker, business agent".

In the large towns the feminine dalāla denotes a "dealer in women's clothes" who frequents the houses of the rich, offering the women fabrics, clothes and jewellery.


DALTĀWA, the head quarter town of the Kaddā of Khālīṣ in the Irāq of Diyalā, central Irāq (44° 30' E, 33° 50' N). The population of the town —all settled Irāqī Arabs, with Shīʿ predominance over Sunnī—was some 10,000 in 1367/1947, and that of the kaddā 70,000; the two dependent nābiyās are those of Khān Banī Sa'd and Manṣūriyya (formerly Dal b'Abba). The name Daltawa is said to be a corruption of an original Dālatābaḥ. Surrounding by date-gardens, the town is watered from the Khālīṣ canal, an important offtake from the Khalis canal, an important offtake from the Diyala, right bank. Though still largely old fashioned, and never very healthy, the town now contains a number of new streets and buildings, especially on the north side. The modern services and communications were greatly developed during the last 30 years. Though nowhere mentioned in mediaeval writers, because then of little importance, the town is certainly of some antiquity, and was watered from the Nahrawān-Diyālā canal also for amongst themselves.


AL-DALW [see Nūḍūm].

DĀM, [see sīkka].

DĀMĀD, a Persian word meaning son-in-law, used as a title by sons-in-law of the Ottoman Sultans. Under the early Sultans, princesses (sultān) of the reigning house were occasionally given in marriage to the vassal princes of Asia Minor, for example, to the Karamānghūl, and even to the vezirs and generals of the sovereign; the case of the saint Amīr Ṣūltān of Bursa, who married a daughter of Bāyazīd I, is, however, unique not only for that but also for later periods. We afterwards find Grand Vezirs, Kapudan Paḫās, Ağās of Janissaries, Bostāndjābāhs and other high officials as sons-in-law of the Sultan; the best known are Ibrāhīm Paḫā, the favourite of Sulaymān I, Rustem Paḫā (husband of Mīhrīmāh), Soksul Mehemmed Paḫā (husband of Asmākhan), Ibrāhīm Paḫā (son-in-law of Mehemmed III), Ibrāhīm Paḫā under Ahmed III etc. (cf. Hammer, GÖR, index s.v. Sulṭānī). The title dāmād was applied to some of them both by their contemporaries and in historical writings and remained current to the end of the empire (e.g., Dāmād Mәhmūd Paḫā, Dāmād Ferid Paḫā [q.v. etc.]).

The marriage ceremonies were celebrated with great splendour and are minutely described in the Ottoman chronicles as well as by western travellers (cf. Hammer, GÖR, index s.v. Hochzeit und Vermählung); the dowry had been fixed by Sulaymān I at 100,000 ducats and the appanage (khaṣās) brought in 1000-1500 aspers daily. (Venetian Relazione of 1608, in Barozzi-Berchet, 72; Hammer, viii, 211); in addition a large palace was usually bestowed on the princesses. Till the time of Sulaymān I the Dāmāds were usually sent into the provinces as governors to prevent them having any personal influence on the affairs of the Sublime Porte, (Koĉbeâ, ed. of 1928, 94, 97). Etiquette compelled the Damad to put away the wives he already had and to take no further wives (cf. the Venetian Relazione already quoted, 103 ff. and Hammer, iv, 103); he became the slave of his wife and this relationship finds expression in the form of address used between the spouses (cf. the above reports, 72, 104; de la Mottraye, Voyages, 338 ff.; Hammer, Staatsverfassung, i, 476-84 = GÖR, viii, 211-13; C. White, Three Years in Constantinople, iii, 180 ff.). The statement that sons born of such marriages were done away with at birth (Eton, Survey of the Turkish Empire*, 101; Hammer, GÖR, iv, 463), may be disproved (cf. Djeuwed, vi, 196 ff., Relazioni loc. cit., 181, 372); only in earlier times they were debarred from all public offices (Relazioni 181).

Bibl. in addition to that given in the article: Ismail Hakki Uzuncarsih, Osmaniş Dersлетинên Saray Teşkilâtî, Ankara 1945; A. D. Alderson, The Structure of the Ottoman Dynasty, Oxford 1956, 97-8. On the use of the title Kuregen by the sons-in-law of Mongol rulers see Djuwayni-Boyle, 174 n. 11; Mostaert and Cleaves, Treas Documents Mongols, HJAS, 1852, 474; and article GÖRŞAN.

(J. H. Mordtmann*)

AL-DAMĀD, "son-in-law", an honorific title given to fils musulmān princes, among them Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-ʿAstārabādī, called also al-Muṣallīm al-Thāliḥ, the "third teacher" in philo-
sophy after al-Farabi. This title properly belongs to his father who was the son-in-law of the famous Shi'i theologian 'Ali b. al-Husayn b. 'Abd al-‘Alî al-Karaki, called al-Muhallabī al-Dhâlî (Brockelmann, S II, 574), but it was extended to the son, who is more correctly called Damâd or Ibn al-Damâd.

A noted divine, he is, however, chiefly esteemed for his attainments as a scholastic theologian (muqallid), and two of his numerous works, al-Uṣūf al-Mubin (also called by the author, at four places in the text, al-Sîrîd al-Mustâhîm) and al-Sâbî al-Sabîn, are still prescribed, in spite of their being outrightly condemned by the Shâfi’îs. Specimens of his poetry are given in the Râyâ al-Arîfîn and the Bayât al-Hikâht al-Ufâr al-Mubîn, which has been the subject of numerous commentaries. Mawlawi Fadl-i Kâbir b. Muh. al-Husayni al-Damad); Sarkâs, Mu‘âqil al-Mubâţâh, col. 860; C. Brockelmann, S II, 579-80; Fethâlâbî Khâna-i Dânishgâh-î Iran, (compiled by Muhammad Ta’lî Dânish-Puzûhû), Tehran, 1332/1953, iii, 152 (where several other references are found); Muhammad b. Hasan . . . . . . al-Hurr al-Amîlî, Amal al-Amîlî fi ‘Ulâmî Dâbal al-Amîlî, 498; Muhammad b. Sulaymân Tunakbûnî, Khaqâ ‘Ulâmî al-Damad, Tehran 1304/1886, 145, 238-40 (also Urdu translation by Mu’âzrî ‘Ali Râ’dî, Haydarâbâd 1340-1/1921-2); ‘Abd al-Azîz ‘Ulama’-i Damad) al-Kalâm, Risâla dar Faqîl al-Tîm wa al-‘Ulâmî (MS.); Ridâ? Kull Khan Hidayat, Majma’ al-Fuâda’î, Tehran 1295/1878, vii, 2; Lûtî ‘Ali Kâhan ‘Aghâr, Ashra Kada, 1290/1882, 159; Ridâ Kull Khan Hidayat, Riyâd al-Arîfîn, Tehran 1305/1888, 166-7; Browne, iv, 256-7, 406-7, 426-9 and index; ‘Abd al-Kumurî of Kundâwâr, A’lâmâ, al-Nâdirî, 1370/1956, ii, 206-7; Bakhtawar Khan, Mir ‘Ulama’-i Damad (MS.); Muhammad Ridâ‘ Bandâh), Zinât al-Tawârîsh, fol. 553; “Aghâ” Ahmad ‘Ali, Haft ‘Asmân, Calcutta 1873; Rieu, Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the British Museum, ii, 835; Muhammad Muhsin ’Agâ’ Buzurg al-Tîhrânî, al-Dhânî’î, ii, Nadîfî 1335, 261 (and elsewhere, under the entries referring to his works). (A. S. BAZMEH NASARIO)

DAMAD FERD PASHA, one of the last Grand Vizirs of the Ottoman Empire. Mehmed Ferd, son of Hasan Izzet, a member of the Council of State (Shârâ-yi Dewlet), was born in Istanbul in 1853, served in minor diplomatic posts, and, upon his marriage (1886) to ‘Abd al-Hamîd II’s sister Medîha, was made member of the Council of State and senator, and given the rank of Pâsha. In 1917 he became co-founder and chairman of the Hürriyet we îltifât dâbî ile (see), After the Ottoman defeat he served his brother-in-law Mehmed VI as Grand Vizir (4 March to 2 October 1919 and 5 April to 21 October 1920). His policy of accommodation to the victor powers in hopes of winning lenient terms proved as futile as his attempts to suppress the national resistance movement in Anatolia under Kemal (Atatürk). Nationalist pressure forced his resignation in October 1919. Restored to office after
the reinforced Allied occupation of Istanbul, his
government was responsible for issuing the well-
known anti-nationalist fetwds (signed by the šayḫ al-
DjebraiI). The DjebraiI and his staff were accused to the
army against the nationalists in Anatolia. On
10 August 1920 his cabinet signed the peace treaty of
Sèvres, but the growing strength of the national-
ists soon caused his final dismissal. In September 1922 he left Istanbul for Nice, where he died on 6 October 1923.

*Bibliography*: Mahmud Kemal Inal, Osmanlıs
devrinde son sadrazamlar, Istanbul 1940-53,
2029-2004; Millî newssal 1340 (1924), 352; Tanık
Z. Tünaýa, Türkîyedde siyast parîtler, 1925, 315,
451-55; Ali Fuat Türkâldî, Göçî sî sharksîmîr,
1951; Wf, 1928-9, r-154; Kemal [Atatârlik], Nutuk
(see 1934 edn., index); Ibrahim Alâtîtn Gövsa,
Türk mevlâtları anıskêlopesi, 1946, 136.

(D. A. Rustow)

**DAMAN (A.),** in Islamic law, the civil liability in the widest meaning of the term, whether it arises from the non-performance of a contract or from
**DAMANHt)R,** a town derived from the ancient
pagarchy suppressed in 755/1354 and the relic burnt.

According to Sonnini the town was “large but
form of a
hasîd, literally “transgression”).

Prominent particular cases are the liability for the loss of an object sold before the buyer has taken
possession (dâman al-âbâdî), for eviction
(dâman al-mabi al-adjir, d. al-sunnd).

In a wider sense, dâman is used of the risk or responsibility that one bears with
an act or not. Questions of

la responsabilite' dtlictuelle en droit musulman,
Paris 1926; F. M. Goadby, in
*Revue Algerienne,* 1-24, 51-75. (ED.)

**DAMANHÎR,** a name derived from the ancient
Egyptian Timnîrèh, the city of Horus. It is not surprising that a number of cities of this name are to be found, almost all in the Nile Delta.

I. Damânîr al-Shâhid, Damânîr “of the
Martyrs”, one of the northern suburbs of Cairo. This
name was also called Shubrâ ‘l-Khayma or Shubrâ ‘l-Khiyâm,
Shubrâ “of the tents”.

There was once a Christian reliquary in this place containing the bones of a martyr. On 8th Bashâ’ar (3rd May) each year, the town celebrated a holiday
while the people accompanied this casket in pro-
cession to the Nile, into which it was plunged in
the hope of promoting the success of the river’s annual flood.

There was no doubt excessive drinking on this
day and the feast was forbidden in 702/1302. It
was re-established in 738/1338 but was definitely
suppressed in 755/1354 and the relic burnt.

*Bibliography*: Abî Sâlîh, fol. 45; Ibn
Mammâti, 372; Mukaddasî, 54, 194, 206; Yâkût,
ii, 601; Ibn Dukmâk, v, 46; Makrîzl, ed. Wiet,
1926-29; the same, Suluk, i, 941 (trans. Quatremé-
re, ii, b, 232); Ibn Taghrîrîdî, ed. Cairo, viii,
202-3; Ibn Djiân, 7; Quatremère, Mémoires sur
l’Égypte, i, 360; Amelineau, *Géographie de l’Égypte,* 113-35 (to be consulted with caution); J. Maspero

II. Damânîr, the capital of the province of Buhayra,
the ancient Hermopolis Parva of the Byzantine era.

Since the name is ancient it can hardly be called an
Islamic creation, but nothing is heard of it in the
chronicles until the time of the Arab conquest. The
important locality is Karatsa, the only name known
to the ancient authors, who mention it as the capital of a pagarchy (hâra).

The oldest reference is to be found in Ibn Mammâti,
who calls it Damânîr al-Wâhâb. Ibn Djubayr and
Yâkût passed through it. To them it was an urban
centre of medium size surrounded by a wall. Ibn
Mammâti mentions a canal named after the city,
the Bahar Damânîr. The sultan Barkûk restored its
fortifications, in order better to resist the in-
cursions of the Bedouin; furthermore the town had
suffered greatly in the earthquake of 702/1302.

Damânîr increased in importance and according to
Ibn Dukmâk, it possessed a Friday mosque, schools,
caravanserais and covered markets. It was,
then, not only the capital of the province of Buhayra,
but also the residence of a senior Mamlûk officer
commanding the whole of the Delta. The post road,
skirting the desert from Cairo to Alexandria, had
a stage post there and there was also a carrier
pigeoncote.

According to Sonnini the town was “large but
badly built, almost all the houses being made either of mud or of bad quality brick. It is the centre of the trade in cotton, which is gathered in the vast and beautiful plains surrounding it.

On 30th April, 1799, a French company was massacred there by the troops of Mahdi Ahmadi; the reprisals were terrible.

Damannah is now a heavily populated town. The railway between Cairo and Alexandria has a station there, and it is the centre of a network of secondary railway routes.


Other places of the same name are mentioned in geographical lists but not described.


**DAMASCUS** [see *DAMASCUS*].

**DAMAWAND**, the highest point in the mountains on the borders of Northern Persia (cf. *Alburz*), somewhere below 36° N. lat. and about 50 miles north-east of Tehran. According to de Morgan it rises out of the plateau of Râhne to a height of 15,000 feet above it. The various estimates of its height differ: Thomson estimates it at 21,000 feet (certainly too high), de Morgan at 20,260, Hedin at 18,187, and in the last edition of Stieler's *Erdkunde*, it is given as 18,830 feet. Its internal activity of the central volcano had not then just below the summit of the mountain, where it is collected in the summer months by the people of Ask and Damawand and sold by them. Around the foot of Damawand rise numerous mineral springs, of which two in particular—one in the little town of Ask, the other somewhat further north on the Herâz (Herhaz)—enjoy a great reputation as baths. The majority deposit considerable sediment; for example Ask is built on such alluvium (Polak, *op. cit.*, ii, 229). The apricots grown in the valleys of Damawand are highly esteemed in Persia. (Polak, *op. cit.*, ii, 146).

Like the other giants of Eastern Asia, such as Ararat, Damawand was long regarded as inaccessible; this opinion, which was widely held, is found repeatedly in the Arab geographers, although one successful ascent is mentioned (see *'Ali b. Râzîn's statement in Kazwîn*, 159). Oliver (1798) was the first European traveller to visit the mountain, without however being able to reach the summit. The first complete climb was by W. Taylor Thomson in 1837; he was followed in 1843 by the botanist Th. Kotschy and in 1842 by the Austrian engineer Czarnotta. H. Brugsch and Baron Minutoli seem also to have reached the summit in 1860; (see Petermann's *Geographische Mitteilungen*, 1866, 437). In more recent years a number of further successful ascents have been undertaken by Napier and others, usually from Ask; cf. particularly Sven Hedin, *Der Damawand*, v, 436; *Der Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde*, Berlin, xix, 304-22.

In the ancient history of Persia Damawand is the scene of the legendary history of the Pêshêhûd and Kayân rulers. Even at the present day the people of Mâzandaran point out the different places which were the scenes of the wonderful deeds of Djamshîd, Faridûn, Sâm, Zâl, Rustam and other heroes immortalized in the *Shahname*. Damawand is also the abode of the fabulous bird Simurgh. From ancient times the prison of the cruel king Dabâkk (O. Iran. Dahâka, also Bêwarasp) has been located here. Faridûn (O. Iran. Orâetâna) is traditionally said to have shut him up in a cavern on the summit of this mountain, and here, in the belief of the local populace, the imprisoned tyrant lives to this day; the dull sounds which are periodically heard inside the mountain are thought to be his groans, and the vapour and smoke which escape from fissures and springs on the mountain-face are his breath. Obviously the volcanic properties of Damawand have been responsible for these legends. According to another story the demon Sakhr, imprisoned by Solomon, is also locked in Damawand. As the highest mountain in Persia, Damawand is thought by the Persians to be that on which Noah's Ark rested. On the wealth of Damawand legends cf. Yâkût, ii, 606, 610; Kazwîn; Melgunof, 22 ff.; Grünbaum in ZDMG, xxxi, 328-9.

Formerly on the slopes and in the valleys of Damawand there were many fortified places. Nowadays the most important place is the small town called Damawand after the mountain and situated on its south-western spur (according to de Morgan, 6425 feet above sea level). It is said to be very ancient, and according to Mustawfî was formerly called Pishâyân. The beautiful valley of Damawand, watered by two rivers and including ten villages as well as the town of Damawand, no longer belongs to Mâzandaran but to *'Irâq *'Adîjami. Because of its elevated situation the climate is very pleasant; for this reason the *Shâhs* of Persia used to delight in spending the summer in its valleys. The ultra-ashîrî sect of the *'Ali Ilahi
The name of Damawand appears in Persian and Arabic sources in a number of different forms: from the 3rd/9th century. Attached to this name, generally, contain discussions of the following items: i) philological aspects of the animal's name; ii) the anima names which are often at great length, all that pertains to the animals mentioned in any way whatsoever. In addition, he occasionally treated, but also a store house of Muslim folklore, described in prayers and vigils and performed the pilgrimage he stayed in Cairo until his death. He was buried in the Sufi graveyard beside the Djami of Al-Zahir, the madrasa of Ibn al-Bakari, the Kubba of Baybars II, etc., where he held lectures and delivered sermons and exhortations, apportioning his time in turn to the different institutions. A member of the Sufi community established in the Kānḳāh Saḥaḥīyya (previously known as Dār Sā'īd al-Su'ā'ādā), the maqṣūr al-Mubarak, iv, 102, Makrizī, Khiṣṭ, Būlāk 1270, ii, 415), he was celebrated for his ascetic life and credited with performing miracles. Although as a youth inclined to gluttony, he later made it a habit to fast almost continually, indulged in prayers and vigils and performed the pilgrimage six times between the years 762-799/1361-97. During his stay in Mecca and Medina he completed his education with several local scholars, held lectures and gave fatwās, and married twice. After his last pilgrimage he stayed in Cairo until his death. He was buried in the Sufi graveyard beside the Djami of Sā'īd al-Su'ā'ādā (cf. Al-Mubarak, iv, 102 ff.). Al-Damīrī's fame as an author rests on his Hayāt al-Hayāwān, a para-zoological encyclopedia, through which he became known both in the east and the west. He wrote it, as stated in the preface, not because of a natural disposition for such an undertaking, but in order to correct false notions about animals which were entertained even by the learned of his time. The work, completed in draft in 773/1371-2, is not only a compendium of Arabic zoology but also a store house of Muslim folklore, described in part in the researches of J. de Somogyi. The author did not restrict himself to the purely zoological aspect of his subject matter but also treated, often at great length, all that pertains to the animals mentioned in any way whatsoever. In addition, he made frequent digressions into other fields, the most remarkable of which is a survey of the history of the Caliphs (s.v. iswar), which occupies about the thirteenth part of the whole work.

The articles, arranged alphabetically according to the first letters—not the radicals—of the animal's name, generally contain discussions of the following items: i) philological aspects of the animal's name;
2) description of the animal and its habits; 3) mention of the animal in the literature; 5) proverbs bearing upon it; 6) medicinal and other properties (khawaṣṣ) of its different parts; 7) its meaning when occurring in dreams. The work contains 1069 articles but treats of a much smaller number of animals, real and imaginary (among them the Burād [q.v.]), since one and the same animal is frequently entered under different names. Being no professional naturalist, the author often entertained superstitious notions about nature with little attempt at criticism. He merely transmitted and rearranged traditional knowledge basing himself on hundreds of sources which have been analysed, though not quite satisfactorily, by J. de Somogyi. There are three recensions of the work—a long, a short and an intermediate one—of which the long one is available in at least 13 Oriental impressions, of which, however, he entitled [q.v.], extends only to the article (about three quarters of the whole) and is not quite satisfactory from the philological point of view.

Of al-Damiri's other writings only three are extant (see Brockelmann). His last work was a five volume commentary on the Sunan of Ibn Mādjda [q.v.], entitled al-Dībādīja, of which, however, he was not able to finish a clean copy before he died.


DAMNAT (Demnate, Demnat), a small Berber town situated on the edge of the Great Atlas in Morocco, 120 km. east of Marrakush, at an altitude of 960 m., on a small hill overlooking the fertile valley (barley, beans) of the Oued Tassawt, the slopes of which are covered with olive-trees and vines. The town is surrounded by a rectangular wall and includes a mollaah (Jewish quarter); in fact almost half the population, which stands at about 4,000, consists of Jews, whose numbers however are diminishing regularly. Local trade on a large scale in oil, leather and livestock is carried on at the market which is held on Sundays; in addition, tribes from the Atlas and Sahara used to bring their products (hides, wool, dates), bartering them for such manufactured goods as they needed. Demnat thus appears to have owed part of its prosperity to its situation on the route leading from Marrakush to Meknes and Fez in one direction, and to the Draa (Dar'a) and the Tafilalt in the other; but, without exception, the Arab geographers made no mention of it although its foundation certainly dates from ancient times. Leo Africanus appears to be the first to mention it, though he does not give the name of the town (according to a suggestion put forward by G. S. Colin, Adimmei which appears in Épaulard's trans. on p. 115 may be a mistake for Adimnatt) and only mentions a place named El Madina (trans. Épaulard, 130-1), the description of which does in fact correspond closely with that of Demnatt. Leo stressed the importance of the Jewish community and of the local leather-work; he also noted the lack of security on the roads, every merchant finding it necessary to maintain "an arquebusier or a crossbowman." For the rest, the history of the town is little more than a series of disturbances caused either by jealousy of the Jewish population's wealth, or by dynastic rivalries in which the town was the stake. During the 19th century Demnatt began to be of concern to the Western Powers who were obliged to intervene to protect the Jews from persecution by the authorities; as a result, on 17 Sha'bân 1304/11 May 1887, sultan Mawlay Hasan resolved to give them a separate mollaah, which they still occupy and which formed the subject of a monograph by F. Flamand, Un Mellah en pays berbère: Demnate (IHEM, Notes et Documents, x), Paris 1913 (see further, idem, Les communautés israélites au Sud-Morocain, Casablanca 1959). Some years earlier, however, Ch. de Foucauld who stayed at Demnatt on the 6th and 7th October 1883 was able to note (Reconnaissance du Maroc, Paris 1888, 77-8) that the Jews were treated with exceptional generosity by the Muslims with whom they lived "pellemeli." The two elements of the local population in fact lived together on good terms with each other; their long-standing association had given rise to affinities in practical matters, particularly in regard to the veneration of saints, even though one could not always tell if they were Muslim or Jewish or in fact if they had ever existed (see L. Voinot, Pêlerinages judéo-musulmans au Maroc (IHEM, Notes et Documents, iv), Paris 1945, 25 sqq., 60-1); 4 km. south-east of Demnatt there still exists a grotto known by the name of Imi n-Hift (opening of the grotto) where Jews and Muslims celebrate a pagan ritual at a miraculous spring (L. Voinot, op. cit., 27-8; E. Douxtt, Missions au Maroc: En tribu, Paris 1914, 216-17).

Seven years before the capture of Demnatt by Col. Mangin (1912), Said Boulifa stayed there and made a study of the Berber dialect of the Ahl Demnatt (Textes Berb., in dial. de l'Atlas marocain (Pub. École des Lettres d'Alger, [XXVI], Paris 1908-9); as a result the local dialects, which are important by reason of their situation at the edge of the two large groups in the South (taslih-bisit) and Centre (tamasghit), have been the subject of research carried out by E. Laoust (Étude sur le dialecte berbère des Nija, Paris 1918, and Mots et Choses Berbères—an ethnographical work—Paris 1920).

Leo Africanus noted that Demnatt possessed a number of legal experts, but the true Damnatt rarely figure in Arabic literature; however, we may note 'Ali b. Sulayman al-Dammatt, author of a commentary on the Sunan of Abî Dâwûd entitled Darajat mikbat al-'uwdî ila Sunan Abî Dâwûd, published in Cairo in 1928.

Bibliography: given in the article.

(Ch. Pellat)

AL-DAMURDASHI, 'Ahmad, Egyptian historian of the 12th/13th century. Nothing is known of his life beyond the fact that he held the post of hâkhûd of the 'Azâbân regiment in Cairo, but he may have been a relative of the family of Hasan Efendi al-Damurdashi, who flourished in the early 12th/17th century, and about whose doings he is well informed). His chronicle, al-Durra al-musûma fi aqâyîd al-hînâna, extends from the period 1099-1169/1688-1755. It reveals unfamiliarity with Arabic, and the sense is sometimes garbled or obscure. Nevertheless it is valuable, both as a detailed record of events in Cairo, and as perhaps the sole extant chronicle of Ottoman Egypt composed by a member of the military élite. There are considerable differences in phraseology, and even in the data, between the British Museum and Bodleian manuscripts: the former is unique among known copies in giving the name of the author. One recension of al-Durra seems to have been used as a source by al-Djabarti for his 'Adja'dî a-l-dâhk; for example, Djabarti's second legend of the origin of the Dhu-'l-Fâkriyya and Kâsimiya factions, and his list of the sandja'h boys at the beginning of the 11th century H. are closely paralleled in al-Durra: (Djabarti, i, 23-44; BM. Or. 1073, 5a-6b; Bodl. MS. Bruce 43, 2a-3a). (P. M. Holt)

DANAâm [see SIKKA].

DANANKIL, DANKILA [see DANANKIL].

DANCE [see RAKE].

AL-DAâmNî, 'Abû 'Amr 'Uthmân b. Sa'îd b. 'Umar al-Umawi, Mâlikî lawyer and above all, "reader" of the Kûrân, born at Cordova in 371/981. After having made his pilgrimage to Mecca and spent some time in Cairo between 397/1006 and 399/1008, he returned to his birthplace but was soon forced to flee, first to Almeria and finally to Denia (Dâniya, whence his nisba), where he settled down and died in 444/1053.

Among more than 120 works which he wrote and enumerated himself in an urjûqâ, only about ten are known (see Brockelmann, I, 407, S. 1, 719); two of them deal with questions of grammar, and the others with matters connected with the "readings," a science in which Abû 'Amr al-Dânî had become famous. His most celebrated works are the K. al-Muđâlî fî Ma'rîjat Rasm Maşûkî al-Amsâr (see S. de Sacy, Notices et Extraits, viii, 290) and al-Tâysîr fî 'l-Kirdâî al-Sâbî (ed. O. Pretzl, Istanbul
1930), which was the one most studied according to the evidence of Ibn Khaldun (Prolegomenes, ii, 456); al-Muhkam fi Naṣīḥ al-Maṣāḥīḥ has recently been edited in Damascus (1939/1960) by 'Uzzāt Ḥasan.

Bibliography: EI, s.v. al-Dani, by Moh. Ben Chenbeh; Dabbī, no. 1155; Ibn Bashkuwāl, no. 873; Ibn Khayr, Fahrara, index; Maḥkārī, Analektes, i, 550; Yāḥūt, ii, 540; Ibn Faḥrūn, Dibāḥa, Fez 1316, 191; Dibāḥa, Boğula, iii, 316; Suyūṭī, Tabākāt al-Boğula, xiv, 5; Freytag, Einleitung, 380; Bebb, Dibāḥa, v; Korābī, 197; Al-Maqrīzī, Fī tābīb. Ar. Sic. ii, 579; Pons Boygues, Eṣsayo, no. 92; Nöödeke, etc., Gesch. des Orāns, iii, 214 ff. (Ed.)

Dānishghā (see Dānimā').

Dānishmendīds, a Turcoman dynasty which reigned in northern Cappadocia from the last quarter of the 5th/11th century until 573/1178. The origins and first conquests of its founder, Ṭāhir Dānishmend, are obscure. Appearing in Cappadocia during the year of anarchy which followed the death, in 781/1085, of the Seljukīd Sulaymān b. Kutlumuş, he became involved in the events of the First Crusade. When historians became interested in him they resorted to legends or imagination to fill the gaps in their knowledge. But it was above all the epic romance of which he was the hero that gave rise to an imbroglio of historical facts which is difficult to unravel. The oral epic tradition about Dānishmend was put into writing for the first time in 643/1245 by Mawlānā Ibn ʿAlāʾ; this first romance, now lost, was rewritten in 761/1360 by ʿArīf ʿAlī. This romance which attributes to Dānishmend a legendary relationship with the famous epic heroes Abū Muslim and Sayyid Bāṭṭāl and which is conceived as a sequel to the Romance of Sayyid Bāṭṭāl, very soon gave rise to error through the fault of certain Ottoman historiographers who could not distinguish between historical truth and legend. The chief culprits were the historians of the 19th/6th century, ʿIlī and Dīnābāḏ who, by treating the romance as a historical document, mingled legendary elements with history in their works. These errors which were to be repeated by historians in succeeding centuries, Karamān, Kabīr Čelebi, Mūsā-īdīn-bāḏī, and others have been reproduced in the works of orientalists who made use of these sources. Those scholars who attempted to determine which parts of the story were, in their view, in disagreement with historical data often succeeded only in further confusing the facts. When Dānishmend appears in the historians' account of the First Crusade he is already master of Sebaste, the Iris Valley with Eudoxias (Tokat), Comana, Amasya, Neocaesarea where he resided, and Gangra; he controlled the route from Ankara to Caesarea, the towns of the Pontic coast paid him tribute, and his foraging parties laid waste the shores of the Black Sea, making incursions into Georgia and Armenia. Later he was to make a further conquest, Melitene, and it is in connexion with Kūlāḏī Arslan b. Sulaymān's expedition against this town in 490/1097 that Dānishmend is first mentioned in history. The sultan having laid siege to Melitene which was defended by the Armenian governor Gabriel, Dānishmend appeared on the scene and made peace between the opposing leaders. These events were interrupted by the capture of Nicaea by the Crusaders in 490/1097. In the summer of the same year Dānishmend, together with the other Turkish amirs, took part in the harassing attacks to which the Crusaders were to be subjected throughout their march across Anatolia. But soon afterwards an important occurrence was to bring him into prominence: in 494/1098, Ramazān b. ʿAlī, one of the most eminent of the Crusaders' leaders, Bohemund of Antioch, when going to the help of Melitene which was besieged by Dānishmend, fell into the hands of the amir who imprisoned him in the fortress of Neocaesarea. The following year the Franco-Lombard Crusade coming to the rescue of Bohemund took the Cappadocia route and was defeated by Dānishmend. In September of that year the amir took part in the massacre of the Crusade's last army, made up of contingents from Aquitaine and Bavaria, which was wiped out near Heraclea in Cappadocia. A year later, Dānishmend entered Melitene after a siege lasting for three years and, by his generosity, won the praise of a population made up of different races and creeds. In Şaḥbān 496/May 1103 the amir freed Bohemund with whom he had concluded an alliance against their common enemies, Byzantine and Seljuk. But the death of Dānishmend which took place in the year 497/1104 prevented Bohemund from reaping the benefits of this alliance and allowed Kūlāḏī Arslan to take part of his rival's territory, as well as the town of Melitene. Dānishmend's eldest son, Amir Ghażal, succeeded his father. Intervening in the dynamic struggles which divided the sons of Kūlāḏī Arslan, he was defeated in 510/1112 by his son-in-law Masʿūd. In 510/1112 he defeated the amir of Erzindan, Ibn Mengükjek, and his ally the duke of Trebizond; but he set free his prisoner Ibn Mengükjek who was also his son-in-law, an act which was a source of dissension between the allies. In 518/1123, on the death of Balak, Amir Ghażal recaptured Melitene. Intervening in the war then being waged between Masʿūd and his brother Malik 'Arab, prince of Ankara and Kašāmunu, he defeated the latter and in 521/1127 captured Caesarea and Ankara from him. 'Arab appealed for help to Byzantium, but Amir Ghażal also took Gangra and Kašāmunu and imposed his authority over Cappadocia. In 523/1129, on the death of the Armenian prince Thoros, Amir Ghażal intervened in Cilicia, in the following year defeated Bohemund II of Antioch, brought the Armenian prince Leon into subjection and ravaged the Count of Edessa's lands. He then had to turn against John Comnenus who in 527/1132 took Kašāmunu from him. Amir Ghażal who had given refuge to Isaac Comnenus, then revolted against his brother, and recaptured the town in the following year. In reward for his victories over the Christians the caliph al-Mustarshid and the sultan Šanḏar granted him the title of Malik, but when the envoys reached Melitene they found the amir on his deathbed and it was his son Muḥammad who was invested in his place, in 528/1134. John Comnenus at once resumed hostilities and, in 529/1135, recaptured Kašāmunu and Gangra, but these two towns fell once more into the hands of the Turks as soon as the Emperor had withdrawn. The reign of Malik Muḥammad is marked by a series of unsuccessful attempts by John Comnenus, in both Cilicia and the pontic region at different times, to recapture the strongholds which had been taken by the Dānishmendids, as well as by the amir's inroads into the territories of the count of Marash. In 536/1142, Malik Muḥammad died at Caesarea which he had rebuilt and where he had resided. It was his brother Yaghībāhān, governor of Sebastea, who proclaimed
himself amīr at the expense of his nephew Dhu l'-Nūn, and who married the dead man's widow. By thus usurping power, the new amīr caused the father-in-law of Mas'ūd and subsequently, with his brother-in-law Killiđ Arslan II. The emperor Manuel who had at first allied himself with the Saldjūkids as a means of preventing the Dānishmendids' incursions into Byzantine territory, in 553/1158 took Yaghbhāsān's side against Killiđ Arslan II and imposed his authority over Dhu l'-Nūn. The following year marks the opening of hostilities between Killiđ Arslan and Manuel, while at the same time war flared up between the rival dynasties as a result of Yaghbhāsān's abduction of Killiđ Arslan's fiancée, the daughter of the Śalṭukid amīr of Erzūrm, who was married to Dhu l'-Nūn. But the death of Yaghbhāsān in 559/1164 gave rise to dynastic quarrels which provided Killiđ Arslan with his opportunity to destroy the amīrate. Yaghbhāsān's widow married Dhu l'-Nūn's nephew Ismā'īl b. Killiđ Arslan, who then proclaimed him amīr. In order to protect the interests of Dhu l'-Nūn, against whom he was afterwards to turn, Killiđ Arslan invaded the Dānishmendids' territories. In 567/1172, as a result of a palace revolution during which Ismā'īl and his wife perished, Dhu l'-Nūn was called to Sebastea and proclaimed amīr. He was at once attacked by Killiđ Arslan, and appealed for help to his father-in-law Nūr al-Dīn, aābek of Damascus, whose intervention compelled Killiđ Arslan to hand back the territories he had taken from Dhu l'-Nūn. Nūr al-Dīn withdrew, leaving a relief garrison in Sebastea. But Nūr al-Dīn died in 569/1174 and Killiđ Arslan at once seized Sebastea, the Iris valley with Tokat and Comana, then Amasya, and proceeded to lay siege to Nāc, the eastern district of the province of Alicante, the most southerly of the three present-day provinces which were defeated, the Saldjūkids took possession of Nāc, and Dhu l'-Nūn's Dukrūr was put to death by poison on Killiđ Arslan's orders in 570/1175. In the surviving Melitene branch discord reigned among the three sons of Dhu l'-Kurnnayn b. ʿAyn ad-Dawla, who had died in 557/1164. The eldest, Nāṣr al-Dīn Muḥammad, was dethroned in 567/1170 in favour of his brother Fakhr ad-Dīn Kāsīn; but the latter, who was barely fifteen years old, was killed in a riding accident on his wedding day; and it was from the third brother, Afridūn, that Nasr al-Dīn Muhammad took back the town in 570/1175 and reigned for three years under Killiđ Arslan's suzerainty. But in 573/1176 the Saldjūkids occupied Melitene, and so came the end of the Dānishmendids. According to Ibn Bībī, Yaghbhāsān's three sons Muṣaffar al-Dīn Mahmūd, Zahrīr ad-Dīn Illī and Badr al-Dīn Yūsuf entered the Saldjūkids' service and helped Ghiyāṭ al-Dīn Mugeto, at first with the assistance of the learned Muṣaffar ad-Dīn Kaybghūraw I to regain his throne; in gratitude the monarch rewarded them by giving them important positions and restoring some of their possessions (cf. al-ʿAwdmir al-ʿAldHyye, Ankara 1956, 76 ff.).

Bibliography: Matthew of Edessa, Chronicle, trans. E. Dulaireur, Paris 1858; Michael the Syrian, Chronicle, trans. J. B. Chabot, iii; Anna Comnena, ed. B. Leib, iii, 18, 76, 200, 201, 210; Niketas Choniates, ed. Bonn, 27, 29, 46, 152, 159; Kinnamos, ed. Bonn, 14, 15, 16; Durand de S. Antonio, S. Martin or de la Nao), Denia was a Greek colony. Cato achieved a victory over the Spanish in the neighbourhood of this town before 195. The liberator of Spain, Sertorius, found his last point of support there, as well as a powerful naval base; according to the most likely evidence it was there that he was assassinated in 73. Caesar punished the town with Pompey (Danismendiler, in Atlas, II, 1956, 89-103; 1. Mėlikoff, La Geste de Melikh Danismend, i, Paris 1960 (see bibliography). (I. Mėlikoff) 
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DANIYA, Span. Denia, capitol of the north-eastern district of the province of Alicante, the most

southerly of the three present-day provinces which were occupied Melitene, and so came the end of the Dānishmendids. According to Ibn Bībī, Yaghbhāsān's three sons Muṣaffar al-Dīn Mahmūd, Zahrīr ad-Dīn Illī and Badr al-Dīn Yūsuf entered the Saldjūkids' service and helped Ghiyāṭ al-Dīn Mugeto, at first with the assistance of the learned Muṣaffar ad-Dīn Kaybghūraw I to regain his throne; in gratitude the monarch rewarded them by giving them important positions and restoring some of their possessions (cf. al-ʿAwdmir al-ʿAldHyye, Ankara 1956, 76 ff.).

Bibliography: Matthew of Edessa, Chronicle, trans. E. Dulaireur, Paris 1858; Michael the Syrian, Chronicle, trans. J. B. Chabot, iii; Anna Comnena, ed. B. Leib, iii, 18, 76, 200, 201, 210; Niketas Choniates, ed. Bonn, 27, 29, 46, 152, 159; Kinnamos, ed. Bonn, 14, 15, 16; Durand de S. Antonio, S. Martin or de la Nao), Denia was a Greek colony. Cato achieved a victory over the Spanish in the neighbourhood of this town before 195. The liberator of Spain, Sertorius, found his last point of support there, as well as a powerful naval base; according to the most likely evidence it was there that he was assassinated in 73. Caesar punished the town with Pompey (Danismendiler, in Atlas, II, 1956, 89-103; 1. Mėlikoff, La Geste de Melikh Danismend, i, Paris 1960 (see bibliography). (I. Mėlikoff)
was a distinguished commentator on the Kur'an. Denia was at that time one of the most important cities of the Levante and the country round it, where the fields were cultivated almost without interruption throughout the year, was very rich. The semi-insular kingdom of Denia played a very important part also as a naval base and in its dockyard was constructed the greater part of the fleet which Muhammad used for piracy and with which, after he had seized the Balearic Islands, he undertook his celebrated expedition to Sardinia (406/1015). His son, *Ali, called Ibn al-Athari, was taken prisoner by the Germans at the same time that his father was put to flight and pursued by the Christian coalition which retook the island. Ransomed after several years of captivity, he succeeded his father in 436/1044, and reigned for 32 years until 468/1076. Born of a Christian mother and brought up in captivity, he became a Muslim, but possessed none of his father's qualities. Dissolute, miserly and a coward, he confined himself to warring all he could out of his subjects, and his only undertaking consisted of sending a large ship full of food in 446 or 447 (1054-55) to Egypt, where famine was raging; it came back full of money and jewels. When his brother-in-law, al-Mukta'dar, wanted to enlarge his frontiers on the Denia side, *Ali was incapable of resisting him, and his subjects abandoned him, delivering the town up to al-Mukta'dar who sent *Ali to Saragossa where he died in 474/1081-2. Al-Mundhir succeeded his father, al-Mukta'dar, in the kingdom of Denia, and his son, Sulaymân, continued to rule under the suzerainty of the Banû Batr until 484/1091. In the same year the Moravians had just taken Almería, which they seized along with Murcia, Játiva and Denia, all of which fell later into power of the Almohads. In the spring of 599/1203, these last concentrated in the harbour of Denia a powerful squadron and landing party, who, on their way to attack the Banû Ghâniya [g.v.] at Majorca, put in at Ibiza and seized Palma in September of the same year. Denia was at that time governed by Muhammed b. Ishaq, who had succeeded his father Ishaq b. Ghâniya on the throne of Majorca but had been deposed by his brothers because of his adhesion to the qanûr [q.v.]. He was recommended him strongly in his will. In 641/1244, Denia was finally taken from the Muslims by James I of Aragon (Don Jaime el Conquistador), and one of his captains, the German Carroz, undertook the redivision of its lands. In 726/1325, it was given to the Infante, Don Pedro, whose descendants, the royal dukes of Gandia, ruled the County from 1356 up to the time that the Catholic Kings made it a Marquisate. In 1560, it lost most of its population through the expulsion of the industrious Moors by Philip III, and from that time on was of no importance. However, in the War of the Spanish Succession, Denia, whose harbour was fortified, fought stubbornly on the side of the Archduke, was besieged three times by Philip V, and taken in 1708. In 1812-3 it was occupied by the French.

The most famous Arab scholar of Denia is the great commentator on the Kur'an, al-Dâni [q.v.]. Abu 'Amr Uthmân b. Sa'îd.


Apocalyptic revelations are attributed to Daniel the Elder, it being suggested that a book recording such predictions was found in the coffin supposed to contain the remains of Dâniyâl (whoever he might be) which was brought to light at the time of the Muslim conquest of Tustar, and buried again with the body at the command of Caliph 'Umâr; according to a legend told by al-Birûnî, Dâniyâl acquired his knowledge in the Treasure Cave; Muslim sources moreover hand down, besides a garbled version of chapter xi, some authentic quotations from the Book of Daniel. Perhaps it is this Daniel whom the K. al-Tâdînân (70) places on the same footing as Lukmân [g.v.] and Ibn 'Kar- nayn [g.v.]; three characters considered by some as prophets not apostles or simply as just but not inspired men.

Other traditions treat as two characters the Daniel of the destruction of the first Temple in Jerusalem and the Christian Babylon: an elder Daniel and a son of the same name; the former, son of the Judaean king Jehoiakim, the latter becoming an uncle to Cyrus by marriage (a garbled reference to the marriage of Ahasuerus and the Jewess Esther; moreover, another tradition has Ahasuerus converted to Judaism by Mordecai and taught by Daniel and his three companions).

Muslim tradition has retained, somewhat distorted, episodes related in the Book of Daniel: the presence of Daniel and his companions in the court of Buhlgh- Naṣṣar [g.v.];—Nebuchadnezzar; Nebuchadnezzar's dreams; the friction between Daniel and his detractors (here presented as Magi) and his miraculous delivery from the lions' den; Belshazzar's feast and the deciphering of the mysterious writing. Nebuchadnezzer's being driven temporarily to dwell with the beasts of the field is also to be found here and al-Tha'lâbî is even able to narrate the king's death in a version forming one of the numerous variants of the folk theme used by Schiller in his ballad *Der Gang nach dem Eisenhammer* (see Stith-Thompson, *Myth-Index*, K. 1612, iv, 414). The character of Daniel is also introduced in the framework of stories which in the Bible centre round Ezra and Nehemiah: Ahasuerus did not allow Daniel and his three companions to return to the Holy Land, but
he permitted Daniel, a great judge and a viceroy throughout his reign, to take from the royal treasure all that Nebuchadnezzar had taken from Jerusalem and restore it to the Jews.


DĀNĪYĀL, called Sultan Dānīyāl in the histories, the youngest and favourite son of the Mughal emperor Akbar, born Adjmer 2 Dīnārādī 979/22 September 1571. In 1608/19 he was appointed military governor of the Deccan, and after his conquest of the city of Ahmadnagar (1009/1601) he was honoured by Akbar and given the province of Khāndēgh, fancifully named Dānīyāl after him. He is described as well-built, good-looking, fond of horses, and skillful in the composition of Hindūstānī poems. He figures in Abu ‘l-Fadl’s lists of the grandees of Khandesh, fancifully named Dandesh after him. He died of delirium tremens at Burhanpur on 9 Dhu ‘l-Hijja 1013/28 April 1605.

Bibliography: see AKBAR.

DANKALI, plural Danakil, a tribe occupying the western Red Sea coast from the neighbourhood of Zālā (39° 15' E, 15° 10' N) to French Somaliland, and spreading inland over territory of extreme heat and desolation to the foot of the main escarpment of Ethiopia—that of a relatively small ruling caste divided between 1303/1885 and 1372/1952 between Eritrean (that is, Italian and British) and Ethiopian rule, the people had at no time—or have now no remaining claims of political unity or any more cohesion than can be based on common language, religion, and living-conditions; the only potentate commanding more than sub-tribal or group prestige has been the Sultan of Asssa, resident at Sardo. The Danakil in 1934 numbered probably about 50,000 to 80,000 souls.

The Danakil language, also called 'Afar, can be placed as a dialect of the lower-Kushite branch of the Southern Hamitic group. It is close to the Saho language (of the plateau-dwelling tribes west and south of Zālā), and has links with the Somali dialects.

Bibliography: M. Nesbitt, La Danakial esplorata, Florence 1930; O. Dante, La Danakia Selenitranoue, Asmara 1909; A. Pollera, Le Popolazioni indigene dell’Eritrea, Bologna 1935; British Military Administration of Eritrea (per S. F. Nadel), Races and Tribes of Eritrea, Asmara 1943; D. Buxton, Travels in Ethiopia, London 1949. (S. H. Longrigg)

DĀR, a Persian word meaning “door” or “gate”, found in many Iranian and Turkic languages. It is synonymous with Arabic bāb and is used similarly, e.g., dar-e Tabriz, dar-e Erbil, dar-e India dar-bār (darbar). In a special sense it refers to the ruler’s court, or in extension, to a government bureau, already in pre-Islamic Iran. In Pahlavi it was usually written with the heterograft BB’. (R. N. Frye)

DĀR, (dwelling place), house. The two words most commonly used to designate a dwelling place, bayt and dār, have, etymologically, quite different meanings. Bayt is, properly speaking, the covered shelter where one may spend the night; dār (from dārā, to surround) is a space surrounded by walls, buildings, or nomadic tents, placed more or less in a circle. Dārām is the tribal encampment known in North Africa as the dwuur. From the earliest times there has been in Muslim dwellings a tendency to arrange around a central space: the park, where the shepherd’s flock will be sheltered from the blows of enemies; the courtyard, where the non-nomadic family will live cut off from inquisitive strangers. The first house which Islam, in its infancy, offers for our consideration, is that built by Muḥammad, on his arrival in Medina, as a dwelling place for himself and his family, and as a meeting place for believers. The courtyard surrounded by walls is its essential feature. A shelter from the sun, intended to protect the faithful at prayer, runs alongside the wall on one side. Rooms built along another side were occupied by the Prophet’s wives and were added to as a result of his subsequent unions.

Tradition brings us an interesting detail on the subject of these rooms. Their entrance on to the courtyard was fronted by a porch of palm branches which could be shut off, if required, by curtains of camel-hair. This front annex of the room, which recalls the rūṣāb, the movable screen of the nomadic tent, which keeps the dwelling in touch with the outside world, and plays the part of a vestibule, was to be perpetuated in the Muslim house.

This arrangement, of a central open space, surrounded by habitable rooms, certainly does not belong exclusively to the Arab world. This disposition is also characteristic of the nomad homes, with its atri um, and the Hellenic house with its peristyle; it must have been adopted very early by
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the Mediterranean countries. But this type of
domestic architecture seems to offer an ideal frame-
work for the
rigorous symmetry of the rooms which surround
them. Five rooms exhibit flat-based ledges cut into-
rich, presents a most sober external appearence—
offer the builder a rich and varied aesthetic theme,
on the other hand the Muslim dwelling, however
one which
even more clearly from the climatic conditions which
affect the majority of Muslim countries. The latter,
as is well known, almost all occupy a long east-west
region in which rain is rare, the sun fierce, and the
heat of summer intense. The scarcity of rain and the
steppe-like arid character of these countries make
water, be it pool or fountain, a much appreciated
element of comfort and adornment—one which
plays its part in the decoration of palaces as well as
in more modest dwellings. The fierce sun and hot
summer motivate the arrangement of underground
recesses such as the sarādb (sing. sarādb) of ʿIrāk
and Persia, or the buildings of rooms which are well
ventilated but lit only by a subdued light, such as
the iwān. The iwān is a room enclosed by three walls,
opening out in the whole width of the fourth side,
as an enormous gaping flat-based ledge, and is
generally roofed by a cradle-vault (semi-cylindrical).
Open to the space of the courtyard, it recalls the
risāk of the Arab tent; it can act as a reception
room and is not without similarity to the proostas
of the ʿAbbasid, which it resembles in its genuine
Iranian creation. In the Parthian palace of Hatra
(2nd. century A.D.) it is revealed in all its majesty.
It was to become a characteristic theme of the
architecture of the Sāsānids. The most famous
example is the Tāb-i Kislār, the palace of Ctesiphon,
built by Ḵirosaw Anūshirwān (531-579 A.D.). The
Mesopotamian architects working for the ʿAbbasids
were to make the iwān one of the essential elements
of their monumental compositions. The palace of
Ctesiphon clearly inspired the builder who created,
in 227/836, the great iwān of the palace of al-Muʿtaṣīm
at Sāmān [q.v.]. It is to be found on a smaller scale
in 147/764 in the palace of Ṣuyyūḥ; this princely
dwelling exhibits courtyards surrounded by buildings.
In two of the courts, two iwāns open out face to face,
each preceded by a gallery, along the whole width of
the courtyard. This symmetrical arrangement, with
two wide galleries facing each other and the iwāns
opening out in the far wall, used according to the
season—summer and winter—and has been perpetuated
in the houses of modern ʿIrāk. The gallery, or wide
room, giving on to the courtyard through three bays,
is called a türām; the türām is flanked by two small
rooms (called ʿada) which re-establish the rectangular
scheme. However, by the 3rd/9th century this
architectural idea (wide ante-room, deep iwān with
lateral rooms whose doors open on the ante-room)
moved towards the West and began to reach the
Mediterranean world. In some houses of al-Pusṭāl
(old Cairo) generally attributed to the ʿAbbāsids, the
türām plays an important role. The courtyard, which
one reaches by one of the corners, is framed by
walls, and the four sides contain türāns, some deep,
others shallow and rather like wide, flat-based
ledges. On one of the sides there is an ante-room with
three bays, and at its far end we find a central türām
and the two flanking rooms. The arrangement of the
wide ante-room and the türām forms a characteris-
tic T shape. These Tulūnid dwellings, built in
brick like the monuments of the period, comprise
several storeys. They were provided with a system
of conduits which brought fresh water and carried
away dirty water. Their courtyards were decorated
with pools and plants. In two houses, a fountain is
built into one of the rooms and the water is channeled
into the courtyard pool. In the rooms of rectangular
shape, the short sides of the rectangle and the long
wall facing the entrance are often cut into by level
ledges, a sort of atrophied türān, where seats could
be placed.
Before following up the westward migration of
these elements of domestic architecture shown by the
Tulūnīd houses, it seems worthwhile to indicate
how they have changed on the spot, and what can
be found of them, modified by Turkish influence, in
the modern dwellings of Egypt. The courtyard is
still an important element in these dwellings, but it
is no longer in the centre of the building. It stands
in front of them, accessible by a curved corridor.
The visitor can be received here, in a low room
(takhlahbāgh), opening out widely on the ground
floor, or in a loggia (mašʿād) which stands above it
and dominates the courtyard. If the visitor is
entering the interior of the house, he will be received
in the selāmilḵh. Its principal element is a large room
(mandara) whose central part, a substitute for the
courtyard, is paved, adorned with a fountain and
surrounded by two or three türāns—or rather,
lwāns, as the word has come to be used in local
parlance. These lwāns, raised above floor level, are
furnished with carpets and divans. The šarīm is
completely separate from the selāmilḵ and is acces-
sible by a door opening onto the courtyard and by
a staircase. The ḳāṭaʾ, its principal room, is not
dissimilar to the mandara, for here, too, one finds
a central space and lateral extensions. But it is dif-
ferent, and derives more evidently from the ancient
courtyard, for the walls surrounding the central
space rise to the level of the terraces, and carry a
lantern which lights the interior.

The dwelling with the central courtyard, with
the characteristics inherited from the Iranian
tradition being adapted to the domestic theme of
the Roman world, spread early across the Medi-
terranean countries of Islam. Evidences of this expan-
sion have been found in archaeological researches in
recent years. Excavations lately undertaken at
Ṣabra-Mansūriyya, the town founded in 335/947 by
the Fāṭimid al-Mansūr at the gates of al-Kayrawān,
have revealed a palace with walls of clay once
decorated with ceramic marquetry. Here we find
the arrangement of the wide ante-room and the deep
lwān with two rooms alongside. From the same
period, or possibly a little earlier, the castle of the
Ṣanḥāḏīl Amir Ziri at ʿAshš, dated about 324/935,
is interesting for the use of courtyards and for
the rigorous symmetry of the rooms which surround
them. Five rooms exhibit flat-based ledges cut into
DAR — DAR-I AHANIN

the wall facing the entrance; these inner recesses are fronted on the outside by rectangular fore-parts.

About a hundred years later, at Ṣanḥāḏa in the Berber territory, the palaces of the Ka‘fa‘ of the Banū Ḥadid were being constructed. Three of these royal dwellings have been excavated. Dār al-bahr, the largest, owes its traditional name to the sheet of water which entirely occupied a large courtyard. Above the huge pool were the state rooms. A second courtyard was surrounded by buildings presumably for domestic use; storerooms for provisions and a bath intended for guests. The flat-based ledges, probably derived from the ʿaiwan which certainly was already well known to Sassanid architects, give variety to the interior construction of the rooms. In another Ḥammādīd palace, the Ksar al-Mandār, castle of the Fanāl, the four sides of a central room, once no doubt roofed by a cupola, are hollowed out in this fashion: a similar cruciform plan is seen in Palermo in the pavilion of the Zīza, built by the Norman kings (Twelfth Century). One of these ledges contains a fountain whose water flows in a canal across the room as in Tulunid houses in al-Fustat, already mentioned.

The survival of the Asiatic elements taken over by domestic architecture in North Africa can be seen in Sedrata, a town in the Sahara founded by the Khārijī Berbers south of Ouargla, which was inhabited from the tenth to the twelfth centuries. Houses recovered from the sand contain rooms giving on to multiple courtyards. In addition to buildings provided with storerooms for provisions, the house includes state-rooms richly decorated with plaster sculptures, sometimes roofed by a cradle-vault which joins two half-cupolas on shell-shaped corbels. Some of the rooms are preceded by galleries opening, as at al-Fustat, by three bays onto the courtyard. The room follows the T-plan, consisting of a wide shallow room, and the ʿaiwan in the wall facing the entrance. The two ends of the wide room each show a raised couch framed by an overhanging arch.

We do not know when and how this type of house, with its combination of Persian and ʿIrākī elements, reached Muslim Spain and the Maghrib. Many fashion designers from Bagdād or from Sāmarrā were imported by the Western Caliphs, especially in the 3rd/9th century, and made a mark in Andalusia. Perhaps in this way we can explain certain of the architectural elements revealed by the Castilejo of Murcia, attributed to Ibn Mardanīsh (541-66/1147-1171). Here we find wide rooms, at the end of which there is a narrow room preceded by a fore-part. The inner rectangular courtyard is designed in the manner of a garden divided by two paths intersecting at the centre—a characteristic Persian theme. Two overhanging pavilions on the shorter sides of the rectangle mark the position of the paths. This type of dwelling, transplanted into Muslim Spain, takes on an incomparable beauty and amplitude in the Alhambra, the palace of the Nasrid kings of Granada. It is known that the principal buildings of this royal habitation, the work of Yusuf I (735-55/1335-1354) and of Muḥammad V (755-93/1354-1391) are arranged around two rectangular patios. One of them (Patio de los Liones) is divided by two paths in the shape of a cross, dominated by two overhanging pavilions on the shorter sides of the rectangle, as at the Castilejo of Murcia. Water plays an important part in the décor of these courtyards, filling the pool of Alberca and playing over the ʿaiwan of the Lions. Galleries and wide ante-rooms opening on to the court-yards lead to state-rooms, such as the splendid Ambassadors’ Room which is in the Comares tower, the outstanding feature of the enclosure. The wide rooms have, at each end, a recess, a lateral ʿaiwan, bounded by an overhanging arch, as in the houses of Sedrata.

This theme of garden-courts, with fountains, and crossing paths, which certainly seems to have come from Irāk, must have reached Magrib even in the Middle Ages. It survives in the charming ʿiryadās, the interior gardens found in Fez and Marrakesh. The Algerian house, especially in Algiers itself, is quite different. The vestibule (ṣabīla), very long, and bordered by seats, leads on through a curved corridor, or by a staircase, into the courtyard. The latter is enclosed by the columns and horseshoe arches of four galleries; a fountain plays in the centre. The rooms beneath the galleries, on the ground floor or on the upper storeys, are very wide and rather shallow, the limited height being necessitated by the weak bearing of the ceiling beams. Opposite the door is a recess containing a divan. In this we can see a degenerate form of the ʿaiwan, whose movements we have traced from ʿIrāk. In Algiers, this median recess has a fore-part supported by arms set at an angle into the façade. This, there can be little doubt, is an eastern fashion, imported by the Turkish masters of the town. In the villas of the suburbs, the less restricted space makes this overhang unnecessary; the fore-part rises from ground-level. On the upper storey, it develops into a sort of small salon, a belvedere with windows on the three sides, and frequently surmounts the entrance porch. The Tunisian house is a little different, the rectangular court-yard having galleries only on the two shorter sides. The principal rooms follow the T-plan, with the wide room (bayt), the deep laqūn (kkhāl), and the two small rooms alongside, (maḥṣura, plu. maḳāsir).


DÅR-I AHANIN. Persian “the iron gate”, also called Derbendi-ī Ahānīn. The Arabic form is Bāb- al-Ḥadid, old Turkish Tāmīr qapî. A name used for various passes in the eastern Islamic world. The most famous pass called dar-i āhanin, is the pass in Māwarā al-Nahr (Transoxiana), in the Baysuntau Mountain Range near the modern village of Derbent located on the old road between Samarqand and Tirmidh.

Perhaps the earliest mention of this “Iron Gate” is in the account of the Chinese pilgrim Hsian Tsang who went through the pass in 630 (570 D.). He described it briefly. The first mention of this
pass under its Persian name is in al-Yaqubi, Caldun, 290, 5. In later times this pass was considered the boundary between Mā warā the Nahr and the lands dependent on Balkh. The pass is frequently mentioned in Islamic literature, but the first European to visit the site was Clavijo who passed here in 1404 and mentioned a customs house from which Timur received revenue. The pass is mentioned by Sharaf al-Dīn Yazdī, al-Mawardi, ed. M. Ilahday, Calcutta, 1887, 1, 49, and the Bādburnāma, ed. Bevideger, 124, under the Mongolian name qa'ūla (in Arabic script kalhalgh). The pass is also mentioned by Buqdhālshī, later a governor of the pass, is first mentioned by Muḥ. Wafā Karmāngh, Taḥfīlat al-Khānī (unpublished, in the former Asiatic Museum, London, f. 184), in the description of a campaign by Muḥ. Rāḥfī Khān in 1171/1172. A road runs through the pass today but it is no longer of any importance.


DĀR AL-AHĐ, "the Land of the Covenant", was considered as a temporary and often intermediate territory between the Dār al-Islām [q.v.] and the Dār al-Harb [q.v.] by some Muslim jurists (see Al-Shāfi`ī, Kāmil al-Umm, Cairo 1932, iv, 103-104; Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd, Kītūb al-Khurādī, trans. A. ben Shenemah, Leiden 1958, 58). Al-Mawardi (Kītūb al-Khākām al-Sulṭāniyya, trans. E. Fagnan, Algiers 1915, 291) states that of the lands which pass into the Dār al-Islām, there can be no other territory other than the Dār al-Islām and the Dār al-Harb. If people in such a land break the agreement they are to be considered as rebels.

But, there existed, even in early Islam, a type of tributary lands which could be considered as part of the Dār al-Islām, and there can be no other territory than the Dār al-Islām and the Dār al-Harb. If people in such a land break the agreement they are to be considered as rebels.

Abū Ḥanīfah, however, holds the opinion that such a land can be considered only as part of the Dār al-Islām, and there can be no other territory than the Dār al-Islām and the Dār al-Harb. If people in such a land break the agreement they are to be considered as rebels.

More precise information on the conditions affecting such lands is provided by the examples in Ottoman history. In the ʿahdīnāmes granted by the Ottoman sultans to the tributary Christian princes (see Fr. Kraelitz, Osmanischen Urkunden in türkischer Schrift, Vienna 1899, 12-426; Fr. Babinger, Beitrag zur Frühgesch. der Türkennerrschaft in Rumelien, Munich 1944, 21; Feridūn, Munšaḵāʾ al-Salṭānī, ii, Istanbul 1926, 351-380) we find that such submission and the payment of a yearly tribute (kharadī) by the Christian prince, with the request of peace and security on the one hand and the Sultan's grant of ṣāḥī wa amin [q.v.] on the other, are the essential points for the conclusion of an ʿahd. It is absolutely an act of grant on the part of the Sultan. In the ʿahdīnāmes it is often stipulated that the tributary prince is to be 'the enemy of the enemies of the Sultan and the friend of his friends'. Besides these, further conditions were usually imposed, such as the sending of hostages to pay homage in person to the Sultan every year, and the provision of troops for his expeditions. In his ʿahdīnāme the Sultan promises by oath peace, protection against the internal and external enemies of the prince, of the respect, of the religion, laws and customs of the country (cf. Feridūn, ii, 355), no colonization of Muslim people there, and no interference by Ottoman officials in internal affairs. A ḡāf-i-khāhābi of the prince represents him at the Court. His people could freely enter and trade in Ottoman territory. Following Ḥanafī opinion, the Ottoman Sultan considered them as his own kharadī-paying subjects and the land as his own land (cf. Kraelitz, 57, doc. 7); Feridūn, ii, 358). If the circumstances changed, the Sultan could increase the amount of the tribute. If the prince failed to fulfill any of his obligations toward the Sultan, he would declare him a rebel and his land Dār al-harb. If the Sultan saw fit, he could bring the land under his direct rule. But the first step in expanding the Dār al-Islām was usually to impose a yearly tribute. Most of the Ottoman conquests were achieved through it (cf. İnci, Ottoman Methods of Conquest, in Stud. Isl., ii, 193). See also DĀR AL-ṢULṭĀN.

lished his residence in Casablanca, Sultan Mawlay Sulayman closed the port to commerce in 1794, and summoned back to Rabat the Christian traders who had set up business there. It was not reopened until 1830. 

European traders began to return from 1840 onwards, and the influx was particularly great in 1852. The first ones were representatives of French manufacturers in Lodève. They were sent in quest of raw wool, in an attempt to free themselves of dependence on the English market. They were followed by English traders from Gibraltar, by Germans, Portuguese, and French Asians. 

The port's traffic (imports plus exports valued at 14 million gold-francs) exceeded that of Tangier.

Following the loan of 1904 and the Conference of Algiers in 1906, French officials took over control of the Casablanca customs post, and a French company undertook improvements to the port facilities. These events constituted a threat to the Şa'wiyah tribe which inhabited the surrounding countryside, and on 30 July 1907 they attacked and killed some European workers in a quarry outside the city walls. The intervention of a French warship provoked the sacking of the city, during which the Jewish quarter suffered particularly severely. The French replied by a bombardment on August 5th, and two days later 2000 troops under the command of General Drude were sent ashore from a French squadron. Spain also sent a squadron of assault troops. The French expeditionary force gradually occupied the whole of the Şa'wiyah territory by driving back the warlike tribes, and the train of events ended with the establishment of the French Protectorate in 1912. 

As a result of the decision of its first Resident General, Lyautey, to make it the principal port of Morocco, the city underwent an enormous expansion. No doubt the decision would have been very different if Casablanca had not already known considerable economic prosperity. This arose in part from the presence of a sizeable European colony, in part from the need to supply material to the Expeditionary Force. The modern port is completely man-made. It has 4,870 m. of deep-water quays, and is protected from the open sea by a breakwater 3,180 m. long by the European vice-consul in Casablanca, and a French customs post, and a French warship killed some European workers in a quarry outside the city walls. The intervention of a French warship provoked the sacking of the city, during which the Jewish quarter suffered particularly severely. The French replied by a bombardment on August 5th, and two days later 2000 troops under the command of General Drude were sent ashore from a French squadron. Spain also sent a squadron of assault troops. The French expeditionary force gradually occupied the whole of the Şa'wiyah territory by driving back the warlike tribes, and the train of events ended with the establishment of the French Protectorate in 1912.

As a result of the decision of its first Resident General, Lyautey, to make it the principal port of Morocco, the city underwent an enormous expansion. No doubt the decision would have been very different if Casablanca had not already known considerable economic prosperity. This arose in part from the presence of a sizeable European colony, in part from the need to supply material to the Expeditionary Force. The modern port is completely man-made. It has 4,870 m. of deep-water quays, and is protected from the open sea by a breakwater 3,180 m. long. In 1956 it registered 81½ million tons of traffic.

The census of 1952 showed a population of 680,000 (to be compared with 20,000 in 1907): 472,920 Muslims, 74,783 Jews (more than a third of the total Jewish population in Morocco), and 132,719 foreigners (of whom 99,000 were French).

The old city consisted of 3 districts: Medina (middle-class), Taqer (working-class, not entirely built-up), and Mdâhid (Jewish). Today the whole area, its walls still in part intact, is called Old Medina, and to the W. and S.W. it has extended beyond the walls. The whole of the Jewish population lives there, mingled with the Muslims. The European districts have grown up around Old Medina, particularly to the E. and S., and further Muslim districts have been built outside these, the principal one being an immense area of 200,000 inhabitants, New Medina. The shanty-towns on the outskirts of the city, to which countryfolk fled in search of work, have now been largely replaced by working-class dwellings, constituting quarters such as Muḥammadīyya to the E. (formerly the 'Central Quarters'), Sidi 'Uṯmān to the S. (formerly Ben Mīlī), and Ḥasanīyya to the N. and N.E. (al-Ǧādir). The S.W. The main centre of industry is in the N.E. along the road to Rabat. It contains the headquarters of most of the country's light industries, and is the most important industrial region in Morocco.


DAR AL-DARB, the mint, was an indispensable institution in the life of mediaeval Middle Eastern society because of the highly developed monetary character of its economy, particularly during the early centuries of Muslim domination. The primary function of the mint was to supply coins for the needs of government and of the general public. At times of monetary reforms the mints served also as a place where obliterated coins could be exchanged for the new issues. The large quantities of precious metals which were stored in the mints helped to make them serve as ancillary treasuries.

Soon after their conquest of the Middle East, the Arabs made use of the mints inherited from the former Byzantine and Sasanid regimes. It was only during the Umayyad period that the Muslim administration began to interfere with the minting organization. This was manifested in the setting up of new mints (e.g., Kūfa, Wāṣit) by al-Hādiḍi, in the famous coinage reform of ʿAbd al-Malik [see DINAR], and in the centralizing measures of Hīṣām who drastically reduced the number of mints. The policy of Hīṣām, obviously influenced by Byzantine minting traditions, could not be maintained for long by the ʿAbbasid caliphate. During the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd the office of nāṣir al-sikha (inspector of coinage) was set up. Although by this measure the caliphate relinquished its direct authority over the mints in favour of a subordinate agency, it still defended the principle of a centralized minting system. But this office seems to have disappeared with the shrinking of the political and administrative authority of the ʿAbbasids. The increased number of mints whose operations were necessitated by rapidly expanding trade and industrial activities, and the rise of many petty rulers asserting their control over these mints, led to a complete decentralization of minting, a situation closely resembling that which existed under the Sasanids.

The assumption of control over the mints was one of the elements indicating the assertion of independent power by rulers. It was symbolized by the inclusion of their names in the inscriptions on the issues of their mints, hitherto an exclusive pre-
rogative of the caliphs. By this measure, also, they declared themselves responsible for the quality of their coinage. To safeguard the integrity of the coinage and consequently the interests of the general public, the mints were submitted to the legal authorities (e.g., hādi al-buṭūd in Fātimid Egypt and Syria, and a hādi in 11th century Baghdad) whose agents personally assisted at the minting processes. In spite of this system, the confidence of the general public was abused by the rulers who exploited their mint prerogatives by illegal monetary speculations. The usual method was to declare the coins in circulation invalid, and order their exchange against the new, secretly debased issues, obtainable in the official mints.

The staff of the mint consisted of clerical and manual employees. The former were in charge of book-keeping and of internal security. The manual workers, such as the subhakān (melters) and darrābān (minters), carried out the actual coining operations. A special position among the craftsmen was occupied by the nakkāsh (die-sinker) whose professional activities were restricted to engraving only.

Coins issued by Muslim mints were struck of gold, silver and copper (see dinār, dihram, fals). Precious metals for coining consisted of bullion which was supplied by the official authorities as well as by private customers. The latter delivered also obliterat coins and ‘foreign’ coins which were prohibited on local markets. A prescribed percentage of such deliveries was retained by the mint as a coining levy. The money cashed from the customers was spent on the wages of the minters, on the costs connected with minting operations, as well as on a special government tax. During the period of flourishing trade activities which entailed intensive minting operations, the proceeds from the mints yielded a substantial income to the government.

But the economic regression of the late Middle Ages drastically diminished the demand for coinage, with detrimental effects on the position of the mints and the profits derived from them. It then became practicable to farm out the mints, an expedient resorted to, for instance, by Mamluk Egypt.


Ottoman period. — The Ottoman mint is generally known as *Darbkhāne-i Şâmîre* but also *darrbhān*, nubrākhān, and dār-al-darb. The first coin from an Ottoman mint was an *âbre* [g.pr.] struck in Bursa probably in 727/1326-7 (cf. I. H. Uzuncarşılı, *Belleten* xxxiv, 207-221). On the *âbres* and *manglars*, copper coins, of Murād I and Bayâzîd I no place-name is found (H. Edhem, *Meskîhâ-i Oltamyiyya*, Istanbul 1334, nos. 1-58), but we know that under his sons there were mints in Bursa, Amasya, Edirne, Sivas and Ayasuluğ (Ephesus) (see H. Edhem, nos. 59-138).


In their expanding empire the Ottomans established new mints in the commercially and administratively important cities and in the centres of gold and silver mines. Thus, under Bayazîd II, new mints were established in Ankara, Karatova (Kratovo), Kastamonu, Gelîbullu (Gallipoli) in addition to those in Istanbul, Bursa, Edirne, Sivas, Ayasuluğ, Novarberda, Novobrod, Üsküb (Skopje), Amasya, Tire and Rûsiyya, which existed already under Mehmed II. Under Süleyman I, gold coins were struck in his name in Aleppo, Damascus, Misr (Cairo), Amid, Baghdad and Algiers. In Şâîhâl 953/October 1546 a new mint was established in Djjandja, a small town to the north of Erzînджân, when rich silver and gold mines were found there. The mints in Morava (Gilan), Novaberda, Sidrekapsa and Serebnica (Srebrenica) owed their existence to the rich silver and gold mines (see R. Anhegger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bergbaus im osmanischen Reich*, in BSOAS, xiv, 1953, 231-242). The Ottoman laws required that all bullion produced in the country or imported from abroad be brought directly to the *darbkhânes* to be coined. Also upon the issue of a new *âbre* those possessing the old were to bring it to the mint. The special agents, yaṣâk-kulüs, were authorized to inspect any person for bullion or old *âbre* (see Belleten, xxiv, 669, doc. 2, and Anhegger-Inalcik, *Kânannâme*, no. 2, 5, 58) and the gold or silver was exempted from the customs duties. The state levied a duty of one fifth on all silver coined at the *darbkhâne* which corresponded to the difference between the real and face values of the *âbre* (Belleten, xxiv, 679 and Anhegger-Inalcik, no. 58).

As a *mukâfa* [g.v.], this revenue was usually farmed out at auction to the highest bidder. The contractor, *şâmil*, was to pay it in regular instalments to the public treasury (see Anhegger-Inalcik, no. 15). Spandugino (ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1896, 57) tells us that each new issue of *âbre* under Mehmed II brought a revenue of 800 thousand gold ducats. The *mukâfa* of the Bursa *âbre* mint alone amounted to 6000 ducats in 892/1487 (see Belleten, xxii, 56). All the mints in the empire could be farmed out as one single *mukâfa* (Anhegger-Inalcik, no. 13). But an *şâmil* in turn could farm out at his own responsibility the local *darbkhânes* to others. The *şâmil* employed *emins* and *wehbîs* to assist him. Though he was responsible for the revenue of the mint its actual operation and control were in the hands of the employees appointed by the state, namely an *emin* or *neșir* who had its supervision (Anhegger-Inalcik, no. 13), a *şâhî-i *âsîr* who was the director and in this capacity responsible for all the technical and legal requirements (Anhegger-Inalcik, no. 14).
and, Ewliyâ Celebî, Seydîhatnâme, x, 135) and an ustdd or usta who supervised the actual minting processes. Under him the technicians and workers were divided into several groups, the kâleddns who prepared the standard ingots by melting the metal, the kehleddns or kelleddns who made them into the sikke-zens or sikke-kâns who, under strict supervision, prepared the steel plates to be minted and the didebdns, sikke-zens or sikke-kiâns who made them into the didebdns, sikke-kâns.

Minting was arranged on the basis of newbet, a system that at each turn 13065 dirhams [g.v.] of silver were delivered from the capital out of which 3000 were placed in the khaçine, treasury, and 10,000 were delivered to the ustdd to be minted, 65 dirhams were accepted as the legal metal.

The general supervision of the darbkhdнане and of its accounts was the responsibility of the local kâdi who kept there his own emîn (Anhegger-Inalcik, no. 13). It was the kâdi’s duty periodically to see the accounts and send the balance sheets, muhasâbât-i darbk hd ne, to the central government (a deler of the muhasâbât-i darbk hd ne-i Bursa of the first half of the 10/16th century is now in Belediye Kütüphanesi, Istanbul, Cevdet yazm. no. 0.59).

In the berâts given to the âtimls and emîns it was made clear how much they should pay for the bullion purchased and how many coins should be minted from each bullion, and all this reflected the monetary policy of the state.

Until 865/1460 out of each 100 dirhams of silver 265 or 278 âble were struck, but it was 355 or 400 âble under Mehmed II, 500 under Süleyman I and 1000 in 995/1588. The original Ottoman monetary system based on âble was disrupted from this time on (for the causes, see Bellast, lx, 656-664). The spoiled and adulterated (ûday and ârûb) âbles invaded the market. The renewed attempts to put right the quality and value of it, the so called tâşıhid-i sikke, failed (see M. Belin, Essais sur l’his. économique de la Turquie, Paris 1883, 118 ff.; I. Ghalîb, Tabwumî Mesâkkâh-i Oltâmîyânî, Istanbul 1307, 220-226). In 1010/1601 the use of bad and old âble was prohibited once more and the rate of sağh (“good”) âble was raised to 120 ûday and 2 ârûb. In the following period the Ottoman mints showed little activity and many of them were closed down. In the 11th/17th century only were the mints of Istanbul, Cairo, Baghdâd, Tripoli, Tunis and Algiers steadily active. The main reason for this situation was that Europeans, realizing the big profit to be made from the differences in price of silver, began increasingly to import their silver coins in the Levant (in 1614 the French alone imported 7 million écus). First rêydâls, Spanish reales, then in the 17th/18th century arslân, esedi or aber kalb gurûş, Dutch Lowen riksdaler, and the hany-gurûş, German thalers, invaded the Levantine markets. The import of these coins was free of duty, but the mark sağh had to be struck on them in the Ottoman darbk hd ne as a condition of free circulation, because Europeans were increasingly importing counterfeit coins especially struck for the Levant. In 1010/1601 one gold coin was rated officially at 400, and one gurûş (piaster) at 160, âble (Başbuğâlet Arşivi, Fekete tashî, no. 3043).

Eventually the gurûş was made the Ottoman monetary unit, as the âble became too small in value as a result of the continual devaluations and devaluations, and the abundance and cheapness of the commercial silver. The first Ottoman gurûş of 6 dirhams of silver was struck in imitation of the German thaler in 1099/1688 (see I. Ghalîb, 237, 254). It was rated 4 para (pâre), which was struck first under Murâd IV. Pieces of half a gurûş, nişîfiye, and a quarter of a gurûş for gold and others at Tawuhan-taftî in Istanbul and in Bosna-Saray for copper coins in 1100/1691.

The new system opened a new era in the history of the Ottoman coinage. The âble ceased to be the basic unit, though it was struck until 1234/1819; special care was then taken to improve the quality of the coins struck (see I. Ghalîb, 230). New darbk hd ne were opened in Edirne, Izmir (Smyrna) and Erzurum for gold and others at Tawuhan-taftî in Istanbul and in Bosna-Saray for copper coins in 1100/1691. New machines and techniques were adopted (Râşid, Ta’rikh, Istanbul 1282, ii, 443). During the same period, for better control, the provincial darbk hd ne were again closed down. In 1312/1720 the silver coins struck were the gurûş of 8 dirhams and 12 kârs, the solota of 6 dirhams and 10 kârs, the para of 2-3 1/4 kârs and the âble of 3/4-1 3/4 kârs in weight. The gurûş and solota contained 60% pure silver (I. Ghalîb, 280).

As the Ottoman government always considered minting as a source of revenue to meet its financial difficulties, the value of the silver coin subject to adulteration, and all attempts at reforms (tâşıhid-i sikke), failed (I. Ghalîb, 303, 327, 407; A. Dewedt, Ta’rikh, iv, Istanbul 1275, 122; v, Ist. 1278, 289).

The situation became most confusing under Mahmiid II, and, eventually under ‘Abd al-Megjid, by the firman dated 26 Safar 1250/29 April 1840, Western principles of monetary policy were accepted as a guide by the government (see the text in S. Soûf, Usâlî Mesâkkâh-i Oltâmîyânî ve edînegiîyânî, Istanbul 1311, 76-114). Enlarged by the new buildings, the darbk hd ne-i âmir was completely modernized by the machines and specialists brought from England (see H. Ferid, Nâkî ve 5 tartîb-i mîlî, Mesâkkâh, Istanbul 1333, 215-222). In 1259/1643 new gold and silver coins known as Medjîdi were struck (see I. Ghalîb, 422).


India. — The earliest coins of Muslim rulers to circulate in India—disregarding the insignificant issues from the early Arab kingdom of Sind in the rst/8th century—were the bilingual lankas struck at Lahore by Mumûd of Ghazni in 418/1027 and 419/1028; after Lahore became the residence of the Ghaznawid princes small billion coins were occasionally struck there, but nothing is known of the mints they employed. Murîzî al-Dîn Muham- mad b. Sâm struck coin at Lahore, Dîhil and
'Parashawar' (Peshawar) as well as at Ghazni and, after the conquest of Kanawdj (q.v.) in 930/1523, there also; these coinages were assimilated in weight series as well as in design to the existing coinages of north India, and included gold money—a convenient way of using the proceeds of plunder and war booty to maintain the local currency and simultaneously proclaim the victor's success. Muhammad b. Sām's lieutenant Yldız struck coin in his own and his master's joint names, small dānnās as well as large dānnās assimilated to the local billon currency, first at Kārmān, including also some gold and silver, and later in billon only at Dihli. The outline of the Cawhnān horseman was retained in the designs, frequently also the Kārmān bull of Shīva, which seems to indicate that Hindu craftsmanship were still employed in the production of coin. Up to the death of Muhammad b. Sām no gold or silver money had been struck in India, with the exception of the Kanawdji gold pieces. Silver appears to have been coined first by Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish; silver lānksas of an original weight of 175 grs. His reign clearly brought a time of experimentation for his mint, for the weights and designs of his early coins are very diverse; by 632/1234 a stable design for the silver coinage seems to have been reached, which was taken as a model for his later gold coinage. Bills of exchange were issued by the mint, remained the most frequent currency, supplemented by smaller coin in copper. The silver struck up to this time was very impure. His mint, for the weights and designs of his early coins clearly brought a time of experimentation for his successor, his-ed Din's successor, Ala al-Dīn; his ed-Dīn's Dihli coinage was 10.5 parts in 12.

There also; these coinages were assimilated in weight series as well as in design to the existing coinages of north India, and included gold money—a convenient way of using the proceeds of plunder and war booty to maintain the local currency and simultaneously proclaim the victor's success. Muhammad b. Sām's lieutenant Yldız struck coin in his own and his master's joint names, small dānnās as well as large dānnās assimilated to the local billon currency, first at Kārmān, including also some gold and silver, and later in billon only at Dihli. The outline of the Cawhnān horseman was retained in the designs, frequently also the Kārmān bull of Shīva, which seems to indicate that Hindu craftsmanship were still employed in the production of coin. Up to the death of Muhammad b. Sām no gold or silver money had been struck in India, with the exception of the Kanawdji gold pieces. Silver appears to have been coined first by Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish; silver lānksas of an original weight of 175 grs. His reign clearly brought a time of experimentation for his mint, for the weights and designs of his early coins are very diverse; by 632/1234 a stable design for the silver coinage seems to have been reached, which was taken as a model for his later gold coinage. Bills of exchange were issued by the mint, remained the most frequent currency, supplemented by smaller coin in copper. The silver struck up to this time was very impure. His mint, for the weights and designs of his early coins clearly brought a time of experimentation for his successor, his-ed Din's successor, Ala al-Dīn; his ed-Dīn's Dihli coinage was 10.5 parts in 12.

In the reign of 'Alī al-Dīn Muhammad Shāh, 695-715/1295-1315, the expense of the army caused him to contemplate reducing the silver lānka from 175 to 140 grs.; but gold lānka remained at the nominal 175 grs., often crudely struck, and the gold huns of his southern conquests seem to have been re-struck as camp currency, with no attempt to bring them up to the standard of the northern mints: their average fineness is described in the A'in-i Akbari, i, 5, as 8.5 parts in 12, whereas 'Alī al-Dīn's Dihli coinage was 10.5 parts in 12. Devagiri now appears as a mint-town, including a gold issue in 714/1314-5. 'Alī al-Dīn's successor Kūṭb al-Dīn Mubarak Shāh, 716-20/1316-20 struck at 'Kutbabad' (= Dihli?) new square silver and gold pieces of standard weight, also square copper pieces of 66 and 33 grs.

Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluk continued the Dihli series almost unchanged, and also struck coin on his expedition to Bengal in 724/1324; but his son, Muhammad b. Tughluk, has been called a "prince of moneymen": his numismatic types are characterized by novelty of form and variety of weight as well as by perfection of execution. Gold coin was struck at Devagiri, later renamed Dawlatbad (q.v.), and at Sultānapur (= Warangal), up to the 200 grs. dīnār; the Dihli coinage was much subdivided: the lānka was reckoned at 64 kānis, and coins of 1, 2, 6, 8, 12, 16 and the full 64 kānis are known. The kānis was further divided into 4 copper fals. Besides this system there was a partial decimal system of 25, 50 and 100 kānis: the 50-kānis piece, called 'adāli, of 140 grs. silver, replaces the silver lānka as the largest silver piece of the coinage; the new dīnār exchanged at 8 old silver lānksas or 10 'adālis, a fictitious rate in terms of the relative values of gold and silver. The complete scheme of the sub-divisional currency was later conflated to mix silver and copper in arbitrary multiples to produce coins of similar size but different intrinsic values; this brought in the 'black lānka', containing only 16.4 grs. silver, valued at one-eighth of the old silver lānka. According to Abu l-Fadl (A'in-i Akbari, i, 7, s.v. Darrāb) the metal was cast into round ingots and cut by hand; since the black lānka was of the same size as the silver lānka, the same dies could be—and were—used for both, thus speeding and easing the work of the mint workmen. The uniform small size of the dies required less labour in the striking and resulted in increased efficiency of the mint.

In 731/1331-2 appeared Muhammad b. Tughluk's 'forced currency' - the new black tokens nominally valued at one 'adāli; the experiment failed owing to inadequate precautions against forgery. Tokens were turned out in thousands by local artisans, but after three years all were called in and redeemed. The whole operation thus became virtually a temporary loan from the sultan's subjects which was repaid at a swingeing rate of interest. The issues reverted to normal after this, except for some gold and silver coins of 741-3/1340-3, struck in the name of the Egyptian caliphs.

Firuz Shāh Tughluk, 752-90/1351-88, continued the 175 gr. gold lānka, but not its silver counterpart. Gold coin became more plentiful, thus relieving silver of its earlier responsibility, and mints concentrated on fractional issues, including small pieces in mixed silver and copper; assays of the 140 gr. pieces show 17.85 or 24 gr. of pure silver. The later Tughlukid sultans, and the Shāhī sultans of Dīawnpur, followed the Firuzian tradition with little change.

After the sack of Dihli by Timūr the mints were in decline. Gold largely disappeared, thanks to Timūr's depredations, and the Sayyid Khizr Khān struck coin in the names of Firuz and other of his predecessors, (but not in Timūr's name, as Ferishta asserts), using the original dies.

In the Deccan, mints were first established under the Bahmanīs (q.v.); before these were set up at Aḥsanābād-Gulbarga and elsewhere, goldsmiths and dealers in bullion had been authorized to make money without reference to a royal stamp, and the currency was protected by the guild of craftsmen. Interesting among the later Deccan coinages are the silver lārin, 'fish-hook' money, struck by 'Alī II of Bijāpur, which became a standard Indian Ocean trading currency in the 10th/16th century (see G. P. Taylor, On the Bijapur lārin or lārin, JASB, NS vi, 1920, 687-9).

The Mughals. Bābur's reign, 932-7/1526-30, was virtually a military occupation, and Humāyūn's was hardly a period of stability; this is reflected in their coinage, which seems to have been struck irregularly and to follow Central Asian patterns and a Central Asian system, probably depending on imported workmen. Both struck silver adalis at Agra,
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Geography and inhabitants.
Dar Fur was one of the chain of Muslim states
composing bilād al-Sudān. Its eastern neighbour was
Kordofān, from which it was separated by a tract of
sand-hills. To the west lay Waddāl. The Libyan
desert formed a natural boundary on the north,
while the marshes of the Baḥr al-Ghāzāl (q.v.) marked
the southern limits. Dar Fur comprises
three main zones: a northern zone, the steppe fringe
of the Sahara, providing grazing for camel-owning
tribes but little cultivation; a central zone (14° 30' N
to 12° N) with rainfall ranging from 12" to 25" (in the mountains), a country of settler cultivators;
a southern zone of heavy rainfall (25'-35')
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company, and Shāh 'Alām's coinage with wreaths of
roses, shamrocks and thistles, commemorating Lord
Lake's entry into Delhi in 1863, shows a very
extravagant imitation of the French coinage.
The Mughal coinage in general shows great
diversity of mints—well over 200 are known—and
a constant search for variation. The inscriptions
could vary for each month of the year; for some
years Dājāngūr struck round and square rupees
in alternate months, and later varied the month
names by zodiacal signs. Emblems appear on the
coins from the time of Humāyūn; sometimes these
appear to have marked a change of mint-masters,
sometimes they were distinctive mint-marks.
That the practice of the later Mughal mints was
substantially the same as that recorded by Abu l- Faḍl
is shown by the Ḥidāyat al-bawā'id of 1126/1714-5
which records the current mint rules (quoted by
W. Irvine, Mint rules in 1126 A.H., in Proc. ASB.,
1898, 149-52) and prescribes a differential revenue
to be exacted from Muslim and Hindu merchants:
the latter when specially appointed (makhudānān ki
mubarrari bāghand) pay less than the Muslim rate of
1/4, on average, 1/5 per cent more.
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and the western bidâd al-Suddân. The route to Kordofân and the east was a pilgrimage road, although some pilgrims preferred the long route through Egypt. Besides such articles as ivory and ostrich feathers, Dar Fûr exported slaves, obtained from the pagan lands to the south. Many of these were sold to the Beylik of Deyrûl-Zafra, to the south. The construction completed in 1911, of a railway linking El Obeid (al-Ubayyid) in Kordofân with Khartoum and Port Sudan, followed by the annexation of Dar Fûr in 1916, ended the importance of the old routes to the north. The capital was finally settled in 1206/1791 at its present site of El Fasher (al-Fashir [q.v.]).

The discrepancies in the traditional genealogies of the Kayra were noticed by al-Tunusi, Nachtigal and Shukayr. These genealogies are more or less associated with folk-heroes, the chief of whom are Bush ibn Muhammad Fadl and Shukayr, an intelligence official of the Condominium, whose principal informant was Shaykh al-Tayyib, (d. 1902), formerly smâîm to sultan Ibrâhîm.


Traditions of the early sultanate. In the absence of any native chronicle, we are dependent for information on foreign observers. Of these, the most important are the Tunisian Arab, Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Tûnusi, whose visit of eight years began in 1218/1803; the German, Gustav Nachtigal, who was in Dâr Fûr in 1894; the Austrian, Rudolf v. Slatin, governor 1881-3; and the Lebanese, Na'âm Shukayr, an intelligence official of the Condominium, whose principal informant was Shaykh al-Tayyib, (d. 1902), formerly smâîm to sultan Ibrâhîm.

The discrepancies in the traditional genealogies of the Kayra were noticed by al-Tunusi, Nachtigal and Shukayr. These genealogies are more or less sophisticated attempts to schematize traditions associated with folk-heroes, the chief of whom are Ahmad al-Ma'kûr, Dâlî, and Sulaymân Solong (i.e., "the Arab"). The many variants of tradition cannot be detailed here. Ahmad al-Ma'kûr, an Arab of Tunis, of Hilâl or 'Abbâsîd descent, is represented as the ancestor of the Tundjur rulers who preceded the Kayra, or as the link (by marriage) between Tundjur and Kayra. His son (or more remote descendant), Dâlî, was the organizer and legislator of the Furawi state. A descendant of Dâlî, Sulaymân Solong, usually described as the son of an Arab woman, is credited with the introduction of Islam, and is the first of the historical rulers. Ahmad al-Ma'kûr may represent a genuine memory of Arab intermixture with the Tundjur (or Fûr) or may be a late invention to antedate the coming of the Arab element. The epithet al-Ma'kûr, "the Lame" is probably the arabicization of a non-Arab name: it is explained in Slatin and Shukayr by an obvious legend. Dâlî (or Dalî Bafr) may have been an historical individual, or may embody the traditions of the Kayra rulers before the coming of Islam. Sulaymân Solong, a warrior and administrator, is Dâlî's Muslim counterpart and may have absorbed traditions originally connected with him. Sulaymân was probably not the founder of the Kayra dynasty, but simply the first Muslim ruler. The claims that the royal clan was descended from the Banû Hilâl or the 'Abbâsîs are sophistications, reflecting North African and Nilotic Sudanese influences respectively. The two claims are, of course, incompatible. There is more verisimilitude in a tradition that the Kayra, together with the Musabba'ât and the ruling house of Waddal, were descended from the Faṣâra. This
is in harmony with the tradition that Sulaymân’s conquests were achieved in alliance with the nomad Arabs.

While Sulaymân may have begun the introduction of Islam into Dâr Fûr, the full islamization of the region was a slow process. The persistence of non-Islamic customs into the 19th and 20th centuries is noted by all observers. The religious teachers (fâhî for fâhî; jukarâ is invariably used as the plural), came mainly from the western bîlât al-Sudân, and from the Nilotic region, both areas where the Malikî school predominates. Little is recorded of the sultans who immediately followed Sulaymân: his second successor, Ahmad Bakr, is remembered as the father of many sons, five of whom were sultans after him. The traditions of both Dâr Fûr and Waddâl preserve the recollection of a series of wars between the two sultanates, beginning in the time of Ahmad Bakr and continuing until Muhammad Tayrâb, early in his reign, made peace with sultan Djawdâ of Waddâl. Both ‘Umar and Abu ‘l-Kâsim are said to have been killed in these wars, in which the advantage generally lay with Waddâl.

The later sultanate.

Fuller traditions begin with the reign of Muhammad Tayrâb, who died only 16 years before the visit of al-Tûnûsu. He is represented as luxury-loving and pacific, but his reign ended in war against sultan Hâshim, the Musábbârîw ruler of Kordofân. The pretext for hostilities was found in Hâshim’s aggression against the eastern frontier of Dâr Fûr, but al-Tûnûsu suggests that Tayrâb’s real motive was to secure the succession for his son, Ishâk, at the expense of the surviving sons of Ahmad Bakr. Ishâk, entitled al-khâlijî, “the successor”, was left as regent in the capital, while the sultan’s brothers and ministers accompanied Tayrâb on campaign. Hâshim was expelled from Kordofân and sought refuge with the Fundjî sultan of Sinnâr, while the Fûrawî army occupied his dominions. The legend that Tayrâb advanced as far as Omdurmân (Umm Durnâm) and defeated an ‘Abdalâlî army is not mentioned by al-Tûnûsu or Nachtigal, and is a later elaboration, probably of the Mahdist period. Tayrâb died at Bâra in Kordofân, poisoned, it is said, by his grandees.

Tayrâb’s death was followed by a succession struggle between the partisans of Ishâk and those of the sons of Ahmad Bakr. The latter finally chose as their sultan the posthumous son of Ahmad Bakr, ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Rashîd, a pious and scholarly youth. His election was brought about by Muhammad Kurra, a eunuch of the late ruler, whom ‘Abd al-Rahmân appointed as his chief minister. Kurra succeeded by a pretender, Muhammad Abu Madyan, a son of sultan ‘Abd al-Rahmân. Muhammad ‘Ali Paşâ, who claimed Dâr Fûr by virtue of a farman of sultan ‘Abd al-Màqîd (13 February 1841; see J. C. Hurewitz, Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, New York, 1956, i, 120), supported Abû Madyan, and an expedition was prepared. The project was abandoned on the death of the ambitious bàkînmâr of the Egyptian Sudan, Ahmad Paşâ Abû Widân, in Ramadan 1259/Sept.-Oct. 1844. Relations between Hûsuyan and the viceroyes Saîd and Ismâ’îl were friendly. In the later years of Hûsuyan’s reign, his sight failed, and affairs were directed by his sister, the iya basî Zamzam.

His successor, sultan ‘Ibrahim, soon became involved in hostilities over the Rizaykât with al-Zubayr Rahmân Manşûr, the Sudanese merchant-prince who controlled the western Bahr al-Ghazál. Al-Zubayr invaded Dâr Fûr from the south, in collusion with the bàkînmâr Ismîlî Paşâ Ayyûb, who brought a force from the east. ‘Ibrahim was defeated by al-Zubayr, and killed at the battle of Manawâshl on 24 Oct. 1874. Dâr Fûr was annexed to the Egyptian Sudan.

The Khedivial and Mahdist Periods.

Fûr resistance, based on Dj. Marra, continued under a series of shadow-sultans. The first, Hasan Allâh b. Muhammad Faḍl, surrendered to al-Zubayr in 1879, and was sent, with a large number of Fûrawî princes and notables, to Egypt. His brother and successor, Bûsh, raised an alarming revolt, but was killed by al-Zubayr’s son, Sulaymân. A further revolt, in 1877, against newly imposed taxation, found a leader in Hârûn, a grandson of Muhammad Faḍl. He besieged El Fasher, the provincial capital, but was driven back to Dj. Marra, and was killed in 1880 by al-Nûr Bey Muhammad ‘Aŋkâra, subsequently a Mahdist officer. Another grandson of Muhammad Faḍl, ‘Abd Allâh Dûd Bandjîa, next assumed the sultanate in Dj. Marra.

The outbreak of the Mahdist revolution in 1881 produced a critical situation in Dâr Fûr, since many of the Mahdist sympathizers with the Mahdi, like them a riverain Sudanese, while both the Fûr and the Rizaykât wished to throw off khedivial rule. After the Mahdi’s capture of El Obeid and defeat of the Hicks expedition (January and November 1883), Slatin, the Austrian governor, was isolated, and he surrendered in December to Muhammad Bey Khâlid, formerly sub-governor of Dûr, whom the Mahdi had appointed as his agent in Dâr Fûr.

‘Abd al-Rahmân’s young son, Muhammad Faḍl, was installed as sultan by Muhammad Kurra in 1215/1800-1, but a rift grew between the ruler and his minister, and Kurra was killed in Radjâb 1219/Nov.-Oct. 1804. Faḍl’s long reign was a period of declining power. An expedition sent by Muhammad ‘Ali Paşâ of Egypt, under his son-in-law, the daftârdar Muhammad Bey Khâsurw, defeated the Fürwî viceroy of Kordofân, the màhûmûn Musallâm, at Bàrâ in 1821, and annexed the province. Revolt in the Nile valley, however, defelected the daftârdar from the conquest of Dâr Fûr. Muhammad ‘Ali ‘Abd al-Kârim Sàbûn, the sultan of Waddâl, devastated the vassal state of Dûr Tâma and laid it under tribute. Faḍl assisted a brother of Sàbûn to obtain the throne of Waddâl after his death, but failed to establish a protectorate. The Bûkûkàra, especially the Rizaykât, also gave much trouble.

Faḍl’s successor, Muhammad Hûsuyan, was threatened by a pretender, Muhammad Abû Madyan, a son of sultan ‘Abd al-Rahmân. Muhammad ‘Ali Paşâ, who claimed Dâr Fûr by virtue of a farman of sultan ‘Abd al-Màqîd (13 February 1841; see J. C. Hurewitz, Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, New York, 1956, i, 120), supported Abû Madyan, and an expedition was prepared. The project was abandoned on the death of the ambitious bàkînmâr of the Egyptian Sudan, Ahmad Paşâ Abû Widân, in Ramadan 1259/Sept.-Oct. 1844. Relations between Hûsuyan and the viceroyes Saîd and Ismâ’îl were friendly. In the later years of Hûsuyan’s reign, his sight failed, and affairs were directed by his sister, the iya basî Zamzam.

His successor, sultan ‘Ibrahim, soon became involved in hostilities over the Rizaykât with al-Zubayr Rahmân Manşûr, the Sudanese merchant-prince who controlled the western Bahr al-Ghazál. Al-Zubayr invaded Dâr Fûr from the south, in collusion with the bàkînmâr Ismîlî Paşâ Ayyûb, who brought a force from the east. ‘Ibrahim was defeated by al-Zubayr, and killed at the battle of Manawâshl on 24 Oct. 1874. Dâr Fûr was annexed to the Egyptian Sudan.

The Khedivial and Mahdist Periods.

Fûr resistance, based on Dj. Marra, continued under a series of shadow-sultans. The first, Hasan Allâh b. Muhammad Faḍl, surrendered to al-Zubayr, and was sent, with a large number of Fûrawî princes and notables, to Egypt. His brother and successor, Bûsh, raised an alarming revolt, but was killed by al-Zubayr’s son, Sulaymân. A further revolt, in 1877, against newly imposed taxation, found a leader in Hârûn, a grandson of Muhammad Faḍl. He besieged El Fasher, the provincial capital, but was driven back to Dj. Marra, and was killed in 1880 by al-Nûr Bey Muhammad ‘Aŋkâra, subsequently a Mahdist officer. Another grandson of Muhammad Faḍl, ‘Abd Allâh Dûd Bandjîa, next assumed the sultanate in Dj. Marra.

The outbreak of the Mahdist revolution in 1881 produced a critical situation in Dâr Fûr, since many of the Mahdist sympathizers with the Mahdi, like them a riverain Sudanese, while both the Fûr and the Rizaykât wished to throw off khedivial rule. After the Mahdi’s capture of El Obeid and defeat of the Hicks expedition (January and November 1883), Slatin, the Austrian governor, was isolated, and he surrendered in December to Muhammad Bey Khâlid, formerly sub-governor of Dûr, whom the Mahdi had appointed as his agent in Dâr Fûr.
In 1884, a Mahdist force captured Dûd Bandâja, who subsequently became a Mahdist officer. After the Mahdi's death in 1885, Muḥammad Khalîd contested a plot with the Aḥrâf (the Mahdi's relatives), to oust the new sovereign, the Khalîfa, ʿAbd Allâh b. Muḥammad [quoted]. He marched on Omdurman with considerable forces, but was intercepted and arrested at Bâra (April 1886). He had left to govern Dâr Fûr a son of sultan Ibrâhîm named Yûsus, who in 1887 revived the sultanate. A force under ʿUmmân Ādâm, the governor of Kordofân, defeated and killed Yûsus early in 1888. ʿUmmân Ādâm now assumed the governorship of Dâr Fûr also.

A few months later, Mahdist authority in Dâr Fûr crumbled, in consequence of a revolt, originating in Dâr Tâma under a messianic ḥâkîm, Abû Dûmmayyâ. He was joined by the shadow-sultan of the Fûr, Abu ʿl-Khayrât (a brother of Yûsus b. Ibrâhîm) with his supporters. The Mahdist forces were heavily defeated in two battles, but Abû Dûmmayyâ died of smallpox and his followers were routed outside El Fisher (February 1889). Abu ʿl-Khayrât fled to Di. Marra, where he was killed by his slaves in 1891. ʿUmmân Ādâm re-established his authority in the province, especially over the Baḫƙâra, who had supported the Mahdiya against the khedivial administration, but were now resentful of Mahdist control. The Khalîfa's tribal policy, executed by ʿUmmân Ādâm, rested on three bases: the substitution of new nominees for the hereditary chiefs, the enforced migration (ḥidjâra) of tribes to Omdurman, and the exploitation of tribal rivalries. The great migration of the Taṭîsha, the Khalîfa's own tribe, was set on foot by ʿUmmân Ādâm in 1888, and had important consequences for the Mahdist state.

ʿUmmân Ādâm died in 1891, and was succeeded as governor by Muḥammad Ḥâmid, like himself a relative of the Khalîfa. In 1894, a Belgian expedition from the Congo reached the southern fringe of the province and concluded a treaty with the chief of the Farîḫî tribe, but withdrew shortly afterwards, (see A. Abel, Traduction de documents arabes concernant le Bahr-el-Ghazal, in Bull. de l'Académie royale des Sciences coloniales, xxv/5, Brussels, 1892, 1385-1409). In 1896, Muḥammad was recalled to Omdurman, to command the forces sent against the Anglo-Egyptian invasion.

The reign of ʿAlî Dinâr and subsequent history. When the Mahdist state fell in 1898, ʿAlî Dinâr, a grandson of Muḥammad Fadîl, who had had a chequered career in the Mahdia (see A fragment from Alî Dînar, in Sudan notes and records; xxvii/1, 1953, 114-6), seized El Fisher and installed himself as sultan. Nominally a vassal of the Condominium government in Khartoum, he long imitated as success the Khalîfa's policy of excluding Europeans from his dominions. He was challenged by a survivor of the Mahdist régime, Sanîn Hûsâyn, who had held Kaṣkâbiyyâ since ʿUmmân Ādâm's time and now assembled a force of tribes north of the Kordofân province. Sanîn was not finally defeated until 1908. Like his predecessors, ʿAlî Dinâr had difficulty in asserting his authority, on the one hand over the Baḫƙâra, on the other, over the buffer states between Dâr Fûr and Waddâl. This western frontier problem became more serious with the French occupation of Waddâl in 1909. The French, while accepting Dâr Fûr proper as within the British sphere of influence, wished to occupy the buffer states. Although the British, through the Condominium government, vigorously supported Fûrîwîlî claims, the sultan, after prolonged hostilities, succeeded only in holding Dâr al-Masâlît. Finding himself pressed by the extension of French power, and exasperated by a series of local grievances against the Condominium government, ʿAlî Dinâr was sympathetic to the Ottomans in the First World War. On the pretext of forestalling an attack from Dâr Fûr, the Condominium government sent a force against him. The sultan's army was defeated near El Fisher on 21 May 1916. and he himself was killed on 6 November.

The removal of ʿAlî Dinâr, was followed by a settlement of the western frontier with the French. The final compromise in 1919 allowed Dâr Fûr to retain Dâr Kûmr and two-thirds of Dâr al-Masâlît, part of which had been ceded by its ruler to the French in 1912. The delimitation of the boundary was completed in 1924. The pacification of Dâr Fûr did not prove difficult, although there was a belated rising under a messianic ḥâkîm at Nyala in 1921. As a consequence of its late annexation, Dâr Fûr did not share in the early phase of development of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan: it remained an isolated and backward province until the last years of the Condominium. The opening-up of air communications from 1947, the development of schools, and the construction of a railway line through southern Kordofân to Nyala (completed in April 1959) are indicative of the fuller integration of Dâr Fûr in the modern Sudan.

Administrative history.

The administrative system under the Kayra sultans was described by al-Tûnûsî and, more systematically, by Nachtigal. It had few Islamic features. Almost all the titles were Fûrîwîlî, not Arabic; the chief exception being the sultan's personal representatives (mâdâdûm, pl. mabâdâm), who were usually appointed for a term of years and exercised overriding powers in their provinces. The royal women (sing., mayâm) held a dignified position; the queen-mother was the second person in the realm, but more real power was possessed by the queen-mother and the sultan's sister. Slaves and eunuchs played an important rôle: the chief minister, who was also ex officio governor of the eastern province, was a eunuch. The powers of this functionary were reduced after the death of the kingmaker, Muḥammad Kurra. A tradition that sultan Abu ʿl-Kâsim was desertected in battle by his relatives because of his inclination to the blacks probably marks an increase in the military rôle of the ruler's slave-household at the expense of the free clansmen.

A reorganization of the slave-army was carried out by sultan Muḥammad Hûsâyn, who equipped his troops with firearms. Besides the slave-soldiers, the forces included warriors summoned at need to the black; probably marks an increase in the military rôle of the ruler's slave-household at the expense of the free clansmen. A reorganization of the slave-army was carried out by sultan Muḥammad Hûsâyn, who equipped his troops with firearms. Besides the slave-soldiers, the forces included warriors summoned at need to the black; probably marks an increase in the military rôle of the ruler's slave-household at the expense of the free clansmen.
allowed, to that of other parts of the Egyptian Sudan. A governor (mudir umum Ddr Fur) had his headquarters at El Fasher, while sub-governors (mandib) were stationed at El Fasher, Shakkâ (to control the Rizaykât territory), Dârâ (on the route from the south to the capital), and Kâkbâbîyya (on the route to Wадdâl). The governors have been listed by R. L. Hill, *Rulers of the Sudan*, 1820–1885, in *Sudan notes and records*, xxx/1, 1951, 85–95.

The Mahdist régime inherited the problems and administrative structure of its predecessor. Dâr Fur, later combined with Kordofan in the Province of the Darfur and its neighbours under Sultan ʻAlî Dînâr, is to appear in *Sudan notes and records*. The government archives in Khartoum contain a very considerable body of material relating to the Mahdist, the rule of ʻAlî Dînâr and the Condominium period.

(F. M. Holt)

**Dâr al-Hadîth. I. Architecture**

II. Historical development. The name Dâr al-Hadîth was first applied to institutions reserved for the teaching of hadîth in the sixth century of the Hijra. The conclusion that until that time hadîth were taught in the ‘an-Nâsir al-Muhammadi al-Madînî’ bi-tâliq ad-‘Arab wa l-Suddn, one of the centres for hadîth-study and their distribution in different centuries throughout the Muslim world. Interest in the science of hadîth and the study of it had continued for centuries without intermission in Syria, where the first Dâr al-Hadîth was founded, one of the centres (with an interruption of 90 years) being Jerusalem (op. cit., 93b).

In his treatise *al-Amâsir dhawât al-‘itârah* (MS Velyeydîn 645/3, 908–909), al-Dâhâbî (d. 748/1347–8) gives us comprehensive information about the centres for hadîth-study and their distribution in different centuries throughout the Muslim world. The government archives in Khartoum contain a very considerable body of information about the government officials and their distribution in the centre of the government council is the most important function. For the administration under ʻAlî Dinâr and the Condominium, see G. D. Lampen, *History of Darfur, in Sudan notes and records*, xxxii/2, 1950, 203–8.

The first institution to be called specifically Dār al-Ḥadīth was founded by the Atabeg Nur al-Dīn (d. 569/1172-3) (al-Numayrī, al-Dāris fi 'tarrākh al-madāris, Damascus 1946, i, 99, cf. Msh. Studi., ii, 187). Though Nur al-Dīn was himself Hanafi, he limited this school to Shafiʿīs (Wüstfenfeld, Die Akademien der Araber und ihre Lehrer, 69), and set over it the historian and mubaddith ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAsṣākir (d. 571/1175-6) (al-Numayrī, op. cit., i, 100). There were many madrasas for this institution and the people attached to it (Abū Shāma, al-Raṣūdatayn, Cairo 1956, i, 23). Ibn ʿAsṣākir was succeeded by his son al-Kāsim (d. 600/1203-4) (al-Numayrī, op. cit., i, 100). Al-Numayrī gives the names of the rectors of this hadīth-school down to Ibn Rāfīʿ (d. 718/1318). The opening of this first Dār al-Ḥadīth was followed by the establishment of numerous similar institutions to which leading historians and mubaddiths were attached, mostly in Damascus and its neighbourhood (for which al-Numayrī records the names of 152), but spreading immediately all over the Muslim world: thus ʿAbd al-Latīf al-Baghdādī (d. 620/1223-2), on going to Mosul in 585/1189, found such a dār al-ḥadīth on the ground floor of the Madrasa of Ibn Muhādīr (Ibn Abī ʿUsaybīʿa, ii, 204); in 622/1225 al-Malik al-Kāmil Nāṣir al-Dīn founded in Cairo a dār al-ḥadīth inspired by the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Nāṣiriya, setting over it Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥaḍrāt b. Dībāy. Madrasas of Jerusalem, over 40 in number, were set up by Sayf al-Dīn al-Malik al-Nasīrī (Khitat, ii, 123-8). Al-Malik records the names of 16), cf. al-Nuṣayri, op. cit., i, 100). There any who have refused to be converted after being duly invited on the best terms, and against whom any kind of warfare is henceforth permissible in keeping with the rules of ḍiḥḍa ḳaṭib or, more especially, al-dār al-ḥarb is rebel: the emperor of Byzantium is malik al-Tā𝐿īyīn (al-Ṭabarī, Annals, passim). Classically, the dār al-ḥarb includes those countries where the Muslim law is kept in force, but where dhimmīs no longer enjoy any protection there, and the protection of the faithful and dhimmīs. A territory of the dār al-Īslām, reconquered by non-Muslims of any description, thereby becomes a territory of the dār al-ḥarb once again, provided that (1) the law of the unbelievers replaces that of Islam; (2) the country in question directly adjoins the dār al-ḥarb; (3) Muslims and their non-Muslim dhimmīs no longer enjoy any protection there. The first of these conditions is the most important. Some even believe that a country remains dār al-Īslām so long as a single provision (ḥukm) of the Muslim law is kept in force there. The definition of the dār al-ḥarb, like the concept of dhimmī, has in the course of time been modified by the progressive loss of unity and strength in the Muslim State. The notion of dhimmīs as non-Muslims of any description, thereby becomes a territory of the dār al-Īslām to be converted after being duly invited on the best terms, and against whom any kind of warfare is henceforth permissible in keeping with the rules of ḍiḥḍa. Dār al-Ḥarb, ‘the Land of War’. This conventional formula derived from the logical development of the idea of the ḍiḥḍa [q.v.] when it ceased to be the struggle for survival of a small community, becoming instead the basis of the “law of nations” in the Muslim State. The ʿUmmān, in its latest texts on the holy war, IX, 38-58, 87, makes this “holy war” a major duty, a test of the sincerity of believers to be waged against heathen communities as long as they are to be found (IX, 5). This war must be just, not oppressive, its aim being peace under the rule of Islam.

The ʿUmmān does not as yet divide the world into territories where peace and the faith of Islam reign, (dār al-Īslām [q.v.]), territories under perpetual threat of a missionary war (dār al-ḥarb), or, of course, territories covered by agreements and payment of tribute (dār al-ʿahd, dār al-ṣulh [q.v.]).
writer al-Shâbushtî (d. 388/998). The vizier of al-
€Aziz, Ya'qüb b. Killis (d. 380/990), organized
dr al-frikma which was administered by the
dr al-dâr, numerators, logicians and mathematicians. The Cairo
dr al-Hâkim housed in the north-western
building, to the south of the eastern part of the
or 461/1068, in the reign of al-
€Muntasir during the civil wars, and during the
or 576/1180, the library was once more closed. Šalâb al-Dîn sold the
palaces, but the books, unfortunately some of them were re-purchased by
men such as al-Kâšî al-Fâdîl.

Bibliography: Makrizi, Khâlîq, Bullâk ed., i, 408-9, 465, 458-60; ii, 342, 363, 487; Cairo ed., ii, 253-5. 313, 334-7; iV, 258, 192, 377; Kindî, 600, 640; al-Kâšî, 440; Ibn Khallîkân, Cairo ed., 1949, vi, 28; O. Pinto, Le biblioteche degli Arabi, Florence 1928, 8-9, 14-5, 23; K. 'Awwâd, Khâdit kutub al-Irâb, in Sumur, 1946/2, 218-23; i, 245; al-Khalîkan, Cairo ed. 1934, ii, 100; Bundar, ed. Hutsma, 18; Ibn al-Sâmi, Shâhdârî, iii, 104 (s.a. 383); Abu l-'Alâ' al-
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Dâr al-Ilm, 'the Land of Islam' or, more simply, in Muslim authors, dârrud, 'our Country' is the whole territory in which the law of Islam prevails. Its unity resides in the community of the faith, the unity of the law, and the guarantees assured to members of the umma [q.v.]. The umma, established in consequence of the final revelation, also guarantees the faith, the persons, possessions and religious organization, albeit on a lower level, of dâmmis, the followers of the creeds of Christianity and Judaism which sprang from earlier revelations, and of the Zoroastrians (Madjûs) [cf. dâmâmm, dâmm]. Until the beginnings of contemporary history Islam's ocular
aspirations were maintained. Hadîçis go back to the Prophet, e.g., a dâhm, on the capture of Rome (al-Bukhari, Dîhâd, § 135-139), are the source of these aspirations. In the classical doctrine, everything outside dâr al-Islam is dâr al-barb [q.v.]. However, the historic example of Nadjîrân (al-
€Balâdîjûfî, Futâh, section ii, s. 852 Nadjîrân) and, at a later date, that of Nubia are proof of the permibility of truces (budnâ, salûk) concluded with the sovereigns of neighbouring territories, who preserve their internal autonomy in exchange for tribute which constitutes an external and formal recognition of the Muslim sovereign's authority (cf. Dâr al-

models of calligraphy, on all scientific subjects. It was
governed by two şâfirî and a hâdî, and after Sâbi'ûr's death the Shî'î poet al-Shârif al-Murta'dî is thought to have taken over its administration. We also have the names of some of those who were appointed librarians, such as the grammarian Abû Âmmâd 'Abd al-Sâlim, otherwise known as al-
€Wâdîjîkâ (d. 405/1014) (a friend of Abu l-'Alâ' al-
€Ma'arî) and the secretary Abû Mansûr Muhammad b. Alî (d. 418/1027). Sâbi'ûr's library was used by
numerous scholars, in particular by Abu l-'Alâ' al-
€Ma'arî during his stay in Baghdad (393-400/1009-1010), and it also received the works of con-
temporary writers such as the Fâtîmid secretary Abû b. Khâyrân (d. 431/1040). It was finally burnt down when the Saldâjûks reached
Baghdâd in 447/1055-56. The vizier 'Amîd al-Mulîk al-Kundurî was able to save only a few books from destruction.

It is thought that a Sunni Dâr al-Ilm was founded at Fustât in 400/1010 by the Fâtîmid caliph al-
€Hâkim; it was governed by two Mâlikî scholars, but after three years they were put to death and the library was suppressed (Ibn Taghîbirî, ii, 64, 105-106).
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sophie d'Abou-l-'Alâ', in BEO, x, 1943-4, 127-9; idem, La profession de foi d'Ibn Batta, Damascus 1958, xxii-xxiii; G. Mâkdisi, The Topography of

eleventh century Baghdad, in Arabica, vi (1959), 195-6. (D. Sourdeib)

Dâr al-Ilm, 'house of science', the name
given to several libraries or scientific insti-
tutes established in eastern Islam in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries. After the disappearance of al-
€Ma'arî's Bayt al-Ilm (q.v.), a man of letters called Allâb al-Dîn Ya'âvî al-
€Munadidiim (d. 275/888), friend of al-Mu'tawakkil and, later, of al-
€Mutawakkil, appointed librarians, such as the grammarian Abu 'l-
€Alâ' al-
€Harîrî and the secretary Abu Mansur Muhammad b. Alî (d. 418/1027). Sabûr's library was used by
different scholars, in particular by Abu 'l-
€Alâ' al-
€Ma'arî after his stay in Baghdad (393-400/1009-1010), and it also received the works of con-
temporary writers such as the Fâtîmid secretary Abû b. Khâyrân (d. 431/1040). It was finally burnt down when the Saldâjûks reached
Baghdâd in 447/1055-56. The vizier 'Amîd al-Mulîk al-Kundurî was able to save only a few books from destruction.

It is thought that a Sunni Dâr al-Ilm was founded at Fustât in 400/1010 by the Fâtîmid caliph al-
€Hâkim; it was governed by two Mâlikî scholars, but after three years they were put to death and the library was suppressed (Ibn Taghîbirî, ii, 64, 105-106).
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Government in Early Islam, in Stud. Isl., 4; O. Turan, The ideal of World Domination among the Medieval Turks, ibid., (A. Abel)

DAR AL-MA'FUCZÂT AL-UMMÂYYA. The Egyptian State Archives, consisting of the administrative records of the governments of Egypt from the start of the sixteenth century until the present time, and stored at the Citadel and in the Abidine Palace in Cairo. The extant archives of the Ottoman treasury and administration in Egypt from the time of its conquest by Selim I in 922/1517 until it became autonomous under Muhammad 'Ali at the start of the nineteenth century are located at the Citadel (al-Ka'da) archives, which were built by Muhammad 'Ali in 1242/1827 to store the materials remaining after a disastrous fire in 1235/1820. A very few late-Mamlûk documents and registers, less important nineteenth-century administrative records, and all registers of births and deaths in Egypt are also kept at the Citadel, but the bulk of the nineteenth and twentieth century Egyptian government records are kept at the Abidine Palace in Cairo.

Materials remaining from the Ottoman administration fall into two broad classifications—registers (daf'dat) and individual documents (awrâk). There are two basic types of Ottoman administrative registers, those containing copies of orders and decrees, written in the Şiyâdât script, and those containing financial data, written in the Şiyâdât script. Most of the registers of Ottoman orders and decrees stored in Egypt were destroyed in the fire of 1820, and such materials are available only in the published collections of Feridun and Hayrun Efendi (see bibliography) and in the Mümümm-î Mişr registers kept in the Bayvekkâlet Arjâvi [v.q.] in Istanbul. The materials remaining in the Citadel archives are principally financial registers and a few individual documents. In addition, the archives possess numerous private collections seized by the State upon the death of their owners. The nineteenth and twentieth-century archives kept in the Abidine Palace are far more comprehensive and complete and include copies made in recent times of materials concerning Egypt found in the principal European archives.

Registers of the deliberations of the Dâwân of Ottoman Egypt and of judicial archives since late Mamlûk times are found in the archives of the religious courts (al-Maâîma li 'l-Ahwdl al-Shakh-šiyâya) in Cairo.

Bibliography: S. J. Shaw, Cairo's Archives and the History of Ottoman Egypt, in Report on Current Research, Spring 1956, Middle East Institute, Washington, D.C., 1956, 59-72; J. Deny, Sommaire des Archives Turques du Caire, Cairo 1930; Muhammad Ahmad Husayn, al-Wathâ'ik Munshâ'd al-Saldâ'în, Cairo 1945, 93-4; M. Lewis, The Ottoman Archives as a source of History for the Arab Lands, in JRAI (1951), 139-155; Michaud and Poujolou, Correspondance d'Orient, 1830-1831, vi, Paris 1835, 292-3. For some published collections of documents from the archives of Ottoman Egypt, see: Recueil de Firmans Impériaux Ottomans adressés aux valets et aux Khâdîs d'Egypte, 1006 A.H. 1302 A.H., Cairo 1934; Muştafa Hayrun Efendi el-Siwâd, İhâd-i Hayrun Efendi, Bülâk 1241/1825; Ahmed Feridün, Munshâ'd al-Saldâ'nî, 2 vol., Istanbul 1274/1857-8; G. Lamens Bey, Recueil de la correspondance de Mohamed Ali, Khâdis d'Egypte, Cairo 1913. On the palaeography and diplomatic of these and other Ottoman administrative materials, see DIPLOMATIC.

(R. Paret)

DAR AL-Sâ'ÂDA [see SARAY].

DAR AL-SALÂM, "Abode of Peace", is in the first place a name of Paradise in the Kur'ân (vi, 127; x, 26), because, says Baydâwî, it is a place of security (salâma) from transitoriness and injury, or because God and the angels salute (salâma) those who enter it. Hence it was given to the city of Baghdad by al-MA'Nî, as well as Mardinat al-Salâm (cf. BAGHDA, and also the geographical lexicon of Yâqût, ad init.). For the capital of Tanganyika see DAR-ES-SALAM.

(T. H. Weir*)

DAR-ES-SALAM, capital of the British administered United Nations Trusteeship Territory of Tanganyika, formerly German East Africa, lies in Lat. 6° 49' S. and Long. 39° 16'E. The settlement of
DAR-ES-SALAAM — DAR AL-SHIFA

DAR-AL-SHIFA? [see SIMKHASTAN iii].

DAR-AL-SINA’ (also, but more rarely: Dār al-ṣanʿa). Etymologically, this compound can be translated "arsenal" establishment, workshop. In fact it is always applied to a State workshop: for example, under the Umayyads in Spain to establishments for gold and silver work intended for the sovereign, and for the manufacture and stock-piling of arms. But the sense most widely used is that of "arsenal for the construction and equipment of warships"; dār ṣin’a li-ṭīnḍā al-sufun; or simply dār al-ṭīnḍā, which also occurs. This does not indicate the arsenals which we would consider later, while the construction of private merchant ships is not dealt with. See BARRIYYA, MILĀḤA, SAFINA, USTūL.

From the Arabic compounds dār al-sin’a, dār al-ṣanʿa the words for "arsenal" and "wet-dock" in the "mediterranean" languages are derived: Castilian alaraza, arsenal, darsena; Catalan darsanera, darsena; Italian arsenale, darsena; Maltese tarżara, tarsnar. It is probably from an Italian dialect that Ottoman Turkish borrowed its tersūn (sometimes "returkized" as tarsẖāne, on the analogy of topẖāne "arsenal for artillery"); the word passed into several languages from the early Ottoman Empire: modern Greek τερσάνα, Syrian Arabic tarsẖāne, Egyptian Arabic tarsūn and tarsẖāne.

Eastern Mediterranean. It was naturally in the eastern Mediterranean that the first arsenals in the service of the Muslims operated, partly inherited from the romano-byzantine Empire. Victorious on land, the Arabs remained exposed to reprisals by sea, which they tried to prevent by making use of the experience of the indigenous populations until, before long, they themselves took the offensive. Muʿawiyah, when still governor of Syria, was the first to organize an arsenal at Acre, in 28/649, for the Cyprus expedition; the arsenal was later transferred to Tyre, where it was combined with a fortified dock, closed at night with a chain, in which vessels took refuge. Nevertheless, al-Mutawakkil thought it expedient to restore the arsenal to Acre, and Ibn Tūlūn, when he was put in charge of it, had it fortified (by the grandfather of the geographer al-Mukaddasī) in the model of the one at Tyre. It is possible that smaller establishments also existed at times at Tripoli and Lāḏīğiyya (Latakia); however, apart from the sea they were eclipsed, in the extreme north, by the riverside works at Tarsus which combined the activities of the holy war on land and sea until, as the result of a revolt, the Caliph al-Muqtadī had its fleet burnt in 287/990 and, fifty years later, the Byzantines regained possession of it. The Crusades gave the final blow to these establishments which were probably already weakened by disorders and political divisions, and it does not seem that the Mamlūks subsequently restored them even at Beirut, which had become the chief town on the littoral.

Egypt. It was also Muʿāwiyah, when Caliph, who was responsible for the reopening of the Egyptian arsenals which the autonomous rulers of Egypt were, from the 3rd/9th century onwards, to bring to their fullest and most lasting development. The first to operate were those which the Byzantines had owned, at Kulzum (Clysma)—later to be replaced by Suez—which, thanks to the restoration of the canal linking it with the Nile, served both the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, and at Alexandria. Other naval centres were later established at Rosetta, Damietta and Tinns on the mouths of the Nile, and to protect
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them from Byzantine raids the 'Abbasids (al-Mutawakkil in particular) had them fortified and equipped with enclosed harbours like those in Syria. Numerous faptive expeditions of troops of men and materials, made from the Umayyad period onward, to meet the needs of these arsenals. Nevertheless, the most secure, and consequently most highly developed, arsenal was the one established on the Nile near Fustat (later Cairo), at first on the island of Rawda, in 54/674; probably damaged by Marwân II who had the ships burnt to prevent the 'Abbasids from pursuing him (129/750), it was reorganized during the naval struggles of the 3rd/9th century with the Byzantines by al-Mutawakkil (238/853); the island at that time was called Dîazîrat al-šînâ‘a. The fortifications which it had possessed in the time of the Byzantines (under the name of Babylon), and which had fallen into disrepair since the conquest, were restored by Ibn Tuḫdî, who also carried out the work of rebuilding the fleet. The decisive effort was however made by the 1khsbîddîs in the following century, to meet the Fātimid threat. As it was at that time impossible to defend the arsenal from attack owing to its insular position, Ibn Tuḫdî had the island made into a garden, and gave orders for another arsenal to be set up on the river bank at Fustat at the place then called Dâr bint al-Фâth. It seems however that under the Fatimids the two arsenals operated alternately or simultaneously; the wâzîr al-Ma‘mûn al-Baṭâbîlî in 516/922 tried to rationalize shipbuilding by making the arsenal at Misr (Fustât), now enlarged, specialize in ghaḍândî and “State vessels”, and the Island arsenal in gâlândisyyât and barbîsyyât. A third arsenal operated in the quarter known as al-Maks, north of the town, at the time of the early Fātimids, but we know nothing more about it; a fleet fitted out against Byzantium was burnt there in 586/996. The events of the Crusades and the troubles at the end of the dynasty proved fatal to the fleet and to the Cairo arsenals which disappeared in flames. Salâdîn attempted to re-establish shipbuilding at Alexandria, and in the Mamlûk period we once again hear of a fleet fitted out at the time of the Cyprus expedition; but these were sporadic efforts occurring at long intervals and, roughly speaking, although there had been sudden fluctuations in shipbuilding even earlier, it is safe to say that the Egyptian arsenals disappeared in face of the Italian domination over the Mediterranean.

The Muslims in Crete had an autonomous naval base at Khandak in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries. The West. The oldest arsenals in the West were necessarily somewhat newer than those in the East, but some of them were perhaps to survive longer, and the East at times tried to make use of the West in this respect as a reserve of materials and equipment.

Ifrîkiya. The oldest arsenal in the West was at Tunis [q.v.]. It was founded in about 75/694 by the governor Ḥassân b. al-Nu’mân on the orders of the Umayyad Caliph in the East, 'Abd al-Malîk b. Marwân (who also reorganized the arsenal on the coast of Ifrîkiya and, in particular, to conquer Sicily.

Other maritime arsenals were recorded at Al-Mahdiyya, Sousse (= Sûsa) and Bougie (= Bigûiya).

Al-Andalus. It was only in the first quarter of the 4th/10th century that the Umayyads in Spain built arsenals. In fact they needed fleets, firstly to resist the Norman attacks, and subsequently to support their policy of intervention in North Africa against the Fâtimids. The most important arsenal was at Almeria (= al-Mârîya). Others are recorded at Tortosa (= Turtûsha), Denia (= Dânîya), Almuñecar (= el-Munakkab), Málaga (= Mâlalâ), Gibraltar, Saltés (= Shaltîsh), Santa Maria de Algarve (= Shantamariyya), Silves (= Shîlîb), Alcacer do Sal. There was, perhaps, one at Cadiz (= Kâdîs), a fief of the Banû Maymûn, whose family provided several shâdîs for the Almoravid fleets, and also in the Lusitanian.

Western Magrib. The two oldest are those at Ceuta and Tangier, on the straits of Gibraltar, intended at first for merchant ships. With the advent of the three great Berber-Moroccan dynasties, the Almoravids, Almohads and Marinids, these arsenals became military establishments. They supplied warships and transport vessels, making it possible to keep command of the straits and to allow the passage of armies sent to defend Muslim Spain.

The other principal arsenals known in the Middle Ages were at Algiers (this was to be particularly developed later, after the Ottoman occupation), Oran, Hunayn, Bâdis, al-Ma‘mûra (now al-Mahdiyya at the mouth of the Subû), Salé and Anfa (now Casablanca).

Sicily. We cannot say if the Muslims established arsenals in the places they occupied on the island or the Italian mainland in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries. It is probable that there were some in Sicily, at Palermo and Messina.

Indian Ocean and neighbouring seas. In general, the Indian Ocean with its Muslim branches the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf were peaceful areas compared with the Mediterranean; many pirates were to be found there, but no hostile naval power. Police forces consequently proved sufficient, and it is probable that merchant ships, built as we know without nails, were often used by them; there seems to have been no true arsenal of the Mediterranean type. However, apart from Kuluzum which has already been referred to, it is certain that the Fâtimids maintained a fleet with ʻAyyûb as its base, to safeguard pilgrims and merchants in the Red Sea on their way to the Yemen. There is little doubt that shipbuilding was carried out in the large eastern commercial ports: Aden, at an earlier period Basra (or rather its outer harbour and precursor Ubulla), Sirf, later replaced by Rîsh, Shâhîr then Mascat in ʻUmân, and perhaps also in Muslim towns on the coast of west India and east Africa; apart from Ubulla, it is difficult to be certain of their status and political character, and even there the dockyards were not able to remain in operation after the 5th/11th century when the maritime activity of Başra and Sirf began to decline considerably.

The Timber-Supply. The arsenals were naturally set up either within a short distance of districts producing timber for shipbuilding (pine and cedar, oak, acacia labak or sam in Egypt, sycamore and to some extent palm and fig) or else in a favourable situation for importing it from Italian, Indian (teak, coconut palm) and East African merchants, not to mention the raiders of the Anatolian coasts. Of the various causes of the decline in ship-building after the 5th/11th century, one may be the increasing shortage of timber.

Bibliography: A. H. Fahmy, Muslim sea-power in the Eastern Mediterranean, 7th-10th century, 1950; Ekk. Eickhoff, Seekrieg und Seepolitik zwischen...
DAR AL-ŠINA — DAR AL-ULTUM


DAR AL-SULH 'the House of Truce', territories not conquered by Muslim troops but by buying peace by the giving of the tribute, the payment of which guarantees a truce or armistice (huadana, sulh). The two historic examples of such a situation, which were evidently the starting-point for the whole theory, are Nadjran and Nubia. Muhammad himself concluded a treaty with the Christian population of Nadjran, guaranteeing their security and imposing on them certain obligations which were later looked on as khardad (q.v.) by some, and as diizya (q.v.) by others (for the whole question see Baladhurî, Futâh, 63 ff.; Sprenger, Leben Mohammeds, 3, 502 ff.; M. Hamidullah, Documents sur la diplomatie musulmane, 78 ff., Corpus, no. 79 ff.). In the course of events this protectorate proved to be of no use to the inhabitants of Nadjran on account of their geographical situation. For Nubia it was somewhat different. Thanks to their skill in archery the Nubians were able for centuries to defend themselves against the Muslim attacks and to preserve their independence. As a result, ʿAbd Allâh b. Saʿd in 31/652 concluded a treaty (sulh) with them imposing not a poll-tax (diizya) with them. On the other hand, some were not prepared to admit that, besides the Ddr al-Isldm and Ddr al-harb, (q.v.), there existed a third category of territories excluded from Muslim conquest, and they held that in this instance it was in reality a question, not of a sulh or ʿahd, but merely of an armed truce (huadana) and the implementation of reciprocal undertakings (see Baladhurî, Futâh, 236 ff.; al-Makrizî, Khatif, ed. Wiet, iii, 290 ff.; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Futâḥ Muṣr, ed. Torrey, 189). This somewhat vague theory also provided a basis upon which it seemed possible to establish contractual relations with Christian countries; presents sent by the latter were consequently looked on as a khardad. The legal theory was expounded as follows by al-Īmârî. All the territories more or less directly under Muslim control can be divided into three categories; (1) those which have been conquered by force of arms; (2) those which have been occupied without battle after the flight of their rulers; (3) those which have been acquired by treaty, this third category including two instances which depend on whether the property (a) becomes common property (waḥîf) of the Muslim community, or whether (b) it remains in the hands of the former proprietors; in the first instance the former proprietors can in fact remain on their land and become dhimmis; they pay khardad and diizya and their country becomes Ddr al-Isldm; in the second instance, the proprietors of the land keep their estates by contract and from their revenues pay a khardad which is considered as a diizya, and collected until they are converted to Islam; their territory is considered neither as Ddr al-Isldm nor Ddr al-sulh or Ddr al-harb; and their estates can always be alienated or mortgaged without restriction; if the property is transferred to a Muslim, the land is no longer liable for khardad; this state of affairs will continue as long as the proprietors observe the clauses of the treaty, and the diizya for which they are liable cannot be increased since they are not in the Ddr al-Isldm. However, according to Abu Ḥanîfa, if their territory became Ddr al-Isldm they would then be dhimmis and subject to diizya. As regards the situation created by a rupture of the treaty, the various schools are not in agreement. According to al-Ṣâḥîfi, the country, if it is then conquered, belongs to the first category, that is to say, territories acquired by force; and if it is not conquered, it becomes Ddr al-harb. Others, on the contrary, claimed that in both cases it becomes Ddr al-sulh (see al-ʿAbkâm al-sulhdnîyya, Cairo 1298, 131 ff.). It is evident that the position was irregular and ambiguous. Al-Īmârî himself (150 and 164) includes this Ddr al-sulh in his enumeration of Muslim territories (bîldî al-Isldm) and al-Balâdhurî does not observe this distinction when discussing khardad.

In the period immediately following the Crusades numerous treaties, the details of which we possess, were concluded with Christian princes or princelings (treaties with the king of Armenia, the princes of Tyre, the Templars of Anjarâf, etc.; cf. al-Makrizî, Histoire des Sultans Mameluks, trans. Quatremère, ii, 201 ff., 206 ff., 218 ff.). For details and forms, and the traditional justifications of truce agreements concluded between Muslim sovereigns and non-Muslim princes, see al-Kâlqângî, Suḥâ, xii, 321 ff.; xiv, 7 ff.


(D. B. MACDONALD-A. ABEI)

DAR AL-TAKRIB [see ʿIKṬĪLĀS]

DAR AL-TIBĀʾA [see MATRĀʾA]

DAR AL-TIRĀZ [see TIRĀZ]

DAR AL-ULTÜM or the "House of Sciences", (a) an establishment for higher instruction founded in 1872 by ʿAli Pasha Mubârak [q.v.]. Its aim was to introduce a certain number of students of al-ʿAzhar [q.v.] to modern branches of learning by means
of a five year course, in order to fit them for teaching in the new schools. In fact, as other centres were created in Cairo for the teaching of science, its curriculum was remodelled a number of times and the exact sciences were relegated to the background. The length of the course was reduced to four years. Attached as a Faculty since 1946 to the University of Cairo (formerly Fu'ād), Dār al-Ulūm endeavours to be at the same time Arabic and Islamic, and is proud to be the great Muslim Teachers' Training College of Egypt, influential through the teachers and inspectors who have been trained there. The students are divided into sections: four for Arabic language and three for Islamic studies. The diploma given on completion of the course is equivalent to a Bachelor's degree, and can be followed by a Master's degree or a Doctorate. Since 1951-2, apart from the students of al-Azhar, men who have passed the government secondary schools' 'Baccalauréat' (lawgik) have been admitted, and since 1953-4, a certain number of women students. Formerly, as at al-Azhar, the teaching was free and a modest sum was given to the students monthly, but now teaching fees are charged, with special concessions for those who undertake to become teachers. In 1957-8, there were 1,715 students as well as some scholarship holders completing their education in European universities.


(b) the religious institution at Deoband (q.v.).

c) Fārangi Mahāll. In a house known as the Fārangi Mahāll in Lucknow, granted by Awrangzīb to his family as compensation for loss of property on the murder of his father in 1103/1691, Nizām al-Dīn started two years later a madrasa which came to be known as Dār al-‘Ulama Fārangi Mahāll. Muḥāf al-Nizām al-Dīn's fame rests mainly on the introduction of a syllabus of religious instruction called dārs-i Niṣāmīya, an improvement on the syllabus said to have been originally drawn up by Faṭḥ Allāh al-Shirāzī, a well-known scholar of Akhīr's circle of the sīra of the Prophet, and this syllabus on the rules of Arabic grammar, logic, and philosophy, while practically no attention is given to modern disciplines. There has more recently been a persistent demand for a change in the curriculum, so far unsuccessfully.

With the establishment of the Dār al-‘Ulama at Deoband the Fārangi Mahall institution lost the pre-eminence it had enjoyed since the time of Awrangzīb, and has now receded into the background; in recent times it has been politically active: in the agitation in the late 1930s for the creation of a University of Allah-abad, it nominated Shibli Muhammad, and failed to imbibe either the spirit of orthodoxy characteristic of Deoband or the purely rationalistic attitude of 'Alligār. Its foremost scholar was Sayyid Sulaymān Nadwī, whose completion of the Urdu biography of the Prophet, started by Shibli, is a blending of the seemingly divergent views of East and West in the field of historical research. The Nadwa, however, was not successful in the religious sphere; its leaders were not orthodox, and could not instil into their students the spirit of classical Islam. The result was that the Nadwa came to be known merely as an educational institution with Arabic as the medium of instruction, and its reputation as a seat of learning and Islamic research is now on the decline.


DĀRĀ, DĀRĀB, Persian forms (adopted by Arab writers) of the name of the Achaemenian king familiarly known under the hellenized form Dareios (Darius). Dārāb, and its abbreviation Dārā, are directly derived from the ancient Persian Darayavahvah- (Bartholomae, Altiranisches Worterbuch, 738; the different grammatical cases attested by Persian inscriptions, in Tolman, Ancient Persian Lexicon and Texts, 1008, s.v. darayvanah; for the ancient historians of these kings, Gr. I. Ph., ii, index, s.v. Dāreios).

The sources of information about these princes collected by Persian and Arab historians are legendary rather than historical (cf. preface by J. Mohl, Livre des Rois, 19th ed., v, 1877). The Persian poet Firdawsi (op. cit., v), of later date than the Arab historians, was inspired by their accounts particularly in regard to the reign of Ardashir (Iskandar), but he combined them with elements from Persian legends. His account, even when stripped of poetic elaborations, is fuller than those of the Arab historians, even the earliest in date, al-Ṭabarī. A short summary follows (Dārāb and Dārā are Darius II and Darius III respectively).

Goshtāsp (Vishtasp, the Greek Hystaspe), king of Persia, named as his successor his grandson Bab-
man, son of Isfandyar (Vahman, derived from the Avestan Vohu Manah, “Good Thought”), in whom we recognize Artaxerxes (Artakhshatra) Longhard. In accordance with the hēvēr-dar (hastaveda) practice, Bahman married his own daughter Homay (“he who appears to represent in popular legend Parsatis”), historically the wife of Darius II, to quote J. Mohl; Bahman got her with child; before his death, he declared her to be Queen of Persia, and named as his successor the child whom she was to bear. From the time of its birth, the mother entrusted her child to a nurse who reared it secretly: when it was eight months old, the queen placed it in a box filled with treasure and committed it to the waters of the Euphrates; two spies set by the queen to keep watch brought her news that a washerman had rescued the baby. He and his wife, having lost their son, adopted the child and named it Dārāb (Persian: dar ăb, “in the water”, popular etymology); he grew up and questioned his parentage. A war broke out; he took part in it, came to the notice of the queen, then won great renown; the Persian commander—in-chief spoke to the queen of him and led her to recognize a jewel which she had fastened on her infant’s arm. On Dārāb’s return she had him proclaimed king. He founded Dārābgird, defeated first the Arabs and then King Fāykalōs (Philip of Macedon); he compelled him to pay tribute and married his daughter. He was however repelled by her foul breath and sent her back, pregnant, to her father. She gave birth to a son whom she named Iskandar. Dārāb had Iskandar recognized as his own son. Dārāb for his part had had by another wife a son named Dārā. Then the two young princes became kings. Iskandar, refusing to give Dārāb the requisite tribute, conquered Egypt and invaded Persia which he hoped to take over from his half-brother; disguised as an ambassador he came to Dārāb’s camp and was received with great pomp; he was, however, recognized, took to flight and succeeded in escaping; subsequently inflicting four defeats on Dārāb. Dārāb was assassinated by his minister who informed Iskandar; horrified by the news, the latter hurried to his half-brother whom he found on his death-bed. Dārāb spoke with nobility of God’s almighty power, and asked Iskandar to marry his daughter Rusḥanak ( Roxane) and to treat the Persians well. Iskandar who became king of Persia made further conquests. (The Deeds of Alexander, Iskandar-nāma, written by the Persian poets Nizāmī, Amir Khusraw, Dāʿīml, only describe Dārāb’s defeat, with further moralizing upon the fickleness of fortune.

Accounts given by the Arab historians differ only in certain details from that of Firdawš. In the Chronicle by al-Ṭabarī (Persian version, trans. Zotenberg, i, 508 ff.), the infant Dārāb was saved from the water by a miller; Homay, when told of this, entrusted her son to him with the words (in Persian): dar ("look after him!"); whence the name Dārā (another popular etymology); “it is also said that he was called Dārāb because he had been found in the water” (dar ăb); Homay voluntarily told her son the secret of his birth when he reached his twentieth year; on Iskandar’s refusal to give tribute, Dārā had a symbolic message sent to him (racket, ball, sack of sesame) very similar to that sent by the Scythians to Darius I (Hecdotus, iv, 131-33; and cf. E. Dobrée, Le dechiffrement des ecritures, French trans. 1959, 24); as a result of Dārā’s injustice and wickedness, his soldiers deserted and his two chamberlains murdered him with the complicity of Iskandar who was hypocrite enough to be present at Dārā’s death-bed and then to punish his assassins. Hamza of Khorasan (probably a nephew of Dārā) to the throne and Iskandar was crowned as Dariush III. In al-Tha’labī’s History of the kings of the Persians (ed. and trans. Zobtenberg, 393 fl.), there is the same fanciful derivation of the name Dārāb, an account practically identical with al-Ṭabarī’s, also insisting upon Dārā’s wickedness and Iskandar’s duplicity. The same account appears in al-Makdisī’s Book of the Creation (ed. and trans. Cl. Huart, iii, 154-9), with the exception that Iskandar, after refusing to pay tribute, thought better of it and sent it with an apology: Dārā gave him his daughter’s hand.

Just as the Pseudo-Callisthenes had made Alexander heir to the kings of Egypt, so the legendary history of Persia made Iskandar a half-brother of Darius III with whom he disputed the throne (possibly a confused allusion to Cyrus the Younger’s revolt against his brother Artaxerxes II in 401). Dārāb (or Daras-Anastasiopolis) is a fortress situated between Mardin and Nasbīn, captured from the Greeks by Chosroes I during the campaign in 540 (Nöldeke, Gesch, der Perser ... zur Zeit der Sassaniden, 127, 372 and 445).

Bibliography: In addition to the references given in the article: Firdawš, Shāhnāma, ed.-trans. J. Mohl, in fol., v and trans. in 12, v; ed. Tcheran 1934-35 (pub. Beroukhim), vi; Ṭabarī, index. (B. CARRA DE VAUX-H. Masse) DĀRĀ [see AĞHĪR’ĀT].

DARĀ. This is the name both of a river of south Morocco which rises on the southern slope of the High Atlas and flows into the Atlantic south of the Djebel Bānī, and of a Moroccan province which stretches along the two cultivated banks of this water-course from Agdz as far as the elbow of the river Darā, for a distance of about 120 miles in a generally north-west to south-east direction. This province is traditionally divided into eight districts corresponding with the wider parts of the valley which are separated by mountain barriers forming narrows. From north to south these are: Mazgīta, Ayt Sadrā, Ayt Zarī, Tinīlzīn, Tarnāṭa, Fazwāṭa, Ktāwa and Māhimād. It is populated by generally Berber-speaking tribes and by coloured people who can be divided into ‘āblāt, slaves imported from the Sahara and negro countries, and ḫārātīn, who have a dark skin but whose features are not negroid, and who are thought to be the most ancient occupants of the region. Jews, apparently of Berber origin, complete the sedentary population of more than 100,000. At least up to the submission of Darā to the French Protectorate in 1932, the sedentary population lived in subjection to the sometimes Arab, but mainly Berber, nomad tribes of the surrounding mountains.

Darā has been inhabited from a very early date and must certainly have had an eventful history since it is a productive region in the midst of areas which are almost desert. Traditions lead us to believe that the Jews played an important part politically up to the 10th century and that Islam was brought there by a descendant of the founder of Fes in the first half of the 3rd/9th century. Later, at the end of the 9th century Darā came under the domination of the Maghrābīs (belonging to the Zenāta) who had settled in Sidjīlmāsā.
With the Almoravids, Dar'a really enters on to the historical scene, for it served as an important fortified town which dominates Zagora. From the second half of the 10th/11th century on, Dar'a was part of the Moorish empire created by the Almoravids, then by the Almohads and the Marinids. The Ma'ūlī Arabs infiltrated there towards the end of the 7th/13th century and exercised a dominating influence.

In the 10th/16th century, this province was the cradle of the first Shī'īte dynasty of the Sa’dīs [q.v.] and was the place from which the sultan Ahmad al-Mansūr started on his expedition to the Sudan (1591). This shows, in a very striking manner, the role of Dar'a as a point of contact between Morocco and the Sahara. Thanks to the trade with Gao and Timbuctoo at the beginning of the 11th/17th century, this region enjoyed a brief period of prosperity.

To-day, this overpopulated and poor region provides Casablanca and various other towns with a considerable number of workers, for its almost stagnant agriculture is very far from being able to support its growing population. This emigration is usually a temporary one, linked with the vicissitudes of its climate and agriculture (Naissance du proU-tariat marocain, Paris, n.d., 67-9).

(R. LE TOURNEAU)

DAR'A — DARA SHUKOH


DAR'A SHUKOH, eldest son of Shah Djiwan and Mumtāz Mahall, was born near Adjmer on 19 Safar 1024/20 March 1615. He received his first mansāb [q.v.] of 12,000 dāli (6000 savār) in 1042/1633, as also the dīdār of Hisār-Fīrūzā, regarded as the appearance of the heir-apparent. The same year he was given the command of an army sent to defend Kandahār which was threatened by the Persians, and again in 1052/1642 when the threat was renewed. The attack, however, did not materialize. In 1053/1643, he was given the governorship of the sūbah of Ilāhābād to which were added the sūbahs of Lahore in 1053/1643, and Gujjārāt in 1059/1649. Though he took some interest in Lahore and constructed a number of buildings and market-places, he left the other sūbahs to be governed by deputies, himself remaining at the court. By 1058/1648, he had attained the mansāb of 30,000/20,000, which incidentally was the highest rank attained by Shāh Djiwan before his accession.

Following the failure of two attempts to recover Kandahār from the Persians (who had captured it in 1059/1649), Dārā was deputed to lead a third expedition for its recapture in 1062/1652. Although the siege was vigorously pressed, and forts in Zamin-dāwar taken, Kandahār itself defied capture. The failure of the campaign, due partly to a division in Dārā's camp as also his lack of experience, adversely affected his prestige as a political and military leader.

On his return, Shāh Djiwan associated him more closely than ever with the affairs of the state, bestowing upon him unprecedented honours, and the rank of 60,000/40,000 (1067/1657). It seems that Shāh Djiwan, having clearly marked out Dārā as his successor, wanted to avoid a struggle for the throne on his death, a position which his younger sons were not prepared to accept. In 1067/1657, when Shāh Djiwan fell ill, his younger sons, fearing that Dārā might use the opportunity to seize power, advanced towards Agra on a plea of meeting the Emperor, thereby precipitating a war of succession (see AWRANGZIB). Awrangzib and Murād raised the slogan of Dārā being a heretic (mulhīd) and the orthodox faith being in danger from his constant association with Hindu yogis and sanyāsīs. However, the slogan of religion does not seem to have influenced significantly the actual alignment of the nobles. Dārā was defeated, first at the battle of Sāμmhār near Agra (7 Ramadān 1068/8 June 1658), and then at Deora (28 Djamād I 1069/23 March 1659). Shortly afterwards he was captured by an Afghan noble, Malik Dīlwān, with whom he had taken shelter. He was brought to Delhi and executed (22 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1069/10 Sept., 1659), a formal charge of heresy being laid against him. Dārā's elder son, Sulaymān Shukoh, soon followed him to the grave, a younger son, Sipīr Shukoh, being imprisoned at Gwālīyār.

Although Dārā had an undistinguished political and military career, he was one of the most remarkable figures of his age. A keen student of sufism and of tawḥīd, he came into close contact with leading Muslim and Hindu mystics, notably Miyyān Mīr (d. 1045/1635) and Mūllā Shāh (d. 1071/1661) of the Kādiri order (becoming a disciple of the latter in 1050/1640), Shāh Mūḥibb Allāh Ilāhābādī, Shāh Dīrūbā, Sarmad the famous heterodox monist, and Bāhā Lāl Dās Bayrāgī, a follower of Kābir. A number of contemporary paintings showing Dārā in the company of sūfis and sanyāsīs have been preserved.

Dārā was a prolific writer. His works include: Saifīn al-awliyāyā (1050/1640) and Saikīn al-awliyāyā (1052/1642), dealing with the lives of sūfī saints, the latter with those of the Kādiri order; Risāla-i Ḥākh numā (1056/1646) and the rather rare Tarbhīyat-i Ḥakībī, both based on well known sūfī works; his Dilwān, also known as Ishtir-i asam, recently brought to light, containing verses and quatrains in a pantheistic strain; Hassābīt al-āṣīfīn (1062/1652) containing the aphorisms of sūfī saints belonging to
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various orders; Mukhālama-i Bābā Lāl wa Dārā Shuḵoh, a record of his discussions with Bābā Lāl in 1065/1655; Masmaʿ al-bakhrayn, (1065/1655), perhaps his most remarkable work, being a comparative study of the technical terms used in Ṣeddānta and Sūfism; and the Sirr-i akbar (1067/1657), his most ambitious work, being a translation of fifty-two regional variants: principal Upāniṣhads which Dārā claims to have completed in six months with the aid of learned pandits and sāwaddīs. In addition to this, with Dārā's patronage and support, four translations into Persian were made of a number of Hindu religious works such as Yōga-Vaṭaṅga, the Gīta and the mystic drama Prabhūda-Candradaya. Dārā was also a good calligraphist, and patronized the arts: the: an album (Marabhāq) of calligraphic specimens and Mughal miniatures was presented by him to his wife Nādira Begām (d. of Parwiz) in 1051/1641-42 with a preface written by him.

In some of his later writings, Dārā shows considerable acquaintance with Hindu philosophy and mythology. He was attracted by a number of ideas which have obvious parallels in Hindu philosophy, such as the trine aspect of God, the descent of spirit into matter, cycles of creation and destruction, etc. However, he was opposed to the practice of physical austerities advocated by the exponents of yōga and favours mysticism by praying to God desired not to inflict punishment but that He should be approached with love. Like a number of eminent Muslim thinkers (cf. Mir Abd al-Wāḥīd, Ḥabābīk-i Hindi, 1566) Dārā came to the conclusion that there were no differences except purely verbal in the way in which Vedānta and Islam sought to comprehend the Truth. Dārā's translation of the Upāniṣhads which he regarded as "the fountain-head of the ocean of Unity", was a significant contribution in the attempt to arrive at a cultural synthesis between the followers of the two chief faiths in the country, being the first attempt to comprehend and to make available to the educated Muslims these fundamental scriptures of the Hindus.

It may be doubted if Dārā's interest in gnosticism was motivated by a pastoral considerations. From an early age, Dārā felt that he belonged to the circle of orthodox opinion had accused him of heresy and apostasy as early as 1062/1652, it does not seem that Dārā ever gave up his belief in the essential tenets of Islam, affirming them at more than one place. Nor does the undoubted pantheistic strain in his writings go beyond what had been considered permissible for sīfī. The opposition of these orthodox elements to Dārā stemmed from a deeper conviction, viz., that emphasis on the essential truth of all religions would in the long run weaken the position of Islam as the state religion, and effect their privilege. It was thus closely related to Dārā's position as an aspirant for the throne.

Dārā occupies a pre-eminent place among those who stood for the concept of universal toleration and who desired that the state should be based on the support of both Muslims and Hindus, and remain essentially above religion. His defeat in the war of succession did not, by any means, imply the defeat of the trend he represented.


DARĀBDĪR (modern Darāb), a town in the province of Fārs in the district of Faith, situated 280 kilometres east of Shīrāz at an altitude of 1188 metres and with a population of 6,400 people (1950). In Iranian legend the foundation of this town is ascribed to Dārā, father of Dārā (Darius III Codomannus). The Sāsānīd ruler Ardashīr rose to power by revolt from his post as military commander at Darābdīr. The stone-strewn remains of the Sāsānīd town lie 8 kilometres south-west of the modern village. The outline of the fortification walls exist as does the debris of a fire temple, located at the centre of the site. Six kilometres south-east of the modern village is a Sasanid rock-cut relief known as the Nakgh-ī Rustam or as the Nakgh-ī Shāpūr. In the immediate vicinity is a spacious cruciform hall hewn into a rocky hillside, known as the Masjīd-ī Sāngi. Although it bears inscriptions dated 652/1254 and the title of the Sultan Aḥāb Bakh, the hall is probably of the approximate period of the rock-cut relief.

Bibliography: Muhammad Nasir Mirzā Aḥkām, Fursat Husaynī Shīrāzī, Āgāh-ī Aḥdām, Bombay 1314/1896, 97-9; Le Strange, 288 f.; A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, Copenhagen 1944, 86-7; Farhang-i Dīvāngīyā-ī Īrān, Tehrān 1330/1951, vol. 7, 95. (D. N. Wilber)

DARABUKKA, a vase-shaped drum, the wider aperture being covered by a membrane, with the lower aperture open. The body is usually of painted or incised earthenware, but carved and inlaid wood, as well as engraved metal are also used. In performance it is carried under the arm horizontally and played with the fingers. The name has regional variants: darbukha (or darbukha), dirbakh and darbūkha. Dozy and Brockelmann derive the word from the Syriac ardabak, but the Persian dambak is the more likely, although the lexicographers mistakenly dub the latter a bagpipe. The name darbukha, and its variants, is quite modern although a darbukha (a copyist's error for darbukha) is mentioned in the Alf layla wa layla. The type is to be found in ancient Egypt. The dirūdja is mentioned by Al-Mufadjad al-Salama (d. 319/930) although he wrongly thought that it was a kind of tumbak, as do many Arabic lexicographers, but we know that it was a drum from Al-Maydāni (d. 518/1124). Ibn Mukarram (d. 710/1311) says that the correct vocalization is ‛urrūdja, and that form—with variants—is to be found in the Magrib. The word has no counterpart in Al-Maḳkaf, are doubtless misreadings of ‛urrūdja. Al-Shukundi (d. 628/1231) uses the Berber name aguwayl for this drum, and that is still the name used in the Magrib, although Fost calls it akwa, whilst it is the gallal of Algeria. In Tripolitania the name tabdaba is popularly used, and in Egypt tabke. Bibliography: EI, Suppl., s.v. tabk, 215-6;

**AL-DARAKUTNI**

Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali b. ‘Umar b. Ahmad b. Mahdi b. Mas‘ud b. al-Nu‘man b. Dīnār b. ‘AbdAllāh, was born in Dār al-Rutn, a large quarter of Baghdad, whence he got his nickname, in 366/978. He was a man of wide learning who studied under many scholars. His studies included the various branches of Hadith learning, the recitation of the Kur‘ān, fiqh and belles-lettres. He is said to have known by heart the diwan of poets, and because of his knowing the traditions of the Kur‘ān, and belles-lettres. He is known as an expert on traditions from one man or from one hadith. He wrote in which Sahihayn, the earliest book on the subject. Among other books on the science of Tradition. His *Kitāb al-Kirdhat*, on Kur‘ān readings, in which he began by stating the principles of the subject. He was the first writer to do so.


**DARAN (DEREN)** [see the article ATLAS].

**AL-DARAZI, MUHAMMAD b. ISMA‘IL**, was one of a circle of men who founded the Druze religion [see DURU]. He was not an Arab, and is called Naṣṣātkin in the Druze scriptures; according to Nuwayri (who calls him Anuṣṣātkin), he was part Turkish and came from Bukhārā. He is said to have come to Egypt in 407 or 408/1017-18 and to have been an Isma‘ili dā‘ī [see dā‘ī and ISMA‘ILYYA], in high favour with the Caliph al-Hākîm, allegedly to the point that high officials had to seek his good graces. He may have held a post in the mint (Hamza accuses him of malpractices with coinage). He is said to have been the first who proclaimed publicly the divinity of al-Hākîm; he is also accused, as heretics commonly were, of teaching tawā‘līkh (reincarnation) and ṣabā‘a (antinomianism) regarding the rules against wine and inceṣj, though this latter is most unlikely. It is possible that his doctrine was a popularizing version of Isma‘îlisms such as the dā‘īs often warned against. His key treatise is said to have taught that the (divine) spirit embodied in Adam was transmitted to ‘Allî and (through the imāms) to al-Hākîm. This would differ from orthodox Isma‘îlism presumably in exalting ‘Allî over Muham- mad, imāmate over prophesy; and then in making public the secret ta‘wil (inner meaning of scripture) and probably recognizing the contemporaneity and validity of the letter of revelation *tanzil*. For the commentator of Ḥamzā’s letters calls his followers Ta‘wilīs, who are accused by the Druzes of altogether rejecting the *tanzil*. Ḥamzâ himself deems it necessary to remind al-Darazi that the inner truth and its outer form are always found together. He also accuses him of recognizing only the humanity of al-Hākîm, not his divinity; which would follow, in Ḥamzā’s eyes, from his identifying al-Hākim with ‘Allî, the āsād, who is a mere imām, leader of men, and far from the indefinable One, to Whom as such no functions can be assigned.

Al-Darazi seems to have gained a number of followers among al-Hākim’s admirers, evidently with the approval of al-Hākim himself. Ḥamzâ, evidently claiming priority with al-Hākim, regarded al-Darazi as insubordinate and acting rashly on his own initiative; for instance, publicly attacking the Ṣāḥibah though warned against this. Ḥamzâ refused to let him see his doctrinal writings; he criticized the symbolism of the title al-Darazi first assumed, “sword of the faith”, only to be worse offended when al-Darazi assumed instead a title, *sayyid al-Ḥādīyyin*, “chief of the guided”, which overreached Ḥamzâ’s own title, al-Ḥādî, “the guide”. He claims that some of al-Darazi’s followers had at one time acknowledged Ḥamzâ’s claims to leadership in the
movement, and that al-Darazi himself had done so, having been converted by an agent of Ḥamza, 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Ḥabbāl—who subsequently supported al-Darazi. Sacy thinks Ḥamza regarded him as the Dād, Ḥamza’s Rival as Ḥimān, and would as such have a major cosmic rôle. But many of al-Darazi’s followers, most notably a dādī al-Barṣāfī, had from the first rejected Ḥamza as unauthorized by al-Ḥakīm.

It seems that al-Darazi, probably in 408/1017-18, took the step of making public, with al-Ḥakīm’s private but not open blessing, a demand for his acceptance of the divinity of al-Ḥakīm—according to Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi, by reading his treatise in the main mosque of Cairo. This occasioned several riots, which engulfed Ḥamza also, and which evidently caused the whole movement to lose favour; it was probably this which forced Ḥamza to suspend his own preaching during 409. The Druze accounts are allusive, and other accounts seem to confuse several episodes, leaving the riots and the manner of al-Darazi’s death unclear. Ḥamza’s letters in 410/1019-20 seem to presuppose his death, which the Druze commentator places in 410, and imply that it was Ḥamza himself who—having denounced al-Darazi and others to al-Ḥakīm—brought about his death on al-Ḥakīm’s orders. Ḥamza then tried to win over his followers, promising to intervene with al-Ḥakīm if the followers would commit some sin which he could recognize.

Sibt Ibn al-Djawzi makes al-Darazi withdraw secretly, on al-Ḥakīm’s orders, to Syria to preach, because people there readily accept novelties—which sounds like a later explanation of Druze geography. His name, in the form Durzī, was applied to the Druze community, probably not because it was he who first converted those of Syria—local tradition assigns this task to others—but because the whole movement was first associated with him in the public mind; thus al-ʿAntāḳī applies the name “Darazīyya” to Ḥamza’s own followers. The notion sometimes found, that either licentious teachings or loose moral practices among subsequent Druzes are to be traced to al-Darazi, is unsupported.


**DARB** (see MADĪNA).

**DARB** [see DĀR AL-DARB and SIKKA].

**DARB AL-ARBA’IN** [see DĀR AL-DARB].

**DARB AL-ARBA’IN**, one of the principal routes linking bilād al-Ṣūdān with the north, obtained its name from the forty days’ travelling-time required to traverse it. W. G. Browne, the only European to have gone the whole way (in 1793) took 58 days from Assūṭ to “Sweni” (al-Suwayna) near the southern terminus. Muhammad ‘Umar al-Ṭūnusī in 1803 covered the same distance in 60 days. Starting from Assūṭ, the route ran to the Khārdjī oasis, an outpost of Ottoman Egypt. Thence it proceeded across the desert to al-Shabb, a watering-point where, as the name indicates, alum is found. At the next oasis, Salīma, a branch diverged to the Nubian Nile, which it attained a little above the third Cataract at Mūḫāl, the frontier-post of the Fundūl dominions. This route was followed in 1698 by Ch. J. Poncet (see his Voyage à l’Aethiopie, ed. Sir William Foster, in The Red Sea and adjacent countries at the close of the seventeenth century, (Hakluyt Society, Second Series, no. C), London 1949). From Salīma the Dār al-arba’īn proper continued across the deserts to al-Suwayna, the frontier post of Dār Fûr, where the caravans were held to await the sultan’s pleasure. The route ended at Kubayh (Cobbe, Browne), about 33 miles NW of the sultan’s residence at al-Fāshir. Kubayh, which is now deserted, was in the 18th and early 19th centuries an important town, principally inhabited by merchants, many of whom were vellum dealers. The Darf al-arba’īn was the route followed to Egypt by the kāfījat al-Ṣūdān, which brought slaves, camels, ivory, ostrich feathers and gum, and returned with metal manufactured goods and textiles. During the 19th century, in consequence of the political changes of the eastern bilād al-Ṣūdān, and the decline of the slave-trade, the Dār al-arba’īn lost its importance, and only sectors of it are now occasionally used.


**DARB-KHĀNA** [see DĀR AL-DARB].

**DARBAND** [see DERBEND].

**DARBUKKA** [see DARABUKKA].

**DARD**, one of the four pillars of Urdu literature and one of the greatest of Urdu poets, Khādīja Mir (with the tahgalīs of Dard) b. Khādīja Muhammad Nasir “Andalib” al-Husayni al-Būqhārī al-Dīlahwī, claimed descent from Khādīja Bahā’ al-Dīn Nakghbandī and in the 25th step from the Imām Ḥānīf al-Ṣakārī. Born in 1133/1720-21 in the decadent Imperial Dihlī, Dard received his education at home, mostly from his father, a very well-read man and the author of Nīlā-i ‘Andalib, a voluminous Persian allegory dealing with metaphysical and abstruse problems and of another Sūfī work, Risāla-i Huqūq Afṣā (still in MS.). Casual references in Dard’s work (‘Ilm al-Ktb, vide infra) show that on the com- pletion of his studies he had attained proficiency in both the traditional and rational sciences. Starting life as a soldier he tried hard to secure a dājdījī, but soon withdrew from everything worldly and devoted himself, when barely 20 years of age, to a life of privation, austerity and asceticism. In 1172/1758-9, when he was 39 years old, he succeeded his father as the spiritual head of the local Čūghtīs and Nakgh- bands, and, despite the disturbed conditions prevailing in the capital in the wake of Nādir Shāh’s invasion of 1152/1739 and Ahmad Shāh Abdalī’s incursions of 1175/1761, he did not leave Dihlī, being the only Urdu poet of note not to do so. A great Sūfī, he passionately loved music and contrary to those who believed in the maxim “al-giml iṣrāʾīl min al-ṣawād” (music is more heinous than adultery), he was completely familiarized with the leading musicians of the town but also regularly held musical concerts (madājil-i samā‘) twice a month at his home, which were attended, among others, occasionally even by the ruling monarch Shāh ʿAlam Bahādūr Shāh I [q.v.]. In one of his works Nīlā-i Dār (p. 37) he describes devotional music (samā‘) “as ordained by God”.

Essentially a Sūfī writer, Dard’s first work Asrār al-Ṣāḥīb, was written during Fīkhā, while he was
still a lad of 15 years of age. It is a small tract dealing
with the seven essentials of al-Salat. In, however,
the 'Im al-Kitāb, a voluminous commentary on
Risāla-i Wūriddā, comprising 648 very closely-
written large-size pages. It is entirely on sulūk and is
profusely interspersed with long Arabic quotations.
Its style is sober and staid but powerful and the argu-
ments adduced are cogent and sound. This book can
safely be ranked with some of the outstanding works
of Shahjahanabad, outside the Turkoman Gate.

His other works are: Shams-i Makbī (composed
1195-99/1780-84); a short Persian diwan (Dihil,
1309/1891-2); an Urdu diwan (first published at
Dihil in 1272/1855 and later frequently printed);
Humāmāt-i Chānīā in defense of devotional music and
Wūridt-i Dard, also on mystic problems. All these
works have been published.

For an estimate of his quality and importance as
a poet see urdu literature.

Dard died at an advanced age on 24 Ṣafar 1199/6
January 1785 and was buried in the old cemetery
[now abandoned and converted into a public park]
of Shahjahanabad, outside the Turkoman Gate.
His tomb, along with that of his father and the
attached small mosque, is still preserved and visited
by the local Muslims.
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DARDANELLES (see Ġana 'qal' ē boğazi).

DARDIC AND KÄFIR LANG UAGES, the
description now generally applied to a number of
the Dardic and the Kāfīr languages and
dialects, spoken in the mountainous N.W.
corner of the Indo-Aryan (IA) linguistic area,
in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Kashmir. With the
exception of Kashmiri, they are numerically insigni-
ficant, and have no written history. The others are
known only from vocabularies and grammatical
sketches, etc., the oldest dating from about 1830.
There is still a great lack of adequate grammars,
vocabularies, and collections of texts.

In the following account there is a departure from
the normal transcription conventions of the Encyc-
lopaedia: the symbol ʃ is used for a voiceless
retroflex sibilant (retroflex, e.g., ʃuq); similarly
the symbol ʃ is used for the retroflex nasal.

The Dardic and Kāfīr languages may be roughly
grouped as follows:

I. Kāfīr Group. (a) Kāti (Bāshgall), spoken,
in two main dialects, in the Ramgul, Kulum, Kītīl
and Bāshgall valleys in north Nūrīstān (Kāfīrīstān);
(b) Prasūn (Waśi-veri; Verōn) in a small
valley wedged in between the Kātīl in Kītīl
and Bāshgall; (c) Aškōn (with Wāmālī), south of Kāti,
between the Alishār and Peś rivers; (d) Wāigāl
(Wai-alā), in the Waigal valley, south-east of
Prasūn. There is a not inconsiderable dialect
variation, and especially Gāmbīrī, spoken in the
Tregam valley east of Waigal towards the Kunar,
differs in many respects from ordinary Waigall.
The Kāfīr languages have certainly occupied their
isolated valleys since very ancient times. (c) and (d)
have been more exposed to outside influences than
(a) and (b); the last language has undergone such
violent sound-changes that it has become incompre-
hensible to its nearest neighbours.

Dardic group. II. (e) Kālaša, spoken in two
dialects by the Kālaš tribe, who are still mainly
pagan, in the upper Chitral (Cīrāh), chiefly in the west
valleys. Closely related to Kālaša is Kītīl, the
principal language of Chītral, spoken, with
little dialect variation, by the Khō tribe (see
Chītral, ii). Khōwār has adopted a number of
words from Wākhi, as well as from some Middle
Iranian languages (cf. BSOS, viii, 294 ff.). These
two languages represent the earliest wave of IA
penetration into the Hindu Kush region.

III. (g) Dīrāt, in one village in an east side
valley of Chītral, between Mīrkhanī and Aranūd. It
has adopted a number of Kāfīr words, and has
little connexion, except the geographical one, with
(h) Gāwar-Bātī (Nārisātī), spoken in a few
villages on the Kunar river, on both sides of the
Chītral-Afgān frontier. There is a tradition that this
language was brought in from Šawāt a few hundred
years ago. (i) Remnants of dialects of a some-
what similar type are found further south, in
Ningālām on the Peś (nearly extinct), and in
Shūmāshī in N. E. Pašāt territory.

IV. (j) Pašāt, spoken in numerous and widely
differing dialects, from the lower Kunar in the east,
through Lāghmān, and right up to Gūlhārān on the
Pašīndā. The number of speakers may well run
into the 100,000 guessed at in the LSI. Pašāt is
descended from the ancient languages of Hindu
and Buddhist civilization in Nagarāhār, Lāmpāka
and Kapīshā, and there is still a marked difference
of vocabulary between the east and west dialects.
A few numerals of Pašīt type have been recorded in
Al-Bīrūnī's India.

V. (k) Bāškharīk (Gāwrti/Gārwī), in the
upper Paṇḍjakora valley, above Dīr, and in three
villages at the head-waters of the Swāt valley;
(i) Torwāl in the upper Swāt valley, below Bāshk;
(m) Maīyā, with a number of related dialects
(Kanyawālī, Dūbērī, Cilīs, Gōwo, etc.), in the
Indus valley region between the Šīnā and the
Pašīt speaking areas. Maīyā is also called Kōhi-
štānī, but this term is also used for (k) and (l); in
some respects it approaches (p); (m) Wōpadōrt
(nearly extinct) and Kafārkālā, on and near the
Peś, just above Čīgha Sārā on the lower Kunar.
Connected with (k) and (l), but containing forms of
a more ordinary Lahnda [q.v.] type, is (o) Tirahi, in a few villages S.E. of Diallabād, driven out of Tirāh by the Afridis and probably the remnant of a dialect group once extending from there, through the Pashtūwar district, into Swāt and Dīr. VI. (p) Sinā, spoken in many dialects in Gilgit, Čilās, etc., as far south as Gurez in Kashmīr, and towards the east isolated in Drās and Dāh Hanū in Baltīstan, formerly even beyond Leh; (q) Phalūrā, an archaic offshoot of (p), spoken in a few villages in S. E. Chitrāl. A related dialect, Sāwāli, is spoken south of Gāwār-Bātī; (r) Dumākī, the speech of the Dāms (musicians and blacksmiths) in Hunza, speaking Burūshaskī [q.v. in Supplement]. It is influenced by (p), but has complex affinities with languages further south. VII. (s) Kashtāwārī, in the Kashmīr valley, with Kashtāwārī as a true dialect, and other dialects strongly influenced by Dōgīrī, etc. The nomenclature and classification of these languages have been much discussed. E. Kuhn, in an important article in the Album Kern (1882) used the nomenclature and geographical term "Hindū Kush dialects". Pischel, Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, 28, called them "Dārdū and Kāfīr dialects", employing the name Dārd in the extended sense, accepted since. He thought that they were related to the so-called Pāścā dialect of Prākrit. This theory was further elaborated by Grierson in a series of publications, but no cogent linguistic arguments have been offered in support of it. According to Grierson the Dārdic (or "Modern Pāścā") languages are not IA, but contain a number of Iranian features, and constitute a separate third branch of Indo-Iranian (IIr). Grierson divides the Dārdic and Kāfīr languages into four Kāfīr groups (= I, III, IV + e) and (o); (B) Khowār (= fj); (C) Dārd group (= V, VI, VII). His classification has, in the main, been accepted in such recent works as Les langues du monde (2nd. ed. 1952), and Mhd. Shahidullah's article in Indian Linguistics, Turner Jubilee Volume, ii, 1959, 117. On the other hand, S. K. Sen (JRAS, 1911, 1 ff.), drawing attention to some undoubtedly un-Iranian features of Bāshgāti (Kālī), came to the conclusion that this language was of Iranian origin, and agreed with Grierson that the whole group must be separated from IA. Finally, S. K. Sen (ibid., LXXIV) went so far as to contend that the real Kāfīr group (I) was not at all IIr, but a separate branch of the IE family. In order to avoid confusion, it is important to distinguish between I (Kāfīr group) and the rest (Dārdic, II-VII). The latter languages, apart from some Kāfīrī admixtures in (g), and in a few isolated cases in (e) and (b), contain absolutely no features which cannot be derived from Old IA. They have simply retained a number of striking archaisms, which had already disappeared in most Prākrit dialects. Thus for example the distinction between three sibilant phonemes (s, ś, sh), or the retention, in the western dialects, of ancient st, śf. The loss of aspiration of voiced stops in some Dārdic dialects is late, and most of them at least some trace of the aspiration has been preserved. There is not even a single common feature distinguishing Dārdic, as a whole, from the rest of the IA languages, and the Dārdic area itself is intersected by a network of isolgloses, often of historical interest as indicating ancient lines of communication as well as barriers. Dārdic is simply a convenient term to denote a bundle of aberrant IA hill-languages, which in their elative isolation, accentuated in many cases by the invasion of Pashtū tribes, have been in a varying degree sheltered against the expanding influences of IA Midland (Mādhyādeśa) innovations, being left free to develop on their own from the beginning. In the Kāfīr group (I) the situation is an entirely different one. Although very heavily overlaid by IA (Dārdic) words and forms, these dialects have retained several decidedly un-Iranian features. The complete loss of aspiration of voiceless as well as voiced stops (e.g., Kālī kur 'ass'; dyūm 'smoke'; S. Kalaṣa khār; dhūm) must go back to an extremely remote past, when we also find, e.g., Kālī (d)ār 'to kill': cf. Sanskrit hrim-; han. Cf. also Kālī (d)ār 'to know'; dī 'bowstring', both with unaspirated dī in Sanskrit. In this respect Kāfīr follows Ir. as against IA in abolishing the distinction between aspirated and unaspirated sounds, while retaining the one between ancient IE palatal and palatalized velar stops. In most other respects, however, as in the preservation of s, it agrees with IA: Kāfīrī c ( = ts) corresponding to Skt. ṭ, Av. Avestan s (e.g., in Kālī dac 'ten') is an archaic feature, and still more so is the retention of dental s after u, as in musā 'mouse'. The vocabulary of Kāfīrī contains a number of words not known from IA; some of these appear also in Iranian, e.g., kān-, etc., 'to laugh', cf. Pers. bhand; wæŠgātī, etc., 'wasp', cf. Ir. Pamir dialect, Yidgāh wofstå; Prasun yase 'belt', cf. Av. yāh-; etc. Other words are found only in Kāfīrī, and, in a few cases, in some of the adjoining Dārdic dialects. We are, therefore, entitled to posit the existence of a third branch of IIr, agreeing generally with IA, but being situated on the IR side of some of the isoogloses which, taken as a whole, constitute the borderline between IA and Ir. This branch had also retained archaisms of its own, and must have separated from the others at a very early date. The present-day Kāfīrī languages represent, so to speak, the decayed ruins of this original building, largely rebuilt and reconstructed with the help of foreign (IA) material, but with the outlines of the original structure still visible. Bibliography: (see also article Chitrāl, ii): G. Budruss, Beitr. zur Kenntnis der Pāścā-Dialekte, Leipzig 1919; idem, Krawat: Proben eines Maiyd-Dialektes, Wiesbaden 1959; idem, A Dictionary of the Kashmiri language, A Dictionary of the Kashmiri language, London 1924; G. A. Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India (cited above as LSI), viii/2, with bibliography up to 1919; idem, ibid. i/1 (Tirāhī); idem, A Dictionary of the Kashmiri language, Calculta 1932; D. L. R. Lovmer, Phonetics of the Gilgit dialect of Shina in JRAS 1924; idem, The forms and nature of the transitive verb in Shina in BSOS, iii; idem, The conjugation of the transitive verb in the principal dialects of Shina, JRAS 1927; idem, The Dumākī language, Nijme gen 1939; G. Morgenstierne, in Norsk Tidsskrift for Språkvidenskap: Askūn (Vols. ii and vii); idem, S. Kalasa; dhum) Khowār (xv); Prasun (xv); Wāmdā, Askūn (xvi); Wotapur (xvi). S. E. D. Dārdic ( = Köhīstānī) (with F. Barth, (xviii); idem, AO viii (Torwālī); Tirāhī (ibid., (xii); Bashkārīk (xviii); idem, Det Norrøne Videnskaps-Akademī i Oslo, Skrifter, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, Phalār (1940, v); Gāwār-Bātī (1950, i); idem, Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages: Fashat texts and vocabulary, iii, 2 and 3. (G. Morgenstierne) DARDIRYYA, name of the Egyptian branch of the Khalawītīya [q.v. order. See also TARĪQA.
DARDISTAN, the name given to the area, lying between the Hindu Kush and Kâghan, between lat. 37° N. and long. 73° E., and lat. 35° N. and long. 74° 30' E., the country of the Dardas of Hindustan. In the northwest sector it embraces the Shâina-speaking territories, i.e., Gilgit, Astor, Gurayz, Cîlás, Hódur, Dârâl, Tangir etc., or what is now known as Yâghistan. In a wider sense the feudatory states of Hunza, Nâgar and Chîtrâ (q.v.) (including the part known as Yâšîn), now forming the northern regions of Pakistan, comprise Dardistân; in the widest sense parts of what was till very recently known as Yâghistan. In a wider sense the feudatory regions of Pakistan, comprise Dardistân; in the

"placing it on the frontier of Kashmir and in the vicinity of modern Afghanistan". He, however, does not use the name "Dard" while referring to the country; on the other hand Strabo (xv) and Pliny (Natural History, xi) call the people inhabiting the area as Dardae or Dardai. The Dards are the "Darda" of the Sanskrit writers, a region to which Buddha sent his missionaries and bhikshus. Those whom they take prisoners in these raids, they sell as slaves" (Voyages par Mir 'Izzetulla in 1812 in Klaproth's Magasin Asiatique, ii, 3-5).

Strange enough the Dards have no name in common, each tribe inhabiting a different valley carrying a different name, derived mostly from the areas inhabited by them.

The history of Dardistân, a name first given to the entire country by Dr. G. W. Leitner after his visit in 1866, is the history of its component parts, namely Hunza, Nâgar, Chîtrâ, parts of Baltistân, Ladakh, Gilgit etc. (q.v.). The main enemy of the Dards, otherwise a peace-loving people, was the Dôrâ State of Kazhmîr under its first ruler, Gulâb Singh. He led a number of expeditions against the Dards. In 1850 a large Sikh army sent against Cîlás met with an ignominious defeat. Next year, a force of 10,000 strong, under Bakhshâlî Harr Singh and Dîwân Hari Cand succeeded in destroying the fort of Cîlás and scattering the hill tribes who had come to the assistance of the Cîlásis.

A little-known fact about the outlying states of Hunza and Nâgar is that they never owed any allegiance to Kazhmîr except that they occasionally sent a handful of gold dust to the Mahâraížâ and received substantial presents in return. These two states have rather more than once been hostile to the Dôrâ Kingdom.

The prevailing religion in the whole of Dardistân is Islam; a form of Shi'â is met with in most of the lands. The Mawla'îs, as they call themselves, profess to be good Muslims with strong leanings towards the seventh Shi'-îimâm. They, however, owe allegiance to the Āghâ Kânân. The Kalâm-i Pir, a book in Persian, an edition of which was published by Ivanov (Bombay 1935), is held in high esteem among the Mawla'îs. (See further ISMA'ILYYA).

Camâr-khân in Yâghistan became the centre of the remnants of the Mûdshîdhân, the followers of Sayyid Ahmad Barâli (q.v.) after their defeat and dispersal in 1246/1831 at Bálîkîlî in the Kâghan valley, at the hands of the Sikh forces led by Prince Shîr Singh, a son of the Lahore Chieftain, Ramdîlî Singh. Because of the suspected revolutionary and subversive activities of these Mûdshîdhân and their descendants, entry into Yâghistan from British India and subsequently from Pakistan was regulated by permits. This system was, however, abolished by the Pakistan Government in 1959.

Bibliography: G. W. Leitner, Dardistan in 1866-1886 and 1893, Woking n.d.; idem, The Hunza and Nâgar Handbook, Calcutta 1889 and 1893; idem, The languages and races of Dardistan (Part II of this work deals exhaustively with the flora and fauna, rivers, mountains, the occupations etc. of the people of Dardistan); idem, article in Asiatic Quarterly Review, January 1892. See also the articles CHÎTRÂ, HUNZA AND NÄGAR, and Muhammâd 'Ali Kâsrûr, Muşâhâdât-i Kîbul wa Yâghistan, Karachi n.d.

AL-DARDJINI, ABU L-'ABBÂS AHMAD B. SA'ID B. SULAYMÂN B. 'ALLI B. ISKÎLAF, an Ibâdí jurist, poet and historian of the 7th/13th century, author of a historical and biographical work on the Ibâdí, the Kitâb Tabâbât al-Mašâ'ûbîhîh. He belonged to a pious and learned Berber-IbadI family from TâmîdÎr, a place in the Dîjâbâl Nafúsâ in Tripolitania. His ancestor, al-Hâdíj Iskîlaf b. Iskîlaf al-Nâfusî al-Tâmîdîrî, an eminent fâkîh, lived in the neighbourhood of Nîfā' in the Dîjârd (q.v.). Son of Iskîlaf, the pious 'Ali, who lived in the second half of the 6th/12th century, earned his living by trading with the Sudan. In the course of one of his trading journeys, in the year 575/1179-80, he is said to have converted the pagan king of Mâli in the western Sudan to the Ibâdí faith, but this is a legend (cf. J. Schacht, in Trauxes de l'Institut de Recherches Sahariennes, xi, 1954, 21 f.). His son, the famous lawyer Sulaymân, who was the grandfather of Abu l-'Abbâs, lived at Kanûmâ in the Dîjârd; he was regarded as a saint. The father of Abu l-'Abbâs, Sa'id, who was a distinguished traditionist, settled at Dârîdîn al-Sufla l-Djâdida near Nefîth.

We do not know much about the life of al-Dârîdîn. He must still have been very young when he went to Ouargla in 616/1219-20, where he spent two years studying with the Ibâdí shaybhs of this city. Afterwards he returned to the Dîjârd, where we find him engaged in historical studies at Tûzér in 633/1235-6. Later he lived for some time on the island of Djîrâba, where he was highly regarded by the 'açâdâh (Ibadî scholars). It was at the request of these that he conceived the idea of writing the Kitâb Tabâbât al-Mašâ'ûbîhîh.

The Kitâb al-Dawwâhir al-Muntakhtâbîh, of Abu l-Kâsim b. 'Ibrâhîm al-Barrâdî (q.v.), gives some information on the origins of this work.

"Here", says al-Barrâdî, "are the circumstances in which Abu l-'Abbâs came to write his book. Al-Hâdíj Isâ b. Zakariyyâ' had just arrived from 'Oman bringing various works with him. . . . His brothers in the east had asked him to send them a work containing biographies of the earliest Ibâdîs and recounting the virtues of the western forebears. Al-Hâdíj Isâ consulted the learned 'âzâdâh who were then to be found in Djîrâba and told them of this desire of their co-religionists in the east. They thought first of the book of Abu Zakariyyâ, but they recognized that it was not sufficiently complete, and that the style of the author, who was accustomed to the Berber language and hence not very accurate
in the rules of Arabic grammar or the propriety of its terminology, was often defective. They thought then of having a new work compiled on the history of the Rustumids and the vicissitudes of the ancient doctors. No-one was more suitable than Abu l-"Abbās to fulfil this task worthily and it was to him that it was confided".

The Kitāb Tabakāt al-Maghribiyyāh exists only in some manuscript copies (a few in the Mzb and one in the collection of the late Z. Smogorzewski). It consists of two distinct parts of which the first is merely a reproduction of the Kitāb al-Shahābūrānī, taken in as Athībī al-"Imāma of Abū Zakariyāyy. Yahyā b. Abī Bakr al-Wardjāmi, or rather of the first part of this chronicle. It contains a history of Ibadī penetration into North Africa, of the installation of the Ibadī imāmāte and of the imāmāt of the Banū Rustum family, and finally some biographies of Ibadī doctors of Maghribi origin. The second part, the original work of al-Dardjīnī, is a collection of biographies of doctors and other celebrated Ibadīs, divided in the customary way into twelve classes, each class covering a period of fifty years. The first four classes of the work cover the biographies of the eastern Ibadī doctors of the 1st/7th and 2nd/8th centuries. The author found it pointless here to give biographies of famous personages from the Maghrib, retaining the reproducing the corresponding part of the work of Abū Zakariyāyy. The sources of the biographies of these eastern scholars are sometimes very old. The eight classes which follow, on the other hand, are confined to biographies of Ibadī doctors of Maghribi origin. The last 4 classes, indeed, deal only with persons from Ouariga, the Oued Righ, the Oued Souf, the Djerda and the island of Djebra, and are therefore of no more than a local importance.

Al-Dardjīnī used a large number of sources in the second part of his book, among others the historical and biographical works of Mahbūb b. al-Raḥlī al-"Abdī (2nd/8th century) and Abu l-"Irāfī Sulaymān b. Abī al-Sālim al-Wisayyūn (6th/12th century). He included in his work some curious passages which are of great value for students of Ibadī history, for example the rules concerning the constitution of the khul'a laid down by the great Ibadī scholar, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Bakr al-Nafāṣī (5th/11th century), and the khul'a pronounced at Medina by the famous Ibadī chieftain, Abū Ḥaṣma al-Shārī (2nd/8th century). The exquisite language of the Kitāb Tabakāt al-Maghribiyyāh surpasses by far in elegance all other Ibadī works of North African origin, and the author has corrected the style of his Maghribi sources, as can be seen from a comparison with the original text of the chronicle of Abū Zakariyāyy.

Al-Dardjīnī is also the author of a dāwān and of letters in verse. As a jurist, he decided a number of questions on the division of inheritances, which al-Ḥittālī (gg.) put together afterwards.

The date of his death is unknown, but it was undoubtedly in the second half of the 7th/13th century.

introduced (called the new aq'lm, with 43 letters). This gave way in 1928 to the Latin alphabet which in turn was replaced in 1938 by the Cyrillic alphabet. In written Dargin, based on Arabic, there is also a script called Farsi or New Persian. The fact that New Persian literature arose and flourished in Khurasan and Transoxiana because of political reasons (Iranian dynasties of the Tahirids and Sâmanids) has caused some difficulty. The language was basically a West Iranian dialect, hence the name Farsi after the province. In Islamic times, if not before, elegant Dari diverged more and more from the rather stilted language of the tabhavi books, kept alive primarily by Zoroastrian priests. By the time of the Mongol conquest of Iran the term Dari had gone out of use.


(R. N. Frye)

DARI, one of the words most generally used to denote a tax, applied in particular to the whole category of taxes which in practice were added to the basic taxes of canonical theory. These latter (sakti or uşur, djiysa and kharddi, etc.) and their yield in the "classical" period, have been covered in a general survey in an earlier article, BAYT AL-MAL, and a detailed description of the methods of assessment and collection will be given under their respective titles, in particular under Kharddi; along with kharddi and sakti will be included associated taxes and payments linked with them or levied on other categories of agricultural or pastoral wealth; finally, in the article Djiysa will be found a discussion of the problem of the original distinction between djiysa and kharddi. Apart from djiysa which, as a poll-tax, is not concerned with the nature of the wealth, the above-mentioned taxes which form the basis of the official fiscal system of Islam are essentially concerned with agriculture and stock-breeding; only the theoretical definition of sakti makes it possible to include the products of industry and commerce, but only with the Muslims and, as we shall see, is far from embracing all the effective forms of taxes to which they were subject; and no canonical tax covers the fiscal dues which the State arrogates to itself in the pursuit of certain causes, an aspect of its administration. It is of this whole group of taxes, usually called darâ'ib or rûsun, and often stigmatized by theorists, on account of their more or less extra-canonical character, under the name mukâs, that we shall attempt to speak here although, precisely because they are poorly represented in doctrinal treatises as well as in papyri, any research into them is made under more difficult documentary conditions than is the case with canonical taxation, and they have been scarcely noticed by historians.

In the practice of the last years of the Prophet's life, treaties concluded with certain communities of dhimmis had allowed them to make payments in kind with goods useful to the Muslims, if they produced them; after the conquest, and on a larger scale, stipulations of the same sort had again been expressed for the benefit of the army of occupation; and for many centuries the same element occurs in the taxes paid by certain provinces with important specific products, either natural or manufactured. It is however clear that it was always a question of the method by which the total contribution from the province was compounded, and not of specific taxes on industry or the trade of individuals. As regards sakti, this of course includes a levy on...
possessions in the form of precious metals (money included) or merchandise, as on other categories of goods as well. In the case of the dhimmis, the state levies a tax on the basis between "rich" and "poor"; but in fact it amounted to a preferential tariff granted to Muslims within the framework of a more general tax levied on traders of all faiths: it was to be confirmed in the rule that the Muslim should pay 1/40 = 2.5%, the dhimmis 1/50 = 2%, and the foreign merchant 1/10 = 10%. Indeed, it seems clear that, whether or not under the pretext of zakāt, the State levied certain dues in its very nature; the schedule that such a conception implies, with an official fixing of values and a distinction between consumer goods and those intended for trade, obviously presents great difficulties particularly to a merchant when travelling, for, on introducing himself to officials in a new province, he has to prove that he has already made the obligatory annual payment, since it is impossible to determine the amount of his sakāt himself and even to pay it direct to the "poor"; the conception of an annual payment became impracticable at the time of the political fragmentation of Islam, no State being prepared to be deprived of the proceeds of a tax on the ground that it had already been paid to another. Even if in Byzantium, for example, complaints that the Alexandria customs-post taxes pilgrims without enquiring whether they have already paid their sakāt, and moreover without distinguishing between goods for private consumption and goods for trade, and between pilgrims and merchants. All this helps us to understand that what was taking place was a reorganization and development of the kind of taxes which had been known to the pre-Islamic empires and which more or less must have survived the conquest in the framework of local institutions, particularly for towns enjoying a "treaty" which left them free to dispose of certain goods which were well organized, on the great international trade routes, and from the very first naturally at the ports (Ubulla, the fore-port of Māsurah, the tithe-man. The "tithe" levied there can only have been taken in kind on certain merchandise, and for the most part it was therefore necessary to pay in cash according to an official estimate of value; in this way there were evolved certain kinds of customs tariffs such as the one preserved in the Mulakhsās (see Diak.). In theory no customs-post should exist except on the frontiers of Islam, for the foreign merchant is in law indebted only to the Muslim community as a whole; in fact, from the start the large region it seems to have had autonomy in customs, and this state of affairs became general everywhere, imme-
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credibly so after the establishment of many separate principalities. In addition there were often town
dues at the gates of towns, and tolls on the trade routes, particularly the water-ways, from which the khard迪 itself was not exempt. The theoretical justi-
fication for such dues, insofar as one was looking for argument, is in this case less clear than for customs; it may in certain cases, as also for other dues to be discussed later, be a question of taxes for the use of a route belonging to the State; in general, variations of this "protection", hīmāya or khaṣāra, became widespread and, although the normal taxation implied such protection, payments had to be made to the zandh, to local authorities of all kinds and, in bedouin countries, to the tribes, according to immemorial custom; payment generally is calculated on a "load" of an ass or camel. Finally, although the jurists ignore the point, we must add that in addition to dues for the import of goods others, for export (to obtain authorization), were sometimes imposed or substituted, as in other mediaeval societies. The result of all this was that, contrary to what one might expect, the Muslim world, even at the time of the whole great political unity, did not allow goods to circulate with any real freedom from those restrictions which so impeded them in, for example, the more divided European communities.

A second category of dues can be grouped under the heading of the renting of lands or buildings belonging to the State. The State, rediscovering ancient habits or regulations under the Aṣbahān, sometimes looked upon itself as the proprietor perhaps of the whole territory of a town, but invariably of the ramparts and public highways, calculated on the basis of a width of forty cubits; everything that had in fact been established or built on this land had to recognize the ownership of the State by paying rent; in practice all the shops in the souks and markets in public places were subject to this charge. Dionysius of Tell-Mahre again provides us with evidence from the reign of al-Mahdi, of whom we know in particular from al-

Ya'kubī that he introduced dues on the saḥīs in Bagdad, and from others that he made the same innovation in Egypt. This did not however signify that the State did not recognize some sort of ownership by occupants of shops or houses standing on rented land, since in fact it left them free to dispose of them normally by inheritance, sale, waṣf etc. It regarded itself as having a more direct ownership of the khāns and fundūs, to enter which it was of course necessary to pay; in Egypt, this was true of many shops.

With regard to the khāns, there was also hīmāya, protection of goods, to be provided. The same justification was given for the dues which the State required from individuals wishing to make use of the post (barād), weights and measures, as well as certain instruments in which it retained a monopoly and, of course, the profit made from minting money. Ovens, presses, and mills also came into this category although private ones also existed, which were subject to taxes similar to those applying to trades in general.

Indeed, it seems clear that, whether or not under the pretext of sakāt, the State levied certain dues
collectively on various organized trades or industrial establishments—without prejudice to secondary taxes on regulation, poisoning, etc. in the case of goods in which it had a monopoly or whose export it regulated (fabrics from Egypt and Fars, among others). In addition, dues were charged on certain sales (especially of livestock) and on the exercise of brokerage which was particularly indispensable in commercial dealings with foreigners. We make no mention here of manufactures in which the State retained a monopoly, or of the fifth on mines, treasure troves, etc.

Dues for himdya appeared frequently, though it is not always possible to distinguish between those which do or do not merge with certain of the dues noted above. Originally it was, generally speaking, a matter of demands from individuals or from local police, but subsequently the State replaced these beneficiaries, while keeping up their demands. We leave aside the question of State duties and legacies. The drawing up of any written legal deed also of course incurred a tax.

The waqfs in principle were independent of the State, on condition that taxes were paid to it unless they had been renounced; but it tended to take over control, paying a fixed allocation to the parties concerned, while keeping the surplus: a kind of manipulation of property in mortmain.

It should not be imagined that the various sorts of taxes and dues that we have just noted always coexisted everywhere and to the same degree. Of course it was Egypt which was the fiscal paradise, following the tradition of Antiquity. It is possible that at the start the conqueror, satisfied with the payment of poll-tax and other taxes and grants of land agreed upon by the terms of surrender, failed to pay attention to other sources of revenue which had been added by earlier regimes; subsequently, when equivalent measures were re-established, the Muslims accused the Copts of having appropriated them, though one cannot be certain if they meant that these revenues had fallen into private ownership, or that the local powers had embezzled the proceeds. Tradition, simplifying a complex process that had been considerably confused by the contributions of Ibn al-Mudabbir, head of Egyptian finances on the eve of the Tulunid régime (mid 9th/10th century), the particular responsibility for introducing the policy of new extra-canonical taxes. Succeeding régimes, according as to whether they were compelled by a desire for legality and popularity or by financial needs, alternately abolished and re-established all or part of these taxes which no doubt reached their fullest development during the difficult times of the last Fatimids; part of them (but not the customs) was later abolished by Saladin, with the loss of 100,000 dinars, and the report which has been preserved is one of the principal sources of our knowledge; but Saladin's successors re-established and perfected them (al-Maqrizi, Akhlaq, I, 103 ff., Ibn Mammât, ed. Atiya, chap. 5).

In 'Irak, tradition and the strength of custom did not allow such a fiscal system to be established as the fact that the 'Abbasids had not the ability or the means to utilize for their own advantage the revenues from commerce like those from agriculture perhaps forms a part, which is difficult to evaluate, of their financial difficulties. Ibn Râ'îq was said to be the first to set up a toll-house at the very gates of Baghdad. It was naturally the Buyids who in particular made repeated efforts to introduce in 'Irak a system similar to that of the Fâtimids; 'Abûd al-dawla, the best organizer of the dynasty, and his immediate successors tried to impose dues on the fine textile products which were the livelihood of great numbers of Baghâd artisans: popular riots compelled them finally to abandon the project, and the same was true of the attempt to place dues on mills, etc. In the time of the Bûyids, Basra was notorious for the severity of its dârâbî, as was Fars; in Iran, on the other hand, Isfahan in particular and the whole territory of the Sâmanids had moderate dârâbî.

This very diversity raises a problem. It is indeed found in all sections of the fiscal organization, which was adapted to economic conditions and inherited different traditions, according to the region. But here there is another point. In principle, the Muslim has the right to pay his sakât direct to the "poor", and if, as happened in fact, he paid it to specialized agents, it was understood that the money had to go direct to the true beneficiaries, and not pass into the coffers of the State, which was taken to imply that it was spent on the spot and not centralized in the capital; furthermore, we have indicated that various taxes had to be regarded as himdya, which clearly meant that the beneficiaries were those who provided this himdya, the local authorities. It can hardly be doubted that the police, either in their official form as shurta, or as shâhidî militia etc. were the recipients of particular of these fiscal taxes in particular. From all this it emerges that the Bayt al-Mal was not the recipient of all the taxes that we have noted. We must not, however, go too far in the opposite direction. In fact, all the mukâs abolished by Saladin had very clearly been profitable to his treasury, and it was no less clear that, to swell his own fortunes, 'Abûd al-dawla in Baghâd made the fiscal efforts to which we have referred. Customs, which affected Muslims and non-Muslims alike, were in fact regarded as being unrelated to sakât and profited the Treasury. The same was true of the proceeds from rents. However, it was a principle of the Muslim fiscal administration that local expenditure was met from the proceeds of local taxes, only the surplus being sent to the Treasury; the latter did not provide any means of evaluation for the dârâbî and other basic taxes. In fact, without exception, the dârâbî do not appear in the 'Abbasid "budgets" that still survive. However, the proceeds from certain dârâbî perhaps formed part of the revenues of the caliph's or sovereign's private treasury, with which he thus contributed to the obligatory "good works".

Economic and international circumstances have sometimes brought about appreciable modifications in the system of dârâbî and, more particularly, customs. Al-Ghazâlî granted that the tariff could be lowered, even for infidels, if it was advantageous to the community to encourage the import of certain goods. From the 6th/12th century, this was in fact the object of the treaties concluded with the "Franks", setting up differential tariffs according to the goods, and sometimes even conferring on those nations' merchants advantages superior to those legally enjoyed by the Muslims. Naturally, this was not a practice peculiar to the Muslim States: Byzantium concluded similar treaties. It appears indeed that certain Muslim groups like the Kârimis with the Indian Ocean trade were allowed to enjoy preferential tariffs at the end of the Middle Ages (according to the Malaqallāh, see 252).

Bibliography: neither books nor papyri
provide documentation on the aspect of financial history considered here (apart from the doctrinal definition of commercial zakāt and taxes on the non-Muslims which fīkh approximates to it). Information is to be found either in geographers such as Muhammad or, for certain countries, in various chroniclers and authors of technical treatises on administration, of which only a few examples can be quoted here; for Mesopotamia, Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, Syriac Chronicle, ed. trans. J. B. Chabot (see Cl. Cahen, Fīkhī, etc., in Arabica, 1954), Miskawayh, Tadjīrī, ed. trans. Margoulouith (The eclipse of the Abbāsid Caliphate), with sequel by Abū Shudā'ī Rushawārī; for Egypt, in addition naturally to the materials in Maḥrī, Khaṭṭāt, particularly i, 103 ff., Ibn Mammātī, Kawkāwīn al-dawwarīn, ed. Aṭīya 1934, Nābuluslī, Abhār al-Fayyūm ed. B. Moritz (see Cl. Cahen, Impôts du Fayyum, in Arabica, 1956; for Arabia, G. Wiet, Un Décret du sultan Mālik Asårī à la Mecca, in Mélanges Massénon, III, 1957, and in particular the Yemeni Mulkhabbās al-jītān, on which see the article by Cl. Cahen and R. B. Serjeant in Arabica, 1957; on Syria, Kāmil al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Adīm, Zubāda, ed. S. Dahan, i, 163 ff. (on the treaty of 358/969 with Byzantium), and *Ita al-Dīn b. Shadī, ed. S. Dahan, 1950 (see Sauvaget, Aţeq, 253-4), and, for the Diţāra, the same, provisionally in REI, 1934, 111-2.

The treaties with the Franks are given in Mas Latrie, Traittés concernant les relations des chrétiens avec..., l'Afrique septentrionale, 1866; G. Müller, Documenti sulle relazioni della città toscana coll'Oriente, 1879; Tafel and Thomas, Ursuchungen zur alteren Handelsgeschichte Venedigs, 3 vols. of Fontes Rerum Austriacarum, 2nd s., xii-xiv, 1856-57. For the later Middle Ages, see the Italian technical treatises such as the Pratica della Mercatura by Pegolotti, ed. A. Evans, Cambridge Mass. 1936.

As regards the modern literature, besides the information given earlier in Aghnides, Mohamm. Merch. Fīkhī, etc., B. Ifren, etc., the same, provisionally in REI, 1934, 111-2. A. Mez, Renaissance, viii; R. Heffening, Das Islamische Fremdenrecht, 1925, various works by Arabic-speaking scholars should now be added: 'Abd al-'Azīz Dūrī, Ta'rīkh al-İrāq Kidsi'da fi al-kār al-rābī' al-hīdarī, Baghdād 1948; Abābās al-Azāzīlī, Ta'rīkh al-dārīb al-ṣāhibiyya, Baghdād 1959; M. Awwād, al-Muṣafīr fi l-İslām, Baghdād 1950; Ṣāhib al-Barawī, Ḥalālat Miṣr al-khāṣṣīyyiya fi ahd al-Fātimiyyn, Cairo 1943.

(C. CAHEN)

(2) — West. The history of fiscal systems in the Maghībī is still to be written, and perhaps may never be written. The texts are few and difficult to interpret, the terminology vague. The turbulent history of the country gave no opportunity for the establishment of a lasting fiscal tradition. Tax-collection, like the other functions of government, was generally acknowledged to be the only proper regulator of finance. There seems to have been only one at any time or another, the government accepted payment in this form. There is some evidence that certain taxes were occasionally farmed out, but this seems in the Maghībī to be a late development first reported under the Almoravids and sporadically mentioned thereafter. There is no clear distinction between the privy purse and the public treasury.

West. Governor General, or the Caliph.—There are no contemporary texts. They collected ṣadaqa and ʾakār and diżīya but there is no clear indication of what these terms implied; later writers tend to interpret them in the light of legal doctrines which became established later. It seems as though the multitude of newly-converted Muslims led to the same difficulties in Ifīrkīya as it had in ʿIrāk 20 years before, and there was an ill-fated attempt by Yazzīd b. Abī Muslim to deal with them as Ḥādirī Ḥādirī had done. In the earliest decades the khums had some importance and there were even attempts to treat the vanished populations themselves as booty.

Aghlabīds.—New tax names (masāqlīm, ḥabbālī) appear, without definitions, and a distinct reference to the conversion of the tithe from a proportion, in kind, of produce to 10 ḥālīm per area.

İdrīsīds.—Little information. The Jews of Fez were obliged to pay the diżīya.

Rustamīds.—This period affords the only (and probably idealized) account of the distribution of the agricultural produce accruing from taxation. Fātimīds.—The taxation system seems to take on a better-organized aspect, though this may be an illusion due to the nature of the sources. For the first time we hear of a cadastral survey and of ṭawwil or ṭawwi (“apportionment” of tax?), and an attempt to establish the fiscal system on a rational and regular footing. Customs or octroi dues are first mentioned.

Zirīds, Hammādīs, Berber Principalities (Maḥrāwa, B. Ifren, etc.), Almoravids.—Information is very sparse, but Ibn Khallīkān describes the Almoravids' tax-collecting detachments composed of European mercenaries.

Almohades.—'Abd al-Muṣin is traditionally remembered as the one who introduced ħarādī into the Maghībī. However this may be understood it probably symbolizes some striking innovation on his part. These in fact are obscure account by Ibn Abī Zarī' of a land-survey which preceded the levying of ħarādī.

The zāhī al-ażāghī (first mentioned in connexion with Maḥrūr) was an important official in charge of finance. There seems to have been only one at any
given time and he is always mentioned among the high officers of state. The mushrif, on the other hand, was...
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| 39x153 | Le Regime douanier du Maroc et le developpement du commerce marocain [(J. F. P. HOPKINS), 1958; Michaux-Bellaire, in Les impots marocains, xi; idem, in Les origines jusqu'a nos jours, Paris; J. Ganiage, Les origines du protectorat francais en Tunisie, Paris 1959. (J. F. P. HOPKINS)] | 92x153 | (3) — OTTOMAN EMPIRE. In the Ottoman system the taxes were divided into two groups, hukuk-i 'urfiiyye and rusum-i 'urfiiyye. The former included 'urf [q.v.] or ondasik, Sharidi, dziya [q.v.], hums-i 'urfii levied on mir, rams mined and khanima [q.v.]. Other Islamic taxes objected to by some legislators, such as maks [q.v.], were included rather among the 'urfii taxes by the Ottomans (for the 'urfii taxes dealt with by the Ottoman legis see Molla Khusrw, Durar al-hukkdm fi sharh gharur Al-akbam, Istanbul 1258, 1259-39). On the other hand they added to the 'urf an 'urf tax called saldiriyye or saldirik which raised it from one-tenth to one-eighth, and collected some additional dues, rusum or 'addi, on hives, fisheries, hay, and vegetables. Also dziya was somewhat modified in its application in the Ottoman empire. The 'urfii taxes [see 'urf] were those assessed by the Sultan and, in origin, were mostly pre-Ottoman local taxes. They were recorded by the Ottoman tabirir [q.v.] emins and proclaimed in the kanunnames (see Kanuns) of the sandjak. With the development of 'urf this kind of taxation grew in importance, though from the 10th/16th century there appeared a strong tendency to accommodate these taxes, at least formally, to the Sharia. The 'urfii taxes, generally called rusum or 'addi, were divided into various categories: 1. Up to the late 10th/16th century the basic 'urfii taxes were biti resmi and ispenji [q.v.]. The latter was paid by every adult non-Muslim at the rate of 25 akce [q.v.] per person. Widows paid it at the rate of 6 akce under the name of blue resmi. 2. Of the taxes levied on livestock the most important was 'addi-i agnim or koyun resmi which was usually 1 akce for two sheep, collected directly for the central treasury. The pastureage due, called yasih resmi, oluk resmi or resm-i lenagah was usually one sheep or its money equivalent for each flock of sheep of 300 | 146 | DARIBA |
which passed over to another sandjak, kadi or timar. It was paid to the person holding the land as timar or bahis (see Timar). The dues called bid-i hauz [q.v.] or haviyâdet were principally such dues levied on occasional cases as djerid-im or kanluk, fines, išerisâne or gerdeh resmi or nikâh ahesi bridegroom duty, yava and baqubun, dues paid while running away cattle or slaves, tapu resmi, [q.v.] (see Timar). A third such item, the dues called kanluk, or djerdâm, market dues, paid per load; kapan (bâbûn) and mişvin or terâza rusâmû, duties levied at the public scales. There were also gümûrûk, customs duties, getâ resmi, tolls levied at mountain passes and river fords, koprû bâbûl, bridge-toll. The state established monopolies on the trade of such commodities as salt, rice, wax-candles, soap, sesame and tobacco. The monopoly of minting was also a large source of revenue [see Dar al-Dur]. In the provinces became more and more arbitrary, and from the late 10th/16th century this made them virtually autonomous. As the central authority weakened the abuses of the system grew and most of the other ʿurfî taxes were assigned as timârs to the members of the ʿaskeri class who collected them themselves in their respective timâr lands. In view of the difficulties for the central government in collecting taxes in kind, such as ʿurfî, and of the lack of adequate means of communication, this system was maintained as the best possible method at that time. In essence timâr was a form of hauzla. The distribution and assignment of timârs were made by lâtirr and all this made a vast department of financial administration called deltar-i hawdulâ [q.v.] under a nisibâğı [q.v.]. The total sum of the revenues in this section was about 200 million akçe or about 3.5 million gold ducats in 933/1527-934/1528. Income unrecorded in the delters [see Başvelkâlet Arşivi] was to be collected by officers of the Sultan called mewbûldijî or mewbûldâji, under the defterdar, directly for the treasury. Except for the ʿahdîr, ʿahdi taxes, resmi-berat and tebdhîre and bâyi al-mîl (that is, escheated properties), mewbûlât, and the revenues from the imperial domains [see Kuiss] were collected for the central treasury, khâmis-ı ʿtimir, either directly by kuls, men of slave origin at the Porte, or through the ʿiltizâm system. The following is an official statement of the revenues from these sources for the provinces of Rumel, Anadolu, Karaman, Dhuhaul-Kadriye and Rum in the fiscal year of 933/1527-934/1528 (Istanbul Univ. İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, x, 1-4, 269).

This was about one fifth of the total amount of the state revenues in the same year. The most important item in it, mukdaṭaṭ, included the revenues of the Imperial domains (Khaṣṣ-i ʿHumayun), state monopolies, khâmsi-ı şarî, customs duties and imposts on trade. The mukdaṭaṭ were usually farmed out to the müllezîms or mukdaṭaṭ ʿısmil under the system of mukdaṭaṭa [q.v.], and their accounts were kept in the mukdaṭaṭa defterleri in the defterkhâne-i ʿtimir (one of the oldest and most important of these defters covering the reign of Mehmed II is in the Başvelkedel Archives, Istanbul, nos. 176, 6222, 7387). The ʿiltizâm system was essential for the Ottoman finances from the beginnings of the state and was also used by the big timâr-holders. Upon an order, hauzla, of the Sultan payments were made for state expenses directly by the müllezîms. From the 10th/ 16th century onwards, the ʿiltizâm system became dominant throughout the empire and the mukdaṭaṭa began to be farmed out for much larger sums. By the 12th/18th century the governors of some provinces became müllezîms at the same time, which made them virtually autonomous. As the central authority weakened the abuses of the system grew until in 1255/1839, by the rescript of Gülshânê, ʿiltizâm, termed a "destructive instrument", was abolished. The system of emôn, a system of collection of mukdaṭaṭa revenues directly by salaried employed called emûn, was made general and
mulações, financial heads in the sand [q.v.] with full responsibilities, were appointed. But the decrease in the state revenues under the new system compelled the government to restore ilçizams which lasted to the end of the Empire.


(4) — Post-Ottoman Egypt. In the years immediately preceding the Napoleonic invasion of Egypt in 1798, the Egyptian government’s principal source of revenue was derived from numerous taxes levied on the land. These fell into three main categories: (1) al-mâl al-hâr; (2) al-mâl (or bûjdmat) al-kûşâﬁyya; and (3) supplementary taxes, the _mudâf_ and _barrânî_. The government farmed out all these land taxes to _mulaçâms_ who collected them through their agents, most of whom were members of the Copt corporation.

The first of these taxes, al-mâl al-hâr, was composed of the mirî and the _jâzâ_. The _mirî_ was a fixed tax, part of which was destined for the Sultan’s Private Treasury in Istanbul while the remainder was kept in Egypt to support the cost of local government. The _jâzâ_ went to the concessionaires of _iltizâms_ (tax farms), the amount of this tax being fixed by the terms of the concession. To increase their profits, the _mulaçâms_ eventually demanded the payment of extraordinary taxes ( _mudâf_ and _barrânî_), collecting them regularly despite their illegality. The _mâl al-kûşâﬁyya_ was paid for the military and administrative expenses within the Egyptian provinces. All these taxes were paid either in specie or in kind.

The government’s other sources of revenue included a succession tax ( _hulûn_ ) paid by those heirs of _mulaçâms_ who desired to inherit tax farms; the _djîzâya_ [q.v.]; fixed tax on customs duties, which the tax farmers of customs were required to remit to the government; a tax levied on certain government officials whose functions involved the collection of recognized dues; duties on boats navigating Egyptian waters; duty on the corporation of goldsmiths; various levies on trades, merchants, and _wikâlas_, i.e., buildings designed for the reception of merchants and their goods; the proceeds from grants of tax farms on the sale or manufacture of various products; and profits from the mint. About a quarter of the revenue obtained from these sources was sent to Istanbul along with the _mirî_ on land and some Egyptian produce for use in the _saray_ and naval arsenal.

This fiscal system remained substantially the same during the three-year period of the French occupation of Egypt. Napoleon announced shortly after his arrival in Cairo in July 1798 that he wished to change none of the existing institutions or traditional taxes but planned only to eliminate arbitrary exactions and to introduce a regular system of tax collection. Indeed, the only change he made at the outset was to join the lands formerly held by Mamlûk _mulaçâms_ to the state domain for the profit of the French Republic (approximately two-thirds of the land of Egypt). Napoleon then confirmed the non-Mamlûk _mulaçâms_ in their _iltizâm_. Taxes continued to be collected by the Copts, under the supervision of French inspectors.

When Muhammad ‘Ali became Pasha of Egypt in 1805, he altered the fiscal system radically by expropriating the _mulaçâms_ and the beneficiaries ( _mulaçârrîfî_ ) of _al-risâba al-ahbâsîyya_, state lands which had been illegally endowed with the characteristics of _waḥî_ property. _Waḥîs_ on houses and gardens, i.e., endowments based on _waḥî_ property, were not affected, however, since they were considered sound or legal _waḥîs_. As compensation for their loss, the _mulaçâms_ received a pension and the right to cultivate their _waṣîyya_ lands (the portion of the _iltizâm_ which had been assigned to _mulaçâms_ for their exclusive enjoyment). Neither was heritable; upon the death of the _mulaçâms_, these pensions ceased and the _waṣîyya_ lands reverted to the state. The beneficiaries of _riwa_ lands also received a life pension while the state assumed the responsibility of maintaining mosques and charitable institutions, which had depended for their support upon revenues from these lands.

A cadaster of all cultivated ( _mâ’ûn_ ) lands was carried out in 1813-14; registers were prepared, listing the names of landholders, the quantity of land held, and the amount of the _mirî_, now a single tax replacing the former complex schedule of taxes and rated according to the fertility of the land and ease of irrigation. The only lands excluded from the cadastral registers were the _waṣîyya_ lands of the expropriated _mulaçâms_ and the uncultivated or uncultivable land (the so-called _abâdîyya_ land). The rate of the land tax did not remain fixed at
the 1813-14 level, but was augmented periodically as the Pasha’s need for revenue mounted; nor did all the land remain under direct government supervision. Instead, Muhammad ‘Ali assigned estates to members of his family, to favourites, and to foreigners. Some of these estates were known as ūdāsiyya (q.v.); others as ṣab‘idāsiyya (estates reclaimed from lands uncultivated at the time of the 1813-14 cadastre and granted on favourable terms); and ṣuhdās, estates consisting of bankrupt villages whose taxes were collected by their new landholders (sawsu‘a’akhkūds) rather than by members of the government hierarchy. The substance of the land (rabāba) of all these estates was retained by the state, the landholders possessing only usufructuary rights (tasāruf).

Along with his land reforms, Muhammad ‘Ali also monopolized all money crops (cotton in particular), creating in consequence of this new policy an important source of revenue for the government.

Other innovations, as well as the retention of taxes antedating Muhammad ‘Ali, are reflected in the extant budgets of this period. Receipts fell into three major categories: (1) direct taxes; (2) customs and appaltos, farms for the collection of duties on sundry items granted by the government for one or more years; and (3) profits from agriculture and industry. Direct taxes incorporated taxes on property, i.e., mūri (land tax), tax on date trees, on cities and towns, on gardens, and duties on wakkīlas, bazaars, and houses; taxes on persons, called ṣurdat al-rū‘ās, a personal tax amounting to 3 per cent on known or supposed revenue of all the inhabitants of Egypt, which was paid by all government employees, including even foreigners, by Egyptian employees of non-government establishments, by fāllāhin, and by artisans and merchants, the dā‘iyā, and a duty on dancers, prostitutes, jugglers, and conjurers; taxes on things, i.e., duties on boats navigating Egyptian waters, fish of the Nile, salt, oil, fruit, and butter;

Revenues from customs and appaltos included customs collected at Damietta, Rosetta, Būlāk, Old Cairo, Deraouli, Asyût, Dijdja, al-‘Uṣayr, and Cairo, Deraouli, Asyût, Suez, Djidda, al-‘Uṣayr, and al-‘Rū‘ās.

In general, Muhammad ‘Ali’s fiscal system endured until the British occupation of Egypt. Ibrahim Pasha introduced nothing new during his short reign, while ‘Abbās altered the system very little, although he economized on those projects begun by his grandfather which seemed wasteful. He abolished those ṣuhdās whose proprietors had failed to comply with the terms of their concessions, and suppressed the octrois. He also relieved the tax burden of the peasants by removing a large part of the ṣurdat al-rū‘ās.

His successor, Sa‘d al-Pasha, changed the existing fiscal system, somewhat, by ending the monopoly system and opening the country to free trade, allowing foreign merchants to deal directly with the Egyptian peasants. To compensate for the loss of revenue from government monopolies, he introduced a new policy regarding land taxes. Former tax-free lands were now taxed, some with the ḥalādí, and others with the ʻuṣur, the rate of taxes being substantially increased as well. In 1853, during ‘Abbās’s reign, the revenues from the land tax had amounted to 346,296 pures or £1,741,995; by 1858, Sa‘d had increased them to 501,985 pures or £2,509,492, almost a 50 per cent increase on land taxes alone (Green, May 1, 1858, in F.O. 78/1401). In addition, Sa‘d reinstated the entire ṣurdat al-rū‘ās, adding it to the land tax.

Sa‘d’s Land Law of 1858 introduced an important innovation of long-range significance. Under this law, the right to inherit, mortgage, and retain land permanently was granted to existing landholders, provided they paid their taxes. If these taxes were not paid within five years, the landholders were deprived of their lands permanently. This time limit, imposed by the new land law, was a direct change from traditional practices. Formerly, a peasant who had failed to pay taxes on his aṭhar land (land held on usufructuary tenure but passed from father to son for generations) was dispossessed until such time as he was able to meet his obligations. In this way, he could always hope to recover his land, and the peasants were particularly felt in the next reign. Those peasants who had over-extended their credit during the cotton boom of the 1860’s were greatly in debt when the market collapsed at the end of the American Civil War. Consequently, many peasants, unable to pay their taxes, lost their land.

The Khedive took advantage of the peasants’ plight to add more and more of their land to his private estates, until he eventually possessed one-fifth of the agricultural land of Egypt, which he exploited for his own profit.

Khedive Ismā‘il resorted to numerous expedients to increase his revenues. Among these was his Mukibbala Law of 1871 which provided that all landholders agreeing to pay six years’ taxes in advance would be permanently exempted from 50 per cent of their land tax, whether ḥalādí or ʻuṣur. This fiscal device failed to meet Ismā‘il’s expectations because many landholders refused to take advantage of it. Ismā‘il was no sooner removed from office when the law was abrogated (1880) and taxes reimposed on all land. With the British occupation of the country in 1882, the fiscal functions of the Egyptian government passed into the hands of the British administrators.
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sur l'administration des provinces de l'Égypte, dans les dernières années du gouvernement des Mamlouks, and P. S. Girard, *Mémoire sur l'agriculture, le commerce de l'Égypte*, in *Description de l'Égypte*, État Moderne, 1st ed., Paris, 1809, 1813, 1822; Silvestre de Sacy, *Sur la nature et les révolutions du droit de propriété territoriale en Égypte*, depuis la conquête de ce pays par les musulmans jusqu'à l'expédition de François, published in three parts in *Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France*, i, Paris 1815, 1-105, v, Paris 1822, 1-75, and vii, Paris 1824, 5-224; Abd al-Rahman al-El-Bahari, *Aḍḍiḏ ib al-ḍarbā fi l-‘arḍajtim wa l-‘aḥkār*, 4 vols., Cairo 1322/1904-5; Gibb-Bowen, i, Chapters V and VI, ii, 40-2; Georges Rigault, *Le Général Abdallah Menou et la dernière phase de l’expédition d’Égypte (1799-1801)*, Paris 1911; Helen Anne B. Rivlin, *The Agricultural Policy of Muhammad ‘Ali in Egypt*, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1961; Bouitros Ghali, *Rapport de la Commission d’enquête de l’impôt foncier*, published in three parts in *Mémoires de l’Institut Royal de France*, i, Paris 1815, 1-105, v, Paris 1822, 1-75, and vii, Paris 1824, 5-224; Philippe Gelat, Supplément, Alexandria 1890; Viscount Milner, *England in Egypt*, London 1909; The Earl of Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, London 1908; G. Douin, *Histoire du Règne du Khédive Ismail*, 3 vols., Cairo 1933-42; Pierre Crabbes, *Ismaïl le Malégn Kédsé*, London 1933; David S. Landes, *Bankers and Pashas*, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1958; diplomatic and consular records for Egypt deposited at the Public Record Office in London and in the Archives du ministère des affaires étrangères in Paris. *Rivlin* (5) — Persia. There is, on the whole, a remarkable continuity of practice in the matter of taxation in Persia from early Islamic times down to the 20th century; but whereas there was in early times an attempt to reconcile existing practice with Islamic theory and sporadic efforts to abolish non-ghari taxes, after the break with tradition in early Mongol (Ilkhanid) times, in spite of the Islamization of the administration under Ghāzān Khān and his successors, the general tendency was away from the Islamic theory of taxation towards a multiplication of taxes and dues and a greater variety of usage. Moreover, since there was no longer even an outward attempt to make the tax administration conform to the ideal of Islamic theory, the tendency towards arbitrary action increased; but the general principles of the tax system, the methods of assessment and collection, and the main problems to be faced did not vary greatly and such changes as took place prior to the 20th century were of degree rather than of a more fundamental kind. New dynasties and new rulers did not involve fundamental changes in the tax administration. The tax regime of Uzun Hasan, laid down between 874/14670 and 882/1477, is alleged still to have been operative in Safavid times. Many of his main features of the Kāḏār tax administration are already to be seen under the Safawids, the period of Afsār and Zand rule having brought little that was new in the field of taxation. At no time, however, did the government make the effort to overhaul the whole system. In general the amount of money in circulation was limited; commerce was not highly developed and there was difficulty in transporting and remitting large sums of money, all of which affected the system of administration in general and of taxation in particular. Further, the tendency for the silver currency to depreciate makes it difficult to evaluate accurately the changes which took place in the amount of tax levied and its relative incidence. Money going into the Royal Treasury is alleged by various foreign observers to have been hoarded and seldom to have reappeared in circulation; but as against this the money thus accumulated would seem not infrequently to have been dissipated on military expeditions, accession gratuities to secure the throne against rival claimants, and other emergencies; while the frequency with which the pay of the army and the official claimants, and other emergencies; while the frequency with which the pay of the army and the official

To what extent the revenue of the state and the ruler's private income; any surplus eventually found its way into the royal purse. In the Safawid period there was a broad distinction between funds belonging to the state (māli-i māṣāliḥ), administered by the mustaʿfī al-māmālīk under the Grand Vazir, and the funds belonging to the royal household (māli-i bẖāṣa), administered by the mustaʿfī of the diwān-i bẖāṣa, corresponding roughly to the earlier division between the āḥkār and the dargāh. How early this distinction is found is uncertain. Chardin affirms that it was first introduced by Shāh Sūfī (A.D. 1629-42); in any case there was considerable overlapping between the two divisions. By Kāḏār times the distinction between them such as it was had disappeared. The general tax structure and the broad division into "fixed" taxes (māli wa gẖâlāt and later māliyāt) and extraordinary levies and requisitions, and the purposes to which the revenue was devoted, namely the payment of the army, salaries of officials, pensions, and the upkeep of the royal court, were largely the same. Whereas, however, under the Šafawids large areas of the empire were alienated from the direct control of the central government and little supervision exercised over the tax administration of these areas, there was an attempt under the Kāḏār to centralize the tax administration; but the farming of the taxes to governors and others made nonsense of this and by the 20th century chaos prevailed in the tax administration. Collection was profoundly unsatisfactory; such checks and controls as had been devised had broken down, and the system was oppressive in its operation.

The most important of the "fixed" taxes were those levied on the land or its produce. A great variety of practice existed as regards both the method and rate of assessment. Moreover the extent of the area subject to the payment of land tax varied considerably. Much of the land as stated above was alienated from the direct control of the government in the form of tiyāūs and suyārḡāls, which carried full or partial immunity from taxation. The latter were granted mainly on crown lands, waḥf land, and dead lands. According to Chardin the Safawid empire was divided into "provinces" (māmālīk), i.e., into directly administered areas, and indirectly administered territory (bẖāṣa); the governors of the former, he affirms, remitted to the central government only a lump sum by way of a present (piyḵāsh) at the new year and a proportion of the produce and products of the province for the use of the royal court and workshops, retaining the remainder of the provincial revenue for the expenses of the provincial administration. To what extent
such provincial governors under the Şafawids and those of the provincial governors who farmed the revenues of their provinces under the Kâğıtars exercised freedom of action in the assessment and collection of taxes is not entirely clear. In either period the mustawfls of the central government prepared and sent, usually annually, to the provinces detailed assessments of the provincial districts, known as dastâr al-‘amal, according to which, or on the basis of which, the mustawfls in the provinces allocated the tax demand among the provincial population. It is also not clear to what extent the tax demand was paid in kind, the grain thus obtained being stored in government granaries and held against emergencies such as military expeditions and famine, or in some cases sold at fixed prices to the local population. Where the tax demand was made in kind as a fixed proportion of the crop it was presumably usually levied on the threshing floor before the division of the crop between the landlord and the peasant.

The extent of crown lands fluctuated. In cases where they were directly administered land tax as such was not levied, the whole of the produce after the deduction of the tenant’s share going to the treasury. If leased, the rent paid by the tenant presumably included, or was in lieu of, tax, and resembled an ordinary crop-sharing agreement. Under the Şafawids the land round Işfahân was largely crown land and administered by a special diwân under the mustawfl-i Ḵâṣṣa.

In addition to the tax on the land or its produce water dues in the case of large rivers were levied. Pasture dues and a herd tax were also collected in some areas from both the settled and the semi-settled population; but their incidence and method of assessment varied. Among the other ”fixed” taxes was a tax on real estate (other than agricultural land), such as baths, shops, water-mills, and caravanserais etc. (mustaghalldt), computed in early Kâğıtâr times at 20 per cent of the estimated annual profit. Malcolm alleges that there had been large increases in crown property of this nature owing to confiscations after the fall of the Şafawid and later dynasties. Where such property was rented by the crown to tenants, the rent presumably included, or took the place of, the tax levied on privately owned property of this kind. A poll-tax was paid by non-Muslims, Jews, Armenians, and Zoroastrians; and by foreigners unless granted special immunity. This derived from the canonical poll-tax of džiya. Various other sections of the community, including settled or nomadic, paid also what amounted to a poll-tax (sârāna, sar-shumdâr). There are references in various documents to some kind of house or family tax (ḥûnâ-šumār). Poll-taxes were finally abolished by the law of 20 Âḏâr 1305 A.H. (solar)1926.

Taxes were levied on the craft guilds, except where special immunities were granted, by a group assessment, also known as bunila. In Işfahân in Şafawid times the kalântâr and nakhb of Iṣfahân would assemble the guilds in the first three months of the year and the nakhb would fix their bunila with the hadkhûlî of the guild, this being subsequently allocated among the individual members of the guild. In practice, however, in the same way as the assessment of the land tax tended to become out of date so too was the bunila of the guilds often out of date. Craft guilds were also subject to tax on the tobacco trade. Market taxes were also in some cases levied. The main fixed taxes to which merchants were subject were road tolls (rîhdârî) and customs in the main some 20% of the crop; though a tradition affirms that prior to the reign of Fath ‘All Şâh the rate was one tenth. This rate seems unlikely, however, to have been generally current. In any case a wide variety of practice existed. On grain crops the tax demand was paid in kind, the grain thus obtained being stored in government granaries and held against emergencies such as military expeditions and famine, or in some cases sold at fixed prices to the local population. Where the tax demand was made in kind as a fixed proportion of the crop it was presumably usually levied on the threshing floor before the division of the crop between the landlord and the peasant.

The land tax was assessed in three main ways: by measurement, as a proportion of the produce, or in a lump sum. The assessments were not made at regular intervals and were frequently hopelessly out of date; though where the tax due was assessed as a definite proportion of the crop, the income therefrom could be estimated. Tax collectors of necessity estimated this annually. The most common form of assessment by Kâğıtâr times was the computation of the revenue due from a town or village in a lump sum; this had the advantage of avoiding annual visits by the tax collectors to assess the amount of the crop. The tax due, assessed partly in cash and partly in kind, was known as the bunîla of the town; it included from about the middle of the 19th century also the number of soldiers which the area was required to provide or a sum equivalent to the wages of a given number of soldiers. The final allocation of the tax demand among the population of the town or village was made locally. Special remissions on account of natural calamities or in return for some special service were granted from time to time and occasionally the tax was remitted wholly or partly. Moreover levies were made on account of arrears or to meet some emergency or special need, and the general tendency was for these to become part of the regular assessment. Further by the manipulation of the conversion rates (fasīr) by which taxes assessed at an artificial currency rate or in kind were converted into cash, the rate of taxation was increased.

The assessments being usually out of date, it frequently happened that a village which had declined in prosperity and whose inhabitants had decreased on account of war, famine, emigration or some other cause, would be over-assessed and the amount of taxation due from the individual taxpayers automatically raised. Conversely villages which had increased in prosperity or had been newly developed were often under-assessed.

The rate of taxation levied on each plough-land varied from 14 to 20 per cent of the produce; in addition dues were levied on each plough-land. Under the Şafawids a somewhat similar situation presumably prevailed; Chardin, however, states that the tax on silk and cotton was one third of the produce. The rate in Kâğıtâr time seems to have been
dues. The former were usually levied at so much per
animal load at each town, the rate at which they
were levied varying. Customs duties were paid on
merchandise at the port of entry or exit. In the
Šafawid period a duty of 10 per cent was levied by
the customs houses in the Persian Gulf; on other
frontiers the duty was levied per load. Certain
exemptions and reductions were granted to various
foreign merchants. By the Treaty of Turkomanaşcay
(1828) an ad valorem tariff of 3.5 per cent was imposed on
imports and exports by Russian merchants; in due
course equivalent treatment was demanded by and
given by Russia. In Persia the granting of grants and
only 2 per cent but were subject in addition to road
tolls. The revision of the custom tariff in 1903 was
prejudicial to Persia and partial to Russia. The
customs and road tolls were usually farmed in each
district.

A levy on mines and pearl fisheries was made at
the rate, in Šafawid times, of one third of the produce.
The payment of “fixed” taxation; perhaps the due
that revenue in Kadiar times. In the latter part of the
19th century the post and telegraphs became an
additional source of revenue.

Numerous other dues made up the “fixed”
revenue. Here again a great variety of practice
existed and there is little detailed information on
the rates at which these various dues were levied.
Many of them were still levied in the 20th century.

The liability of the taxpayer was not limited to
the payment of “fixed” taxation; perhaps the most
onerous were levies on agriculture, called (pishkash),
or a money payment taken in lieu of this. The
liability did not necessarily begin at the birth of the
individual, but descended to his descendants.

The exaction of such service however could not fail
to degrade the station of the peasant and artisan
and to be levied not only on the amount of produce
but also as a special charge for the
administration of the country, abolish certain of the
irregular taxes and requisitions, increase the revenue,
and improve collection. A decree of 1303/1885-6 laid
down certain changes in the collection of the revenue
and attempted to define the financial responsibility of
the governor. Instructions were issued for a new
land survey and the levy of land tax at the rate of
10 per cent of the produce and various dues in
1307/1889-90. These and other measures were not,
however, attended by any marked degree of success
and were not operative throughout the country.

full figures cannot be given for the total revenue
owing to the impossibility of computing the extent of
the revenue outside the “fixed” taxes. According to
the Tadbirat al-Muluk the state revenue (i.e.,
excluding revenue from the Kādijār) in late Šafawid
times amounted to 8,000,000 tumdans. 82 per cent
of this came from taxes registered in the awquirā,
which Prof. Minorsky thinks may have been land
taxes; levies including rents from real estate excluding
agricultural land, etc. accounted for 14.5 per cent,
mines for 2 per cent, and produce and products
remitted to the royal workshops for 1.5 per cent.
According to the same source the total cost of the
army and administration was 491,965 tumdans which
were levied in order to meet the financial deficit of the
country. According to the nature of the occasion the
whole country or a district or section of the community
was subject to the levy. Its incidence was
arbitrary and the average levied great
scope for the show of partiality and the exercise of
injustice. Suyürğalis consisted of levies made for
the keep and expenses of military forces, government
officials, and foreign envos passing through the
country and like the žähriā bore heavily upon the
peasantry. Presents (pīshkash) were of two kinds,
“casual” and “regular.” The latter were remitted
annually at the New Year and in some cases to
certin religious festivals, such as the ūd-i mawālid,
by provincial governors, chiefs of tribes, and high
officials. The amount of these presents was fixed
broadly by custom. The occasions for the levy of
such presents were various. On the assumption of
office by governors and high officials a payment,
comparable to the equivalent of purchase money, was
often expected. Presentations to the governor in the
gift of money in many cases would cost its recipient a sum commensurate
with his position in society; the progress of the shah
through a district would involve the presentation of
presents by all and sundry; similarly the visit
of the Shah to the house of a favoured minister would
impose upon the latter and his family and retainers
heavy expenses in the form of presents; further,
the fees of the numerous body of persons who
received pensions from the state had frequently to
purchase the renewal of these grants, as did also
the holders of tiyals and their heirs. This system of
pīshkash extended throughout the administration;
not only did the Shah expect and receive pīshkash,
his governors and ministers also demanded and
received similar treatment in the areas under their
jurisdiction and from their subordinates.

A further charge on the peasants and some of the
trade guilds was labour service exacted by the state
or a money payment taken in lieu of this. The
incidence of labour service varied from place to
place and it is difficult to assess it in money terms.
The exact amount of service required could not fail
to degrade the station of the peasant and artisan
and to emphasize his subjection to authority.

The liability of the taxpayer was not limited to
the payment of “fixed” taxation; perhaps the
most onerous forms of taxation to which he was subjected
were constituted by extraordinary levies, of which
žähriā and suyürğalis were the most widespread and the
most burdensome, and “presents” (pīshkash),
casual and otherwise. Žähriā comprised levies made to
meet special expenditure such as that occasioned
by a military expedition, the construction or repair
of a royal building, or some special festivity, or
simply on the occasion of another financial
deficit of the revenue. According to the custom of the occasion the whole
country or a district or section of the community
was subject to the levy. Its incidence was
arbitrary and its levy gave great
scope for the show of partiality and the exercise of
injustice. Suyürğalis consisted of levies made for
the keep and expenses of military forces, government
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was any surplus remaining remitted to the central treasury. According to Malcolm the “fixed” revenue in the early 19th century A.D. amounted to about three millions sterling. Local estimates put the receipts from Naw Ruz presents at two fifths of the “fixed” revenue, from fines one fifth of the “fixed” revenue, and the sum levied by public requisitions two fifths of the “fixed” revenue, the total revenue of the Shah being thus estimated at c. 6 millions sterling, only a proportion of which was paid in cash and large deductions being made for the expenses of collection before remission to the central government. Fines present on the “fixed” revenue at 45,169,516 tumâns (or £ 1,652,820, converted at 33½ kirans to the £ sterling, the rate prevailing in 1888), comprising taxes in cash 36,076,757 tumâns, in kind (converted at government rates) 10,100,983 tumâns, customs 8,000,000 tumâns, and posts, mints, telegraphs, etc., 1,191,776 tumâns. Expenditure, excluding local charges for the collection of revenue, reductions for bad harvests, etc., he estimated at 42,233,472 tumâns (£ 1,260,700), comprising maintenance of government buildings 2,633,472 tumâns, the army, the central administration, pensions, allowances, and the Shah’s establishment, etc. at 21,600,000 tumâns, showing a surplus of 13,136,044 tumâns (£ 392,121). These figures, however, do not give a true picture of revenue and expenditure since not only is the revenue derived from sources other than “fixed” taxes and dues omitted, but also expenses for military expeditions and equipment, foreign journeys, and unforeseen emergencies. The total picture was far less favourable and such reserves as may have been accumulated were rapidly dissipated in the second half of the 19th century A.D. and the early years of the 20th century. Foreign loans were contracted to make good budgetary deficits, for the servicing of which the customs were mortgaged. By 1911 there was an annual deficit of c. 6,000,000 tumâns, which in fact was usually increased to some 11,000,000 tumâns because the “fixed” taxes were not collected in full. By 1922 there had been considerable changes in the proportions of the total revenue derived from different sources; nearly half the revenue was derived from the customs tariff, and oil royalties constituted a not inconsiderable part of the national revenue.

The grant of the Constitution in 1906 marks the beginning of a new phase in the tax system of Persia. Under the constitution the approval of the National Assembly was necessary for the regulation of all financial matters, the preparation and execution of the budget, the imposition of new taxes, the reduction for bad harvests, etc., he estimated at c. 6,000,000 tumâns, which in fact was usually increased to some 11,000,000 tumâns because the “fixed” taxes were not collected in full. By 1922 there had been considerable changes in the proportions of the total revenue derived from different sources; nearly half the revenue was derived from the customs tariff, and oil royalties constituted a not inconsiderable part of the national revenue.

The grant of the Constitution in 1906 marks the beginning of a new phase in the tax system of Persia. Under the constitution the approval of the National Assembly was necessary for the regulation of all financial matters, the preparation and execution of the budget, the imposition of new taxes, the reduction for bad harvests, etc., he estimated at c. 6,000,000 tumâns, which in fact was usually increased to some 11,000,000 tumâns because the “fixed” taxes were not collected in full. By 1922 there had been considerable changes in the proportions of the total revenue derived from different sources; nearly half the revenue was derived from the customs tariff, and oil royalties constituted a not inconsiderable part of the national revenue.

The grant of the Constitution in 1906 marks the beginning of a new phase in the tax system of Persia. Under the constitution the approval of the National Assembly was necessary for the regulation of all financial matters, the preparation and execution of the budget, the imposition of new taxes, the reduction for bad harvests, etc., he estimated at c. 6,000,000 tumâns, which in fact was usually increased to some 11,000,000 tumâns because the “fixed” taxes were not collected in full. By 1922 there had been considerable changes in the proportions of the total revenue derived from different sources; nearly half the revenue was derived from the customs tariff, and oil royalties constituted a not inconsiderable part of the national revenue.

The grant of the Constitution in 1906 marks the beginning of a new phase in the tax system of Persia. Under the constitution the approval of the National Assembly was necessary for the regulation of all financial matters, the preparation and execution of the budget, the imposition of new taxes, the reduction for bad harvests, etc., he estimated at c. 6,000,000 tumâns, which in fact was usually increased to some 11,000,000 tumâns because the “fixed” taxes were not collected in full. By 1922 there had been considerable changes in the proportions of the total revenue derived from different sources; nearly half the revenue was derived from the customs tariff, and oil royalties constituted a not inconsiderable part of the national revenue.
Their fiscal administration, therefore, was based upon precedents developed by the Muslim administrators and judges of the Eastern Caliphate with an admixture of Hindu tradition. The reconciliation of Islamic law and patterns with native tradition did not prove too difficult because of certain similarities between the two.

A group of taxes payable only by the Muslims came under the category of zakāḥ. The State does not seem to have levied the zakāḥi on personal property, but left it to the discretion of the individual to pay. In the case of non-Muslim merchants the rate was doubled. This was the only tax paid by non-Muslims which was classified as zakāḥ.

Property left by Muslims dying without heirs belonged to the State and was earmarked for charitable purposes. The property of a dhimmī dying in similar circumstances was handed over to his community.

Dīzya was levied in accordance with the rulings of the Ḥanafi jurists. Buddhists and Hindus were recognized as dhimmis along with 'the peoples of the Book'. Muhammad b. Ḥāsīm, the conqueror of Sind, first extended the status of dhimmis to Buddhists and Hindus and no subsequent ruler withdrew it. The sultans of Dīlī assessed dīzya in their own money; they charged ten, twenty, and forty lānchas per annum, in accordance with the income of the assesses (Shams-ī Sīrādī ʿAṭīf, Taʿrīkh-i Firāzgāhī, Calcutta 1896, 383). Imbecile old men, cripples, the blind, and those who had not enough to pay the tax after defraying the cost of their living, were exempt. Women and children also were exempt. Non-Muslim servants of the State also were not required to pay the dīzya. The Brāhmans remained exempt most of the time.

Dīzya was levied in accordance with the rulings of the Ḥanafi jurists. Buddhists and Hindus were recognized as dhimmis along with 'the peoples of the Book'. Muhammad b. Ḥāsīm, the conqueror of Sind, first extended the status of dhimmis to Buddhists and Hindus and no subsequent ruler withdrew it. The sultans of Dīlī assessed dīzya in their own money; they charged ten, twenty, and forty lānchas per annum, in accordance with the income of the assesses (Shams-ī Sīrādī ʿAṭīf, Taʿrīkh-i Firāzgāhī, Calcutta 1896, 383). Imbecile old men, cripples, the blind, and those who had not enough to pay the tax after defraying the cost of their living, were exempt. Women and children also were exempt. Non-Muslim servants of the State also were not required to pay the dīzya. The Brāhmans remained exempt most of the time. Only Firūz Šah (752-90/1351-88) demanded dīzya from the Brāhmans, who protested and made a demonstration in front of the palace (ibid., 382-4). The sultan did not forego his profit, but he relented to the extent of assessing all Brāhmans according to the lowest rate. Even this assessment was paid by charitably inclined rich Hindus who wanted to relieve the Brāhmans of the burden. This is the only instance on record of a public protest against dīzya. The Hindus perhaps did not find the idea of a poll-tax difficult to accept because it was also embedded in their own tradition.

The spoils of war, technically called ḡanīma, were shared between the State and the soldiers. Legally the State was entitled to a fifth of the yield; because of the increased expenditure upon the army on account of Mongol pressure, ʿAṭīf-al-Dīn raised it to the maximum allowed under the sharē': a half (I. H. Qureshi, The Administration of the Sultanate of Dehle, Karachi 1958, 103 ff.). Ghiyāṭī al-Dīn Tughluk again reduced it to a fifth. When his son Muḥammad b. Tughluk (725/1325-51) tried once more to increase the level in the Dōrāb by ten to twenty per cent, there was rebellion. A fourth of the gross yield seems to have been stabilized as the recognized demand before Shīr Šāh (945/1538-45) came to the throne (ibid., 111-9).

The Hindus perhaps did not find the idea of a poll-tax difficult to accept because it was also embedded in their own tradition. The Gaharwars of Kanawdī had levied turushkabandika, either from the Muslims resident in their dominions or from all their subjects, as a contribution to defence against the encroachments of the Turks. Even during the British period a poll-tax was levied by some Rajput states.

The principle of the kharḍāl al-mubāsama was applied to the kharḍāl lands. This was found convenient because the Hindus were used to various forms of sharing the produce of their lands with the State, as they recognised that the State was entitled to a share of the agricultural produce. As the share of the State was traditionally considered to be a defined percentage of the actual produce, the basic principle of kharḍāl al-mubāsama was acceptable to the Hindus. Thus the requirements of the ghazī and Hindu tradition could be easily reconciled and there was no need to create confusion by any radical change in the principles of assessing the State demand on agricultural produce. The Hindus had developed various methods of sharing the produce with the State before the establishment of Muslim rule. These included actual sharing through grain heads of equal size, appraisement and the division of the field. Through long experience appraisement gained considerable accuracy and, because of its convenience, was widely adopted. Gradually the average yield in a unit of homogeneous area came to be so well established in popular knowledge that it was sufficient to measure the area under cultivation to calculate the yield. All these developments were intended to spread the time of assessment so that the harvest would not lie in the open field awaiting the arrival of the assessment team. The village accountant, the pāwārī, kept a record of the area cultivated and the crops raised in every season. He also kept a record of the average yield. These traditional methods, called Sharing, Appraisement and Measurement, were left almost intact by the sultans of Dīlī. The sultans encouraged Measurement, because they found this device a more convenient method of accounting and collection. Its great weakness was that it worked satisfactorily only in normal seasons. If the rains failed or the area suffered from other disaster, the normal yields could not be expected. It was then necessary to revert to Appraisement or Sharing. If the peasant felt that the Appraisement was not fair, he could always elect Sharing. This was an insurance against excessive assessment.

The proportion of the State demand to the gross produce varied in accordance with local tradition. In the areas conquered and brought under effective administration up to the reign of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kahlīlī (695-715/1296-1316) the prevailing proportion was a fifth of the yield; because of the increased expenditure upon the army on account of Mongol pressure, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn raised it to the maximum allowed under the sharē': a half (I. H. Qureshi, The Administration of the Sultanate of Dehle, Karachi 1958, 103 ff.). Ghiyāṭī al-Dīn Tughluk again reduced it to a fifth. When his son Muḥammad b. Tughluk (725/1325-51) tried once more to increase the level in the Dōrāb by ten to twenty per cent, there was rebellion. A fourth of the gross yield seems to have been stabilized as the recognized demand before Shīr Šāh (945/1538-45) came to the throne (ibid., 111-9). However, in certain desert areas, the demand was as low as a seventh; there also seem to have been certain outlying provinces, such as Gudjarāt, where it was a half.

The spoils of war, technically called ḡanīma, were shared between the State and the soldiers. Legally the State was entitled to a fifth, but because the soldiers were paid salaries out of the Public Exchequer, the sultans considered it fair to give a
fifth to the soldiers and to deposit four fifths in the public treasury. Under Firuz Shah the legal ratio was restored (‘Ayn al-Mulk Mährū, Inšgād-i Mährū, Letter xv. [MS. in Bankipore Public Library, Patna, India]). The State was also entitled to a fifth of all minerals, provided they were capable of being melted and bearing an imprint. The same applied to treasure trove, if it consisted of unstamped bullion or money minted before the Muslim conquest.

In addition to the above taxes, local imposts were continually imposed in spite of repeated abolitions by the State. These went mostly into the pockets of the local authorities and did not contribute to the income of the State. They had come down from very early times and were so deep-rooted in the habits of the people that their effective abolition was difficult. They were not excessive and were generally petty levies on certain professions and the sale of a few commodities (Qureshi, op. cit., Appendix H, 244 ff.).

The fiscal administration of the Sultanate was vested in the diwan-i ważrat, which was presided over by the ważir. He was assisted by a deputy. The mušir-i mašālik was the accountant-general, and the mušawvi-i mašālik the auditor-general (‘Affī, op. cit., 419-20). Every provincial capital had its own diwan-i ważrat which was a replica of the central diwan-i ważrat and functioned under its control (Qureshi, op. cit., 200-1). Every pargana, the smallest unit of revenue administration, consisting of a number of villages, had its ‘ilādī under whom there was an accountant, a treasurer and a field survey and assessment staff. The village accountant and registrar, called pāteswāri, kept all records concerning cultivation, assessment and yields (ibid., 208, 209).

The zakāt on imports was assessed and collected at the local sarā-i ādām. ‘Aqlām was administered by the diwan-i sarā; the property of Muslims dying heirless went to the office of the local hādī. Bibliography: MSS. sources: Shams-i Sirādī, ‘Affī, Ta’rīkh-i Frāzghātī, Calcutta 1890; Dīyā al-Dīn Barani, Ta’rīkh-i Frāzghātī, Calcutta 1862; Frīz Shāh, Futsalāt-i Frāzghātī, British Museum MS. Or. 2039; idem, Strāti Frāzghātī, MS. in Bankipore Public Library, Patna, India; ‘Abbās al-Ḥamīd Muhārzī Ghaznawi, Dastūr al-Khāṣṣa, MS. in Rampur State Library, Rampur, India; Ya‘ṣīb Muẓaffar Kirmānī, Fīkh-i Frāzghātī, India Office Library MS. IOL 2987; Muḥammad ‘Ali Kāfī, Quldundā, Dihlī 1939; ‘Ayn al-Mulk Mährū, Inšgād-i Mährū, MS. in Bankipore Public Library, Patna, India.


(b) The early Mughals. No conspicuous modification of the system described above was attempted until the time of Shīr Shāh. Bābur and Humāyūn made no changes in the existing system, largely the result of Sikandar Lodī’s improvements, which they adopted in its entirety; the statistical returns of Bābur’s times were based on the rent-rolls of Sikandar Lodī, and all calculations were made in accordance with Sikandar’s prescriptions on standards and computation. Both Bābur and Humāyūn granted new diwāns. The account of the reconstruction of the central administration in Humāyūn’s reign (Khānd Amlī, Humāyūn-nāmā, see Bibliography) suggests that there was no change in the work of the revenue ministry, now called diwānis.

The interrex Shīr Shāh was the first ruler to rationalize taxation, especially in respect of the chief source, the land. He tried to counteract the recurring tendencies to impose extra-legal taxes on the cultivators, but there is no evidence that he conscientiously applied the Islamic principles of taxation: gīzāya and zakāt are not mentioned in contemporary records, although the later Ta’rīkh-i Dīwānī gives an extensive list of the sources of state income under heads other than land-revenue: sales tax, conveyance duty, ground rent from market vendors, tax on sugar refinery, ferry tax, grazing tax, cattle tax, profession tax from various artisans, gambling tax, and gīzāya and pilgrim tax on Hindus. Shīr Shāh is said to have forbidden the realization of transit dues and octroi, but how far this prohibition was effective is doubtful; it is probable that a distinction was made between diwānī and khāṭīṣa territories. Property of intestates most probably escheated to the state. Presents to the Emperor do not seem to have been exploited by Shīr Shāh. The changes he introduced in respect of khāṣṣa lands seem to have been the result of the practical experience he acquired in administering the diwānī his father had been assigned under the Lodīs. Sharing of the ripened crop (ghallābakhshī) and appraisement (kankāt, mukThirty years the entitled to a fifth of all accounts, and at the land frontiers. Certain internal
transit duties were also levied, including terry taxes. Other regular taxes included those on salt—in some districts accruing to the provincial revenue, in others to the central administration—; fisheries, particularly the Bengal fish-tanks; rādārī, a road tax for merchants in exchange for protection; and pandārī, a sales tax. Regular revenue from non-tax sources included that from copper, zinc, and silver mines (Aṭīn, index); mint (6,174,500 dān is mentioned as mint income in the Mīrālī-i Aḥmadī, i. O. Ethé 3599, f. 728b), which were established in the principal towns of the empire (R. B. Whitehead in JASB, N.S. viii, 1972, 425-531; N.S. xi, 1975, 325-77; G. P. Taylor in JASB, N.S. x, 1974, 179-97; see also Dār al-Dār, c.); and tribute from vassal chiefs (e.g., the revenue of the sūba of Aṭīmī around amounted to over 7,200,000 rupees, three-quarters of which comprised tribute from Rādī īvī chief; other tributary domains were in Gudjarāt, Uṣrā and Central India). Irregular revenue included presents on appointment (salāmi), escheat through intestacy or forfeiture, and other private estate, and a five-fifth of war booty reserved for the imperial exchequer.

The greatest single source of recurrent revenue was from the land, demanded under several different systems during Akbar's long reign, and documented in great detail in the Aṭīn-i Akbarī and other contemporary texts (see Bibliography). The old methods of khallābābākhī (which prevailed in Sindh when the Aṭīn was compiled, for where there are no records of any survey or measurement) and kankūl remained in force for some areas, but the most favoured system, dābi, was subject to a number of experiments in the first twenty-four years of the reign. First Shih Shah's schedule of assessment rates was adopted for general use by the regent, Bayrām Khān, on the basis of a demand of a prevailing rate of one-third of the average produce, stated in grain. "From the beginning of this eternal reign, every year unavari-
cious and high-minded experts used to ascertain prices and lay them before the royal court; and taking the schedule of crop yield and the prices thereof, used to fix the schedule of demand rates (dastār); and this caused great vexation" (Aṭīn, i, 347, trans. I. H. Qureshi in JPhH, ix, 1953, 208); but by the tenth year the uniform schedules gave place to differential schedules based on local prices. Rates, the measuring instruments had been standard-
dized, and land had been classified in accordance with the time it had been cultivated (banjīdūr, uncultivated for five or more years; pulaḍī, cultivated for more than five years; pulaḍī land lying fallow for a short time was patawūlī, but for three or four years was called ṭalār; when banjādūr land was brought under cultivation the demand was one-fifth of the norm for the first year, increasing yearly until the full pulaḍī rate was attained; there was a similar differential rate for ṭalār; patawūlī was untaxed but paid the full pulaḍī rate on being taken into cultiva-
tion again). The dābi system was abolished in the khālisā lands in the thirteenth year (976/1569) under the specially appointed Shihāb al-Dīn Ahmad Khān, who discontinued the annual assessment and established a nasab (Aḥkār-nāma, ii, 333), not precisely defined but assumed to be a form of assessment analogous to kankūl administered through the muḥaddaws (according to Moreland, Appx.D, "group-assessment", where the term is discussed). A new system was introduced in the fifteenth year (978/1571) when Muẓaffar Khān and Rādī Ṭādīr Maḷ were appointed to the wīsārā, having been set in motion in the eleventh year (on the dating question, see Moreland, Appx.E), described in Aṭīn, i, 347: khānsāngos ("interpreters of customs", accountants and registrars of the pargānas (q.v.) prepared new schedules of produce separately for each pargāna, and on the basis of returns for the whole empire (akhsimāt al-mult) a new mākigel was determined by estimate, and hence a new valuation (джām) made by applying the new schedules to actual or estimated crop areas (actual areas being on hand for the khālisā lands).

In the nineteenth year (982/1575) Akbar, requiring to pay salaries by cash rather than by assignment, decided that the areas of the pargānas of the Empire should be re-examined, and the extent of all land, including that bandīgī or ṭalār, which on cultivation could be expected to yield one crore (hārūṭī, 20 million) tankūs should be separated and entrusted to an official called karkūtī, who was to be responsible for effecting the cultivation of the bandījī land and realizing the correct demand (Tabakdt-i Akbarī, B.M.O. 2274, f. 203), so that in the course of three years all the waste land should be brought under cultivation, improving the condition of the rīḍīya and benefiting the treasury (Aṣbāb-i Ṭādīr, Al-mulâkāt). After a successful start the system broke down under the rapacity of the karkūtī and the corruption of their collectors and clerks. The period of this breakdown coincides with Shāh Mansūr's de facto tenure of the diwanī in the absence of Ṭādār Maḷ on military duty. On Ṭādār Maḷ's return in the twenty-
sixth year (985/1577) he resorted to forcible measures to bring the collectors to account, and the following year an Imperial commissioner (amin al-
mult) was appointed in Ṭādār Al-iūbī, invited from the court of Bidjapur, to both of whom the final system is due.

Previously, in the twenty-fourth year (981/1579-80), the practice of assignment of ḡijāfrīs having been re-established, a new valuation was made, calculated on the data of the previous ten years' operation of Ṭādār Maḷ's assessment rates, described in a notoriously difficult passage of the Aṭīn (i, 347), known as Aṭīn-i ḡāsīla (tr. Qureshi, loc. cit.; see Bibliography for earlier translations and interpretations): the ministry held the correct figures for the preceding five years, and those for five years before were taken from reliable sources. One-tenth of the total was declared to be the average produce (hāsīla) and would be taken as the basis of valuation for the ensuing year; deductions were made for partial or complete failure of crops in any area. This decennial average was re-computed each year; demand rates were now fixed in cash, not grain, thus obviating the necessity for yearly revision of the commutation rates. In the provisions the pargānas are grouped into assessment circles, each with its own schedule (dastār). This system is attributed to Akbar himself.

The final system maintains this ideal of valuation but improves its administration (Aṭīn, i, 285-8). Ṭādār Maḷ's proposals of the twenty-seventh year are incorporated in a code of practice which was periodically amended. Village records are kept by the patawūlī, but were available to the State officials. The collector was required to familiarize himself with local agriculture and to extend cultivation wherever possible; to this end the headman was to be allowed up to 21/2 per cent share in the returns, and was authorized to reduce the sanctioned rates on high-
grade crops, and to depart from the system of dābi if the rīḍīya elected khallābābākhī, kankūl, or
nasak; the rūḍāna was to know in advance the extent of his liability to the State. These regulations were applied, successfully, in the ḥāliṣa lands; there is insufficient information on their operation in dijualgī.

Bibliography: Khānd Amir, Humāyün-nāma, Eng. tr. in H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson, The history of India as told by its own historians, v, 116-26; ʿAbbās Sarwānī, Taʿrīkh-e Ṣūr Ṣahlī; Eng. tr. in Elliot and Dowson, op. cit., iv, 305-433; ʿAbd Allāḥ, Taʿrīkh-i Dāwūdī, partial Eng. tr. in Elliot and Dowson, op. cit., iv, 434-513; ʿAbd ʾAl-Qaddī, ʿĀʾīn-i Akbars, 3 vols., Bibl. Ind. Calcutta; Eng. tr. by H. Blochmann vol. i) and H. S. Jarret (vols. ii and iii), Bibl. Ind. Calcutta. Blochmann’s tr. contains many errors of interpretation of fiscal questions, especially i, 347; improved trs. of this in Moreland, op. cit. below, and Qureshi, JPAHS, i, 1953, 208; idem, Akbar-name, 3 vols., Bibl. Ind. Calcutta; Eng. tr. H. Beveridge, Bibl. Ind. Calcutta; ʿAbd al-Ḵādīr Badaʿūnī, Munštahab al-Tawārīḵ, 3 vols. and Eng. tr., Bibl. Ind. Calcutta; Khādīja Niẓām al-Dīn Ḵāmīṣ, Tabāḵāt-i Akbarī, Lucknow lith. 1292/1875, also B.M.O.R. 2274; ʿAll Muhammad Ḵānī, Ṭawārīḵ, 3 vols., GOS Baroda; W. H. Moreland, The agrarian system of Moslem India, Cambridge 1929 (cited above as E. Tawārīḵ), xi, 1953, 263-69; idem, Akbar’s land revenue arrangements in Bengal in JRAI 1926, 43-56; Sri Ram Sharma, Assessment and collection of the land revenue under Akbar in IJH, xiv, 1938, 709-34; idem, The administrative system of Sher Shah, in IJH, xii, 1936, 38-60; D. P. Baran, Shah ʿAbd al-Rahman’s revenue system in JBORS, xvii, 1931, 136-48; I. H. Qureshi, The administration of the sultanate of Dehlī, Karachi 1958; idem, The pargana officials under Akbar in IC, xvi, 1942, 87-93; idem, Akbar’s revenue reforms in JPAHS, i, 1953, 205-17 (includes improved translation of ʿĀʾīn, i, 347); other references in Pearson, pp. 652-3, 658-47.

(c) The later Mughals. The schedules of cash-dividend, as now understood, in the Mughal empire, in accordance with the principles of Islamic Law. This latter is based on the description of practices than for Dāwūdī’s, although the account in the Maḥdīh or ‘Al-ʿUmārī indicates that on his accession he designated ḥāliṣa sufficient land to yield a revenue of 150 lakhs of rupees, and fixed the expenditure ceiling at 100 lakhs; the expenditure limit greatly exceeded this figure, but the ḥāliṣa income was correspondingly increased. A later writer (Bindrāba, Lubb al-Tawārīḵ-i Ḵᵛān, tr. in Elliot and Dowson, vii, 170 ff.) refers to agrarian orders having been issued by the emperor, but these have not been discovered, and the nature of his systems can best be inferred from Awrangzib’s early orders, referred to below. There is, however, a record of the practice in this reign in one area: the Deccan provinces had been brought almost to economic ruin as a result of the wars of conquest, and during Awrangzib’s second viceregal period their revenue systems were reorganized, from about 1652/1653, by Murshid Kuli Khān that retained plough rents where the state of agriculture was primitive, and elsewhere introduced ḥāliṣa and ḍabt, the former being introduced on differential scales for the first time in India, varying with the nature of the crop and with the nature of the source of water on which the crop depended; assessment rates were fixed at a low figure and were accompanied by positive measures to restore prosperity by repopulating and reorganizing the ruined villages and by capital advances. His achievements in the Deccan had apparently no reaction on the administration in the north.

The state of the revenue system when Awrangzib came to the throne, and his measures towards a reform, can be gauged from two early jāmāns of the 8th and 11th regnal years (1076/1665-6 and 1079/1668-9), with preambles containing descriptions of the systems of assessment then in force, with their defects, and the procedures to be adopted in the future (see Rashīd-ud-Dīn Sārkhā, The revenue regulations of Awrangzib . . ., in JASB, n.s. ii, 1906, 223-55); the former constitutes a manual of practice addressed to the provincial diwān and his staffs, but intended to be applicable also for the staffs employed by ḍājīrg-holders, while the latter was issued with the object of ensuring an assessment and collection of revenue, throughout the whole empire, in accordance with the principles of Islamic Law. This latter jāmān is based on the Fatawa-i ‘Alamgiriyya (q.v.) of contemporary jurists, whose authorities were the law-books and commentaries of the central Islamic lands rather than the practical conditions of agriculture in India, with consequent distortions of interpretation of the situation: e.g., reference to peasants as though they held proprietary rights over the land; to a distinction between ṣagr and ḍabt land, not applicable in India; and detailed rules for land under dates and almonds, irrelevant in India.

The first jāmān is the more practical: revenue from the ḥāliṣa lands was expended by the emperor, not the viceroy, and was assessed and collected by the central diwān through the provincial diwāns. There is to be increased control over the local staffs, and the central authority must be kept informed of actual agricultural conditions by more detailed
annual returns from each village; there is set out a development policy through extension of cultivation, increase of the area under high-grade crops, and the erection and maintenance of irrigation works; the old standard demand of one-third became the new minimum demand, with the maximum raised to one-half—in practice presumably generally demanded, since the officials' primary duty was to increase the revenue. Assessment was usually by nasab, usually of a whole village but on occasion of an entire pargana; the nasab could be refused, in which case revenue could be obtained by dab or ghallande, a disposition of local officials; cash-payments of revenue were usual, although Sarkar has shown (Studies, 217) that in parts of Ufisa revenue was paid in kind. The demand was assessed as a lump sum at the beginning of the year, distributed over the peasants by the headmen; these were paid as the crops matured, and passed their collections to the officials after having set aside their own portions as "village expenses"—a further exaction on an already oppressed peasantry. Provision was made for the occurrence of such calamities as drought, frost, or low prices (the second farman makes a distinction between calamities occurring before and those falling after the crops were cut). That these regulations were intended to set a standard of procedure in the dājīgīr-lands is shown by a provision requiring the provincial dājīn to report on the loyalty and efficiency of the officials, and the large tax-farms in Bengal became the forerunners of the system of zamindāri [q.v.]. The revenues thus passed out of the control of the imperial authority as such, and the later fiscal history more properly belongs to the period of British India.
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7. Indonesia [See SUPPLEMENT].

DARIM [see TAMIM].
AL-DARIMI, 'ABDALLAH B. 'ABD AL-RAHMAN
B. AL-FADL B. BAHRAM B. 'ABD AL-SAMAD ABU
MUHAMMAD AL-SAMARKANDI belonged to the B.
Dārim b. Malik, a branch of Tamīm. He travelled
from a number of authorities in al-Īrāq, Syria and Egypt.
Among those who transmitted traditions on his
authority were Muslim b. al-Hajdāj and Abū
'Isa al-Tirmīdī. Al-Dārimī lived a simple, pious life
devoted to study, and acquired a reputation for
knowledge of Ḥadīth, reliability, truthfulness and
soudness of judgment. He was asked to accept office as
ḥāfīz in Samarkand but refused. The sūltān insisted,
so he accepted the office, but after acting once he
was asked to be excused and this was granted. He was
born in 181/797 and died in 255/869. His writings
have been edited. Dārim shows remarkable mastery of
books, but he is also
credited with a Kurʿān commentary. Al-Ḵaṭṭāb
al-Baghḍādi says he compiled al-Musnad and al-
Qiṣa, but one wonders whether these may not be
alternative titles for the same work. His collection of
traditions is commonly called al-Musnad (publ.
Kānpur, 1329, Ḥaydarābād 1330, Dihī 1337, Damas-
cus 1349), but this work is appropriate only if under-
stood in the wider sense common in earlier times.
It should be called al-Sunān, as the material is arranged
according to the subject-matter. This work has not
been treated on an equality with the other canonical
books, but Ibn Ḣadāj al-ʿAṣḵalānī considered it
superior to Ibn Māḏaʿa Sunān. It is much shorter
than any of the six books. Ḥadījī Khalaʾī mentions
three other works, two of them excerpts from his
Musnad, but they have not survived.
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Ṣalāḥ, Ḫīṣā al-ḥadīth, Aleppo 1330/1913, 42;
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DARİR, MUSTAFA, Turkish author of the
7th/14th century. Very little is known of his life.
He was born blind (darîr) in Erzurum where he studied;
later he travelled in Egypt, Syria and Karaman.
His works which have come down to us are: 1. Tar-
duwar al-Darīr, an enlarged free translation, inter-
spersed with many original verse passages, of Abū
ʿAbd al-Bakri al-Basīri (6th/12th century)
version of the sira of Ibn Isḥāk, filled with stories
and legends borrowed from various sources. It
consists of five volumes and was written by
the order of the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt Abū-Muṣṭafā
ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAllī; it was completed in 790/1385
and presented to the sultan al-Sāliḥ Saḥlab al-Dīn Ḥadījī.
The chapter on the birth of the Prophet seems to
have been inspired by the biography of the Syriac
Celebī ʿAlī in Rasul, compiled in Aleppo in 793/1385;
2. a free translation of Wajīḥīs Futuh al-Shīm, which relate the conquest
of Syria by the caliph Abū Bakr and ʿUmar,
completed in Aleppo in 795/1392; 3. a translation of
the Hundred Ḩadīth; 4. ʿUṣūf wa al-Ṣūliyya, a recently
published mathnawī (Istanbul Univ.
Library no. 311, 862). None of these works has yet
been edited. Darīr shows remarkable mastery of
verse; his verse is fluent and he often reaches the
heights of lyric poetry. His pleasant and simple
prose is one of the best specimens of early Turkish
narrative style.

Bibliography: Istanbul Kütüphaneleri Tarık-
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DARIYYA, a village and a watering place in
Najjd located at 42° 56′ N., 24° 46′ E., on
the Dar al-Sulṭānī pilgrim route from al-Baṣra to Mecca
(Handbook, ii, 150). The village was a much
frequent halting place for pilgrims, for the junction
with the route from al-Baḥrayn was here. The
district of Dariyya, according to Ibn Bulayhiṣ, was
a wide territory in Najjd celebrated by the poets
in pre-Islamic times for its sweet water and pasture.
The famous Ḥimā Dariyya is said to have been
named after the village and was part of the district
(ʿYākūt, iii, 44). There is some doubt as to when the
himā was first reserved. ʿYākūt states that Dariyya
was set aside by Kulayb [q.v.], the legendary hero of
the War of Baṣūs, whose burial ground, according
to traditions handed down by the Tāyyī, lies within
the confines of the himā in the mountains of al-Nīr.
The site of this grave was well known among the
Arabs as late as the 15th century, for al-Samḥūdī,
who completed his work in 886/1481, reports that
Adwāb d. Zāmil d. Dājrī, the lord of al-Ḥasā and
al-Kaṭāf (called by the author, Raʾīs Aḥl Nadhīd),
had heard of the shrine from the local Arabs and visited it
(al-Samḥūdī, ii, 227). Al-Bakrī, however,
claims that Ḥīmā Dariyya was first reserved for the
state by ʿUmar b. al-Ḵaṭṭāb for the camels given as
ṣadaqa or taken in battle. The statement by al-
Hamdānī (772, 24) that Ḥīmā Dariyya and Ḥīmā
Kulayb are not the same but are separated by
the mountains of al-Nīr, which ʿYākūt himself recognizes
as an independent himā, supports al-Bakrī. It is
likely that Dariyya was one of the many himās
of the dhāhilīyya epoch which later changed their
names (Ibn Bulayhiṣ, iii, 244). The Hemmey on
Doughty's map is probably an approximation of the
older Ḥīmā Kulayb. According to al-Ṭabarī (i, 1709)
and ʿUṣūf wa al-Ṣūliyya, Dariyya derives its name from
Dariyya, the mother of Ḥulwān, the son of ʿUmar
and grandson of Kūṭā ʿdī. Al-Hamdānī says that
Dariyya was the daughter of Raʾīs b. ʿNīzār.

The himā reserved by ʿUmar originally extended
6 miles in each direction from the village of Dariyya.
Owing to the continuous increase in livestock, which
reached a total of about 40,000 in the time of ʿUgmān
the himā was enlarged about 10 miles in at least one
direction (al-Bakrī, iii, 860). The land, which was
under the control of the Amīrs of Medina, was released
by the ʿAbbasīd Caliph al-Mahdī and is said to have
yielded, as private property, an annual tribute of
8,000 dirhams in the early ʿAbbasīd period. At
this time the territory was chiefly inhabited by the
Kūlib, against whom Muḥammad had sent troops in A.H. 6
and 7. Dariyya was not without strife, for al-Abdāl
mentions that al-Rabīḥa, a neighbouring pilgrim
station and himā, was destroyed in the year 359/951
through continuous warfare between its people and
those of Dariyya.

Today, by-passed by modern roads, Dariyya is
a poor settlement with about 20 wells and only a few
scattered palms, lying in desolate steppe terrain at
the edge of one of the dikes in the granite shield
underlying the western plateau. Western writers have
frequently confused it with al-Dirīyya [q.v.], the
former Wahhabi capital (cf. Wüstenfeld). Among European travellers in the area, Philby is the first to have visited and described Dariyya and its companion village Miska, about 6 kilometers to the north (The Land of Midian, 9, 52). He mentions Kufic inscriptions found on rocks in Dariyya, attesting to its former prominence as a pilgrimage station. Dariyya is in territory now occupied by ‘Ubayba and Idris, tribes which figured as makeweights in the struggles of the late 18th and early 19th centuries among the Sharifs of Mecca and the ruling families of Rashid and Sa‘ūd for domination of Najd.


**AL-DARIYYA** [see AL-DIR'YYA]

**DARKAWA** Spiritual head of the misha Darkawā, a religious brotherhood founded in north Morocco at the end of the 18th century by an Idrīsī șarīf, Mawālī al-‘Arbī al-Darkawī. His name is supposed to come from the appellation of one of his ancestors who used to be called Abū Darka, the man with the leather shield. He was the pupil at Fas of another Idrīsī șarīf, ‘All b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Djamal, an adept of the mystical doctrine of al-Shadhili (q.v.), and after the latter’s death, he organized and binded inspiration by this doctrine. The seat of this group was at first the șawīya of Bū Brijī in the tribe of the Ban Ẓawālī (on the right bank of the Oued Wargha), then, after 1863, the șawīya of ʿAmajdīt (Amjot) not far from there, where it is still located and where each year at the end of September the annual festival (mawṣūm) of the brotherhood is celebrated. Many pilgrims go there on this occasion.

The Darkawā brotherhood has spread above all in the north and east of Morocco and in the west of Algeria. In Morocco especially it has brought together adepts from every kind of social class, including the Sharifian court: the sultans, Mawālī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (1822-1859) and Mawālī Yūsuf (1912-1927) belonged to it. At the end of the 19th century, the number of Darkāwā in Algeria was estimated at 1,450, and in 1939, at almost 34,000 in Morocco.

The doctrine of the Darkāwā appears perfectly orthodox; it insists essentially on the necessity of man’s consecrating himself as far as possible to the contemplation of divinity and to the mystic union with God. To attain this the Darkāwī must pray as often as he can, and particularly during the sessions of prayer (qibūr) which are held regularly in the customary meeting-places of the brotherhood. These sessions aim at provoking ecstasy by means of the recitation of pious formulas, mystical poems, song and dance. An excellent description of them is to be found in the *Essai sur la mystique musulmane* of E. Dermenhem, the preface to his translation of the Șamārīyya of Ibn al-Fārid (Paris 1931, 64, n. 1). In order better to detach themselves from the world, certain adepts go so far as to live as wanderers, that is to say, they have left the world and those of others killed in the battle, were well-known. Under the guidance of the Arabs Darkawa, a rosary of a hundred beads round their necks. The majority content themselves with paying as little attention as possible to worldly matters, and with taking no part in any form of public life.

Nevertheless, on several occasions the Darkāwā have played a part in politics: one of them, Ibrīs al-Sharīf, provoked serious agitation in the Turkish province of Oran which lasted for several years (1803-9); but for the moderation of the sultan Mawālī Sulaymān (1792-1822), this agitation might have ended in the annexation of western Algeria by Morocco. Soon afterwards, various groups of Darkāwā took an active part on the Berber revolt of the last years of Mawālī Sulaymān’s reign, and the head of the brotherhood was even imprisoned for a time. After the death of Mawālī Sulaymān, the Darkāwā took hardly any further part in the political life of Morocco, even in the troublesome years at the beginning of the 20th century. On the other hand, they played a certain part during the first years of the French conquest of Algeria by opposing the Amir ʿAbd al-Kādir, who was accused of making common cause with the French after the Desmichels (1834) and Tafa’in (1837) treaties.


**DARNA,** in modern pronunciation Derna, a town on the northern coast of Cyrenaica which is to-day the second most important in the region after Benghazi. It is situated in a little plain along the banks of a wādī of the same name, bounded by the plateau of the al-Djabal al-Akhdar, which forms a steep slope to the south and touches the sea to the east and west, but thanks to its never-failing springs it is rich in palms (8,000) and in orange and other fruit trees. Darna owes its origin to the Greeks who founded one of their colonies in the neighbourhood. Darnis, as their trading post was called, did not become a polis and was not one of the five cities combined into a federation in the time of Alexander the Great, which gave the country its name, Pentapolis. It is probable that it developed only in the time of the Hellenistic Ptolemies. Darna shares the fate of the Pentapolis and it became a Roman possession in 96 B.C., in accordance with the will of Ptolemy Apion, who renewed a decision already made in 155 B.C. by Ptolemy Ptolemy Physcon (= Ptolemy VII, Euergetes II Neoteros); concerning these facts, an important inscription discovered at Cyrene, and the bibliography, see Romanelli, *Cirenaica*, 1-24. Under the Byzantines, Darna was the seat of a bishopric which already existed at the time of the Council of Nicea in 325. On the conquest of Pentapolis by the Muslims, see ȘARKA. According to Yâkūt, it was at Darna that the governor of the country, Abū Shaddād Zuhayr b. Kays al-Balawi, was killed in 76/695 (or in 74/693?), as he was hastening to meet the Greeks who had disembarked there in an attempt to recapture the region. Yâkūt says that his tomb, and those of others killed in the battle, were well-known. Under the guidance of the Arabs Darna has ended in the annexation of western Algeria by Morocco. Soon afterwards, various groups of Dârkawā took an active part on the Berber revolt of the last years of Mawālī Sulaymān’s reign, and the head of the brotherhood was even imprisoned for a time. After the death of Mawālī Sulaymān, the Dârkawā took hardly any further part in the political life of Morocco, even in the troublesome years at the beginning of the 20th century. On the other hand, they played a certain part during the first years of the French conquest of Algeria by opposing the Amir ʿAbd al-Kâdir, who was accused of making common cause with the French after the Desmichels (1834) and Tafa’in (1837) treaties.

merchants and pilgrims, which passed about 90 kms. to the south (by Cāy al-Ghazala, al-Tamīmī and al-Maghīlī). It was from the end of the 17th century on, or even later, that Darna revived thanks to the immigration of Andalusians, coming less from Spanish origin goes back to the 17th century: even later (see Ibn Ghalbūn), after they had already found refuge. Accurate information on the arrival of these farmers of Andalusia than from other places in North Africa was continual struggle between the inhabitants of the cities of Cyrenaica, made an expedition against Darna (30th September 1921), one of the first actions was the bombardment of Darna (30th September) and its occupation (16th October). The population of the town was then about 9,500. Under the Italians, Darna became a frequent enough in this country, weakened the town had been in ruins for a long time. It had therefore begun to prosper again when the Dey of Tripoli, Muhammad (1041/59-1632-49), who wanted to keep all the threads of trans-Saharan trade in his own hands, and did not like foreign expansion in farthest than Darna, for a treaty between Yusuf and the United States put an end to this American fleet against Tripoli had met with failure; he had persuaded the elder brother of the Pašha, Ahmad, (Ahmet, Hamet, in the western sources), who was considered the legitimate ruler, to join the expedition. Nevertheless, these troops did not advance much farther than Darna, for a treaty between Yusuf and the United States put an end to this American fleet against Tripoli. In 1835, after the long interval of Karamanlī rule, Cyrenaica came back under the direct government of Constantinople, and Darna, one of the three kaḍās of the sandjak of Benghāżī, was useful to it in exercising a precarious control, which grew gradually stronger, over the interior and Marmarica. The government did its utmost to develop the land between Marsā Sūsa and Darna. When Italy decided to take possession of Libya and declared war on Turkey (49th September 1911), one of the first actions was the bombardment of Darna (30th September) and its occupation (16th October). The population of the town was then about 9,500. Under the Italians, Darna became a very beautiful and well cared for city even tried to attract tourists. During the first world war it remained in Italian hands, and one of the places from which later the reconquest of Cyrenaica began. During the second world war, it passed several times from the hands of the Italians and Germans into that of the allies before its final occupation by the English in January 1943. It suffered much damage and the proclamation of the kingdom (24th December, 1951). Notwithstanding the importance that the Sanisīyā has in Cyrenaica, this tarīkā has only one zdwiya in Darna, whereas 14 other tarīkās are represented there, some of them for as long as 150 years. One of the 70 warriors killed at the side of the above mentioned Zuhayr al-Balawi, Sidi Bu Mansūr al-Farisi, whose tomb stands in the cemetery, has given his name to that part of the town which stretches along the right bank of the wādī. Bibliography: For Darna in ancient times: J. P. Thirge, Res Cyreniensium, Copenhagen 1828, reprinted Verbania 1940 (Ital. trans., Verbania 1940). P. Romanelli, La Cirenaica romana, Verbania 1943 (these volumes have appeared in the collection Storia della Libia); among the Arab geographers, Yāskīt, Muṣḥam, s.v. Darna, mentions the place but is confused in his information. For the events of the Berber period: C. Bergna, Tripoli dal 1520 al 1850, Tripoli 1925, 123 f., 149; Ch. L. Feraud, Annales Tripolitaines, Tunis 1927, 100-4, 109-11, 149, 319 f.; E. Rossi, La cronaca araba tripolina di Ibn Ghalbūn (sec. XVII) tradotta e annotata, Bologna 1926, 101, 149; Ibn ‘Ayyāṣī, al-Riḥla al-‘Ayyāṣīyya, Fez 1316, i, 308 f. (passage copied by Warthilānī, 232); Ibn Nāṣir al-Dāri, al-Riḥla al-Nāṣiriyya, Fez 1320 (passages copied by Warthilānī, 609 f.); Warthilānī, Nuzhat al-anṣār bi l-‘ādā bišīm al-ta‘ārīf wa l-‘aḥādīr = al-Riḥla al-Warθilānīyya, Algiers 1326/1908, 608 f. The occupation of Darna by the Americans in 1805: E. Dupuy, Americains et Barbaresques (1776-1824), Paris 1910, 231-272; Encyclopaedia Britannica, s.v. Eaton, Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
DARSHAN, also less correctly DARSAH, A Samir word (darsana, from the root dr “see” meaning “showing, being visible”; hence, the ceremonial appearance of a king to his subjects. This Hindú practice was adopted by the Moghul emperor Akbar (A’in-i Akbari, i, 73) and his immediate successors. The English traveller Coryat says that Ddhanag in Agra used to present himself three times a day from a canopied window. The failure of Shahjahan to appear during his illness at the end of 1627/Sept.-December 1627 led to rumours of his death. The practice of darsan was at first followed by Awrangzib, but abandoned by him in 1678/1668 as savouring of idolatry.

(D. BURTON-PAGE)

DÁRGHA. The word is derived from the Mongol daru-, ‘to press, to seal’ and was used to denote a chief in the Mongol feudal hierarchy (K. H. Menges, Glossar zu den Volkskundlichen Texten aus Ost-Asien, ii, Wiesbaden 1955, 714 s.v. dargha). In 617-8/1221 the term dargha was not, however, applied exclusively to an official whose functions were those of a town or village police officer. There are several instances of the appointment of a dargha as a tribal chief, whose functions were clearly rather different from those of the dargha of a town or the dargha of the bazaar. For example, ‘Abd al-Razzak states that Timur used sometimes to send a dargha and a mubassil to collect the taxes due from the Hazara near Herat (Malik al-Salādayn, ed. Muhammad Shafi’, ii, 1297). There was also a dargha of the Turkmans in Astarabad in Safavid times (cf. Ḥasan Rūmī, Aḥsan al-Tawārikh, ed. and tr. C. N. Seddon, Baroda, 1931-4, 346-7); and under the Kājārs the taxes of various Turkmun tribes appear to have been collected by a dargha (cf. Rūmān-ya Dowlat-i A‘līyya-i ʿIrān, 2 Rabi‘ 1280, 26 Muharram, 1287). There are other cases also of a dargha being appointed over special sections of the population. Thus, the dargha of the Majdūṣyān of Yazd is mentioned c. 1054/1644 (Muhammad Mufid, Diwān-i Muḥfiz, B. M. Or. 210, f. 363b). It is not stated what his functions were; they may well have been to collect the taxes due from the Zoroastrian community and to enforce any special regulations relating to that community.

Under the Safawids the term dargha was also used to denote a kind of head clerk controlling the staff of the larger government departments; such were the dargha of the farrākhnāna and the dargha of the daftarkhnāna (Tadhkīrat al-Mulk, fl. 91a-b, 141; Tavernier, 222). This usage of the term dargha continued in the Kājār period.

In Muslim India the term dargha was used to denote an official in the royal stables (Abru I-Fadl, A’in-i Akbari, tr. Blochmann, i, 53). In British India it was used to designate the native head of various departments; and from 1793 to 1862-3 the local chief of police was also known as the dargha (H. Y. and C. B. Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, London 1903, 297-8). In George in Safavid times the dargha was a police officer working in conjunction with the mawārisi (constable) and mešīk (Armenian burgomaster) and the hādīkhāna (see the charters...
analyzed by M. F. Brosset in Histoire de la Georgie.


Al-DARUM, the name of a coastal plain in Palestine, and in later particular in the name of a famous fortress of the time of the Crusades, is to be found in the works of Arab authors with both these meanings. The Hebrew dÅrôm from which it is derived and to which it corresponds in the Arabic version of Deuteronomy, XXXIV, 3, appeared in a few passages of the Old Testament for south as a cardinal point, or in any country situated in the south (F. M. Abel), and it was later applied especially to the south-west of Judea, a low-lying region distinct both from Sephela which bordered it on the north and the southern, desert territory of the Negeb. The Byzantine name Daromas, which corresponded to this ancient Darom, was equally applied to the south-west section of the vast district of Eleutheropolis (see BAYT DJIBRIN), while not including the town itself. However, this distinction was forgotten in Arab times and al-Darum, according to the evidence of al-Muyaddadi, was identified with the territory surrounding Bayt Djibrin, and it shared its history from the time of its conquest under the Caliphate of Abü Bakr.

As to the Palestinian citadel of al-Darûm, the Darum of the Crusaders, it stood on the road from Gaza to Egypt on the site marked to-day by the ruins of Dayr al-Balah, to assure the defence of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem from this side. Attacked especially by Salâh ad-Dîn, then conquered by him in 1183/1187 at the time of his re-occupation of the greater part of Palestine, it was later besieged, taken, and then dismantled by Richard Cœur de Lion and the Franks of the Third Crusade in 1188/1189, but was still counted in the Mamlûk period as one of the fortresses depending directly on the nâdîb of the district of Gaza, on the coastal border of the province of Damascus.

Bibliography: P. M. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine, Paris 1933-8, especially i, 420-3; G. Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, London 1890, 437; A. S. Marmardji, Textes Géographiques, Paris 1931, 71-2; Caetani, Annals, index (ii, 1299); Tabari, index; BGA, indices; Yâkût, ii, 525; Ibn al-Athîr, especially xi, 326, 361, and xii, 52-3; Hist. Or. Cr., i to v, indices; Ibn Shaddâd, A'dâb, Southern Syria, ms. Leiden 800, fol. 139 b; R. Grousset, Hist. des Croisades, Paris 1934-6, index, especially ii, 539-62 and iii, 85-7; M. Gaudetroy-Demoboyne, La Syrie a l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, especially 14 and 50. (J. Sourdel-Thomine)

DARûRA, necessity (also Îdírâár), in works of fîkh has a narrow meaning when it is used to denote what may be called the technical state of necessity, and a wider meaning when authors use it to describe the necessities or demands of social and economic life, which the jurists had to take into account in their elaboration of the law which was otherwise independent of these factors.

I. The state of necessity, whose effects are on those of violence, does not result from threats expressed by a person, but from certain factual circumstances which may obligate an individual, finding himself in a dangerous situation which they have brought about (shipwrecked, dying of hunger or thirst in the desert, for example), to do some action forbidden by the law, or to conclude a legal transaction on very unfavourable terms in order to escape from the danger which threatens him. The Kurâ念 contains numerous verses which, directly or indirectly, legitimize on grounds of necessity certain acts which in principle are forbidden (II, 166; V, 5; VI, 119; XVI, 116). Ibn Nujäyd derived from this a maxim which became famous: al-dârûrâ tâhâ al-mâshârâr, which the Ottoman Madjâla (art. 21) reproduced literally and which may be translated: "Necessity makes lawful that which is forbidden".

The effects of the state of necessity of which the writers have fixed the conditions and limits, are more or less drastic according to the domain of fîkh in which they occur.

a) In what concerns prohibitions of a religious character (the prohibition against eating pork or dead animals, or against drinking blood or other liquids regarded as impure, for example), it is admitted without difference between the Schools, that necessity legitimizes the non-observation of these rules. It follows—and this is the opinion which has prevailed in doctrine—that one is even obliged to disregard them in a case of danger.

b) Most of the offences committed under the rule of necessity (for example, the theft of food, a shipwrecked person's throwing into the sea the goods of another shipwrecked person in the same boat if it is too heavily laden) are excused and do not give rise to any punishment, but do not cancel any civil responsibility. Three offences are never legitimized, let alone simply excused, whatever may be the circumstances in which they are committed (apart from legitimate defence). They are: murder, the amputation of a limb, or serious wounding likely to cause death; in these cases the evil inflicted is equal, if not superior, to that which the perpetrator of the offence has endeavoured to avoid, and there is no reason to favour him rather than the victim.

c) Jurists have not paid much attention to the effect of legal transactions (sale, lease) committed under necessity. They regard it only as a case of fikr (ikrâh) to be decided according to the rules which govern violence in general. Nevertheless, in treatises on fîkh rules are found relating to a sale concluded in a state of necessity, when one of the parties (buyer or seller) exploits the circumstances which force the other to buy or sell. The Hânsâfîs call such a sale fâsid; the writers of the other schools decree that the price should not be the same as usual, but the habitual price of something equivalent (qâman al-mîthâb).

II. Darûra is used in a much wider sense by the commentators when they try to justify by practical necessity, solutions which the lawyers of the first
centuries of the Hijra adopted by istihsan or istislah rather than by the rules of reasoning (biyās). In these very numerous cases, the word is no longer synonymous with constraint, but signifies practical necessity, the exigencies of social and economic life. This is why other expressions such as ḥadīṣ or tawāmul al-nās or maṣlaṭa are frequently used. It is almost exclusively in Şafi’i law, which does not recognize istiḥsan, that these divergences from biyās had to be justified by reason of necessity, then taken in its narrower sense (al-ḥiṣb). An individual basis. Beyond the single soul seeking a "path", method of tarlka [q.v.,...ness. But there go also with the hypnosis, either as excitants or consequents, certain physical states and phenomena which have earned for dervishes the ridicule, either as madmen or scorpions and glass, of passing needles through their bodies and spikes into their eyes. But besides these phenomena, there appear amongst dervishes automatic phenomena of _al-Dīn al-Rumi_ (d. at Konya in 672/1274), stimulate the organized expression of religious life in Islam. For centuries that religious life (see _taṣawwuf_) was on an individual basis. Beyond the single soul seeking its own salvation by ascetic practices or soothing meditations, there was found at most a teacher gathering round himself a circle of disciples. Such a circle might even persist for a generation or two after his death, led by some prominent pupil, but for long there was nothing of the nature of a perpetual corporation, preserving an identity of organization and worship under a fixed name. Only in the 6th/12th century—the troubled times of the Saljuq break-up—did continuous corporations began to appear. The _Kādirites_, founded by _Abd al-Kādir al-Dīlānī_ [q.v. (d. 561/1166), seem to have been the first still-existing fraternity of definitely historical origin. Thereafter, we find these organizations appearing in bewildering profusion, founded either by independent saints or by split and secession from older bodies. Such historical origins must, however, be sharply distinguished from the legends told by each of their peculiar ritual and devotional phrases. As the origin of Şafi’ism is pushed back to the Prophet himself, and its orthodoxy is thus protected, these are traced down from the Prophet (or rather from Allah through Gabriel and the Prophet) through a series of well-known saints to the historic founder. This is called the _silsila_ or "chain" of the order, and another similar _silsila_ or apostolic succession of Heads extends from the founder to the present day. Such a dervish must know the _silsila_ which binds him up to Allah himself, and must believe that the faith taught by his order is the esoteric essence of Islam, and that the ritual of his order is of as high a validity as the _ṣalā_. His relationship to the _silsila_ is through his individual teacher (shaykh, mursid, ustād, pir) who introduces him into the fraternity. That takes place through an _āhd_, "covenant", consisting of religious professions and vows which vary in the different bodies. Previously the neophyte (muriid, "willer", "intended") has been put through a longer or shorter process of initiation, in some forms of which it is plain that he is brought under hypnotic control by his instructor and put into rapport with him. The theology is always some form of Şafi’ism, but varies in the different _farkas_ from ascetic quietism to pantheistic antimaniacism. This goes so far that in Persia dervishes are divided into those _bi-šarh_ "with law", that is, following the law of Islam, and those _bi-šarh_ "without law", that is, rejecting not only the ritual but the moral law. In general the Persians and the Turks have diverged farther from Islam than the Syrians, Arabs or Africans, and the same _farka_ in different countries may assume different forms. The ritual always lays stress on the emotional religious life, and tends to produce hypnotic phenomena (auto and otherwise) and fits of ecstasy. One order, the _Khalwatiyya_ [q.v.], is distinguished by its requiring from all its members an annual period of retreat in solitude, with fasting to the utmost possible limit and endless repetitions of religious formulae. The effect on the nervous system and imagination is very marked. The religious service consists of the organized expression of prayer and meditation. These fraternities (ṣura, plural of _farka_ [q.v.], "path", i.e., method of instruction, initiation and religious exercise) form the organized expression of religious life in Islam. For centuries that religious life (see _taṣawwuf_ was on an individual basis. Beyond the single soul seeking its own salvation by ascetic practices or soothing meditations, there was found at most a teacher gathering round himself a circle of disciples. Such a circle might even persist for a generation or two after his death, led by some prominent pupil, but for long there was nothing of the nature of a perpetual corporation, preserving an identity of organization and worship under a fixed name. Only in the 6th/12th century—the troubled times of the Saljuq break-up—did continuous corporations began to appear. The _Kādirites_, founded by _Abd al-Kādir al-Dīlānī_ [q.v. (d. 561/1166), seem to have been the first still-existing fraternity of definitely historical origin. Thereafter, we find these organizations appearing in bewildering profusion, founded either

---

**DARUormal DARWISH**

(DARWISH) is commonly explained as derived from Persian and meaning "seeking doors", pronounced _us-l-a_ and meaning "seeking doors", derived from Persian and meaning "seeking doors", i.e., _Ikhwan_, fraternity, but in Persian and Turkish rather from the singular _rāsh_ or _ristihsan_ or _istihasan_ rather than by the rules of reasoning (biyās) to have condemned, but which the "necessities" imposed, for instance contracts of hire and lease ( _idāra_ ) and of mercantile partnership ( _ṣara_ ), loan of money ( _bard_ ), the agricultural ( _kard_ ), and lease ( _muzdra'a_ ) or _istihsan_, law, which does not recognize _istihsan_, or the historic founder. This is called the _silsila_ or "chain" of the order, and another similar _silsila_ or apostolic succession of Heads extends from the founder to the present day. Such a dervish must know the _silsila_ which binds him up to Allah himself, and must believe that the faith taught by his order is the esoteric essence of Islam, and that the ritual of his order is of as high a validity as the _ṣalā_. His relationship to the _silsila_ is through his individual teacher (shaykh, mursid, ustād, pir) who introduces him into the fraternity. That takes place through an _āhd_, "covenant", consisting of religious professions and vows which vary in the different bodies. Previously the neophyte (muriid, "willer", "intended") has been put through a longer or shorter process of initiation, in some forms of which it is plain that he is brought under hypnotic control by his instructor and put into rapport with him. The theology is always some form of Şafi’ism, but varies in the different _farkas_ from ascetic quietism to pantheistic antimaniacism. This goes so far that in Persia dervishes are divided into those _bi-šarh_ "with law", that is, following the law of Islam, and those _bi-šarh_ "without law", that is, rejecting not only the ritual but the moral law. In general the Persians and the Turks have diverged farther from Islam than the Syrians, Arabs or Africans, and the same _farka_ in different countries may assume different forms. The ritual always lays stress on the emotional religious life, and tends to produce hypnotic phenomena (auto and otherwise) and fits of ecstasy. One order, the _Khalwatiyya_ [q.v.], is distinguished by its requiring from all its members an annual period of retreat in solitude, with fasting to the utmost possible limit and endless repetitions of religious formulae. The effect on the nervous system and imagination is very marked. The religious service consists of the organized expression of prayer and meditation. These fraternities (ṣura, plural of _farka_ [q.v.], "path", i.e., method of instruction, initiation and religious exercise) form the organized expression of religious life in Islam. For centuries that religious life (see _taṣawwuf_ was on an individual basis. Beyond the single soul seeking its own salvation by ascetic practices or soothing meditations, there was found at most a teacher gathering round himself a circle of disciples. Such a circle might even persist for a generation or two after his death, led by some prominent pupil, but for long there was nothing of the nature of a perpetual corporation, preserving an identity of organization and worship under a fixed name. Only in the 6th/12th century—the troubled times of the Saljuq break-up—did continuous corporations began to appear. The _Kādirites_, founded by _Abd al-Kādir al-Dīlānī_ [q.v. (d. 561/1166), seem to have been the first still-existing fraternity of definitely historical origin. Thereafter, we find these organizations appearing in bewildering profusion, founded either
clairaudience and clairvoyance and even of levitation, which deserve more attention than they have yet received. These, however, appear only in the case of accepted saints (waisis: [q.v.]), and are explained as harāmāt [q.v.] (χαράματα) wrought by Allāh for them. But besides the small number of full members of the orders, who reside in the monasteries (ḵhānḵāh, ribāt, zāviya, tābiyya or takya) or wander as mendicant friars (the Kalanderis, an order derived from the Baktāshis, must wander continually), there is a vast number of lay members, like Franciscan and Dominican tertiary friars, who live in the world and who have, apart from any religious significance in the essential context of intuitionists on the one hand and traditionists and rationalists on the other. For this division see further under ṭašawwūf. Now their numbers are drawn mostly from the lower orders of society, and for them the fraternity house is in part like a church and in part like a club. Their relation to it is much more personal than to a mosque, and the fraternities, in consequence, have come to have the position and the importance of the separate church organizations in Protestant Christendom. As a consequence, in more recent times, the governments have assumed a certain indirect control of them. This, in Egypt, was exercised by the Shaykh al-Bakr, who was head of all the dervish fraternities there (Ḵhāb bāyī al-Siddīqb, 379 ff.). Elsewhere there is a similar head for each city. The Sandis (q.v.) alone, by retiring into the deserts of Arabia and North Africa and especially by keeping their organization inaccessible in the depths of the Sahara, have maintained their freedom from this control. Their membership is also of a distinctly higher social order than that of the other fraternities. As women in Islam have generally the same religious, though not legal, status as men, so there are women dervishes. These are received into the order by the Shaykh; but they are instructed and trained by women, and almost always hide their dhwirs by themselves. In mediaeval Islam such female dervishes often led a cloistered life, and there were separate foundations and convents for them with superior's of their own sex. Now, they seem to be all tertiaries. To give a complete list of fraternities is quite impossible here. Besides the separate articles referred to above, see, also, the articles on the various Sufi leaders and orders.


D. B. Macdonald, Dervish in Encyclopaedia Britannica, ed. xi, but to be corrected by above, also his Religious Attitude and Life in Islam, Chicago 1909, and Aspects of Islam, New York 1911, both by index; Ahīm Amlī, Ḳūma al-ṣadād ... al-misriyya, Cairo 1953, 199; For the present state of the brotherhoods, L. Massignon, Annales du monde musulman, ii, Paris 1904, 195, index no. 4, esp. on the Ṣayyīḥ al-Bakrī, ibid. 274, after the list of congregations; more generally, L. Massignon, Annaire du monde musulman, iii, 1929, 457-67: tarba; idem, art. ŪRĪQA in EP; P. J. André, Contribution à l'étude des confréries religieuses musulmanes, 1956. For the various meanings of the word and the two proposed etymologies see Muller, Lexicon persico-latinum, s.v.; Dozy, Suppl., s.v. asre. Miniatures: Ph. W. Schulze, Die Persisch-Islamische Miniatur-malerie, pl. 156, 165; pl. 188 (caricature).

DARYA-BEGI, DERVĪY-BEYI, sea-lord, a title given in the Ottoman Empire to certain officers of the fleet. In the 9th/10th century the term deryā-bey or derīs-beyi is sometimes used of the commander of Gallipoli [see ṢELĪBUL], who had the rank of Sandjak-beyi, and was the naval commander-in-chief until the emergence of the Kapudan Paša [q.v.]. In the 10th/11th century the Kapudan Paša became, as well as an admiral, the governor of an eyal of, which consisted of a group of ports and islands [see PAZLIR-I BAHİR-I ṢAPİF]. This province, like others, was divided into Sandjakis, the governors of which were called deryā-beyis instead of sandjak-beyis. The deryā-beyis and the officers under them held appanages and fiefs like the feudal cavalry; they were required to serve with the fleet, and to supply, equip, and man one, two, or three galleys, according to the importance of their sandjakis. Their fiefs were administered by the department called Deryā Kalem, sea office, which also handled the mensākbāt [q.v.]. The deryā-beyis usually held their appointments for life, and transmitted them to their sons. Their ships were auxiliary to the main fleet.


DARYA-YI ŞAHĪ [see URMIYA]

DASKARA, name of four places in ʿIrāk, viz.: 1. a town on the Diyālā N. E. of Bahgdād, 2. a village in the district of Nahr al-Malik W. of Bahgdād, 3. a village near associate, S. of Bahgdād, 4. a village in Kūhīzāstān (cf. Yāḵt, ii, 575; Marsjad, i, 402; cf. Muḥaddasa, 26).

Daskara is arabized from the Pahlavi dastāka (Dastkarta, Dastakrta), modern Persian Dastājkard [q.v.]; it means a post, a village, a town or simply level ground [see Herzelf, Geschichte der Stadt Samarra, Hamburg 1948, 44]; J. Markwart, A catalogue of the provincial capitals of Eranshahr, Rome 1937, 59; Diwālīkī, Muʿarrab, 67; A. Geiger, in WZKM, xii, 1935, 124; Eddi Shīr, al-ʿAlīf
DASKARA — AL-DASÖKI


The best known is Daskara I, 16 parasangs (c. 88 km.) by the post road east of Baghdād (Ibn Khurra- dādbih, 18-19) just above the 34° N. Lat. It is the most succinct of Sasanian Dastadjird (q.v.), probably a caravan post which developed into an important town. Its association with Hurmizd I (272-3) who very probably rebuilt it (cf. Vālūt, v, 575 and Hamza al-Iṣfahāni, and with Khusrūw Parvēz (590-608) who made it its permanent residence, account for its name Daskarat al-Malik (The King's Daskara) (Hersfeld, Samarra, 44; Ibn al-ʿAlīr, i, 348, 363).

In 628, Heraclius reduced it to a heap of ruins, and a few years later the Arab conquests followed. In the Islamic period, Daskara (or Daskarat al-Malik) was the centre of an agricultural district (fassād) in Astān Shāhī Kubdān, and a caravan station of some importance on the Khorāsān road. (Ibn Khurra-dādbih, 13, 41; Ya’qūbī, Buldān, 270). In early Islamic history Daskara became a Khāridji stronghold (Ibn al-ʿAlīr, ii, 290, 313; Tabāri, i, 336, 398; ii, 590, 866. Even in the 9th and 10th centuries Daskara was associated with it, ibid. iii, 1689-90, 2108).

Daskara, as a village or small town, grew gradually and attained some prosperity in the 3rd/9th century (see Kudāma, 238 for the revenue of the fassād of Daskara). Ibn Rusta considered Daskara a big town (164). Iṣṭaḥkhrī (318-321/930-933) and Ibn Ḥawkal (c. 367/977) describe it as a flourishing town, surrounded by date groves and abundant cultivations. They refer to a clay fortress probably constructed by the Arabs. (Iṣṭaḥkhrī, 87; Ibn Ḥawkal, i, 246). However, Muḥaddasī (375/985) found it a small town with one long market (121; cf. 53). Daskara declined further and in the 7th/13th century. Yālūt followed by the Mārāṣid spoke of it as a mere village (Yālūt, ii, 575; cf. ii, 227; Mārāṣid, i, 402). It is not known when Daskara was deserted.

Arab geographers were impressed with the ruins of old Dastadjird. Ya’qūbī (Buldān, 270) refers to the wonderful buildings of old Persian kings, while Ibn Rusta of Dastagard, the name of a number of towns in the Sasanian empire, also known as the Burhaniyya or Burhamiyya, the followers being generally called Barāhim. Born most probably at the village of Mārūs in the Gharbīyya district of Lower Egypt in the year 639/ 1241 according to Shārānī in Lawdāsī (but 644/1248 according to Maḵrīzī in Kitāb al-Sulāk) and 653/1255 according to Hasan b. ʿAll Shāmī the commentator on his biḥṭ) he spent most of his life in the neighbouring village of Dasık or Dusık where he died at the age of 43 and was buried. His father (buried at Mārūs) was a famous local wāli and his maternal grandfather Abu ʿl-ʿAṣfāṣī al-Wāṣītī (Shaʿrānī, Lawdāsī, iv, 173) as the leading Riḍāʾī ʿAbdallāh in the Gharbīyya district. It would seem that Wāṣītī, in conjunction with a disciple of his, Muḥammad b. ʿHārūn (ibid., ii, 3), possibly in rivalry to İbrahim’s father, were the first to start a legend concerning the saintliness of İbrahim when they credited him with having certified to the beginning of Ramadān by refusing to take his mother’s breast on the day of his birth at the end of Shaʿbān. After a brief study of ʿAbd’s law, İbrahim became a mystic. He left no children but was succeeded after his death by his brother Şayḫ Muṣā (Ibn Ḥawkal).

His works include al-Diwaḥīr (quoted at length in Shaʿrānī’s Lawdāsī) a collection mostly of instructions to novices and homiletic injunctions, al-Diwaḥīr, which enumerates his karāmāt, and al-Ṭabāḵī, a record of intimate conversations (munda-dādī) with God. İbrahim was also the author of several kāsidās, two of which are quoted in Lawdāsī (see also Dar al-Kutub, Cairo, Fihrist Taṣawwuf no. 319 Māḏāmī) a salah (ibid., no. 2593) and a biḥṭ. Al-Diwaḥīr, his major work, consistently argues the compatibility of ḥabṭa and shariʿa. Only in ecstasy is taklīf dropped. Inner purity is the central theme. Adherence to the shariʿa is not by word of mouth, nor is Şūʿism a matter of outward garb or residence in zīwāyas. It is the inward action “ṣamāl diwaḥīnī” that counts, inasmuch as one’s real sīyāya is one’s heart. The ṣilāt is in intimate communion with God “mutaṣāṣīn”, and the strictest obedience to him is enjoined. Love, tasīm (complete trust, i.e., in the ṣilāt) and self-mortification “ṣabḥ al-naṣīr” are the true path of the Şūfī. Although the karāmāt listed in the Diwaḥīr are extravagant, yet they were not unusual for the times. In his ṣawm İbrahim makes the moving prayer that İbrahim made to God that his body be so enlarged that it should fill up all Hell to ransom mankind. It is evident that İbrahim owed no allegiance to any other Şūfī. In the Diwaḥīr he stated that at the age of seven he had exceeded in rank all the other saints with the exception of ʿAbd al-ʿKādir (thus affirming his independence of Riḍā’s and Badawi) but later he stated that at a ceremony in heaven God ordered him to invest all saints with the ḥāṭa saying: “O İbrahim, you are the nakb over them all”. The Prophet at the time was by his side but ʿAbd al-ʿKādir was behind him and Riḍā behind ʿAbd al-ʿKādir.

İbrahim receives the briefest note from Maḵrīzī (Kitāb al-Sulāk, i, 739) and commenting on a certain Khayr al-Din Abu ’l-Karam, the Dasık ʿkhālīfa was died in 890/1485, Ibn Iyās (ii, 228) merely said “la ba’aṣa bīhī”. But Kaʿṭt Bay seems to have had great respect for İbrahim, for he visited the sanctuary in 88/1479 (ibid., ii, 189) and enlarged the building (Murābak, Kaṭṭ, xi, 7). Shaʿrānī devotes more space in the Lawdāsī (i, 143-58) to İbrahim (mostly quotations from al-Diwaḥīr) than to any other saint and it is possible that this was the starting point of a Dasıkī revival. In 1168/1754
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Hasan b. 'All Shamma wrote the first commentary on Ibrahim's hizb entitled Masarrat al-'aynayn bi-
frizb, 'Ali Shamma wrote the first commentary on Ibrahim's frizb, entitled Masarrat al-
Hassan Shamma (ibid., 2097). Another commentary on the frizb is by Muhammad al-Bahi
(ibid., 2593). It would seem that Ibrahim's reputation rested to a large extent on his frizb and its
accuracy of his knowledge of

![DATHINA](image)

This image contains the text of a page from a book. The text is in Arabic and includes information on the history and cultural aspects of a place called Dathina. The text discusses various aspects such as the history of the Dathina area, its geographical location, and its significance in the context of Egyptian history. The text also mentions the work of Muhammad al-Bahi, who wrote a commentary on Ibrahim's frizb, and the role of various scholars and researchers in the study of Arabic philology and Egyptology.

The text is divided into several sections, each focusing on different aspects of the study. It includes references to various works and authors, such as Doreen Ingrams, a survey of social and educational aspects, and the work of other scholars like Ahmad al-Sayrafl, who contributed to the study of Arabic literature.

The text mentions the significance of the Dathina area in the context of educational and religious institutions, and its role in the life of various scholars and intellectuals. The text also highlights the importance of the study of Arabic language and literature, and the contributions of various scholars to this field.

The text concludes with a bibliography, listing various works and authors who have contributed to the study of Arabic and Egyptology. The bibliography includes works on Dathina and its surrounding areas, such as the work of Doreen Ingrams, a survey of social and educational aspects, and the work of other scholars like Ahmad al-Sayrafl, who contributed to the study of Arabic literature.

The text is rich in historical and cultural information, and provides a comprehensive understanding of the Dathina area and its role in the history of Egypt and the study of Arabic literature.
economic conditions in the Aden Protectorate, Eritrea, 1949, 27, 34; v. Wissmann and Hofner, \[see ADWIYA.\]

In the religious sense, the \textit{da'wa} is the invitation, has the primary meaning call or invitation. In the Kur'an, XXX, 24, it is applied to the call to the dead to rise from the tomb on the day of Judgement. It also has the sense of invitation to a meal and, as a result, of a meal with guests, \textit{wulima}: al-Bukhari, \textit{Nikah}, 71, 74; LA, xviii, 285. It also means an appeal to God, prayer, \textit{vow}: al-Bukhari, \textit{Da'awat}, beginning and 26, \textit{Wuha}, \textit{Anbiya}, 3, 26, (Abraham's prayer, cf. Kur'an, II, 125), 40 (Solomon's prayer, cf. \textit{Kur'an}, III, 44; see also \textit{Kur'an}, II, 182: X, 89; XIII, 5; XV, 46 (to which al-Tabari, \textit{Tafsir}, 24, 45, gives a gloss \textit{du'd}). The \textit{da'wat al-mazlum}, prayer of the oppressed, always reaches God: al-Bukhari, \textit{Ma'adil}, 9 (cf. \textit{Dhikr}, 180). The \textit{da'wa} of the Muslim on behalf of his brother is always granted: Muslim, \textit{Dhikr}, 88. The word is applied to a vow of any kind (e.g., al-Mas'udî, \textit{Murûd}, v, 361; Ibn al-Mu'tazz, \textit{Rasa'il}, Cairo, 1365, 53; \textit{da'wa} \textit{bi l-\^hijd}). It can also have the sense of invitation to a meal or to a prayer \textit{(d^*w}).

Thus it was in this way that it was embarked to embrace Islam before fighting could take place: see Abû Yusuf, \textit{Kisâb al-khadir}, Fr. trans. Fagnan, 295; al-Mawardi, \textit{Askhâm}, ch. 4, \textit{bi\^sm}; al-Bukhari, \textit{Siyar}, 101. Elsewhere De Goeje, \textit{BGA}, iv, 235 noted \textit{da'wa} in al-Mukaddas, 311, 5 in the sense of \textit{invitatio ad islam bestiam} and Goldzihier, \textit{Muh. St.}, i, 61 in the meaning of \textit{\^hijr}.

The word \textit{da'wa} is also applied to the propaganda, whether open or not, of false prophets: see, e.g., al-Di\^abis, \textit{Kisâb al-tarbi\^h}, ed. Pellat 75.

By a natural extension \textit{da'wa} also denotes the content of this appeal, the religious law, and the words \textit{da'wa}, \textit{sunna}, \textit{\^hara\^a}, \textit{din}, are often used interchangeably. Lastly the word can be applied to those who have heard this appeal by the Prophet Muhammad, the Islamic community, considered as a united body as a result of this appeal, and to some extent the \textit{da'wa} becomes a synonym of \textit{umma}. Thus in al-Mukaddas, \textit{BGA}, iii, 244, n.c.; cf. Abû Hanifa al-Nu\^man, \textit{Sharh al-\^ah\^b\^r}, in \textit{Ivanow, The Rise of the Fatimids}, text, 4. Note also \textit{id\^ijm\^a} \textit{al-da'wa} in the sense of \textit{id\^ijm\^a al-halima} (\textit{BGA}, iv, 236).

In the politico-religious sense, \textit{da'wa} is the invitation to adopt the cause of some individual or family claiming the right to the imamate over the Muslims, that is to say civil and spiritual authority, vindicating a politico-religious principle which, in the final analysis, aims at founding or restoring an ideal theocratic state based on monotheism. The whole organization responsible for attracting the greatest possible number of people to this idea and for giving power to their representatives, as well as propaganda for this purpose, is thus called \textit{da'wa} which can often be translated as mission or propaganda. The \textit{da'wa} is one of the means of founding a new empire, as Ibn Khaldun noted in \textit{Ibn al-Dja\^hiz} and his master. Abu Hanifa al-Nucman's book describing the beginnings of Fatimid propaganda in the Yemen and North Massar. 
Africa and the establishment of the dynasty in the Maghrib is entitled Kitāb iṣḥāf al-daʿwa waḥdātīyya al-dawla. When the imām was strong enough and at the head of a state, he made his daʿwa public (ażhara daʿwatiyya): Ibn Khaldūn, Proleg., i, 363, Rosenthal, i, 413). Unlike the ʿAbbāsīd al-daʿwa which ceased once the caliph and another over, esoteric side (ażhara), the daʿwa did not cease but, on the contrary, became organized and even more extensive from the time the dynasty was established in Cairo. Though overt in the Fātimid possessions or in territories won over to the doctrine, it continued in secret in other parts, except that it was proclaimed openly in favourable districts (thus the dāʿī al-Muʿāwiyah al-Din preaching to the Buwayhid Abū Kāliq): see the Sīra Muʿayyad-yanīyya, ed. M. Kāmil ʿUsayn, Cairo 1949, 43 ff.). Missionaries were each entrusted with some specified province, denoted by the term island (dijāṣrā: for this name and these divisions see ʿIyān, Rīṣa, 20 and M. Kāmil ʿUsayn, Fiʿl adab Misr al-Fāṭimidyya, Cairo 1950, 19). In Persia it was known by a name recalling its Egyptian origin, daʿwat-i Misrīyān (1941, p. 5). There, as in other periods, the esoteric side (ażhara) of this propaganda could be effected by those who were merely sympathizers, but for doctrinal matters it was carried out by means of preaching by the dāʿīs whose head, dāʿī al-duʿāʾ or chief missionary—whose duties were also called daʿwa (al-Kalḵashandī, al-Sūbūb, x, 434)—had his headquarters in Cairo. In general, the political aim was to convince the Muslims that the imām alone, divinely inspired, aided by God and guardian of the secrets transmitted to ʾAll by the Prophet, could give mankind good guidance, and that dynasties other than the Fātimids descended from Ismāʿīl b. ʿAbū Ṭāfar were usurpers and illegitimate, rotten with vices and neglectful of the most sacred duties of religion. The expression biyām (iẓīmat) al-daʿwa al-ḥādiyya clearly shows the task of directing humanity undertaken by the imāms and upon which their missionaries had to insist. It occurs, for example, in letters from caliph al-Mustansir to the Sulayhīd Arnūs: ʿImām, Cairo 1954, no. 46, p. 157) or in missionaries’ investiture diplomas (al-Kalḵashandī, al-Sūbūb, ix, 19, 8, x, 435, 7 a f.) or in an Ismāʿīlī oath (Shiḥāb al-Dīn al-ʿUmarī, Taʿrifī, 158; cf. B. Lewis, The origins … 59-66, Arabic trans. by A. al-Ḥūsainy, Rosenthal, iv, 597-8). In addition, M. Canard, L’impérialisme des Fāṭimides et leur propagande, in AEO, Algiers, iv, (1942-1947), gives a survey of the methods used by Fāṭimid propagandists to demonstrate the justice of the dynasty’s claims and its exclusive merits, and to denigrate and weaken its enemies, whether Byzantine, Umayyad or ʿAbbāsīd.

The propaganda was also concerned with education and initiation in doctrine. The doctrine of the sect is indeed a combination of political, religious, juridical and philosophical instruction forming a secret, esoteric side (ażhara), whence the name Bāṭinīyya also given to the sect and misinterpreted by Ibn Khaldūn, i, 363, Rosenthal, i, 413, who makes it refer to the saʾir of the imām), founded upon the allegorical interpretation of the Kurʾān and the laws of Islam to attain their ends, and the different methods used, according to the religion of those whom they were trying to win over. Accepting to the Bāṭinīyya which is found in al-Makhrīzī, i, 101 ff., and with greater detail in al-Nwawrī (translation in S. de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druzes, i, Introduction), the initiation of neophytes (al-madāʾūn) was only completed after nine periods of instruction, each one of which was called daʿwa. This system was attributed to the alleged founder of Ismāʿīlīsm, ʿAbd
Allah b. Maymūn al-Kaddāh. In it we see how they proceeded gradually to reveal the secrets of the doctrine, the ta'wil and the ta'wil al-ta'wil (for this last expression see the Masūdī, Tanbih, 395, trans. p. 60, and cf. Golzihz, Vorlesungen, 266; Fr. trans. 206). Ivanov has on several occasions (An Isma'iliastic Work by Naṣūr d-Dīn Ṭustī, in JRAS, 1937, 534; The organization of the Fatimid propaganda, in JBRAS, xxv (1939), 11 and Rise, 133 in the chapter The Myth of ‘Abdu ‘l-Ilāh b. Maymūn al-Qadddh) challenged the existence of these nine degrees of initiation for converts to Ismā’iliism with a gradual revelation of the mysteries. According to him, this is a misinterpretation of the hierarchy of the ḥādīd al-dīn, a kind of Fātimid “clergy” (for this expression see Ivanov, Organisation, 8, and a note in M. Canard’s translation of the Sirāt Jauhdar, 52); these nine degrees have no connexion with either the ancient or modern grades of initiates, there is no trace of it either in the literature of the sect or in controversial literature; he similarly rejects any comparison with initiation in Masonic lodges and their secret ceremonies. It is however difficult to believe that it is merely an invention. The nine degrees were known before al-Makrīzī and al-Nuwayrī, from Sunnī sources, not as stages in initiation but as stages (marātīb, darajāt) in the Machiavellian tricks (hiyal) to recruit new adherents and detach them from their religion (Sunnī interpretation, as opposed to the true religious fervour of the Fatimid). Each stage bears a name corresponding to the dialectical and psychological method used; the names given to these stages by al-Baghdaḍī, Īrāb, ed. Cairo 1367/1404, 179 ff. are: tatarrus, ta’nūs, taškhīk, ta’līk, raḇīt, tāḍīs, ta’sīs, after which come the oaths (ayyām), and then complete detachment (ḥalīl). (See also al-Qāhrahī, Khābādāt al-Bāṭinīyya (Goldzihz, Streitschrift des G. gegen die Bdtinijja Sekte, 19 ff.), and a note in M. Canard’s translation of the Hādīd al-dīn, 161 ff.)

The question remains obscure. Various methods of propaganda and discussion were used, but the period of their full development can hardly be taken back to the time of the beginnings of Ismā’iliism. The outline given by al-Nuwayrī and al-Makrīzī seems to be of later date.

The word da’wā does not only have the sense of appeal and propaganda. We have seen above its use to denote the Islamic community. Similarly, in connection with the Fātimids and Ismā’īlīs, it has the sense of doctrine, religion, community, sect, party of the imām. Ivanov, Organisation, 18-19, noted this polyvalence. Da’wā can even be equated with zone of obedience, empire, dynasty. Ibn Ḥawḡālī says (57-8) that the lands of the Maghrib are in the da’wā of the Commander of the Faithful al-Muʻizz li-Dīn Allāh, and that (221) Kirmān is in the da’wā of the people of the Maghrib. In the Kitāb al-Himma by Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu’mān, chap. 7, man ghamalatu da’wāt al-imām denotes the caliph’s subjects, as a whole. Shuyūk al-da’wā in the Sirāt Jauhdar (trans. 54, cf. Ivanov, Rise, V 9) is synonymous with shuyūk al-dawla. For this use in the sense of dynasty see also al-Ṭālkhārī, 36, 4 and 382; muwadda da’wāt ‘l-Dawla; the black colour of the Ābdāsib dynasty (BGA, iv, 236); al-Makrīzī, Sulhā, i, 18. Finally we may note that da’wā is the equivalent of muddahab among the Wahhībībāt who call themselves ahī al-muddahab or ahī al-da’wā (T. Lewicki, La répartition géographique des groupements bid‘ātis dans l’Afrique du nord au Moyen Âge, in RO, xx, 1957).

In the Ismā’īlī community there was a schism after the death of al-Mustanṣīr in 487/1094, when his son Musta’īl was proclaimed in opposition to his other son Nizār. A group of Ismā’īlīs refused to recognize Musta’īl, and there were two branches or parties in the community, the Musta’īlīs and the Nizārīs. The former were called al-da’wā al-Nizārī, the old, and the latter al-da’wā al-Nīzārid, the new da’wā. This schism became permanent. When Āmīr, Musta’īl’s successor, was assassinated in 524/1130 by the Nizārīs, before dying he handed over his authority to ‘Abd al-Majīdī, the future Hāfīz, his cousin, as his son Ṣayyīb was a minor. The latter disappeared or entered the sāt. The da’wā Nizārī was also called al-da’wā tayyībiyya, and was perpetuated in the Yemen where the ‘Ṣulayhīdīs supported the second claim for the imām al-Tayyīb. It is this da’wā Nizārī, or Musta’īlian or Šayyībī da’wā, which is today represented by the Bohorars in India, whilst the da’wā Nīzāridī or Nizārī da’wā, made famous by Ḥasan b. ‘Ṣababa and the Šaḥīḥīyya (Assassins), is today represented by the Ṣafadīs. For these two branches of the Ismā’īlīs see Ibn Khaḍīlūn, i, 361, Rosenthal, i, 413, al-Shaḥrāštānī, ed. Cureton, 147, 150-152, ed. Cairo 1347, ii, 26, 28-31, Hodgson, The Order of Assassins, index. The Nizārīs or Assassins of Syria, also called Fidā‘īyyīn, who with their fortresses played an important part at the time of the Crusades, were conquered by the Mamlūk Baybars in 671/1274. They continued to occupy a certain number of places. These were then known by the name al-ta’līl al-ismā‘īliyya bi-bīlal al-da’wāt; they called themselves azhāb al-da‘wāt al-rādīya, or muqjīdāt, and had at their head an atābēk appointed by Cairo (see al-Ḳallāshāndī, i, 122; iv, 146, 235, 309; ix, 254). For modern Islamic propaganda and the propagandist school founded by Rashīd Rīdī in the island of Rūḍa near Cairo, called Dār al-da‘wā wa-tīršād ("House of propaganda and direction"), see Goldzihz Richtungen, 343-4.


(M. Canard)

Dā‘wā, action at law. According to a well-known formula the da‘wā is defined as: “the action by which a person claims his right, against another person, in the presence of a judge” (Madżalla, art. 1613). A case submitted to an arbitrator is, equally, a da‘wā. The plaintiff is termed muḍdhah, the defendant muḍḍād al-aṣbāb and the object of the claim
mudda' or, more popularly—though less accurately,—mudda' bihi. We also meet, particularly in the Mālikī madhhab, the terms jālib (plaintiff) and mašlub (defendant). The parties to the suit are called, in the dual, hāsimu and in the plural, khāsimu or khāsuma (opponents)—(singular khasim); more concretely each party is the khasim of the other. The contentious argument itself is the khāsumā (additional synonyms, though of a slightly less technical character, are nīsīn, munānā’u and tāndu).

The fact that the da‘wa envisages two contesting parties excludes from this notion the process in which the magistrate effects ex officio the exercise of certain rights such as measures to safeguard the public welfare.

But in every case which involves the three essential elements of contentious process there is a da‘wād, whatever the judicial authority before whom the action is brought and whatever the nature of the interest in issue.

A da‘wād exists, therefore, in the following cases: in the suit brought by an individual, the victim of an offence against the person, who claims the application of the law of talion (biṣās [q.v.] or the payment of compensation (diya [q.v.]); in the case of prosecutions for various “legal” offences sanctioned by public penalties (huḍūd) (see ḥadd) when brought in the exclusive or partial interest of the victim, such as the offences of theft or fornication; in the case of criminal prosecutions ex officio where the victim intervenes as plaintiff as well as in every case of the exercise of the so-called hisba action, a kind of actio popularis, based on the principle that every Muslim, apart from any personal grievance, is authorized to stand in the rôle of prosecutor for any infringement of the law (see hisba); and finally in the action brought in accordance with the extraordinary procedure of the masālim [q.v.].

Certain conditions are required for the “validity” (ṣihā), that is to say the acceptability, of the da‘wād: there must be an adequate determination of the object of the claim, of the identity of the parties, and of their capacity. The person who does not possess ordinary legal capacity, but who simply has the ability to discriminate, may go to law, provided, however, he is authorized to do so by his guardian or the judge. In a real action the defendant must necessarily be a person in possession of the object in dispute (ṣibāṣ al-yad).

A da‘wād which does not satisfy all these conditions may, however, be subsequently rectified by the fulfilment of the condition(s) in question, such rectification being termed tashīṣ al-khuṣūṣama. This may be accomplished solely upon the initiative of the plaintiff or upon the order of the judge.

The parties may appear in person or through a representative, who may be either appointed by the party (ṣaktī) or, as in the case of the guardian (waṣī) or the wali of those lacking capacity, required by the law. In the case of things which are open to the use of the general public such as sea-water or the public highway, every person is entitled to go to law to defend his right of use. In the event of litigation between defined groups, such as villages in relation to communal property, such as forests, pastures, etc., a single member of each of the groups may go to law in the name of the group whether as plaintiff or defendant, provided, however, it is a question of groups whose number is “unlimited” (hāsem khayr mašlūr), such a group being, according to the general opinion, one whose number exceeds one hundred persons.

Certain estates of property, such as waḥāfs, which are regarded as a legal entity, appear in process of law through the medium of their qualified representatives. The same applies to an inheritance prior to its distribution: in principle each heir may appear as plaintiff or defendant in the name of the succession.

The court which is competent to entertain a da‘wād is the court of the domicile or of the place of simple residence of the defendant. This rule is equally applicable in the case of immovable property. In the Mālikī madhhab, however, it is admitted that in this latter case competence also belongs to the court of the situs of immovable. Where there exists in the same locality a number of judges—as will be the case when judges are appointed for the different madhhab—, or when there is an ordinary judge and a judge appointed to hear suits concerning military personnel (bhūdī ‘askar [q.v.]), the choice of the competent court rests with the defendant. However, all these rules of competence are not of a peremptory nature; they may be avoided by the common agreement of the parties.

The appearance of the parties, is, in principle, a necessary condition precedent to the fighting of the issue; there does not exist, in Islamic Law, a procedure of judgment in default of appearance. Further, various procedures of indirect coercion are laid down with the object of securing the appearance of a recalcitrant defendant. As a last resort, the judge will appoint for such a defendant an official representative (ṣaḥīlī ṣuṣāhkar).

In another system, followed notably in the Shī‘ī madhhab and in the Ṣūfī doctrine, the view is maintained that the appearance of the duly named defendant is not a necessary condition of the da‘wād: the procedure runs its course in the ordinary way in his absence, but without being for that reason considered as a procedure of default; further the judgment delivered will have precisely the same validity as a judgment delivered in the presence of the defendant.

Essentially the process is an oral one; and while the parties may be allowed to present their pleas in written form, the writing never has any validity until it is orally confirmed by the litigant before the judge.

The term da‘f is used for the reply which tends to traverse the da‘wād—and, by extension, for every reply made by a party in contradiction of a plea raised by his opponent.

It is upon the plaintiff that the burden of proof falls. The methods of legal proof are acknowledgement or confession (ibrār), the oath (yamin), testimony (ṣahāda), which is the normal proof for excellence, writing (ḥaff) and legal presumptions (kard‘in).

One particular form of testimony is the tawdur. This consists of the affirmation of a fact by a number of persons (a minimum of twenty-five according to a fairly widespread opinion) so large as logically to exclude any possibility of fraud or lying. It is not necessary in this case that the strict conditions of testimony properly so-called—such as the condition that the witness should have personal knowledge of the attested fact, or the condition of moral integrity (‘addāl, [q.v.])—should be observed. But in spite of this the tawdur is superior to all other modes of proof with the exception of confession.

Writing in itself has no evidential value; it is a
valid mode of proof only in so far as it is orally confirmed by duly qualified witnesses.

In the event of the defendant failing to put in a voluntary appearance with the plaintiff it is a matter of controversy whether the suit is to be regarded as started by the simple action itself of the plaintiff; or whether there can be no question of continuing the process further and naming the defendant until there has first been a preliminary enquiry by the judge to establish that there is at least a prima facie ground for the action.

The system of proof is a 'legal' system, in the sense that the plaintiff bears the burden of proof, according to the dictates of the law and in conformity with the facts alleged, it binds the judge, whatever his own inner conviction may be. Hence one arrives at solutions like the following: in the case where two co-owners in equal shares; or even, according to one opinion, it will be necessary to draw lots (kur 'a) to determine the title to the property.

The trial terminates with the judgment (hukm). Since the system of Muslim judicial organization is a system of a single jurisdiction, the judgment of the hadji is not subject to an appeal before a superior jurisdiction, which does not exist. This principle, however, is subject to two important reservations.

In the first place, in periods or in areas where there exists an organized procedure of mazālim, any person who feels himself a victim of injustice as a result of the workings of the public services, may demand redress by presenting a petition to the sovereign authority. In the second place, the suit may be reopened either before the same judge or before another judge—the successor in office of the judge who may be on other grounds competent—in order to determine the case afresh. Furthermore the principle of res judicata is, to a large extent, unknown to Islamic law. Although it would be difficult to indicate here the precise scope of this rule, which is, indeed, beyond a certain point a matter of controversy, it may simply be pointed out that the authorities are unanimous in holding that a judgment may be contested and, in suitable circumstances, withdrawn or annulled where there is an infringement of an undisputed rule of law.

The right of action at law is extinguished by prescription, the period of which varies, according to different opinions, from three to thirty-six years. In the Ottoman Empire the period was fixed at fifteen years, except in certain cases, such as those relating to a waṣf fund, where the period was extended to thirty-six years. The law further recognizes certain causes of suspension or interruption of the period. Prescription functions as a procedural bar, which-paralyses the exercise of the right of action; it does not affect the substantive right itself.

In the final stage of Islamic law in the Ottoman Empire, as represented by the code known as Medellî-i ahkâm-i 'ulûm yetâ'înî, which was promulgated between the years 1870 and 1877, the old system of the da'wa was reformed in a number of particulars, notably by the recognition of the intrinsic probative value of writing (art. 1736), by the acceptance of the principle of res judicata (art. 1837), and by the introduction of procedure in default of appearance (art. 1833 ff.). These modifications ran parallel with the modernization of the judicial organization, established in accordance with European models and based upon the principles of the doctrines of the judges and the institution of a hierarchy of courts in both systems of appeal.


DAWA'DAR, ala DAWADAR, also DAWATDAR and AMIR DAWAT, the bearer and keeper of the royal inkwell. Under the 'Abbâsids the emblem of office of the waстр was an inkwell. The post of dawadur was created by the Saljuqs, and was held by civilians. Sultan Baybars transferred it to a Mamlûk Aml of Ten: Under the Bahri Mamlûks the dawdâr did not rank among the important amirs, but under the Circassians he became one of the highest amirs of the sultanate, with the title Grand Dawdâr (dawdâr habîr), and with a number of dawdârs under him. The office of dawdâr ranked among the seven most important offices of the realm. There was competition between the ra's naseba and the dawdâr hadîr for the fifth and sixth places, possession of which alternated irregularly between them. Some dawdârs even became sultans. One of the dawdâr's duties during the later Mamlûk period was to decide which of the members of the bâlka (q.v.) were fit to join in military expeditions; in addition, he regularly visited Upper Egypt, and sometimes the regions of Djabal Nâbulus, al-Sharkiyya, and al-Ghârbiyya, in order to collect taxes and gather in the crops. These trips would take place amid great pomp, and the sources discuss them at great length. They were accompanied by cruel oppressions of the local population. At the close of the Mamlûk era, enormous emigrants came to the hands of the dawdâr; thus for example Amir Yâshbak was, in addition to his duties as dawdâr, also amir silâh, wâsit, ustâdât, kâshfâh al-khawshâf (inspector-general), mudabbir al-mamlâka, and ra's al-maysara; no previous Mamlûk amir had accumulated such a great number of offices, though exactly the same offices were accumulated by the dawdâr Tûmânîy, who later became sultan. In the Ottoman and Safavî empires the dawdârs (called divistâr and dawdârs) were functionaries with scribal duties in the chanceries.


DAWA'IR, plural of da'îr, group or family of tribes or families attached to the service and the person of a native chief in Algeria. Before the French conquest, the name of dawâîr (local pronunciation dwâîr) was borne especially by four tribal groups encamped to the south-west of Oran and attached to the service of the Bey of that city, although there were other dawâîr, for example in the Titteri. They were organized as a militia, living on the products of the
land put at their disposition by the Turkish government, and the profit from expeditions against tribes who were unruly or refused to pay their taxes. The Zmāla, their neighbours, played the same part.

Local tradition, as discovered after the French conquest, held the members of these groups to be the issue of troops whom the Moroccan sultan, Mawlay Isma'il, had brought to Tiemcen to fight against the Turks in 1701. The campaign having failed, a number of Moroccan soldiers passed into the service of the Turks and formed a makhzen tribe, placed under the command of two local families. By conquest, they had the privilege of levying the taxes only in the district called Yaqūfīyya in the southern region of Oran, which extended from the neighbourhood of Mascara and the mountains of Tiemcen to the Diabal Amur. Apart from this task, the Dawa'ir were charged with policing the tribes of the western region of Oran, and accompanied the Bey on all his expeditions. They were completely devoted to the Turks.

When the Turkish régime collapsed suddenly after the French expedition of 1830, the Dawa'ir found themselves deprived of their chief reason for existence and sought someone else under whom they could serve. They first embraced the cause of the envoy of the Moroccan sultan, Mawlay 'Abd al-Rahmān, who had come to occupy Tiemcen in 1830 at the request of part of the population, but the Moroccan régime did not last long and they found themselves once again out of employment.

The Amir 'Abd al-Kādir tried in his early days to enrol them into his service, but their chief, Muṣṭafā b. Ismā'il, had already entered into negotiations with the French general in command at Oran, and did not respond to the Amir's advances. Nevertheless, a part of the tribe joined 'Abd al-Kādir. He tried to win over the rest in 1833 and seemed at one time to have succeeded, but Muṣṭafā b. Ismā'il, already an old man, found the authority of the young Amir difficult to bear and separated himself finally from him. He shut himself up in the citadel of Tiemcen with fifty families of the Dawa'ir and the Kūlūghīq [q.v.] of the town. At that time, other groups of Dawa'ir were submitting to the French and were settled around Miserghin. The whole tribe treated of Tlemcen with fifty families of the Dawa'ir.

The name Wadi al-Kasr (Kasr Kamakish in al-Hadjarayn) is said to have been the first to introduce the slaves into the Dawa'ir. The Bedouin tribes of Saybān and al-Dayyin in the highlands showed great reverence for the shaikhīs of this family, but the religious basis of its influence did not keep the tribe from squabbling among themselves, and they could not resist the expanding power of the Ku'ayti Sultanate of al-Mukallā. Later the upper valley became the stronghold of Āl al-'Ammūdī, whose ancestor, al-Shaykh Sa'id b. 'Īsā (d. 671/1272-3 and buried in Kaydun) is said to have been the first to introduce Shi'ism into Hadramawt. The Bedouin tribes of Saybān and al-Dayyin in the highlands showed great reverence for the shaikhīs of this family, but the religious basis of its influence did not keep the tribe from squabbling among themselves, and they could not resist the expanding power of the Ku'ayti Sultanate of al-Mukallā at the close of the 19th century. Dawa'ir now forms a liwā in the Sultanate with al-Hadjarayn as the northern limit. The house of Bā Şūrā of Saybān provides the provincial governors, but Āl al-'Ammūdī has recovered something of its old standing, its main centre now being at Bīda in al-Aymān.

Many of the people of Dawa'ir have emigrated to Aden, East Africa, and Java. For sentimental reasons a number of the rich emigrants maintain houses and gardens in the valley, the only export from which is honey.

AL DAWANI, Muhammed b. Asad Djalal al-Din, was born in 830/1427 at Dawan in the district of Kazarun, where his father was Kadi; he claimed descent from the Calif Abu Bakr whence his misha al-Ṣiddiq. He studied with his father and then went to Shiraz where he was a pupil of Mawlānā Muhyi l-Dīn Gūsha Kāriyūn and Mawlānā Humām al-Dīn Gūsha Bakkīr and Šafi al-Dīn Iḍīj. He held the office of ʿadr under Yusuf b. Dījahānshāh, the Kāri Kāriyūn, and after resigning this office became Mudarris of the Begum Madrasa, also known as the Dar al-Madrasa. Under the Āk Kāriyūn he became Kādi of Fars. During the disorders which occurred in Fars at the time of the break-up of the Āk Kāriyūn kingdom and the wars between them and Shāh Ismāʿīl Šafāwī, Djalāl al-Dīn took refuge in Lār and Dūrān; and when Abu l-Ṣafāth Beg Bayndur took possession of Shirāz, he set out for Kazarun but died some days after reaching the encampment of Abu l-Ṣafāth in 908/1502-3. He was buried at Dawan. He left numerous commentaries on well-known works of philosophy and mystical literature and a number of dogmatic, mystical, and philosophic treatises in Arabic. His commentary on the Tahdhib al-Manṭīk wa l-ʿKalām of al-Taftazānī (d. 791/1389), Lucknow 1264, 1293 (with glosses by Mīr Zāhīd), and his Risālat al-Zawarī, completed in 870/1465 (Cairo 1326 with Taʿlīṣi) have been printed. His best known work is the Lawdmi al-Tadhrib li Maqārim al-Akhlaq, better known as the Aḥkām-i Djalālī, which he wrote in Persian (lith. Calcutta, 1283/1866-7, translated into English by W. T. Thompson, Practical Philosophy of the Muhammadan People, London 1839).

It is a "modernized" and "popular" version of the Aḥkām-i Nāṣiri of Naṣīr al-Dīn Šūš, made at the command of Uzūn Ḥasan, the Āk Kāriyūn ruler, to whom it is dedicated (Persian text, 16). Djalāl al-Dīn admits his debt to Naṣīr al-Dīn, like Naṣīr al-Dīn, like Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṣūš, argues the necessity of a supreme law, a governor, and a monetary currency. The law he interprets to be the Shariʿa and the governor that person distinguished by the support of God and possessing such qualities as would enable him to lead individual men to perfection. Government was either righteous, in which case it was the imāmāte, or unrighteous in which case it was the rule of force. He does not lay down any conditions of election or deposition for the ruler. Any righteous ruler was the shadow of God upon earth, His representative (bāḥth al-allāh), and the deputy (nāʿīḥ) of the prophet Muhammad (236). It is, doubtless, in this sense that Djalāl al-Dīn addresses his patron, Uzūn Ḥasan, as " calmly this " in the poems and the description of the equipage of the world, for the preservation of which cooperation between men was needed. Djalāl al-Dīn recognizes two types of civilization, righteous and unrighteous, which, following al-Farābī and Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṣūš, he calls the "good city" (madīna-i fādila) and the "unrighteous city" (madīna-i ghar-i fādila); and subdivides the latter into the "ignorant city" (madīna-i gāhīla), the "profligate city" (madīna-i ḡābiša), and the "wicked city" (madīna-i dūlāla) (260-1). Within the good city there were several intellectual grades among the citizens and a differentiation of function. Equity demanded that each class should be kept in its proper place and each individual engaged in that occupation to which he was fitted and wherein he could attain to perfection (266). Righteous government, the imāmāte, consisted in the ordering of the affairs of the people in such a way that each might arrive at that degree of perfection which lay in him (269). Unrighteous government was force, and consisted in the subjugation of the servants of God and the devastation of His territories (270). In order to preserve the equipage of civilization, society was to be resolved into four classes; (i) men of learning, such as the ʿulamāʾ, fazlāb, ḥādis, scribes, mathematicians, geometers, astronomers, physicians, and poets; (ii) men of the sword; (iii) merchants, craftsman, and artisans; and (iv) agriculturists, without whom Djalāl al-Dīn states, the continued existence of the human race would be impossible (277-8). He then, still following Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṣūš, divides men into five classes according to their moral nature: (i) those who were by nature righteous and who influenced others, whom Naṣīr al-Dīn describes as the choicest of creation, whom the ruler should treat with the utmost respect and consider to be over the other classes; and whom Djalāl al-Dīn declares to be such people as the ʿulamāʾ of the Shariʿa, the shaykhāhs of darwīsh orders, and mystics; (ii) those who were by nature good but had no influence over others; (iii) those who were neither righteous nor unrighteous; (iv) those who were evil but had no influence over others; and those who were evil and had an influence over others (279-81). He then discusses the means to be adopted to coerce the evil and the need for the ruler to enquire personally into the affairs of his subjects (282 ff.). The final section of the work, also based on the Aḥkām-i Nāṣiri contains a number of political maxims attributed to Plato and Aristotle.

Djalāl al-Dīn's ʿArūd Nāma, written for Sulṭān Qulālī when he was governor of Fars on behalf of his father Uzūn Ḥasan, has been translated into English by W. T. Thompson, ʿArūd Nāma, in the British Museum, ii, 442b; Brockelmann, Cambridge Political Thought in Medieval Islam, Cambridge 1958, 210-23. On Dawānīl's influence in the Ottoman empire, see S. Mardin, The Mind of the Turkish Reformer 1700-1900, in The Western Humanities Review, xiv, 1960, 418 ff. (Ann K. S. Lambton)
DAWAR — AL-DAWASIR

and geographers of the middle ages. In the East, the exact form of the word is dawar or dawar; in the Maghrib, it is dawdr or dawwar (pl. dawdir). The number of tents of which a dawar is composed can vary greatly; it can be as many as several hundreds, or no more than ten. Many different reasons, such as abundance or scarcity of pasturage, security or the lack of it, etc., bring about the splintering of the same Bedouin group into dawars of little importance, or its reunion into dawars of considerable size. Beside this term, which has in a way become the generic one, one finds for less important groups or dialectal representatives rasm, hilla, nazla, farifr, etc. In the administrative language of Algeria, the word douar no longer bears its original primitive meaning, but is employed to designate an administrative area, either nomadic or sedentary, placed under the authority of the same chief, bâ'id, or shaykh. The word dawar was known in Arab Spain. The Vocabulary (ed. Schiaparelli) gives it as the equivalent of the Latin dux, without further definition. In modern Spanish aduar means a gipsy camp.


DAWÁRO, one of the Muslim trading states of southern Ethiopia. It was a long narrow strip of territory lying immediately east of Bâli, and included the great Islamic centre of Harar. It seems to have reached the Webi Shabelle in the south, and the edge of the Danakil lowlands in the north, where, with Bâli, it met the state of Ifat. It is clear, however, that for a time at least, and as far as sent in the rasm, hilla, nazla, farifr, etc., bring about the splintering of the same Bedouin group into dawars of little importance, or its reunion into dawars of considerable size. Beside this term, which has in a way become the generic one, one finds for less important groups or dialectal representatives rasm, hilla, nazla, farifr, etc. In the administrative language of Algeria, the word douar no longer bears its original primitive meaning, but is employed to designate an administrative area, either nomadic or sedentary, placed under the authority of the same chief, bâ'id, or shaykh. The word dawar was known in Arab Spain. The Vocabulary (ed. Schiaparelli) gives it as the equivalent of the Latin dux, without further definition. In modern Spanish aduar means a gipsy camp.
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but the ordinary tribesman knows him only vaguely as one of the Şahaba. In legend both Zayid and the Taghlība are associated with Sadd Mārib (pronounced Mārīd), and Zayid is said to have led the tribe from there into Wādī al-Dawāsir. Rather early sources speak of the Dawāsir as an offspring of ʿĀṣidh, which may be plausible if ʿĀṣidh was in fact a branch of ʿUqayl (q.v.), as ʿAdnānite ʿUqayl once occupied the valley now known as Wādī al-Dawāsir. Against this identification are various indications, admittedly inconclusive, that ʿIyāl Zayid are ʿĀṣidhī rather than ʿAdnānite. ʿIyāl Zayid are sometimes called ʿUqaylī. In legend hold in that Zayid's mother had been falsely accused of adultery.

The other principal division, the Taghlība, has a firm tradition of descent from Taghlīb (pronounced Tughlu) b. (not bīn) Wāyil, which is not impossible, as this ʿAdnānite tribe was in the forefront of eastern Arabian affairs well beyond the heyday of the Karmātīs. For unclear reasons the Taghlība, particularly the section of the Khiylāt, are referred to as ʿĀṣidh al-Dawāsir. The union between the two principal divisions is traced back to al-ʿIrārī, the ancestor of Āḥūbān of the Taghlība, whose daughter is said to have been Zayid al-Mašālmī's mother.

The most important sections of ʿIyāl Zayid are the Masāʿīra, Āḥūsān, the Ḥiylāt, the ʿAṣirān, the Wādāʾīn, the Bādārīn (including the Sadārān), the Ghayyārān, the Sharāfān, and the Ḥarāfīlān. The foremost chief is Ibn Kuwayd of the Masāʿīra, who leads a semi-nomadic life in the hamlet of al-Kuwayz in Wādī al-Dawāsir. The Taghlība consist of five sections: the Umūr, the Mašārīya, the Mašāfīya, Āḥūbān, and the Khiylāt.

The Dawāsir first appear by name about the 7th/8th century, when they were in contact with Āḥ Fadl of Tayyiʿ, the Amir of the Syrian Desert, and with the Māmlūk Sultans in Cairo, who got horses from Arabia. The Dawāsir are called a tribe of the Yemen, and Ibn Bādrān (of the Bādārīn) is named as their chief.

Beginning in 851/1447-8, details on the history of the Dawāsir become more abundant and precise. In that year Zāmil b. Dījāb, the Dījābī (q.v.) lord of al-Ḥaṣā and al-Ṣaʿīf, defeated the Dawāsir and ʿUqaylī (q.v.), the Āḥūbān, and the Khiylāt. In the following year Zāmil led a large force of Beduins and townspeople against the Dawāsir in their own valley (the first mention of the valley as Wādī al-Dawāsir) to punish them for their many raids on the nomads of al-Ḥaṣā. Later Zāmil's son Adīwād launched four separate expeditions against the Dawāsir without reaching their valley on any of them. With the decline of Dījābī power, the Dawāsir multiplied their attacks on caravans carrying merchandise from al-Ḥaṣā to Najd.

Of the 43 battles involving the Dawāsir which are recorded for the period between 851 and 1164/1751, fifteen were fought against Kahtān. Other principal opponents were Subayʿī, Āḥ Maḥrīta, ʿAḥ Kāhirī, and the Fuqūl. Usually the Dawāsir had fewer friends than foes; no other tribe stood by them steadfastly, but on occasion even some of their opponents mentioned above, such as Kahtān, joined their side, which being the evanescent loyalties of desert warfare.

The favourite battleground for the Dawāsir was the watering place of al-Ḥarmāliyya near al-Ḥuwayriyya, where no less than six encounters took place. In the broader district of al-Khiylār the Dawāsir fought seven or eight battles, and four in al-ʿArāma. The Dawāsir engaged in most of their strife on territory not of their own; other tribes seem to have lacked the temerity to assault them in their homeland.

About 1100/1689 pressure by the Dawāsir forced Āḥ al-Ṣaʿīf (q.v.) and Āḥ al- Ḥuṭaita (q.v.), both of Ṣanāʿa, to migrate from al-Haddārī in al-Aflāḥī to the Persian Gulf, where they in time became the rulers of Kuwait and Bahrayn. As the power of Āḥ Saʿīd (q.v.) grew during the 12th/13th century, the Dawāsir were among the last of the great tribes of Najd to adhere to the reform movement of Shaykh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. In 1197/1784-5 Rubayyiʿ b. Zayīd of the Makhārīm swore allegiance to Āḥ Saʿīd, who regained al-Aflāḥī and remained for the rest of his days. The Ḥiylāt and the Wādāʾīn resisted the progress of the reform movement in the valley, supported firstly by the Ismāʿīlī lord of Najrān and then by Ghalib, the Sharīf of Mecca. As the domains of Āḥ Saʿīd expanded, the Dawāsir fought for them in the west side by side with their old enemies Kahtān. In 1212/1809 Dawāsir were among the Beduins who raided Nadra. The large army annihilated by Muḥammad ʿAllī of Egypt at Bisl in 1320/1851 contained a contingent of Dawāsir.

When Āḥ Saʿīd returned to power after the capture of al-Dīrīyya by Muḥammad ʿAllī's forces in 1233/1818, both Turki b. ʿAbd Allāh and his son Faysal maintained Amīrs in Wādī al-Dawāsir. The tribesmen were not always obedient subjects; in 1243/1827-8, for instance, Turki disciplined Beduīn elements of the Dawāsir for their lawlessness.

About 1845 a number of Dawāsir arrived in Bahrayn, having come from Najd by way of the island of al-Zahhānūnīyya, where they sojourned for a few years. In Bahrayn they settled in the towns of al-Budayyī (cf. the Dawāsir town of al-Badīʿī in al-Aflāḥī) and al-Zallīk.

During the civil war between Faysal's sons ʿAbd Allāh and Saʿīd, the chief of al-Sulayyīl in Wādī al-Dawāsir and the Ismāʿīlī lord of Najrān championed Saʿīd's cause. In 1285/1866-7 ʿAbd Allāh's forces under his brother Muḥammad crushed Saʿīd and his partisans at al-Muʿtalā in Wādī al-Dawāsir and during the next year ʿAbd Allāh himself spent two months in the valley inflicting condign punishment on its inhabitants. After the death of Saʿīd in 1293/1875-6, al-Ḥuṭīti of Nājd expanded, and the turbulent elements of the Dawāsir, who if not quickly brought back into the fold, though ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz had no easy time in keeping the peace among the turbulent elements of the Dawāsir, who if not fighting with each other were often at war with Āḥ Murra to the east or Āḥ Murra's cousins of Yāmān to the south-west.

In 1336/1918 Philby became the first Westerner to visit Wādī al-Dawāsir and provide an accurate description of it. The valley in recent years has remained a backwater of the new Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, scarcely touched by the material progress being achieved in many other parts. Wādī al-Dawāsir, once an important way station for the coffee trade between the Yemen and Najd, has been replaced by Bishā in the 20th century. The present centre of influence of the Dawāsir is in their government positions and their new towns on the Persian Gulf.
In the old days Dawasir would go from their valley to the Gulf to work as pearl-divers every summer. Now many who reside on the Gulf shore are landowners, merchants, contractors, and laborers in the oil industry.

In Nadji the Dawasir have been Hanballas since the time of Ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb. Along the Persian Gulf some are Mālikīs, while on the Iranian side a number have embraced Shī'ism.

Wādī al-Dawasir is one of the great eastward trending channels which cut through the long wall of Tuwayk. The Wādī's ancient tributaries, the valleys of Bīsha, Ranya, and Tāthīth, descend from the Hidżād mountains and meet in the basin of Ḥadjiyat al-Mukhatmiyya (for al-Mukhtātimiyya?), where a sand barrier now prevents their waters from reaching the Wādī save in exceptional years (the Tāthīth sayl flooded the Wādī the year before Philby's first visit). The name Wādī al-Dawasir is sometimes restricted to the western part of the valley, in which are found the capital of the whole district, al-Khamasiyya; its sister town, al-Lidām (incorrectly shown as Dam on many maps); and the westernmost settlements known as al-Far'sa. Like al-Khamasiyya, a number of other towns bear the names of units of the tribe, such as al-Sharafa and al-Tabarl, i, 735). It is occasionally replaced by occurrences of ‘Askar or Kasr Kunara, as the Turkish occupation of al-Dawha, which may be roughly estimated at 20-30,000, forms the major part of the total population of Qatar. The city possesses a modern hospital and a small airport which affords connections with international flights out of Dhabran (al-Zahrān) in Saudi Arabia and al-Muharrak in Bahrain. The British Political Agent is the only representative of a foreign government resident in al-Dawha. British Bibliography: Ibn Bīshār, ‘Umān al-madīd, Cairo 1373; Muhammad al-Nabānī, al-Tubāh al-nabānīyya, Cairo 1342; C. U. Aitchison, A Collection of Treaties ..., xi, Dihl 1933; J. G. Lorimer, Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf ..., Calcutta 1908-1915. (R. L. Hadley) DAWLA, 1) an Arabic word signifying the period of an individual's rule or position; it is also often employed in the meaning of 'dynasty'. The root d-w-l may occur in Akkadian dūlu 'to wander around aimlessly' (The Assyrian Dictionary, i, 59) and Syriac dāl 'to move, to stir' ( Brockelman, Lex. Syr., 144 b). However, the basic meaning of Arabic d-w-l is clearly "to turn, to alternate" (relating it to d-w-l). The Kurān says (2.7). It appears to have been the starting point for the development of the meaning "family". How dawla acquired this meaning remains to be investigated. There is nothing to indicate a pre-Islamic origin. Tribal terms, such as bānū or āl, continued to be used in Islam. Genuine verses antedating

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
ing early ‘Abbāsid times and containing dawla in the meaning of “dynasty” have not yet been signalized. Prose references are open to the suspicion of anachronism. Thus, it seems unlikely that an Unnayyad general should have blamed a son of the caliph ‘Uṯmān in these words: “we are fighting for your dynasty (dawlahikum) while you betray it” (al-Balāḏūrī, Ansāb, IVB, 39). An increase in the use of the word is noticeable in the earliest ‘Abbāsid documents, some of which may have been transmitted with literal accuracy. In his speech to the Kūfans upon his accession, al-Saffāḥ said: “...you have raised the rope of the dawla (sayyidah ‘alā dawla)”. This has later, in al-Mansūr’s time, become a frequent feature of titles. However, no conscious application of any dated 290 is doubted by G. C. Miles. Muslim authors stress that this is the first occurrence of dawla meaning “victory”). In a paraphrase of al-Mansūr’s last will, reference is made to the dawla (reign) of al-Mahdī (ibid., iii, 454). The evidence is inconclusive. It seems that at the beginning of the ‘Abbāsid period, the term dawla was by no means well established in the meaning of “dynasty”. However, the word was frequently used by the ‘Abbāsid with reference to their own “turn” of success. Thus it came to be associated with the ruling house and was more and more used as a polite term of reference to it. Soon, one could speak of the supporters and members of the dawla, the supporters and members of the dynasty; again, the precise date of the earliest occurrence of such usage as yet eludes us.

It has been assumed that Persian political speculation along the lines of the Polybian αυκτών πολιτείας contributed to the formation of the concept dawla “dynasty”. Such an assumption may find some slender support in the suggestion advanced by al-Rāzī, Adjectival formation from dawla—dawli—duwali—dawla has not yet been made. In the twelfth century, occasional dawla titles upon their highest officials. But the tenth century was hardly over when dawla titles lost greatly in significance. They were at first supplemented and eventually replaced by other similar titles; this marked the beginning of the excessive use of titles in Muslim countries, which we find occasionally criticized by Muslim authors. A comprehensive study of post-Buyid occurrences of dawla has not yet been made. In the twentieth century, for instance, a court physician was called Aml al-Dawla “Trusted Supporter” (Hibat Allah b. al-Tilmīdī) for dawla titles of non-Muslims, cf. al-Kālkhāndī, Shubh, v, 490 f.; H. Zayyāt, in Al-Masīkhī, xli, 1948, 8 f.). However, while composites with dawla were reduced to merely honorific appellations, it can fairly be said that they always denoted high standing in the community. In India, for instance, they continued to be used by some rulers, and, until the abolition of honorary titles in 1935, Persian cabinet ministers often received titles composed with dawla.

**Bibliography:**

3) From its original meaning, dawla developed quite a few specialized connotations (cf. Dozy, Suppli, i, 476 f., and the dictionaries of Muslim languages other than Arabic; for further, for instance, A. J. Maclean, A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac, Oxford 1901, 62 b). In modern times, an adjectival formation dawli or dawali—dawla, or its pl. duwali, in the meaning of “nation” (< state < government < dynasty)—has become accepted in Arabic as the current term for “international”.

(FOBENTHAL)

DAWLAT GIRAY (918/1512-957/1577), styled the Taht-alghan or Daghlt-alghan (Conqueror of the
DAWLAT SHShah was also called Dawlat-Shah; born at Nawâ in 7 Rabii‘ II 1203/6 January 1789, he was for many years governor of Kirman-shah and Dihl, as well as Safar 1236/3 December 1820 on his return from his campaign against Mahmud Pasha; he has left a number of poems.

**Bibliography:** editions: Bombay, 1887; *The Tadhkiras-i-shuwarâd*, ed. E. G. Browne, London 1901. Translation: *Geschichte der schönen Rede- künste Persiens* . . . by J. von Hammer, Vienna 1818. Rida Kull Khan, *Madjma al-fusâd*, i, 26; Belin, in *Belleten*, no. 46, 390. He died in Safar 1236/April-May 1577. His reign was marked by the vital struggle of the Crimean Khânate against Russia for the heritage of the Golden Horde in the Volga basin, and by the further integration of the Crimea in the Ottoman empire. Mention should be made of the Great Mosque that he built at Gozleve in 779/1571. Six of his eighteen sons became Khân after him (see Giray in *IA*).


**HALIL INALCIK**

DAWLATABAD, a hill fort lat. 19° 57' N., long. 75° 15' E., ten miles N.-W. of Awrangâbâd, now in Maharashtra State, was called Deogiri (properly Devagiri), “the Hill of God”, in pre-Muslim times as the capital of the Yâdavas, originally feudatories of the Western Câlukyas but independent since 1183 A.D., after which they continued to rule the territory from Deogiri independently. ‘Alâ al-Dîn, nephew of Sultan Djalal al-Dîn Firdus Khâldjî of Dihl, acteduated by reports of the immense wealth of Deogiri, reached there by forced marches in 693/1294 and invested the fortress. Râmchandra, the then Râjâ, taken by surprise, was ultimately forced to surrender to the invaders huge quantities of gold, silver and precious stones, which became ‘Alâ al-Dîn’s bait to lure Firdus to his death, as well as agree to the cession of Elipîr to the Dihl Empire. Râmchandra failed to remit the revenues of Elipûr and in 706/ 1307 a force commanded by Kâfûr Hazârdînî, then Malik Nâ’îb, was sent against him; but on making his submission to Kâfûr he was courteously sent to the capital where he offered sumptuous gifts in lieu of tribute. His ready pardon and official appointment as governor of Deogiri, with the title of ‘Alâ al-Dîn, has been attributed to ‘Alâ al-Dîn’s superstitious regard for Deogiri as the talisman of his wealth and power. But his son and successor, Shanka, having defied the Dihl hegemony, Kâfûr was again sent south in 713/1313, where he assumed the government of the state having put Shanka to death. Shanka’s son-in-law Harâpâla proclaimed his independence some three years later, and the new Dihl sultan, Kutb al-Dîn Mu‘ârak Khâldjî, personally led an expedition south, slew Harâpâla, re-annexed the Deogiri lands, and built in 718/1318 the great Mosque that he built at Gozleve in 779/1571. Six of his eighteen sons became Khân after him (see Giray in *IA*).

**Translation:**

This concise anthology of poems which for the most part are well chosen is very useful in literary history, especially for the study of 8th/14th and 9th/15th century poets; but many mistakes have been detected in the notes on the princes and poets, while the judgments expressed on their talents are very often lacking in critical sense.

The next important date in the history of Deogiri was when Muhammad b. Tughluk decided in 727/1327 that, since Dihl was not sufficiently central in his dominions, Deogiri should be renamed Dawlatâbâd and become his capital. Officials were at first encouraged to settle there, but in 729/1329 the entire population was compelled to move to Dawlatâbâd as a punitive measure (Barâni, 481 ff.; Ibn Battû- ta, iii, 314 ff.), and from there as a base of operations order was restored in the Deccan. But shortly afterwards Mughal raids in north India necessitated Muhammad’s return to Dihl and Dawlatâbâd re-
verted to its status as a southern garrison. It was at Dawlatabad that Isma'il Mukh was elected their leader by the Amir-i-Sadah in 1346 and it was again there that a year later Zafar Khan, who had defeated the Dhilli army, superseded Isma'il and became the first Bahmanid sultan. The Bahmanis retained Dawlatabad as a garrison on their northern frontier and improved its defences; the conspicuous Când minâr dates from their occupation. It passed to the Nizâm Şâhîs of Ahmadnagar in 909/1500, becoming their capital in 909/1600. The Mughal emperor Şâhâjâhân clearly considered possession of Dawlatabad to be the key to dominion over the Deccan, and in 1043/1633 it was taken for the Mughals by Mahâbat Khan after a fierce siege ('Abd al-Ḥamîd Lâhawri, Bâyâqa-nâma, Bibl. Ind., 496-536). Salâbat Dîng secured Dawlatabad for the Nizâm Şâhî of the Nizâm Shâhîs of Ahmadnagar in 980/1512, but lost it three years later to the Mârâthâs.

Dawlatabad once boasted of the Fathabad mint (for the name Fathabad given to Dawlatabad in the time of Muhammad I Bahmanî, see Burhân al-Mâthârî, 1936 ed., 47) where coin was struck from 763-6 A.H.; it was also the centre of a paper-making industry.

Bibliography: In addition to references above, see Bilgrami and Willmott, Historical and Descriptive Sketches of H.H. the Nizâm's Dominions; T. W. Haig, Historical Landmarks of the Deccan; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Hyderabad State.

(H. K. SHERWANI)

(ii) Monuments. The earliest building work at Dawlatabad (apart from the rock-cut caves of the 1st century B.C.) is the scarping of Devagiri, a single conical hill of rock some 200 m. high commanding a natural pass. This scarping, dating at least from the early Yâdava times, results in the entire circuit of the rock presenting a vertical face 50 to 65 m. high, above a water-filled moat of rectangular section dug a further 15 m. into the rock (a causeway across the moat leading to a rock-cut shrine shows its Hindu provenance). The utilization of stone of the early Yadava times, results in the entire monument. Largely an improvisation out of temple material, it has tapering fluted corner buttresses and a corbelled dome, and is some 78 m. square in overall plan (illustration in Ann. Report, Arch. Dept. Hyd., 1925-6, Pl. III); the minârâb has since been filled with an idol.

The minârâb has no minaret; fulfilling this function, however, is the Când minâr, 30 m. high, of about 840/1435, similar in shape to the towers of Mahmûd Gâwân's madrasa at Bîdar [q.v.] but with three galleries supported by elaborate brackets. In addition to its function as a minâr of the mosque, it was also an observation post, since it commanded the dead ground on the north-east.

The palaces are mostly in ruins; noteworthy are the bârdarâi mentioned above, built for Şâhâjâhân's visit in 1046/1636, and the Cînl maâhll in Mahâkot, of the Nizâm Şâhî period, with fine encaustic tile-work; the latter was used as a state prison for the last Kutb Shâhî ruler, Abu 'l-Ḥasan (Khâliq Khan, Mumtaqâb al-Lubâb, ii, 371 ff.).

Bibliography: There is no monograph on Dawlatabad as a site; in addition to references in the text, see S. Piggott, Some ancient cities of India, Bombay 1945, 78 ff. (including sketch-map).

(J. BURTON-PAGE)

AL-DAWLATABÂDI, Shihâb al-Dîn Aḥmad b. Shâms al-Dîn b. 'Umar al-Zâwuli al-Hindi, an eminent Indian scholar of the 16th century, was born at Dawlatabad in the Deccan. He completed his studies in Dihli at the feet of Kâddî 'Abd al-Mukhtâdî and Mawânâ Khâdîjî, two eminent disciples of Shihâb al-Maślîf al-Nâṣîr. Shahjâhân, the Delhi sultan, when Timur invaded India, Shihâb al-Dîn left Dihli and settled at Dijawnpur where Sultan Ibrâhîm Sharâkî (804-844/1435-1440) received him with honour and appointed him as the kâddî al-kudâlî of his kingdom. Later on he conferred upon him the title of Malîk al-Ulamâ'. Forigahta says that he was held in such high esteem by the Sultan that a special silver chair was provided for him in the court. He died at Dijawnpur in 848/1445.

Shihâb al-Dîn was a prolific writer. According to Shâykh 'Abd al-Hâkî Muhammad Dihlawi and Muhammad Ghawî Shàtârî he enjoyed some reputation as a Persian poet also. Of his compositions, the following are particularly noteworthy: Shârîk al-Hindi, a commentary on the Kâfyûa (for Ms, Contribution of India to Arabic Literature, Zâbîd Ahmad 401); Shârîk al-Badawû, (Ms, in possession of M. Abû Kâlâm Azîdî); Shârîk al-Islâmîyya, (on scholastic theology (Ms, Rampur, 314); al-Irshâd, on Arabic syntax, (printed at Hydârâbâd); Msâdîd al-Idât, commentary on the famous Kasîfâ Bânât Suîd, (printed at Hydârâbâd); Bâb al-mawwâbî, a Persian commentary on the Kûrâ. DAWLATABAD "AL DAWLATABADI
Dawrak, formerly a town in south-western Khuzistan, was also called Dawrak al-Furs, ‘Dawrak of the Persians’ and sometimes al-Madina, ‘the Town’. The original Persian name was Darak. In the middle ages Dawrak was the capital of a district which was sometimes called after it and was sometimes known as Surraq. Dawrak lay on the banks of the river of the same name, which was a tributary of the Drâhâh; it was connected by canal with the Kârûn [q.v.]. It was famous for its veils and for its sulphur springs. Pilgrims from Kirmân and Fârs used to pass through Dawrak on their way to and from Mecca. As late as the 4th/10th century a fire-temple and some other remarkable buildings dating from the Sassânid era were still to be seen in the town. Dawrak was described in the Hudud al-‘Alâm (130) as a pleasant, prosperous and wealthy town. Towards the close of the 10th/16th century the Bahri Timur occupied Dawrak and the surrounding area, but they were ousted by Sayyid Bârakâr, of the Mughâshâd dynasty of Hwîzâ, the well-known Wilâ‘î of Abârâstân (Khûzistan) about the year 1000/1591-2. In 1029/1619-20 the Beglerbey of Fârs conquered Dawrak and its district (see the Ta‘rîkh-i ‘Alâm-yi ‘Abbâsî, 675). Subsequently the district was occupied by a branch of the Afshâr tribe [q.v.], but they were displaced by Shâykh Sâlûmân of Nâšrabad (see below). Shâykh Sâlûmân [q.v.]. Shâykh Sâlûmân Sâlûmân built a new town, which he called ‘Abbâsîyâ, five miles to the south of Dawrak, which thereafter fell into ruin. In order to protect ‘Abbâsîyâ against the Huwala and other hostile tribes, Shâykh Sâlûmân erected a strong fort there and built a mud wall two miles in circumference round the town. When Layard visited ‘Abbâsîyâ a century later, he found this wall in bad repair; he stated, however, that the many canals and watercourses surrounding it would provide a formidable barrier to invasion if strongly defended (Description of the province of Khûzistan, in J.R.G.S., 1846, xvi, 39; see also his Early adventures in Persia, Susiana and Babylonia, London 1887, ii, 57). In 1933 the name of ‘Abbâsîyâ was changed to Shâh-dagan; it is the capital of the Shâh-dagan district, which was also called the Shâh-dagan district, is about 20,000. The swampy area between Shâh-dagan and the coast of the Persian Gulf is still known as Dawrakistan. The name is also preserved in the Khwar Dawrak, a northern arm of the Khwar Mûsâ, the large inlet of the Gulf which bounds Dawrakistan on the east.

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text: Bâa, passim; Balâshûr, Futûkh, 383, 415; Yûsûf, ii, 618, 620; Marâsîd al-İttâ‘î, (ed. Jûynboll), i, 414, v, 502-3; Kazwâni, Kosmographic (ed. Wûstenfeld), 191; J. Macdonald Kinneir, A geographical memoir of the Persian Empire, 88-9; J. H. Stocqueler, Fifteen months’ pilgrimage in Persia and on the coast of the Persian Gulf and Persia, i, 72; Ritter, Erdkunde, i, 158-60; Le Strange, 242; G. N. Curzon, Persia and the Persian Question, ii, 322-3; Râzmâr and Nawtâsh, Farkhân-i dinârîyâ-yi Irân, vi, 228. (L. Lockhart)
fatwa in which he declared it a bid'a fi abhā (evil innovation), involving undignified treatment of Muslims. For some time afterwards, on the mornings of those moments some members of the Zahiriyya laid down in front of the door of their Shaykh and let him walk over them (A. Le Chatelier, Les Confréries Musulmanes du Hedjaz, 225), but this, too, has now been discontinued.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references given: ‘Ali Paşa Mubarək, al-Ḵāṣṣ al-qaḍāda, iv, 112; D. Deport and X. Coppolani, Les confréries religieuses musulmanes, 329 ff.

---

**DAWD, the biblical David.** David is mentioned in several places in the Kurʾān, sometimes together with his more famous son and successor Solomon (Sulaymān). He kills Goliath (Dā’llūt, Sūra II, 251). God grants him the rule of the kingdom (ibid.) and enforces it (XXXVIII, 20). He makes him a “ḳhāṣṣa fi l-ard” (i.e., the successor of an earlier generation of rulers, XXXVII, 26). He gives him knowledge (ṭibb, with hamza) because of the ability to do justice (ḥukm, esp. XXI, 78 f.; XXXVII, 21-24, 26; jasī al-khāṣṣ, XXXVII, 20). He gives him a zabur (book, psalter, IV, 163; XVII, 55), and makes the birds and mountains his servants, so that they unite in his praise (XXI, 79; XXXIV, 10; XXXVII, 18 f.). God also instructs him in the art of fashioning chain mail out of iron (XXIV, 20 f.; XXI, 80). Together with Solomon, he gives judgment in a case of damage to the fields (XXI, 78). The failure of the rich man and the poor man, which Nathan tells the king (2 Sam, xii, 1-4), is retold in a somewhat modified form (XXXVIII, 21-23). There is no mention of the wrong David did to Uriah, but the subsequent verses show that the king feels himself to be guilty. His prayer for forgiveness is heard (24 f.).

The ḥadīth stresses David's zeal in prayer, and especially in fasting. Kurʾān commentators, historians, and compilers of the “Tales of the Prophets”, specifically mention David as a prophet and add further material from Jewish (and Christian) tradition, including the story of Saul's jealousy of David, and that of the wife of Uriah (this as proof of David's 'temptation', Sūra XXXVIII, 24), and the story of mawṣūla and lain (ibid. 39), a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (μυστάκας) of the Ṣhafi'i school. In theology, he is reported to have held the opinion that the Kurʾān as it exists on the "well-preserved tablet", was uncreated, but as it exists in the actual copies, produced in time, and Ahmad b. Hanbal is said to have refused to meet him on account of this.

Dāwūd’s family came from a village near Ifṣāḥān; he was born in Kūfah in 200-2/815-8. He studied hadīth under well-known authorities in Bāṣra, Baghdād and Nīṣābūr, and then settled in Baghdād where he became highly esteemed as a teacher and mufti. His biographers praise him for his piety, humility and asceticism. Nothing is known of his teachers in ḥadīth proper; his father was a Ḥanafī, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (muṣta'awṣib) of al-Ṣhāfi'i, a description which fits both the starting-point and the later development of his own doctrine, and he himself is called a fanatical adherent (μυστάκας) of the Ṣhafi'i school. In theology, he is reported to have held the opinion that the Kurʾān as it exists on the "well-preserved tablet", was uncreated, but as it exists in the actual copies, produced in time, and Ahmad b. Hanbal is said to have refused to meet him on account of this.

Dāwūd was the author of numerous treatises (see a more or less contemporary list in the Fihrist), some of them extremely long (up to 3000 folios), covering legal theory (ṣūrā) and all branches of positive law (furu); nothing of all this has survived, and we depend for statements of his doctrine on questions of detail on later authors (e.g., al-Ṣubkī, and particularly Ibn Hazm [q.v.], and some of the works on ṣḥāḥīḍ, which however do not always distinguish between Dāwūd’s own opinions and those of his followers. The Hānbal author Muhammad al-Ṣhafi (1307/1889-90), at the suggestion of the mufti of Damascus, Maḥmūd b. Ḥamza Effendī al-Ḥamzāwī (d. 1305/1887-8), collected many of these opinions and compared them with the corresponding Ḥanbalī doctrines (R. f. Maṣūf al-Imām Dāwūd al-Ṣhārī, Damascus 1330). The school of the Ṣhāhrīyya disappeared in due course, and for this reason their opinions and those of their imām, Dāwūd, are not
taken into account in establishing the consensus of the scholars, although a number of Shi'i scholars take, theoretically at least, a more accommodating view (Na'awat and, in more detail, al-Sukki).

Dawud died in Bagdad in 270/884, and was buried there. His son, Muhammad b. Dawud [q.v.], was a famous man of letters.

**Bibliography:** Fihrist, i, 216 f.; 

**DĀWŪD AL-ANTÀÞI [see al-ANTÀÞI**


(PL. H. MARTIN)

**DĀWŪD KHĀN KARARĀNĪ**, younger son of the governor of Bengal under Shīr Shāh, Sulaymān Kararānī, who later asserted his independence, was raised to the Bengal throne in 980/1572 by the Afghan nobles who had deposed his elder brother Bāyzid. Intoxicated by a sense of power he defied the Mughal emperor Akbar and attacked his outpost at Gāhpūr in 982/1574. Munīm Khān [q.v.], sent to oppose him, occupied his capital at Tāndā and compelled him to retreat into Uriśa; he counter-attacked at the important battle of Tukarō’t [q.v. (= Mughalmārī)], but when Mughal reinforcements arrived he sued for peace and paid tribute to Akbar, being permitted to retain the province of Uriśa. In 983/1575 Munīm Khān died and in the following confusion Akbar attacked and regained Bengal. Khān Dāwūd and Todar Māl renewed the Mughul attack in 984/1576, when Dāwūd was captured and executed, and Bengal finally passed into Mughal hands.


**DĀWŪD PAŠHA, KARA [i? = 1024/1613]**. Ottoman Grand Vizier. The year of his birth is uncertain, but, in a “relazione” submitted to the Signoria in 1612, Simone Contarini, who had been Venetian Bailo at Istanbul, mentions a Dāwūd Pašha, whom he describes as a Croat in origin and at that time about 46 years old. According to the Ottoman sources, however, Kara Dāwūd Paša was of Bosnian descent. He was trained in the Palace Schools, being appointed in due course to the office of lükâdar (lukadar). During the reign of Sultan Mehemmed III (1003-1022/1595-1603) he became Kapīdî Bahšl and later, in the reign of Sultan Ahmed I (1012-1026/1602-1617), was made Beglerbeg from the throne. On 3 Sha‘ban 1031/20 May 1622 he was dismissed from the office of Khāntār (khatār), and also in the Eriwan campaign against the Şafawids of Persia in 1021/1612, was held by the Grand Vizierate (9 Radjab = 9 January 1623). He was buried in the mosque of Murad Pasha at Istanbul.


(PL. H. MARTIN)
DAWUD PASHA


DAWUD PASHA, Köşka, Darwis, d. 904/1498, Ottoman Grand Vizier. Of Albanian origin, he came through the devşirme to the Palace School. In 876/1472, as beylerbeyi of Anadolu, he fought under Prince Muṣṭaфа, waļī of Konya, against the Ak-koyunlu ʿUṣufa Miẓār. In the battle against Uzun ʿHasan at Otluk-bel i in 878/1473, he was in command of the vanguard. He served in the Baghdad campaign of 881/1476 and, as beylerbeyi of Rumelia, in the operations in Albania and the siege of Içkhorā (883/1479). After the accession of Bayezid II he was made waļī of Constantinople in 888/1482, succeeded ʿIsā-Kaılan Pasha as Grand Vizier, remaining in this post for 15 years. During this period he went on only two campaigns, the operations against the Mamluks in 892/1487, when he re-occupied Adana and Tarsus and reduced the Wārsakš to obedience, and the Albanian campaign of 891/1492, when he took Tepedelen and defeated the Albanian forces though according to one source he remained at ʿUṣuk to guard against a possible Hungarian attack from the north). He was dismissed from the Grand Vizierate on 4 Ṣādžab 902/4 March 1497 and ordered to live at Dimetoka (with a yearly pension of 300,000 akçe). The reason for his dismissal was that the flight of the Ak-koyunlu ʿOṯmān Bey, a grandson of Mehmed II, to Tabriz was attributed to Dawud Paşa's negligence. Two years later, in 4 Rabī ʿi 904/20 October 1496, he died and was buried in the furque before the mihrāb of his mosque in Istanbul.

He is described as a capable and upright statesman and a patron of learning. In foreign policy he supported Venice. He was one of the richest statesmen of his time: the resmi kūsme due to the kāfīsaker on his estate amounted to no less than 2,000,000 akče. The mosque which he built in the quarter which bears his name exists today, together with an ʿismātel, a ʿalāmī, a school and a madressa. There are also an idārāt and a bār namā named after him. The Dāwūd Paşa Şahraşır, on which the Dāwūd Paşa Barracks now stands, was for centuries a famous camping-ground for the Ottoman army. His sons Muṣṭaфа Paşa and Mehemmed Bey are mentioned in the sources.


DAWUD PASHA (1818-1867/1827-1851), the last Manük ruler of Turkish Irāq, was acquired in Bagdad as a Georgian slave-boy by Sulaymān Paşa (the Great), marriage with whose daughter, together with his own good looks, charm, learning and ostentatious piety, assisted him in his downward career in the civil service under his patron, as confidential secretary, treasurer, daftarādār, and finally kāhyā. By opportunism, violence and a skilful balancing of forces—Kurds, Mamluks, the court, the mob, the tribes—Dāwūd, aged 50 years, obtained the Pashalk for himself in 1233/1817, and assured it by the assassination of his predecessor (Ṣaʿd Paşa), and by timely generosity. He ruled for fifteen years. He adopted a vigorous (at times a treacherous) tribal policy, preserved fair order, chastised the notoriously turbulent Yezidis and the mid-desert ʿAnza, kept a watch on endless Kurdish princely schisms and threats, and contrived to stop a serious Persian invasion (1239/1823). Under orders from Istanbul, he disbanded the Janissary forces in Bagdad, raised and armed new-type regiments, and—fitfully, jealously and inconsistently—permitted a marked increase of European methods, traffic and trade. He constructed numerous public works, and maintained a luxurious court and entourage. His decline and fall (1247/1831) was inevitable in the changing atmosphere of the Turkish government; immediately, it was brought about by his persistent insubordination to the Istanbul authorities, whose emissary (and his own successor as waļī) was able to evict and replace him thanks to a devastating flood in Bagdad and a terrible visitation of plague. Arrested and captive, Dāwūd was surprisingly well treated, re-promoted to important offices in both Europe and Asia, and, high in royal favour, became in 1261/1845 Guardian of the Holy Shrine at Madina. He died in 1267/1851, after a career of extraordinary vicissitudes.

Bibliography: S. H. Longrigg, Four Centuries of Modern Irāq, Oxford 1925, 234-274; the Appendix on sources (328 ff.) particularizes the Arabic and Turkish sources (partly in MS.), and European travellers. C. Huart, Histoire de Bagdad dans les Temps Modernes, Paris 1901. (S. H. Longrigg)
Ministry of Interior. In 1857 he was put in charge of the government publications; and in the following year he became superintendent of the Telegraph Office. He introduced a number of improvements. In that same year, he assisted the Foreign Minister Fu’ad Pasha in applying for a foreign loan. Finally, in 1861, he was appointed to the governorship of Mount Lebanon by the Porte in conjunction with the European Powers. Sent to Beirut with the rank of Vizier, he established the seat of his government in Dayr al-Kamar and organized the new administration in a manner satisfactory to all parties concerned. Among other things, he organized the gendarmerie of Mount Lebanon, built roads and bridges, and established a number of schools, and his wise government soon restored peace, order, and good will in Lebanon. Appointed at first to govern the country for three years, the term of his administration was extended for five more years. During his second term, however, he met with a strong resistance from some of the traditional leaders in the Mountain, and was therefore advised to resign from the governorship in 1868, before the end of his term. He next served as Minister of Public Works, and was sent to Europe to negotiate a loan. But, having somehow incurred disfavour with the Porte, he preferred to remain in Europe. He died in Biarritz on 9 Nov. 1873—1292/1875 according to Sigüell-i Quli Khan.

Dawud Pasha was described by a contemporary as an able statesman and administrator, a good linguist, and a lover of learning. Among other things, he was a member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences. Bibliography: Butrus al-Bustáni, Kitâb dá‘írat al-ma‘âdhîr, vii Beirut 1883, 570-7; Shám Frashehí, Kami‘ al-sü‘lam, iii, Istanbul 1308 A.H., 2111; Sigüell-i Quli Khan, iv, 874; Jouplain, La Question du Liban, Paris 1906, 484; G. Vapercau, Dictionnaire universel des contemporains, Paris 1880, 507. (K. S. Salibi)

Dâwûdpotrôs, a rival branch of the family which to also belonged the Kalhörâs, one time rulers of former Sind. They and the Kalhörâs both claimed descent from Abu ‘l-Faqîl al-Abbâs b. ‘Abd al-Mu’tásîb. The rulers of the former princely state of Bahawalpur, where he said to be of West Pakistani origin, belong to the Dâwûdpotrôs, which unlike their collateral, the Kalhörâs, take pride in calling themselves the ‘Abbâsîs. Their claim to nobility and high birth appears, however, based more on tradition, hallowed through a long period of rulership and authority, than on unimpeachable information derived from reliable sources.

The genealogical tab’,s, contained in some of the local Persian histories, such as the Mâr‘îat al-dawlat-i ‘Abbâsî and the Dâwûhdhâr-i ‘Abbâsîyyâ, are defective and on close examination appear to have been hastily composed at the behest of royalty. However, some references in the older and more authentic works like the Mâ‘âdîr al-Umârâ, (i, 825) show that both the Dâwûdpotrôs and the Kalhörâs were commonly believed to be the descendants of al-‘Abbâs [q.v.].

The common ancestor of both the Kalhörâs and the Dâwûdpotrôs, of whom something is known to history, is believed to be one Muhammad Canney Khan (variants: Câynây Khân, Cínâ Khân, Cânî Khân, Dîhna alias Cnâh Khân), whose father Khânîm is said to have migrated to Sind from Iran via Râ ‘Umdân in c. 559/973, long before the advent of the Ghaznavids in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. But this date is both doubtful and improbable. Most of the works make no mention of Khânîm. They instead mention one Miyân Odnânà, who is said to have lived the life of a ghâyâb with numerous followers. In the fifth generation from him was one Thull Khân (Fatî Allah Khân?) whose son, Bhallâ Khân (Bahâ Allah Khân?) was the father of Canney Khan. Canney Khân was succeeded to the tribal chieftainship by his sons Muhammad Mahdî and Dâwûd Khân, the latter inheriting a copy of the Kurân, the tâbûf (rosary) and the prayer-carpet (muwâllî) belonging to his father; while the former and his heir fell to the share of Muhammad Mahdî whose descendants came to be known as the Kalhörâs after his son, Ibràhîm alias Kalhôrê Khân.

As a result of family feuds, Dâwûd Khân I had to leave the place and shift for himself. He is stated to have founded a new settlement near the town of Wânî, now untraceable. He was followed by his son, Mahmûd Khân and grandson Muhammad Khân as the leaders of the tribe. During the chieftainship of Dâwûd Khân II, a son of Muhammad Khân, the tribe had greatly multiplied and felt the need to enlarge its territory. The descendants and retainers of this Dâwûd Khân II came to be known as the Dâwûdpotrôs irrespective of the fact whether they were the issue of his body or had only spiritual or temporal attachment with him. This explains the fact why certain families were purely religiously engaged in the weaving profession and living in the Shikârpur and Dâdd districts of West Pakistan, still proudly call themselves Dâwûdpotrôs. Some foreign writers (for instance, R. F. Burton, A History of Scinde, London 1850, 410), not fully acquainted with the origins of the Dâwûdpotrôs, were led to believe that the Dâwûdpotrôs as a tribe were of indigenous origin and weavers by profession. In according recognition as equal members to all those who did not belong to the family or the clan of Dâwûd Khân II, the Dâwûdpotrôs simply revived the old Arab custom of admitting manumitted slaves (muwâllî) into the family fold or the clan. The prevalence of this Arab custom among them also lends support to their claim to being of Arab stock and descent.

Dâwûd Khân II was followed by eight chiefs, of whom only Muhammad Khân, Khân II deserves mention. He is credited with having laid the foundations of the town of Shikârpur in 1026/1617. The dates of birth and death of all the Dâwûdpotrôs chiefs who preceded Sâdîk Muhammad Khân I (1136/1723-1159/1746), the founder of the House of Bahâwâlpur [q.v.], are practically unknown, none of them being important enough for history to record his annals. One of the Dâwûdpotrôs chiefs, Mûbârak Khân I, assisted the Mughul prince Muhammad al-Dîn, a grandson of Awrangzîb, ‘Alâmgrî, and the then sâdâbâr of Multân [q.v.] and Lahore [q.v.], in crushing the uprising of the Mîrâns, a powerful Balúch tribe of Dêrâ Ghâzî Khân, in 1114/1702. As a reward for this military assistance, the towns of Shikârpur, Bahâtiyârpur and Khânpûrh were granted to him as a didâr. The town of Shikârpur became thereafter the seat of his administration. Most of the Dâwûdpotrôs were men of military spirit and were engaged in fighting fraternal battles against the rival Kalhörâ chief, Yâr Muhammad Khân alias Khudîs—Yâr Khân. A grim battle lasting over a week was fought in which both the sides lost heavily. Contemporary accounts show that the Dâwûdpotrôs suffered grievously and had to seek for a truce. It was purely a faction fight, a dynastic feud, which determined the future course of events. Coupled with subsequent encounters between the rival factions this battle
culminated in the separation and demarcation of their respective spheres of influence and control. The Dawudpuras, in the final phase, emerged in 1130/1723 in favour of his son Śādik Muḥammad Khān Ḍabbāsī I and died three years later in 1136/1723. An ambitious ruler, he first annexed Ucch [q.v.] followed by a part of the Mughal rába of Multan and the fort of Derāwār, wrested from Rawal Akht Singh of Djasalāmër, whose forefathers had held it for long. In 1152/1739 when Nādir Shāh Afsār invaded India, Śādik Muḥammad Khān I waited on him at Derā Gāzī Khān, and was granted the title of Nawāb. In addition to what he had added to his possessions by the sword he was granted the parganas of Siwāstān and Lārkānā. In 1155/1746 Shīkārpūr, his ancestral home, was attacked by the rival Khalīl Khān chief, Khalīdyār Khān. Śādik Muḥammad Khān,lost his life in the contest, and was succeeded by Muḥammad Bahāwāl Khān I who, the very next year, founded some towns including that of Bahāwālpūr, which ultimately gave its name to the state. It was during the rule of Bahāwāl Khān I that the state came to command respect and gained in political stature. The irrigation canals dug under his orders opened up a new era of prosperity for the otherwise arid regions of the state. Timing his invasion with the onslaught of Multān, which had been recaptured from the Amir of Baha-wālpūr, under detention. Thereafter complete peace prevailed in the state and people from Lahore, Dihīl, Dērā Gāzī Khān and Multān, etc., who felt insecure under the Sikh rule and the disturbed conditions in India, migrated to Bahāwālpūr.

On the death of Bahāwāl Khān in 1803 he was succeeded by his son ʿAbd Allāh Khān, in supersession to his elder brother, prince Wāhid Bāshā, who was put to death. As already mentioned, ʿAbd Allāh Khān assumed the title of Śādik Muḥammad Khān II, on his accession. The greater part of his reign of 15 years (he died in 1825) was spent in either repelling the attacks of the Amirs of Sind, suppressing the rebellions of his own umari or defending his conquered territories. Among other notable events of his reign was the capture of Dērā Gāzī Khān in 1834/1835 by Bahāwāl Shāh Ḍabbāsī assisted by the Amir himself. The very next year he was, however, dispossessed by Ranḍīt Singh, the ruler of Lahore, who made over Dērā Gāzī Khān (see Dērādār) to the Amir of Bahāwālpūr in consideration of an annual sum of 250,000 rupees. During the rule of his successor, Ṣāḥīb Yār Khān entitled Muḥammad Baḥāwāl Khān III (1825-52), Dērā Gāzī Khān along with Muṣṭafāghargh and Multān were irretrievably lost to Bahāwālpūr; having been conquered in 1839 by the French military adventurer, General Ventura, for his Sikh master, Ranḍīt Singh. The Nawāb wreaked his vengeance by providing a contingent 23,000 strong to the British for the capture of Multān, which fell in 1848 to Herbert Edwardes, the Governor General. The latter's coronation ceremony was performed by the Makhdūm of Ucch, a happy result of the reconciliation reached between the ruling family and the head of the most powerful spiritual group in the state. His harsh treatment of his brothers caused the eldest, prince Ḥāḍīḍī Khān, to rise against him. Subsequently Śādik Muḥammad

The threat of Durrānī invasion to his possessions over, he turned to aggression and began to annex the neighbouring areas. His territorial ambitions aroused the suspicion of the Makhdūm Khān of Gāndī Bāshā and the Amir himself. The very next year he was, however, dispossessed by Ranḍīt Singh, the ruler of Lahore, who made over Dērā Gāzī Khān (see Dērādār) to the Amir of Bahāwālpūr in consideration of an annual sum of 250,000 rupees. During the rule of his successor, Ṣāḥīb Yār Khān entitled Muḥammad Baḥāwāl Khān III (1825-52), Dērā Gāzī Khān along with Muṣṭafāghargh and Multān were irretrievably lost to Bahāwālpūr; having been conquered in 1839 by the French military adventurer, General Ventura, for his Sikh master, Ranḍīt Singh. The Nawāb wreaked his vengeance by providing a contingent 23,000 strong to the British for the capture of Multān, which fell in 1848 to Herbert Edwardes, the founder of Bānnū [q.v.], and was annexed to the dominions of the East India Company.

On his death in 1852 he was succeeded by Saʿdāt Khān entitled Śādik Muḥammad Khān III. The latter's coronation ceremony was performed by the Makhdūm of Ucch, a happy result of the reconciliation reached between the ruling family and the head of the most powerful spiritual group in the state. His harsh treatment of his brothers caused the eldest, prince Ḥāḍīḍī Khān, to rise against him. Subsequently Śādik Muḥammad

in 1234/1818 by Shah Shudia Al-Mulk. In 1201/1785 Timur Shah Durrani attacked and bestowed on him khil'at al-Mulk. In 1203/1788 Bahāwāl Khān II was engaged in mop-up operations against the Durrānī who, in close collaboration with the neighbouring chiefs, revolted in 1214/1799 against the Nawāb and defied attempts at his capture. He also incited the ruler of Bīkānī to invade the state, set prince Muḥārāk Khān free, and proclaimed him the Nawāb. After some sharp encounters with the rebels and the state forces under prince ʿAbd Allāh Khān (afterwards known as Nawāb Śādik Muḥammad Khān II), succeeded in restoring peace. The disgruntled Makhdūm, who wielded considerable influence in the state, again rebelled in 1221/1766 at the instance of Shāh Shudia al-Mulk of Kabul. This attempt also failed and two years later the Nawāb entered into a treaty of friendship with the British Government. Thereafter complete peace prevailed in the state and people from Lahore, Dihīl, Dērā Gāzī Khān and Multān, etc., who felt insecure under the Sikh rule and the disturbed conditions in India, migrated to Bahāwālpūr.

In addition to what he had added to his possessions by the sword he was granted the parganas of Siwāstān and Lārkānā. In 1155/1746 Shīkārpūr, his ancestral home, was attacked by the rival Khalīl Khān chief, Khalīdyār Khān. Śādik Muḥammad Khān,lost his life in the contest, and was succeeded by Muḥammad Bahāwāl Khān I who, the very next year, founded some towns including that of Bahāwālpūr, which ultimately gave its name to the state. It was during the rule of Bahāwāl Khān I that the state came to command respect and gained in political stature. The irrigation canals dug under his orders opened up a new era of prosperity for the otherwise arid regions of the state. Timing his invasion with the onslaught of Multān, which fell in 1848 to Herbert Edwardes, the Governor General. Thereafter complete peace prevailed in the state and people from Lahore, Dihīl, Dērā Gāzī Khān and Multān, etc., who felt insecure under the Sikh rule and the disturbed conditions in India, migrated to Bahāwālpūr.

On his death in 1852 he was succeeded by Saʿdāt Khān entitled Śādik Muḥammad Khān III. The latter's coronation ceremony was performed by the Makhdūm of Ucch, a happy result of the reconciliation reached between the ruling family and the head of the most powerful spiritual group in the state. His harsh treatment of his brothers caused the eldest, prince Ḥāḍīḍī Khān, to rise against him. Subsequently Śādik Muḥammad

in 1130/1723 in favour of his son Śādik Muḥammad Khān Ḍabbāsī I and died three years later in 1136/1723. An ambitious ruler, he first annexed Ucch [q.v.] followed by a part of the Mughal rába of Multan and the fort of Derāwār, wrested from Rawal Akht Singh of Djasalāmër, whose forefathers had held it for long. In 1152/1739 when Nādir Shāh Afsār invaded India, Śādik Muḥammad Khān I waited on him at Derā Gāzī Khān, and was granted the title of Nawāb. In addition to what he had added to his possessions by the sword he was granted the parganas of Siwāstān and Lārkānā. In 1155/1746 Shīkārpūr, his ancestral home, was attacked by the rival Khalīl Khān chief, Khalīdyār Khān. Śādik Muḥammad Khān,lost his life in the contest, and was succeeded by Muḥammad Bahāwāl Khān I who, the very next year, founded some towns including that of Bahāwālpūr, which ultimately gave its name to the state. It was during the rule of Bahāwāl Khān I that the state came to command respect and gained in political stature. The irrigation canals dug under his orders opened up a new era of prosperity for the otherwise arid regions of the state. Timing his invasion with the onslaught of Multān, which fell in 1848 to Herbert Edwardes, the Governor General. Thereafter complete peace prevailed in the state and people from Lahore, Dihīl, Dērā Gāzī Khān and Multān, etc., who felt insecure under the Sikh rule and the disturbed conditions in India, migrated to Bahāwālpūr.
Khan was deposed and imprisoned in a grain silo in the fort of Derawar. A small allowance was later settled on him and he was deported to Lahore, where he lies buried. Šahidji Khan assumed the title of Fath Khan, but soon alienated the support of the Dāwūdpūtras, who continued to intrigue unsuccessfully against him. He died, after a rule of five years, in 1858. He was followed by Rājīm Yār Khan entitled Muhammad Bahāwāl Khan IV (1858-66), whose otherwise uneventful reign was marred by internal disturbances and commotions culminating in his death through poisoning. He was succeeded by his minor son, Sadīq Muhammad Khan IV. On attaining his majority in 1879 he was formally invested with the title of Fath Khan, but soon alienated the support of local chiefs by the Government of British India, the state having accepted British paramountcy in 1849 on the annexation of the Pandjāb. Close on his accession the Dāwūdpūtras broke out into a rebellion which was, however, ruthlessly suppressed and its leader put to death.

During the minority of the ruler the state was administered by the Chief Political Officer and Agent to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Pandjāb for Bahawalpur Affairs. A very popular ruler, he was known as "Šubh-i Šādik". The Šahādjišāhān of the House of Bahawalpur, he constructed a number of beautiful palaces, in the construction of which foreign and local artisans were employed. Of these, two, the Šādik-Gath Palace and the Nūr Mahāll Palace, deserve mention.

He was succeeded in 1889 by Mubārak Khan, entitled Muhammad Bahāwāl Khan V, a lad of 16 years and the first Bahawalpur prince to have received education at the Aitchison College, Lahore. He died in the prime of youth in 1907 at Aden while on his way back home from a pilgrimage to Mecca. He was succeeded by his infant son, Šādik Muhammad Khan V (1907-56), then only three years old. During his minority, the affairs of the state were managed by a Council of Regency presided over by the late Mawlavī Sir Rahlm Bakhsh, a native of Thāskā Mirāndžī (Gurām) near Ambālā. His efficient administration, anxiety for public weal combined with piety and philanthropy won him much admiration. In 1947 Bahawalpur acceded to Pakistan and rendered much useful service in the rehabilitation of the uprooted refugees from India, who were then pouring in in large numbers. In 1956 the state of Bahawalpur ceased to exist as an independent unit when it was merged with West Pakistan, on the creation of the One Unit.

Bibliography: Dawlat Ray, Mirādī-i Dawlat-i Ābbāsī, Dhill 1850 (materially different from the Brit. Mus. MS, Rieu iii 951 a); Muhammad Aʿzām Ḥāšhimī, Diwān-i Ābbāsiyya (MS); Dījan Muhammad Khan Maʿrūfānī, Taʿrīkh-i Bahāwāl Khan (Punjab University Library MS); Aʿzām Ḥāšhimī, Ibklā-nāmah-i Saʿādat Aṣyā (MS); Anon., Khūsāsa-i Tawrāri-i Ṣādḥiyya (an abridgment of a work by Sayyid Nūr Allāh, not available to me); Shahamat Ali, The History of Bahawalpur (an abridged and English translation of a Persian work by Pir Ibrāhīm Khan of the Government Agency at Bahawalpur 1840-56); Gazetteer of the Bahawalpur State, Lahore 1908; H. B. Edwardees, A year on the Punjab frontier in 1848-9, London 1851, ii, 314, 319, 344, 377; Ghulām Rasūl Mihr, Taʿrīkh-i Sīnadh (Āhā-ī Khalbā), Karachi 1958, i, 42, 48-60, 100-19 and passim; Sayyid Murād Šāh, Taʿrīkh-i Murād (MS); Naezer Ali Shah, Šādīg-namah, Lahore 1959; Āṭā Muhammad Šikār-pūrī, Tāzāk Nauwā-i Maʿārīkh, Karachi 1960, index; Hīṭīṭ Rām, Taʿrīkh Dera Gāhī Khan, Lahore 1875; idem, Taʿrīkh-i Bahāwālān; Ḥāfiz al-Rāhmān, Taʿrīkh-i Bahāwālpur (MS); Aʿzām-Allāh al-Rāhmān, Subh-i Šādikā, Bahawalpur 1943; F. G. Goldsmid, A Memoir on Shikarpur, Bombay Government Records; see also the article BAHAWALPUR, and C. U. Aitchison, A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sanads relating to India, ix, Calcutta 1892.
surmounted by a dome 40 yds. high from which flew a huge red flag, overshadowing the entire town, housed a Buddhist stūpa (manārat al-buḍḍ) or the dīwāl, after which, it is supposed that the town itself came to be known as Dīwāl (Debal, pronounced by the Arabs as Daybul). A huge stone hurled by the mandjānit wrought havoc with the tower and brought it down with a thundering crash. The post and the gigantic flag, considered by the local population as a symbol of impregnability, fell to the ground. After the fall of the town Muhammad b. al-Kāsim b. Anbasa b. Ishāk al-Dabbi, governor of Daybul under al-Wāḥib Bītābh [q.v.], about 232/846. According to al-Balādhūrī, sub anno, Ibn al-Djawzi, Muntazam v/2, 143) a terrible earthquake destroyed a large part of the town in 280/893, at the same time killing thousands of the inhabitants. The town, however, survived the catastrophe and seems to have been rebuilt as it was long in existence thereafter having been visited, among others, in as late as c. 657/1259 by Radī al-Dīn Ḥasan b. Muhammad al-Šāhīnī [q.v.], who strangely enough refers to the old practice of the wealthy classes of Daybul of indulging in acts of piracy and buccaneering. In 618/1221 Djalāl al-Dīn Khārīzmshāh after his defeat at the hands of the Tātars came to Sind, attacked and captured Daybul and built a Dīmāni Masjid there on the site of an idol-temple. This means that even in the 7th/8th century idolatry was prevalent in Daybul and that there was a considerable number of non-Muslims residing there.

Various attempts have been made to identify and locate the ruined city of Daybul but they have met with little success. The description of the town, as given by Arab writers and travellers, beyond supplying useful information on the past glory of the town, has been of little use otherwise. The Pakistan Archaeological Department undertook large-scale excavation for the first time in 1958 at Bhabbor (Bābābhar), another ruined city, presented by some scholars to be the original town of Daybul. But the uncovered topography of the Bhabbor mound and the archaeological finds so far (1960) discovered there have failed to provide any conclusive evidence that the ruins of Bhabbor are those of Daybul. Iṣṭaḵrī makes separate mention of the town of Daybul and the idol temple of Bahamburā (Bābābhar).

During the early part of Muslim occupation it was a great centre of culture and learning and al-Samʿānī (Kīṭāb al-Amsāb, fol. 236 b) and Yākūṭ mention a large number of traditionists who flourished here.

The destruction of Daybul, its probable causes and the subsequent total disappearance of the town, despite its large size, a big population and its having been in existence till a very late date, are problems which have so far defied all attempts at a satisfactory solution.

**Bibliography:** Sulaymān al-Mabīrī, Kālidat al-ṣamās wa istikhrāj ba‘dīd al-usās, (not available to me); Ibn Khurradadhbih, al-Masālik wa l-Mamālik, Leiden 1906, 62 ff.; al-Masālik, Murūdī, Cairo ed.), i., 378; al-Iṣṭaḵrī, 175 ff.; Ibn Ḥawkāl, 317, 328; Yākūṭ, ii, 638; al-Nuwayrī, Niḥāyat al-ʿArab, (not available to me);
in which the father of the Barbarossas is supposed to have told his sons to obey Khayr al-Din [q.v.] for "he will be your day!" (Venture de Paradis, Alger au XVIIIe siècle, in Ed., 1896, 257).

Another use of the honorific title was to designate a lower rank in the Janissary militia; towards the end of the 16th/17th century in Tunis, the name was born by the heads of the 40 sections of the militia. In 1571 these dayls elected one of their number to the command of the army; this supreme dayl held the whole of the power in the Regency of Tunis, at least from 1594, allowing the beylerbeyi-pacaba to remain in office but with only nominal power (Pierre Dan, Histoire de la Barbarie et de ses Corsaires, Paris 1637, 144-5). Hamâbîd Murâd, when he came into power in 1640 allowed the title of dayl to continue, but the person who bore it was no longer the head of the Regency, even if he remained one of its highest dignitaries.

After 1705, the word dayl is no longer to be found among the titles conferred by the Husaynid sovereigns, but still appears in the Tunisian hierarchy, in the ninth rank, according to Muhammad Bayrâm al-Kâmis al-Tûnisî (Sa'fat al-İ'tîbâr, Cairo 1302/1885, ii, 2-3); it is found in several diplomatic documents of the eighteenth century, particularly in the treaties drawn up between the Regency of Tunis and France on 16th December, 1710, 9th November, 1748, and 4 Ventôse, Year X. The word at that time referred to a high judicial officer. It seems to have continued up to the middle of the 19th century.

In Algiers, after 1671, when the Corsair Captains took over the power of the Aghas (see art. ALGERIA (ii) (2), the title of dayl was borne by the head of the Regency. This was not yet the case at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Pierre Dan was in Algiers.

Elected at first by the company (ta'ïsa) of corsair masters, the dayl was elected by the officers of the army after 1689. Thirty days succeeded each other in power between 1671 and 1830. In theory their power was limited by the control of the diwan of the militia; in fact if the dayl had a strong personality, he enjoyed an absolute power.

The dayls were in Algiers, first in the palace of the Djanina, on the site where the archbishop's house at that time referred to a high judicial officer. It seems to have continued up to the middle of the 19th century.

Bibliography: No books or articles are specially concerned with the function of dayl; some scattered information can be found in sources relating to the Turkish regencies of Algiers and Tunis.

DAYLAM, geographically speaking, the highlands of Gîlan [q.v.]. In the south, the lowlands of Gîlan proper are bounded by the Alburz range; the latter forms here a crescent, the eastern horn of which comes close to the Caspian coast (between Lahijân and Čā友善). In the centre of the crescent there is a gap through which the Safid-rud, formed on the central Iranian plateau, breaks through
towards the Caspian Sea. Before entering the gorge at Mandjill the river, flowing here from west to east, makes a remarkable tributary, the Shäh-rūd, which, rising in the district of Tāfkalān and flowing east to west, skirts the southern face of the Alburz wall. On its southern side the basin of the Shäh-rūd is separated by a line of hills from the plain of Kazwin [q.v.], while on its right side it is fed by a number of streams flowing down the southern slopes of the Alburz. The principal of these tributaries is that watering the valley of Alamūt [q.v.]. The valleys of the Shäh-rūd and its tributaries seem to be the cradle of the Daylamite tribe. Though belonging to the basin of the great river of Gilan (the Safld-rūd), 'Daylam proper' [al-Daylam al-maḥd] is in fact separated from it by the Alburz wall. The Daylamites also occupied the northern slopes of the mountain and its ramifications stretching towards the sea (see Ḳūdhā al-'Alām], and Daylam formed here a wedge between Gilan and Tabaristān [q.v.].

While Gilan is marshy and unhealthy but highly fertile, the highlands of Daylam, much less favoured by nature, were inhabited by a robust and enterprising race of men ready to emigrate or serve abroad. The geographical term 'Daylam' followed the destinies of the Daylamite expansion in the 4th/5th century, and came to comprise many other neighbouring lands (see below).

The ancient period. The remote origins of the Daylamites are uncertain. They probably belonged to a pre-Iranian stock. The name of the peak of Dulfak (or Dulfak), which rises on the right bank of the Safld-rūd gorge to the north-east of the point, however, to his Daylamite connexions (see above, Muta). The name of the Daylamites is known to many classical writers. In the 2nd century B.C. Polybius, v, 44, mentions the northern neighbours of Media: "Δελμοκιοί, Ἀνω-πάσκαι, (non-Arians), Ἐπανωσίου, Ματιάνοι. In the 2nd century A.D. Ptolemy, vi, 2 mentions "Δελμο-κιοί to the north of Choromithrene (Khâr-e Ar u Waramin, to the south-east of Rayy), and to the west of the Tapuri (Tabaristān). On the Iranian side the information begins to emerge only in Sasanian times. Before the decisive victory of Ardāshīr the Sāsānian over Ardāvān the Arsacid the latter is said to have mobilized "the troops of Rayy, Damāvand, Dostpay, and Pāshākār Arūmān" [Kūrmīmāk-i Aṭībākhīr, tr. Nöldeke, 47]. This would suggest Arsacid influence extended over the population of the southern face of the Alburz range. At first the Sāsānians treated the Daylamites with caution (see Marquart, Erānsahr, 126) but gradually the latter became conspicuous both in the army and at the court. Kāwād sent an expedition against Iberia (Georgia) under the command of a "Persian" whose name Bošē (*Bošay) and title ʿOẓūrīq, ʿwahrīs) point, however, to his Daylamite connexions (see Procopius, De bello persico, i, 14). Under Khusraw Anāshrūwān a detachment of Daylamites is mentioned (ca. 552 A.D.) at the siege of Archeopolis (now Tšikhе- Godgor) in Lazica where they were used as expert cragsmen, while the Turic Sabirs were leading the frontal attack (see Procopius, De bello gotico, iv, 14 ed. Din- dorf, 259-50). A few years later the Daylamites were fighting side by side with the Persians and another corps of Sabirs employed by the Byzantines (see Agathias, i, 17) According to Procopius, the "Dolomites" lived in inaccessible mountains; they were never subjects of the kings of Persia, and served them only as mercenaries. They fought on foot, each man being armed with a sword and a shield, and carrying three javelins (acontia) in his hands, which corresponds to the later Islamic descriptions.

Khusraw's famous expedition to the Yemen (ca. 570 A.D.), consisting of 8,000 prisoners from Daylam and neighbouring places, and was led by an old man, also released from prison, bearing the title of wahris [q.v.]. When under Kāvād and Khusraw the passes of the Caucasus were fortified and military colonies settled near them, the names of the latter reflected their origin from Daylam and its neighbourhood (see below, Toponymy). The conspiracy against Khusraw's successor Hārnīz IV, which resulted in his overthrow in 590 A.D., was led by Zoanab, the chief of the "Dilimitic" people (Theophylactus Simocatta, iv, 3, 1).

Daylam and the Arabs. During the Arab invasion the Daylamites took up an indecisive position when the people of Kazvin invoked their help, but, supported by the people of Rayy, they opposed Nu'mān b. Mukarrin sent by the caliph 'Umar. Their efforts to make him their chief or king (chief? i Mūtā (or Mūrzā), were defeated on the river Wādī in Dastabāy (*Dastāb-pay, i.e., the "edge of the plain" stretching between Rayy and Hamadān) (Tabari, i, 265 [sub 32/642]), Balāghūri, 317-25, and other historians mention seventeen Muslim expeditions into Daylam, from the time of 'Umar I to that of al-Ma'mūn, which were reflected in Arabic poems (see Kasrawī, 4-20). The poet Ašā Hamdān (d. 82/942) was himself a Daylamite, though the place-names he quotes (Kǎršīn, Kayūl, Hāmīn, Lahzamm) seem to refer to the region of Damāwand (Wima?). Nevertheless Daylam preserved its independence. The Muslim strongholds against them were in the south: Kazvin; and in the north-east, on the frontier of Tabaristān: the fortifications on the rivers Kālar and Čālīs.

Language and religion. The name of the king Mūtā (?) sounds unusual, but when in the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. Daylamite chiefs appear on the stage in large numbers, their names are clearly pagan Iranian, not of the south-western "Persian" type, but of the north-western variety: thus Gūrāngēd (not Kūránjīd, as formerly deciphered) corresponds to Persian gūr-ângēs "chaser of wild asses", šēr-zīl to šēr-dīš "lion's heart", etc. Iṣṭāqhrī, writing between 9th and 10th centuries, speaks of a tribe called Daylam and adds that in the highlands of Daylam there was a tribe that spoke a language different from that of Daylam and Gilan.

There may have been some Zoroastrians and Christians in Daylam, but practically nothing is known about the pagan creed of the Daylamites. According to Birūnī, (al-ʿAthār, 224) they followed the law established by the mythical Afrīdu who ordered men to be masters in their family and called them kadbihudār. Rather enigmatically Birūnī adds that this institution was abrogated by the 'Alīd al-Nāṣīr al-Uṭrīsh (see below) and thus they reverted to the condition in which people were living in the time of the tyrant Dāhāk Biwarāsp, when "devils and demons" (al-ḥayāfīn wa l-marada) dwelt in their houses and they were powerless against them. Apart from the kadībākhās exercising the rights of pater patriae, the Daylamites had their local rulers of whose existence we can judge by such titles as Wārdān-šāh, wahris (cf. Hübschmann, Armen. Gramm., 78: waḥrīs vaḥrīs "wahris of Vahriz") and even kings (see above, Mūtā). The role of the latter becomes clearer only in the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. in connexion with their collaboration with the ʿAlids.
The ‘Alids. At an early date the mountain fastnesses of Daylam served as places of refuge for the ‘Alids who had been obliged to flee from the ‘Abbāsid. The earliest known refugee was Yāḥyā b. ‘Abd Allāh, whose two brothers had been executed and who himself joined a rebel brother of Hārūn al-Raśīd. He came to Daylam in 275/791, but soon surrendered to the Bārmakī Faḍl b. Yāḥyā. It appears that in the meantime the caliph used pressure on the king of Daylam both by threats and by offers of money (cf. Tabarī, anno 176; Ya‘qūbī, ii, 452).

The Djuṣṭānīs. When in 289/805 Hārūn arrived in Rayy he summoned the rulers of the Caspian region and let the lord of Daylam, Marzūbān b. Djuṣṭān, go with a gift of money and a robe of honour; no payment of tribute is mentioned in this case, while such an obligation was imposed on the other kings. Although this is the first time that we hear of the family of Djuṣṭān, it is likely that the leniency of Hārūn had a connexion with the events of 175/791 when the same king (or his father?) must have been the ruler. Provisionally we can take Marzūbān as the first in the list of the ruling Banū Djuṣṭān.

The next king known to us is Wahṣūdān b. Djuṣṭān; the interval between Marzūbān (who is mentioned in 289/805) and Wahṣūdān (who was still living in 298/812, cf. Tabarī, iii, 188) is too great to consider them as brothers. The consensus (Justi, Vasmārī, Kasrawī, Kazwīnī) is now to insert between them Djuṣṭān I (no. 2), putative son of No. 1, Marzūbān, and father of No. 3, Wahṣūdān. In fact under 201/816 Tabarī reports that ‘Abd Allāh b. Khurṣadūbbih in the course of his victorious campaign in Daylam captured a king called Abū Laylī. Laylī (or Līlī) is known in Daylam as a man’s name (cf. the adventurer Laylī b. Nūmān), and the question is whether he is identical with Djuṣṭān (no. 2) or whether he was a usurper or a local ruler (of Lāḥgīn?).

The situation in Daylam becomes clearer with the advent on the frontier of Daylam of the line of Ḥasanī sayyids, clever politicians and able warriors who succeeded in involving the Daylamites in their struggles and schemes, although no obligation of proclaiming Islam had yet been imposed on them.

Sayyid Hasan b. Zayd al-dā‘ī al-kabbīr (no. 1) stood at the head of a rising in Cālūs and Kulār in 250/864 and protected the inhabitants against the Tāhirīs who wished to appropriate the common lands which served for collecting fuel and as grazing grounds (Tabarī, iii, 1324). According to ʿIṣāqūrī, 205, before the time of Ḥasan b. Zayd, Daylam had been considered as the “territory of unbelief” (Dār al-khurāj) from which slaves had been taken, but the ‘Alids had intervened on behalf of the Daylamites. Wahṣūdān b. Djuṣṭān (no. 3) swore allegiance to Hasan b. Zayd, but soon after broke with him and died.

The Ta’rīkh-i Dīlī wa Daylam (quoted by Dinwaynī, iii, 271) reports that in 248/860 a Djuṣṭānīd began the construction of a building (ʿtimār) on Mt. Alamūt, in which the kings of Daylam took pride. It is more likely that this enterprise marked not the end of the long reign of Wahṣūdān but the beginning of that of his energetic son Djuṣṭān II (no. 4). The latter invited the dā‘ī to send his representatives to Daylam, and under the auspices of the ‘Alids took Rayy from the Tāhirīs and occupied Kazwīn and Zanglān. In 253/867 the caliph al-Mu‘tazz sent an army under Mūsā b. Bughā, who wiped out the successes of Djuṣṭān. In 259/872 the latter made a second, though unsuccessful, attempt to occupy Rayy, and continued to assist the dā‘ī in his struggle against the ‘Abbāsid. In 270/883 Hasan b. Zayd died and was succeeded by his brother Muhammad b. Zayd, called al-dā‘ī al-saghir, to whom also Djuṣṭān swore allegiance (no. II).

The worst experience befell Daylam ca. 276/889 when the Khurṣadūbīsian soldier of fortune Rāfī b. Ḥarīḥṣama, acting on behalf of the Sāmānī, ousted Muhammad b. Zayd from Djuṣṭān. The dā‘ī sought refuge in Daylam. The troops of Rāfī occupied Cālūs, but Rūmīdī, assisting Djuṣṭān, surrounded them. Then Rāfī himself moved forward. Muhammad b. Zayd retreated to Gīlān, while on the heels of Djuṣṭān Rāfī marched from Cālūs to Talaḵān, and for three months (summer of 278/891) this region was plundered by the invaders. Djuṣṭān gave a promise not to assist the sayyid, and Rāfī went on to occupy Kazwīn and Rayy (see Ibn al-Aḥbār, vii, 303, and Ibn Isfandīyār, ed. Eghbal, 252-4). In 279/892 Rāfī, seeing himself threatened from many sides, suddenly swore allegiance to the dā‘ī and returned Djuṣṭān to him, on the understanding that he would send him 4000 Daylamite stalwarts. By threats and promises the Saffārid Ṭām b. Laylī prevented the dā‘ī from helping Rāfī and the latter had to flee to Khūzdīzim where he was killed in 283/November 896. Four years later (287/October 900) Muhammad b. Zayd fell in a battle against a Sāmānī commander.

After a short interval the ‘Alid cause was taken up by the Ḥusaynī Sayyid Hasan b. ʿAll (Nāṣir al-Dīn, al-Thā’īrī, al-Uṯrūṣ “the deaf” (no. III), who despite the shortness of his reign (301/4904-7) is regarded as the greatest of the ‘Alid rulers. According to Tabarī (iii, 2296) the world had never known such justice as that of al-Uṯrūṣ. He had lived for thirteen years among the Daylamites, and succeeded in converting to the Sayyīd creed a considerable number of people “between the farther (eastern) side of the Safīd-rūd and Ḍū‘ulī”. To confirm this achievement al-Uṯrūṣ had the fortifications of Cālūs razed to the ground. He was recognized by Djuṣṭān, and although their first campaign against the Sāmānīs was a failure, the next year, after a pitched battle of forty days the Sāmānīs were driven out of the Caspian provinces.

The enigmatic phrase of Brūnī, referred to above, concerning Nāṣir’s action in disrupting the ancient authority of the Ḥadīkhudūbīsī may hint at the influence of Islamic institutions which had established control over isolated households. Such a trend of events must have been resident by the Djuṣṭānīs, and some historians (Walīyāb Amuli, Taʾrīkh-i Rūyān (750/1349), ed. Tehran, 77; Ibn Wāsīl, Taʾrīkh-i Dill wa Daylam) mention a period of struggles between Djuṣṭān and Nāṣir, though apparently before the latter’s advent in 301/913. He died on 5 Shahrāb 304/31 January 917, after having appointed as his successor his son-in-law, the Ḥasanī Hasan b. al-Kasīm (no. IV). At about the same time, after a reign of forty years, Djuṣṭān was assassinated. The perpetrator of this crime was his brother ʿAll b. Wahṣūdān (no. 5), whom in 300/912 the ʿAbbāsidīs had already appointed their financial agent (istāmāla) in Isfahān. He was disposed in 304, but in 307/920 the ʿAbbāsid commander Muḥīʾ, who had just taken prisoner Yūsuf b. Abī ʿĪsā, reappointed ʿAll as the governor of Rayy, Kazwīn, and Zanglān. In the same year he
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was killed in Kazwm by Muhammad b. Musafir (Kangarl, or Sallarl, of the second Daylamite dynasty of Tarom), who being married to the clever Khara-

suya, daughter of Djustan b. Wahsudan (no. 4) wished to avenge his father-in-law (not his "nephew", as in Ibn al-Athir, viii, 76). With his political attitude, 'Ali b. Wahsudan could hardly have been recognized in the whole of Daylam. However, we learn that when the Hasanid Hasan b. al-Kasim (the dā'ī no. IV) was captured in Tabaristan and delivered to 'Ali to be sent to Baghdad, 'Ali had him imprisoned in his "ancestral fortress" of Alamät (see Ibn Isfandiyar, Egb. 275). Immediately after 'Ali's death, his other brother Khusrav Frurzān, who apparently had acted as 'Ali's locum tenens, released the sayyid. Khusrav Frurzān (no. 6) marched against Ibn Musafir but was killed by him. Khusrav's son Mahād (no. 7) also took up arms against the Kangarid, but was defeated and took refuge with the new rising star of Daylam, Asfar b. Shīroya or Shīroya [q.v.].

The epigons. With this event (ca. 315/927) ends our direct information about the Djūstānids, but remnants of the dynasty may still have carried on, at least in a part of their dominions. When Ibn Musafir had dealt with his Djūstān idol opponents (nos. 5, 6, 7), the former amirs of the 'Alids and Djūstānids had already spread over the Iranian plateau, and Daylam proper lay at the mercy of Ibn Musafir. In a report in which an official (some time before 379/989) summed up the history of Shamlān (Tārom) for the Buyid minister Ibn 'Abbād (see Yākūt, iii, 140-9, as explained by Kasrawī, i, 130-4), he states that the Musafīrids ruled over the whole of the mountainous *Ustāniya and (thus?) appropriated a part of Daylam, whereas the descendants of Wahsudān (no. 3) b. Djustan had to content themselves with the region of *Lādiyya. The same terms appear in the anti-Daylamite and pro-Turkish tract which the secretary Ibn Hassūl presented (ca. 450/1058) to al-Kundurī, the waṣir of Tughril-beg (see Fadlāl al-Atrākh, ed. A. al-'Azzāwī, Belleten, iv/14-5; 1940, 31). Ibn Hassūl explains that *Ostān is the highlands, and *Lādiyya (wrongly printed Lādiyya) the lowlands of Daylam, the former being in the possession of the Wahsudānī (here Isfahān) rūmān and the latter in that of the Djūstānīs, kings. These independent reports indicate that soon after the death of Djustan b. Wahsudān (no. 4) his possessions were split up and the Wahsudānī (here children of the Kangarid Wahsudān b. Muhammad of Tārom) had taken possession of the highlands of Daylam (presumably the "ostān", i.e., "home, centre" of the Djūstānīs). The latter must have migrated to the neighbouring Lādiyya (i.e., the coastal area of Daylam, of which ten districts are enumerated in the Hudūd).

On the contrary, when Sulayf Tughril was operating near Kazwm (Ibn al-Athir, anno 434/1042) the king of Daylam appeared before him with a tribute; then separately Ibn al-Athīr mentions the submission of the Salār of Tārm (Tārom). We have to conclude either that the Djūstānīs had succeeded in reoccupying a part of their dominions, or that the tribute was paid by the Lādiyya branch, or that the latter is more likely, for Nāṣīr Khusrav in his Sāfār-nāma states that in 438/1046 a levy (bādī) was collected at the crossing of the Shāh-rūd (near its confluence with the Safīd-rūd) on behalf of the amir-i amrān who was "(one) of the kings of Daylamān". Nāṣīr describes then his visit to Shamlān whose ruler bore the title of Marzubān al-Daylam Dīl-i Dīlān (sic) Abū Śāliḥ; his name was Djustān Ibhrām and he possessed "many castles in Daylam". This must have been the great-grandson of Wahsudān of Tārom (see above, 191, no. IV), and it appears as though the bādī on the Shāh-rūd was levied also in his name.

The story of the dā'īs ends with the rule of the above-mentioned Hasanid Hasan b. Kāsim (no. IV), son-in-law (ḥaṭam) of al-Uṭrūsh. Although he was nominated by Nāṣīr himself, struggles for the succession began between him and the sons of Nāṣīr, and after the death of the latter the Daylamite amirs, involved in complicated struggles, fought for their own crown. Hasan b. Kāsim was killed ca. 316/928 by Mardawīdī b. Ziyār, then the ally of Asfar b. Shīroya.

Daylamite expansion. The result of the 'Alids' activities was that the Buyids, partly converted to the Zaydī creed, developed strong oppositionary tendencies with regard to the caliphate, and that in their numerous fights for the 'Alids they greatly improved their military skill and became conquering tribes. Under their stimulus the Saldjuks of Tārom appeared before him with a tribute; then

Hulwan and on the western slopes of the Zagros (380-478/990-1085), the Kurdish Hasanuyids (340-409/951-1018) and their branch of Ani (451-559/1055-695); the Kurdish 'Anārids [q.v.] in Hulwān and on the western slopes of the Zagros (351-511/961-1117); the Turkish Marwānīds [q.v.] of Mayyāfārīkān and Diyarbakr (380-478/990-1085), etc. The weakness of the Daylamite régime consisted in the dispersion of the not too numerous elements of Daylam over too vast an area; the splitting up of the dynasty into several rival branches; and finally the Turko-Daylamite antagonism in the area (see below). The first great blow to the Buyid power was the occupation of Rayy by the Ghaznavid Mahmūd in 420/1029; the definite end came under the impact of Tughril-beg who in 447/1055 arrested the last Buyid of Baghdad, al-Malik al-Rāhmī. In Fārs, the last scions of the Buyid house carried on for a few more years as vassals of the Saldjuks, (see Bowen in JRAFS, 1929, 229-43). Outside their
country, the Daylamites continued to serve as mercenaries. Nizam al-Mulk, Siydsat-nama, ch. xix, still recommends the employment of 100 Daylamites together with 100 Khurasanians as palace guards of the Saljuq. Isolated colonies of Daylamites survived in many places before they were absorbed by the local populations.

Toponymy. The area over which generations of Daylamites scattered throughout the ages is very wide, but, in view of the chronological difficulties involved, it is better to combine the references under a single heading. Thus the Babylonian name of the island of Dilmun (Bahrayn) still merits consideration, while the name of Bandar-i Daylam on the southern coast of Fars seems to date back to the Bâyid period. In the sub-Caucasian region the existence of military settlements of the Sasānian times is reflected in such names as Lāzān or Lāzân (now Lāhījī) connected with Lāhījān. The name of Shīrwān is probably linked with that of Shīr (in Arabic Shīrizz) lying at the confluence of the rivers of Talaḵān and Alamūt, cf. Hudud, ch. xxi, § 24, and Djuwayyin, iii, 425 (note of M. Kazwini). Even the title of the king of Sarīr (Avaria) figuring in Bālā- dhurl, 196, as Wahrāzn-šāh, may prove to be linked with the title wahriz, cf. Minorsky, History of Sharrūn, 1938, 23-3. The so-called “Zāzā”, living north of Dīyārbark to Pālū and Darsīm and still speaking an Iranian language, call themselves Dimlā, which name F. C. Andreas identified with Daylam. The (now turkicized) tribe Dumbuli, active in the region of Khoy by the beginning of the 19th century, seems also to be connected with the Dimlā. It is noteworthy that Agathias, i, 17, speaking of the Dīummitai troops fighting in Lasica, says that their homes (perhaps of that particular group?) lay in the neighbourhood of Persian lands "on the middle course of the Tigrīs", i.e., (if the "Tigris" is not a mistake for the Safīd-rūd) in the region where the Zāzā live nowadays. The traveller Aḥū Dūlah, ed. Minorsky, Cairo 1955, § 25, mentions a place called Daylamastān at seven jrasāḥēs east of Shahrārzūr whence “in the days of the ancient kings of Persia” the Daylamites used to send their raiding parties into the Mesopotamian lowlands. The name Lāhījān is probably linked with the title of the king of Sarīr (Avaria) figuring in Bālā- dhurl, 196, as Wahrāzn-šāh, which name F. C. Andreas identified with Daylam. The (now turkicized) tribe Dumbuli, active in the region of Khoy by the beginning of the 19th century, seems also to be connected with the Dimlā. It is noteworthy that Agathias, i, 17, speaking of the Dīummitai troops fighting in Lasica, says that their homes (perhaps of that particular group?) lay in the neighbourhood of Persian lands “on the middle course of the Tigrīs”, i.e., (if the “Tigris” is not a mistake for the Safīd-rūd) in the region where the Zāzā live nowadays. The traveller Aḥū Dūlah, ed. Minorsky, Cairo 1955, § 25, mentions a place called Daylamastān at seven jrasāḥēs east of Shahrārzūr whence “in the days of the ancient kings of Persia” the Daylamites used to send their raiding parties into the Mesopotamian lowlands. The name Lāhījān is probably linked with the title of the king of Sarīr (Avaria) figuring in Bālā- dhurl, 196, as Wahrāzn-šāh, which name F. C. Andreas identified with Daylam. The (now turkicized) tribe Dumbuli, active in the region of Khoy by the beginning of the 19th century, seems also to be connected with the Dimlā. It is noteworthy that Agathias, i, 17, speaking of the Dīummitai troops fighting in Lasica, says that their homes (perhaps of that particular group?) lay in the neighbourhood of Persian lands “on the middle course of the Tigrīs”, i.e., (if the “Tigris” is not a mistake for the Safīd-rūd) in the region where the Zāzā live nowadays. The traveller Aḥū Dūlah, ed. Minorsky, Cairo 1955, § 25, mentions a place called Daylamastān at seven jrasāḥēs east of Shahrārzūr whence “in the days of the ancient kings of Persia” the Daylamites used to send their raiding parties into the Mesopotamian lowlands. The name Lāhījān may be the witness of the transfer of the Daylamite centre from *Ostān (see above) to the region of Lāhījān. North-west of Lake Urmia the centre of Salmās was until recently called Dilmākan; south-west of Lake Urmia near an important Zagros pass one finds a district called Lāhījān (see sāwyu-’būlāk in ET). Several other villages bearing the name Lāhījān are known in the basin of Lake Urmia, north of Mt. Savalan (Lāhīl), etc.

Territory and peoples. The earlier Muslim geographers, such as Ibn Khurdaḏḏibh, Yaḵūbī, Ibn Rusta, Ibn Faḵhī, have little to say on Daylam, but ample information on the country and its inhabitants is supplied by the geographers and historians after the rise of the Daylamite dynasties in the 4th/10th century. Already Ḯāṯāḵhī had described under Daylam all the southern coast of the Caspian and the lands forming a belt to the south of the Alburz range (including Rayy and Kazwīn). Muḥaddas (who lived in the heyday of the Daylamite dominion) adds to it all the coasts of the Caspian comprising the Khazar kingdom at the estuary of the Volga.

Ḵāṯāḵhī (possibly following Balḵī) places the capital of the Dīstān family at Rūḏābār. The editor of Djuwayyin, iii, 434, M. Kazwīn, has presen-
The Isma'ili Fatimid Isma'ili propaganda had been rampant in the environs of Rayy even since the beginning of the 3rd/9th century (see S. M. Stern, in BSOAS, xxiii, 1960, 56-90). Asfár of Daylam and Mardawijd of Gilân had accepted the new teaching (Baghdâdî, Farh, tr. A. Hakîn, Tel-Aviv 1935, 113; Rashíd al-Dîn, Ismâ'îliydn, ed. Docker, Teheran 1936/1937, 152). Under the last Buyids the Daylamites approved endogamy within their tribes, and marriages were concluded by direct agreement between the parties (Mukaddasî, 368-9). It was the fact that the Isma'ili Fatimids had no heir to the throne of Baghdad that, with the accession of the Buyids, also brought about the end of Fatimid dominance in Khurâsân (see DAYR KUNNA).

The monasteries were also an important factor in the political and social life of the Islamic world. For instance, their own libraries, most of which were established in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries by the Nestorian church, were frequently attached to them and contributed considerably to the cultural development, and drew revenue from the properties owned by the monasteries (e.g., vineyards and olive groves). Sometimes after the nearest town or village (Dayr al-Tabib, near Nishân, Dayr al-Za'farîn in Upper Mesopotamia). Monks, called dayrî or dayrînî, lived in the days (also known in 'Irâq as Yamûn, a word of uncertain origin). The monasteries were often no more than simple hermitages, particularly if they were located in remoter parts. Usually however they consisted of several buildings—a church (kantûs or bi'a), cells (bûlûya, pl. bûlûl or kirb, pl. akhûâr and ukuvâyûr, words of Syriac origin, the second being strictly speaking 'Irakî), and outbuildings such as shops and provision stores. Sometimes however they consisted of several buildings—a church (kantûs or bi'a), cells (bûlûya, pl. bûlûl or kirb, pl. akhûâr and ukuvâyûr, words of Syriac origin, the second being strictly speaking 'Irakî), and outbuildings such as shops and provision stores.

The most recent movement in the history of Daylam is the uprising of the Ahl-i Hâqq (q.v.) leader Sâyyîd Muhammad in Kâlîr-daghî in October 1891 (see Minorsky, Notes sur la secte des Ahl-i Hâqq, Teheran 1928, i, 23-37 (Djustanids) — a valuable work; V. Minorsky, La domination des Dailamites, Soc. des Etudes Iranienes, no. iii, 1932, 1-26; M. Kazwînî, annotations to Djuwaynî, iii, 306-9 ('Alîds), 432-45 (Djustanids); IA, s.v. Deilâm (A. Ates). (V. Minorsky)

DAYN [see supplement].

Dayr, a word of Syriac origin denoting the Christian monasteries which continued to function after the Arab conquest of the Middle East. If we are to believe the lists drawn up by Arab writers, they were very numerous, particularly in 'Irâq (along the Tigris and Euphrates valleys), Upper Mesopotamia, Syria (Stylite sanctuaries in the vicinity of the "dead cities"), Palestine and Egypt (along the whole length of the Nile valley). They were often named after a patron saint (Dayr Mûr Yûhanna near Takrit, Dayr al-Sam'ân in northern Syria) or founder (Dayr 'Abd al-În in 'Irâq), but also occasionally after the nearest town or village (Dayr al-Rûsafa in Syria) or a feature of the locality (Dayr al-a'lâ near Mosul, Dayr al-Za'farîn in Upper Mesopotamia). Monks, called dayyûr or dayrînî, lived in the days (also known in 'Irâq as Yamûn, a word of uncertain origin). The monasteries were often no more than simple hermitages, particularly if they were located in remoter parts. Usually however they consisted of several buildings—a church (kantûs or bi'a), cells (bûlûya, pl. bûlûl or kirb, pl. akhûâr and ukuvâyûr, words of Syriac origin, the second being strictly speaking 'Irakî), and outbuildings such as shops and provision stores. Sometimes however they consisted of several buildings—a church (kantûs or bi'a), cells (bûlûya, pl. bûlûl or kirb, pl. akhûâr and ukuvâyûr, words of Syriac origin, the second being strictly speaking 'Irakî), and outbuildings such as shops and provision stores.

The Christian monasteries were centres of religious and intellectual life during the early years of Islam. For instance, the liturgical rules adopted in the 3rd-4th/9th-10th centuries by the Nestorian church were formulated in the Dayr al-a'lâ near Mosul, Dayr al-Za'farîn in Upper Mesopotamia. Monks, called dayyûr or dayrînî, lived in the days (also known in 'Irâq as Yamûn, a word of uncertain origin). The monasteries were often no more than simple hermitages, particularly if they were located in remoter parts. Usually however they consisted of several buildings—a church (kantûs or bi'a), cells (bûlûya, pl. bûlûl or kirb, pl. akhûâr and ukuvâyûr, words of Syriac origin, the second being strictly speaking 'Irakî), and outbuildings such as shops and provision stores.
They were open without distinction to virtually all travellers, including notabilities, and indeed often provided a safer stopping-place than elsewhere. At the Dayr Murra‘n (q.v.) near Damascus, for example, there was a princely residence nearby (confused with the monastery by some authors), and sovereigns or governors were sometimes accommodated in the dayr itself. This was the case in the Dayr al-‘aIla‘ of Mosul, the Dayr Zakkl of al-Rakkka, or the monastery of al-Anbār where Ḥārūn al-Raṣḥid and his retinue stopped in 187/903—it was here that Dja‘far the Barmakīd was executed (Tabarl, ii, 111, 675, 685). After his arrival in 366/976, the Bā’atīkh, the Mu‘aṣṣa‘îm of Fāṭīmah, lived for some months in the monastery of al-Ǧīza. There are ample records showing that during their hunting excursions rulers and princes visited the local monasteries, where they were offered food and drink by the monks. Muslim visitors were also attracted to the monasteries on account of the taverns usually attached to them, and there they were free to drink as much wine as they wished. Each monastery solemnly celebrated an annual festival, and the buildings were generally surrounded by places of entertainment and even debauchery, particularly if they were situated near a large town. This explains why so many of the monasteries figure in bacchic and erotic poetry, and why there are so many stories relating to the questionable behaviour of some of their inhabitants. Indeed, Arab authors of the 3rd/9th and 4th/ioth centuries even wrote whole books about them by collecting poems and stories in which they were mentioned. Only one is still in existence, the Kitāb al-‘Idyrdrat of al-Shābuṣhtī (d. 388/998). But the names of several other books are known, written by Ḥiṣām al-Kalbī, Abu ‘l-Farājī al-‘Iṣfahānī, the poet al-Sarī al-Raṣṣāfī, the two brothers al-Khālidīyyān and al-Sumaysāṭī.

After the Arab conquest the monasteries and churches were subject to special conditions laid down by jurists. Although the existing monasteries remained intact, the monks were forbidden to put up new buildings, or even to repair damage incurred through wear and tear or accidental causes. In reality, however, the fortunes of the monasteries varied with the times, and periods of toleration were followed by periods of persecution. The tax regulations governing the occupants of the monasteries were subject to continual discussion. The monks were initially exempt from poll-tax (diizya), and the tradition was often later confirmed by jurists. But some maintained that exemption applied only to those living in poverty, and the ShāHIṣīs even went so far as to assert that the exemption was unjust. From the chroniclers it would seem that in the ‘Abbasid age some governors subjected monks in Egyptian monasteries to personal taxation, and others in the ‘Abbāsid age granted exemption only in certain circumstances. The question was raised again during the caliphate of al-Muktaḍar, when in 373/985 All b. Ḫisā, chief inspector of taxes in Egypt, demanded that exemption given to the monks of Wadī ‘l-Naṭruṣ be withdrawn; the caliph did not accede to his wishes, and in 366/976 al-Ta’n announced once more that the diizya should not apply to poor monks (see ǦIIMMA).

The 5th/11th century was the beginning of a period of increasing hardship for the Christian monasteries. They had to contend with successive Saljuq and Mongol invasions, a growing insecurity (e.g., Turcoman raids into Upper Mesoopotamia), the worsening of relations with the Muslims at the time of the Crusades, and the progressive disappearance of former small Christian communities.

In ʿIrāq the monasteries near Baḥdād and Samarrā perished, whilst many of those in Egypt were abandoned and became over-run by the sand (some of them have been discovered by recent excavations). After the Mongol invasion Christian monastic life was confined to a few groups of monasteries, primarily in Upper Mesoopotamia, the Mosul and Mardin region (the monasteries of Tūr ʿAbdin), the Sinai desert, and Egypt (at Wadī ‘l-‘Iṣbīh and near the Red Sea). In Palestine and Syria, great monastic centres before the Arab conquest, there remained no more than a few scattered monasteries, mostly near Jerusalem and in Anti-Lebanon. In the Lebanon itself on the other hand monasticism found a new lease of life, particularly in the 15th century when the Maronite patriarchate was established in the mountains at the monastery of Ḥanābīn.

During the age when they flourished, Christian monasteries took part in the artistic life of the region, and it is instructive to compare the decorative techniques used in some of them with Muslim works of the same period. Particularly interesting in this respect are the Dayr al-Suryān at Wadī ‘l-‘Iṣbīh in Egypt, containing stucco ornamentation influenced by the style of Samarrā, and the Mār Behnān monastery near Mosul, some parts of which date back to the 68th/12th century. Furthermore, the illuminating of some manuscripts copied in the monasteries bears a resemblance to that of the oldest Islamic miniatures, which seem to have inherited some features of their style and workmanship.


(D. SOURDEL)

DAYR ‘ABD AL-RAHMĀN, a place in the vicinity of Kūfah, next to Ḧanābīn Rās al-Ḥālūt (Tabarl, ii, 701), near Hammām A’yun (Tabarl, ii, 703). It was the assembly point of the Kūfan army which was sent by al-ḥādīdīhī under the command of al-Ḥājaj against the Khārābīts (Tabarl, ii, 902).

**DAYR AL-‘AKOL**

A town in ‘Irāk (13 parasangs (c. 6.5 km.) south east of Baghdad on the Tigris). (Tabarl, ii, 767-6). Mukaddasi, p. 174 gives the distance as two stages, while Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-‘Umari, Masūlīk al-‘Aṣwārī, Cairo 1924, i, 263, makes it 12 parasangs or c. 67 km.). The town probably grew around a Christian monastery, and was the centre of an agricultural district (fāsūd) in central Nahrawān.

Ibn Rusta (300/912) mentions its Friday mosque and its market, thus indicating some prosperity. Important town on the Tigris between Baghdad and Wasit. It was a well marked bend in the Euphrates as is expressly stated in Syriac sources (cf. Nöldeke, in SBAk. Wien, cxxiv, Abb. IX, 43).

**Bibliography:** References are in the article.

The following are to be noted: Sumer, x, 1954, 120; Le Strange, 35; idem, in JRASt, 1895, 41; K. Ritter, ErdKunde, x, 191, 232. (A. A. Dūrī)

**DAYR AL-A‘WAR.** A place in ‘Irāk named after a member of the clan of Umayya b. Hūḍhāfa of the Ḩayd tribe (Baladhair, Fudh, 283; Hamdānī, Buṭḥā, 182; Ya‘qūb, ii, 64). It is therefore an Ḥayd Dayr (Hamdānī, 135, quoting al-Hayḥami b. ‘Adī; Bakrī, 69, quoting Ibn Ṣabba). Hamdānī’s identification of it with Dayr al-Djamādīm, loc. cit., is probably an error, since no other source confirms it.

Dayr al-A‘war was mentioned in the description of the march of the Sāṣānīan general Rustam from Ctesiphon to Kūfa. It was described as a large and fine town with humid air, as it was surrounded by gardens and palm trees (Istakhrl, 87).

Istakhrl (318-21/930-3) speaks of it as being an important town on the Tigris between Baghdad and Wasit. It was flourishing, well populated, and had markets with many branches at a distance from the mosque (Mukaddasi, 123).

Dayr al-‘Aḵūl is famous in history for the decisive battle fought there in 628/627 between Ya‘qūb b. al-Layḥār al-Ṣafār and the army of the Caliph al-Muṭamīd, led by his able brother al-Muwaffak, in their fight between Baghdad and Wasit. It was flourishing, well populated, and had markets with many branches at a distance from the mosque (Mukaddasi, 123).

Maps of Arab geographers show the gradual change in its position in relation to the Tigris. Balkhi (308/920) and Ṣaḥīḥīḥ put it directly on the east bank of the Tigris. (Sousa, ‘al-‘Irāk’ i–‘Irāk–ad-dawr 283, ed. 1909, 67.) It is therefore an Ḥayd Dayr (Hamdānī, 135, quoting al-Hayḥami b. ‘Adī; Bakrī, 69, quoting Ibn Ṣabba). It was a well marked bend in the Euphrates as is expressly stated in Syriac sources (cf. Nöldeke, in SBAk. Wien, cxxiv, Abb. IX, 43).

**Bibliography:** References are in the article.

The following are to be noted: Sumer, x, 1954, 120; Le Strange, 35; idem, in JRASt, 1895, 41; K. Ritter, ErdKunde, x, 191, 232. (A. A. Dūrī)

**DAYR AL-DJAMĀDĪM.** A place in ‘Irāk, near Kūfa. It was originally owned by the Ḥayd tribe before its migration from ‘Irāk (Bakrī, 69, quoting Ibn Ṣabba; Hamdānī, Buṭḥān, 135, quoting al-Hayḥami b. ‘Adī).

Various etymological explanations of its origin have been given: Abū ‘Ubayda states that its name was derived from the wooden cups that were made in it (Naḥḥād, 412; Ibn Kūtaṭya, Maṣ‘ūrī, 156; Bakrī, Muṣ‘īm, 574; Ya‘qūb, ii, 112, 652). Other authorities assert that it was named after the buried skulls of the casualties of the battle between Ḥayd Bahrā (al-Shakrī, Futḥā, 283; Hamdānī, Buṭḥān, 182) or between Ḥayd and the Sāṣānīans (Ibn al-Kalbi, Fuṭḥā, 283; Ibn Ṣabba in Bakrī, 70; Mas‘ūdī, Tawābih, 175). Ya‘qūb (ii, 652) states that its name was derived from its well in a saline land.

Dayr al-Djamādīm is west of the Euphrates (Bakrī, 70, 573, quoting Ibn Ṣabba) on the highlands of Kūfa (Iṣfahānī in Bakrī, 573; Ya‘qūb, ii, 652) near ‘Ayn al-Tamr and Falludja (cf. [Tabarī, ii, 1073]) and is about 7 parasangs from Kūfa.

The description of the battle of Djamādīm (83/
702) shows that this Dayr is near Dayr Kurra, nearer to Kufa and the Euphrates (Isfahan!, in 837/702, the latter supported by most of the Arab Kufans as well as by some non-Arab Mawāli. The long negotiations had failed; al-Hādji-dād, supported by Syrian Arab reinforcements, defeated Ibn al-Ashārī, who retreated to Maskin, leaving al-Hādji-dād the unrivalled master of Kūfā and enabling him to assert his control over that city by taking severe measures against his opponents. On the battle see Tabari, i, 283, loc. cit. (cf. BakrI, 698, quoting Ibn Shabba), and is therefore to be considered as an Ḵyrad Dayr in origin (Hamdani, Futuh, 283).}

Dayr al-Djamakhdjim is known as the battlefield of the war between al-Hādji-dād and ʿAbd al-Rahmān b. al-ʿAshārī (see Ibn al-ʿAshārī in 837/702, the latter supported by most of the Arab Kufans as well as by some non-Arab Mawāli. The long negotiations had failed; al-Hādji-dād, supported by Syrian Arab reinforcements, defeated Ibn al-Ashārī, who retreated to Maskin, leaving al-Hādji-dād the unrivalled master of Kūfā and enabling him to assert his control over that city by taking severe measures against his opponents. On the battle see Tabari, i, 283, loc. cit. (cf. BakrI, 698, quoting Ibn Shabba), and is therefore to be considered as an Ḵyrad Dayr in origin (Hamdani, Futuh, 283).

Dayr Kurra is mentioned in early Islamic sources, and geographers of the 7th/13th century record that only the ruins then remained. On the occasion of the feast of the Holy Cross many converts to Islam, which came from there. The best known is the Banu ʿI-Dajrah family, of which the vīzīrs al-Ḥasan b. Maḥmūd b. Dāwūd and ʿAll b. Iṣā were members. The secretaries of Dayr Kurra played a considerable political role in the late 3rd/9th and early 4th/10th centuries. In al-Muʿtāmid’s reign they sought to obtain general recognition of the Nāṣrānī convention which granted certain privileges to Christians, and supported the conspiracy of Ibn al-Muʿtazz (966/908). Once converted to Islam, they were devout Sunnīs, tried to restore the waning authority of the Caliphate, and were influenced by the preachings of al-Ḥallādī (of whose disciples at least one was from Dayr Kurra). But the open hostility of the pro-Ṣḥīḥ groups frustrated all their efforts, and they were forced to restore the Sunni caliph’s authority and bring about a reconciliation between Christians and Muslims.

Dayr Kurra is a locality in ʿIrāq some 90 km. south of Baghdad and a mile from the left bank of the Tigris. The name comes from a large monastery still flourishing in ʿAḥbāṣid times; it consisted of a church, a hundred cells, and extensive olive and palm plantations, all enclosed by thick walls. On the occasion of the feast of the Holy Cross many converts to Islam, which came from there. The best known is the Banu ʿI-Dajrah family, of which the vīzīrs al-Ḥasan b. Maḥmūd b. Dāwūd and ʿAll b. Iṣā were members. The secretaries of Dayr Kurra played a considerable political role in the late 3rd/9th and early 4th/10th centuries. In al-Muʿtāmid’s reign they sought to obtain general recognition of the Nāṣrānī convention which granted certain privileges to Christians, and supported the conspiracy of Ibn al-Muʿtazz (966/908). Once converted to Islam, they were devout Sunnīs, tried to restore the waning authority of the Caliphate, and were influenced by the preachings of al-Ḥallādī (of whose disciples at least one was from Dayr Kurra). But the open hostility of the pro-Ṣḥīḥ groups frustrated all their efforts, and they were forced to restore the Sunni caliph’s authority and bring about a reconciliation between Christians and Muslims.
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DAYR KURRA — DAYR AL-ZOR

Djamadjim [see DAYR AL-DJAMADJIM]. This Dayr is about 7 parasangs from Kufa; it is far from, and not on the borders of, Karbala, as A. Musil erroneously locates it in his study (Middle Euphrates, 413).

(SALEH A. EL-ALI)

DAYR MURRÂN, name of two former Christian monasteries in Syria. The name is of obscure origin; the Arab etymology dayr al-murrân, “ash-tree convent”, is suspect, and Syriac does not offer a satisfactory explanation. The better known of the two monasteries was near Damascus, though its exact location cannot be determined. It was on the lower slopes of the Diabal Kays (Tabari, ii, 1270, 1792; Yakut, ii, 672), overlooking the orchards of the Ghita, near the gateway of Bâb al-Farâdis and a pass (takababa) where we may see in all probability the Baradad [q.v.] gorge. It was a large monastery, embellished with mosaics in the Umayyad era, and around it was built a village and, one presumes, a residence in which the caliphs could both entertain themselves and keep watch over their capital. Dayr Murrân was in this respect a counterpart of Dayr Murran. It was in fact in the other direction, to Damascus to put down the revolt of the Kays. Dayr Murrân was made well-known in the 4th/10th century by the poets Abu l-Faradj al-Babbaghâ (al-Tha‘alîbi, Yatima, i, 180), and of it is known by historians and geographers, especially by a panegyrist to Damascus to Hasatche, Mosul and Baghdad. It was probably the site of the ancient town of Kufa on the way to Surâ (Tabari, ii, 644). Al-Ash’âth chose it as an assembly point for his troops after ‘Ali had sent him to fight the Khâridjites (Tabari, i, 3422-4). Al-Muhtâr reached this Dayr in his bidding farewell to Yazîd b. Anas whom he sent to occupy Mosul (Tabari, ii, 644).

(SALEH A. EL-ALI)

DAYR SAMÂN, the name of various places in Syria, often confused by writers past and present, which corresponded to the sites of Christian monasteries still flourishing during the first centuries of Islam. Among the monasteries to which the name Simeon, common in Syria, was given, were Dayr Murran and also incorrectly applied to the Dayr Murrân at Damascus, and the Byzantine constructions built on hill-tops (called in every case Diabal Samân) in the region of Antioch. The most important of the monasteries was 40 km. north-west of Aleppo, and owed its fame to a Styliote who lived there, Simeon the Elder. In the 4th/10th century it suffered severely during the wars between Byzantines and Arabs and, later, between Fatimids and Hamdanids. By Ayyubid times it had probably been abandoned. Nevertheless one of the most interesting archaeological sites in northern Syria today is the remains of the ‘basilica of St. Simeon’ together with the ruins of the extensive quarters which accommodated pilgrims (to which the modern word dayr refers in particular). In the Middle Ages the Muslims transformed the basilica into a fortress called Kal‘at Samân. A second monastery, situated on the road from Antioch to Suwaydïyya, commemorated the Styliote Simeon the Younger, and it is no doubt to this Dayr Samân that the description by Ibn Butlân, reproduced by Yâkût (ii, 672), applies.


(D. SOURDEL)

DAYR AL-ZÔR, a small Syrian town, 195 m. above sea-level, on the right bank of the Euphrates. A suspension bridge 450 m. long, completed in 1931, crosses the river a short distance down-stream from the town. In 1867 it became the chief town of a sanâq and later of a mukâ‘a, and today it has a modern aspect about it. The majority of its 22,000 inhabitants are Sunni Muslims, and the small Christian minority comprises mainly Armenian refugees from former Turkish possessions. There are three mosques and several Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches. It is an important military centre, and also a stopping-place on the road from Aleppo and Damascus to Hasatchê, Mosul and Baghdad. It thus takes the part played in the Middle Ages by Rahbat Makâ and Kârkâsiyä.

It was probably the site of the ancient town of Ausara, from which, via the transposition Auzara, the name Dayr al-Zôr is derived. Its meaning is now explained as “convent set in a grove”, referring to the clusters of tamarisks along side the river. We may suppose that in the immediate neighbourhood of Dayr al-Zôr lay the Dayr al-Rummân mentioned by Yâkût (ii, 662) between al-Râkka and Khâbrâb.
DAYR AL-ZOR — DEDE


DAYSANIYYA, Daysanites or Disanites, disciples of Bar Dişân, Bardesanes, Ibn Daysân, the celebrated syncretist heresarch of Edessa, 154 (or 134)-201 A.D., co-disciple and contemporary of Abgar the Great. Arab authors writing of the dualists have placed him among the false prophets, his dualist conception which, according to Arab writers, is the source of reverence given to the heads of Darwlsh communities, as alternative for ata and baba. The meaning “father” is attested in şhâz as early as the Divan lügâtü al-Turk (compare C. Brockelmann, *Middle Persian* (with Vortickas), Budapest and Leipzig 1928, under dâdê). In western Turkish heroic tales, the term is also used (again as an alternative for ata) for the rhapsodes, thus Korkut Ata, or Dede Korkut [q.v.]. During the period of the Roman Empire, as the *Diwdn lughdt al-Turk* (Leipzig 1928, under dado).

DEAD SEA [see BAHR LÜT].

DEBDOU [see DUBDO].

DECCAN [see DAKHAN].

DEDE, literally “grandfather, ancestor”, a term of reverence given to the heads of Darwh communities, as alternative for ata and baba. The meaning “father” is attested in şhâz as early as the Divan lügâtü al-Turk (compare C. Brockelmann, *Middle Persian* (with Vortickas), Budapest and Leipzig 1928, under dâdê). In western Turkish heroic tales, the term is also used (again as an alternative for ata) for the rhapsodes, thus Korkut Ata, or Dede Korkut [q.v.]. Concerning its use preceding a proper name in ancient Anatolian, cf. Ismail Hakki Uzunçarşı, *Osmans tekhâldına methal*, İstanbul 1941, 173 (Dede Bâlî in a Germiyan deed of foundation).

Dede, following the name, is used predominantly of a priest of the Syrian goddess, at the very time Lucian of Samosata described the ceremonies performed there (Lucian was born about 120 A.D.). It is, no doubt, in his interpretation of Salvation that the origin must be found of the myths about the mingling of light and darkness, as given by Ibn al-Nadîm and al-Şâhârstânî. The *Dialogue on the Laws on the Lands*, the principal surviving work of Bar Dişân—with the very remarkable text on Destiny preserved by Eusebius—allows us to understand his basic philosophy as distinguishing between the physical state of being, herologically dependent upon the stars (it is possible to find an echo of his argumentation against the belief in astrological determinism in the chapter Ibn Ḥazm devotes to refuting the astrologers, Cairo ed., iv, 24), and the moral destiny which, like the escape from darkness, results from the contradiction between the irremediably determined nature of matter and the free nature granted to man by his Creator, who made him in his own image. Moreover this God is, above all, the co-ordinator and creator of a hierarchy of beings whose original characters and affinities he has defined, and in conformity with which this world is constantly built up and destroyed. It is furthermore a world of failure—and here the Manichean spirit is revealed—where God in his patience allows confusion and promiscuity until, after the passage of 6,000 years, he will recreate a world all whiteness, light and good.

Bardesanes’ reputation as an astrologer, despite his own very clearly defined attitude, was finally fixed by St. Ephraem who fought against him in his own town of Edessa, wrote sermons against him and composed hymns which were destined to supplant those by Bardesanes. Posterity, while recognizing his attitude against Marcion, nevertheless included him in the line of Manicheans, alongside Marcion. The Arab authors followed suit. For the Christian heresiologists his philosophy, elaborated under the influence of Valentinism, is tainted with Manicheism.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Nadîm, Cairo edn., 474; al-şâhârstânî, on the margin of Ibn Ḥazm, Cairo, ii, 70-2; ʿAbâ v al-Mâhir al-Baghdâdi, Cairo 1910, 335; Bâkîlânî, al-Maqrîzî, Cairo 1917, 217; F. Nau, Bardisan l’Astrologue. Le livre des lois des pays, Paris 1899; idem, *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*, s.v. (with bibliography).

(A. ABE)
In 1950 Ettore Rossi discovered a second incomplete manuscript in the Vatican Library (Un nuovo manoscritto del "Kitāb-i Dede Qorqut" in RSO, xcv (1950), 34-43), which he published in facsimile with an Italian translation of the whole work and a 95-page introductory study. In 1958 Muharrem Ergin published a new transcription of the whole text with the facsimiles of both the original manuscripts and an introduction. A promised second volume will contain an index, grammar and notes. The work also aroused interest in Ağharbavdān (for a criticism, on ideological grounds, see Osi-Probleme, iii, no. 35, 1951). An edition of the text appeared in Baku in 1939, and a Russian translation, based on an manuscript left by Barthold, in 1950.

The publication of the complete text in 1916 gave great impetus to Dede Korkut studies, and since then a growing number of scholars have been occupied with elucidating many historical, literary, linguistic, ethnological and folkloristic problems of the work. Despite the remarkable contributions of the above-mentioned authors and other scholars (among them M. F. Köprüli, A. İnan, P. N. Boratav, Hamid Aralış, Walter Ruben, Faruk Sümer, M. F. Kirzögüler, etc.) these problems continue to be controversial and there is still disagreement as to the date, authorship, the origin of the existing text, the identity of the heroes and of the place-names, etc. As research stands at present, we can cautiously assume that these stories were collected from oral tradition and put together and polished by an unknown author, probably during the second half of the 9th/15th century. They seem to be mainly based on the reminiscences of the Oghuz Turks concerning their life in their original home in Central Asia. In the present text they relate the life of the Oghuz Turkish tribes in north-eastern Anatolia, the deeds of their prince Bayundur Khan and his chief Salur Kazan Beg, of his wife Burla Khatun, and his son Uruz and their companions, their battles against other Turkish tribes and against the Black Sea Greeks and Georgians. The effect of Islamic culture is superficial. The pre-Islamic elements have strong common characteristics, in expression, style and content, with Anatolian and Central Asian popular literature (e.g., Beyrek) still live in Turkish folklore in slightly altered versions, and two tales (Depegoz and Deli Dumrul) show striking resemblances to Greek legends (Cyclops and Admetus) (cf. C. S. Mundy, Polyphemus and Tegeboś, BSOAS, xviii, 1956, 279-302).

Bibliography: Detailed bibliographical data are given in the following works: Orhan Şak Gökyay, Dede Korkut, Istanbul 1938; Ettore Rossi, Il Kitāb-i Dede Qorqut, Vatican 1952; P. N. Boratav, Korkut Ata, in İA; idem, Dede Korkut hikayelerindeki tarîhî olaylar ve kitabın telifi tarihî, TM, xiii, 1958, 30-62; Muharrem Ergin, Dede Korkut Kitabı, i, Giriş-Metin-Fasımlı, Ankara 1958. For a recent study of the language of the work see E. M. Demircizade, Kitabı Dede Korkut dastanlarının dili, Baku 1959. A German translation of the text was published by J. Hein, Das Buch des Dede Korkut, Zürich 1958.

(Fahri Iz)

DEDE SULTAN, epitaph of a great religious fanatic by name of Bürdüliye Muṣṭafâ, who was prominent in Anatolia in the time of Meḥmed I (further information under BADE AL-DIN B. KĀDICMAWS). (FR. TAESCHNER)

DEFTER [see DAFTA].

DEFTER-I KHAḴĀNĪ [see DAFTA-I KHAḴĀNĪ].
DEFTERDAR — DELI

DEFTER EMINI, the title given in the Ottoman Empire to the director of the Daftar-i Khakan (q.v.).

DEFTERDAR — DELI

DEFTERDAR [see DAFTARDAR].

DEFTER EMINI, the title given in the Ottoman Empire to the director of the Daftar-i Khakan (q.v.). This area, especially the southern part, is dependent on the river for its irrigation and its consequent fertility—especially in the region of Balkh (Bamiyan district), and flows in a general northerly direction through several natural lakes, past Mad(ar) and Ribat-i Karwan, finally reaching the region of Balkh (q.v.). Today the river is called Balkh-āb. The neglect of the irrigation system in the late Middle Ages, however, this was also one name for the Amu Darya (q.v.).

The river is called Balkh-āb. Because of its importance for Balkh, the Delās was also called Nahr Balkh (e.g., Huddā al-Sā`ām. xi, 73, 211, no. 24); in the Middle Ages, however, this was also one name for the Amū Darya (q.v.). Today the river is called Balkh-āb. The neglect of the irrigation system in the late middle ages and in modern times has caused the once country-side to revert to marsh land, and brought about the complete decline of the Balkh region.

In ancient times the Delās was known as Bābxcptos or ζαιρατζες and reached as far as the Oxus (Strabo, xi, 4, 2 (516); Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclop., ii, 2814). Since Islamic times its waters have become dispersed in canals or in swamps.


Maps: Huddā al-Ālam, 339; Fraser-Tyler, 11.

(B. SPULER)

DEHNNANI, KHOQA, Anatolian poet of the 7th/13th century, one of the earliest representatives of the dāwān poetry. Almost nothing is known about his life except that he came from Khurasan and was at one time at the court of the Seljuk sultan ʿAlī al-Dīn Kaykūbād III, for whom he wrote a Sāḥibkhāna of 20,000 couplets which has not come down to us (M. F. Köprüli, Anadolu Selçuklu Tarihinini Yerli Kaynakları, in Belleten, vii, 27, 396-7). Only ten of his poems survive; they have been assembled from various nasīra collections and published from 1926 onwards (see bibliography). Dēhnnānī, unlike his contemporaries, does not dwell on mystical or religious-didactic themes, but sings, with remarkable mastery of ḍurr and a flowing style, worldly love, wine and other set themes of dūrān poems.

Bibliography: Köprüli, Sābihkhana Mehmed Fu'ād, Khoqa Dēhnnānī, in Hayât, i, i, Ankara 1926; idem, Sābihkhana evvi edebiyatı hakkında bazı notlar, in Hayât, iv, 303, Ankara 1928; Meclül Mansuroğlu, Anadolu Türkçesi, xiii aqv., Dēhnānī ve Mansemeleri, Istanbul 1947. (Faik Iz)

DEIR EZ-ZOR [see DAWR AL-ZOR].

DELI, Turkish adjective, meaning "mad, heedless, brave, fiery" etc. In the Ottoman empire the dēlis were a class of cavalry formed originally in the Balkans (Runeli, q.v.) at the end of the 9th/15th or the beginning of the 10th/16th century. Although later official usage, abandoning their true name, styled them delis (guides), they continued to be popularly known by their original name until recent times.

The dēlis were recruited partly among Turks and partly from Balkan nations such as the Bulgars, Croats, and Serbs. At first they were private retainers in the suites of the Beylerbeyi (Beylerbeyi, q.v.) of Rumeli and of the border beys. They were called delis, "mad", on account of their extraordinary courage and recklessness. The caliph ʿUmar was considered the patron of their odeja. Their motto was yasṭalān gevr bağa, "what is written (i.e., destined) will come to pass".

The delis were armed with curved scimitars, concave shields, spars, and maces (bozdogan) attached to their saddles. They wore hats made of the skin of wild animals, such as hyenas or leopards, trimmed with eagles' feathers, and their shields were also decorated with such feathers. Their clothes and horsecloths were made of the skins of lions, tigers and foxes, and their breeches of wolves' or bears' skins, with the hairy side showing. Their calf-length spurred boots, pointed at the toes and high at the back, were known as serhaddi or border boots. Their horses were renowned for their strength and endurance. They received a fixed salary from the Beylerbeyi or the Beys whom they served. In his Ṭabaqāt al-Mamālik ʿī Darājūc al-Maslīk, Ǧīlamzāde Muṣṭafa Čelebi mentions the delis of the Bey of Semendere, Yαhya Pasha-zade Bālī Bey, in connection with the Mohacz expedition, and describes their clothes. In the first half of the 10th/16th century the forces of dēlis of Yāḥya Pasha-zade Bālī Bey and Mehmedmed Bey and of Ghiśl Khusrew, Bey of the sandjak of Bosnia, were famous in the Balkans; Khusrew Bey had 10,000 delis in addition to his other forces.

The cavalry organization of the delis spread later to Anatolia, where delis were numbered among the retainers of vezārs and Beylerbeyis. The clothes of dēlis were changed in the 12th/18th century, when they were seen to wear pipe-like hats some twenty-six inches long, made of black lambskin with a turban wound round them.

Fifty to sixty dēlis made up a company (under a standard, bayrak), groups of several companies being commanded by one delibashi. A new recruit was attached to the retinue of the agha (q.v.), i.e., after learning the customs of the odeja and proving his worth he took an oath to serve the Faith and the State and to be steadfast in battle. At the end of the ceremony, which included prayers, the recruit would then be entered as an agha-dragǎl (apprentice to an agha), a delis' hat being ceremonially placed on his head. Delis breaking their oath, failing to observe the rules of the odeja, or deserting from the battlefield, were expelled and deprived of their hat. In the middle of the 11th/17th century a delis' daily pay amounted to 12 or 15 aspers (akçe), according to Rycaut; Marsigli, writing at a later date, says that dēlis were paid only while on active service.

The delis served the state well in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries, but later they became disorganized like the other military units. Delis deprived of a patron, either through the dismissal of the agha, or as a result of being paid off, wandered about in search of a new patron, raiding villages in the meantime. In the second half of the 12th/18th century their depredations were centred in the regions of Kūthayya and Konya. A delibashi by the name of Kōdja-Başghī, who stood at the head of a numerous band, was notorious at Kūthayya towards the end of the century. While the
**DELI — DELI-ORMAN**

**DELI** is the historical name of a district, the greater part of which lies in north-eastern Bulgaria and the remainder in southern Roumania. But as the term is a popular one, exact boundaries cannot be given. It is usually applied to the triangle, the apex of which is at the town of Ruse, and the two arms formed by the Danube and the Rusek-Varna railway, while the base is somewhat undefined and runs at a certain distance from the coast of the Black Sea. On the north-east, Deli-Orman is bounded by the Dobruja, in the south by the Bulgarian provinces of Tozkul and Gerlovo. The most important places in Deli-Orman are the towns of Buluun, Deli-Orman, Erzurum, Karaman, and Gerlovo adjoining on the south. The Turks of this district form a particular type; they are remarkable for their tall stature and athletic build. Their language reveals dialectical peculiarities which are not found elsewhere in the Ottoman Turkish system but can be paralleled among the Christian Gagauz of Bessarabia. These peculiarities form the reason why they are regarded by some students as descendants of the Turkish Bulgars (K. and Ch. V. Skorpil, Pametnici na gr. Odessos'arna, Varna 1898, 4-6) and sometimes as descendants of the Kumans (V. Moskov, Turetskiya plemena na Balkanskom poluostrvre, in Izv. Imp. Russk. Geogr. Ogledstvou, xi, 1904, 409-17). But a strict philological analysis proves no more than that their language shows certain North Turkish features which perhaps go back to an old North Turkish substratum in the population. This substratum was however assimilated in two waves of southern Turkish elements which came later (cf. T. Kowalski, Les Turcs et la langue turque de la Bulgarie du Nord-Est, in Memoires de la Commission Orientliste de l'Academie Polonaise des Sc. et des Lettres, no. 16, 1933). Nevertheless it is significant that in the Balkan Peninsula the most compact mass of Turks is found not in the south-east but in the north-east, which makes very probable the hypothesis of a very early Turkish settlement in the lands south of the lower Danube. Turkish immigration in the 13th/14th centuries, when they were a grave evil to the people of Anatolia. This prompted the Grand Vizier Yusuf Dii Pasha to decide in Aleppo, on his return from the Egyptian expedition, to recon- 

Deli-Orman only a generation ago was still inhabited predominantly by Turks, but since the middle of the 19th century Bulgarian colonization has been steadily increasing. Nevertheless the Turks still form a considerable percentage of the population. One hears Turkish spoken everywhere, as is also the case in the provinces of Tozkul and Gerlovo adjoining on the south.

The Turks of this district form a particular type; they are remarkable for their tall stature and athletic build. Their language reveals dialectical peculiarities which are not found elsewhere in the Ottoman Turkish system but can be paralleled among the Christian Gagauz of Bessarabia. These peculiarities form the reason why they are regarded by some students as descendants of the Turkish Bulgars (K. and Ch. V. Skorpil, Pametnici na gr. Odessos'arna, Varna 1898, 4-6) and sometimes as descendants of the Kumans (V. Moskov, Turetskiya plemena na Balkanskom poluostrvre, in Izv. Imp. Russk. Geogr. Ogledstvou, xi, 1904, 409-17). But a strict philological analysis proves no more than that their language shows certain North Turkish features which perhaps go back to an old North Turkish substratum in the population. This substratum was however assimilated in two waves of southern Turkish elements which came later (cf. T. Kowalski, Les Turcs et la langue turque de la Bulgarie du Nord-Est, in Memoires de la Commission Orientliste de l'Academie Polonaise des Sc. et des Lettres, no. 16, 1933). Nevertheless it is significant that in the Balkan Peninsula the most compact mass of Turks is found not in the south-east but in the north-east, which makes very probable the hypothesis of a very early Turkish settlement in the lands south of the lower Danube. Turkish immigration in the 13th/14th centuries, when they were a grave evil to the people of Anatolia. This prompted the Grand Vizier Yusuf Dii Pasha to decide in Aleppo, on his return from the Egyptian expedition, to recon- 

Deli-Orman only a generation ago was still inhabited predominantly by Turks, but since the middle of the 19th century Bulgarian colonization has been steadily increasing. Nevertheless the Turks still form a considerable percentage of the population. One hears Turkish spoken everywhere, as is also the case in the provinces of Tozkul and Gerlovo adjoining on the south.

The Turks of this district form a particular type; they are remarkable for their tall stature and athletic build. Their language reveals dialectical peculiarities which are not found elsewhere in the Ottoman Turkish system but can be paralleled among the Christian Gagauz of Bessarabia. These peculiarities form the reason why they are regarded by some students as descendants of the Turkish Bulgars (K. and Ch. V. Skorpil, Pametnici na gr. Odessos'arna, Varna 1898, 4-6) and sometimes as descendants of the Kumans (V. Moskov, Turetskiya plemena na Balkanskom poluostrvre, in Izv. Imp. Russk. Geogr. Ogledstvou, xi, 1904, 409-17). But a strict philological analysis proves no more than that their language shows certain North Turkish features which perhaps go back to an old North Turkish substratum in the population. This substratum was however assimilated in two waves of southern Turkish elements which came later (cf. T. Kowalski, Les Turcs et la langue turque de la Bulgarie du Nord-Est, in Memoires de la Commission Orientliste de l'Academie Polonaise des Sc. et des Lettres, no. 16, 1933). Nevertheless it is significant that in the Balkan Peninsula the most compact mass of Turks is found not in the south-east but in the north-east, which makes very probable the hypothesis of a very early Turkish settlement in the lands south of the lower Danube. Turkish immigration in the 13th/14th centuries, when they were a grave evil to the people of Anatolia. This prompted the Grand Vizier Yusuf Dii Pasha to decide in Aleppo, on his return from the Egyptian expedition, to recon-
Leipzig 1879 (with full indexes); C. Jireček, Das Furstenthum Bulgarien, ... The word Demirbash also means stubborn or persistent, and it is usually assumed that this was the sense in which it was in Albania. In Ottoman times sandiafi-bey of one single bazar street set in the midst of olive, lemon and pomegranate trees, surmounted by the Delvina (so in Turkish and Albanian; Gk. Άξιοστού, inhabitants numbered about 3000 before 1940, of miles from the shores of the Ionian sea, and consists sandjak of the same name, fisheries, olive plantations, and retail trade. Delvina, shown by the church of St. Nicholas (Kisha She’ni on the Ottoman globe-trotter. The largest mosque of all the Islamic places of worship of older times, with the exception of the mosque of Hadjiddi Ahmed Agha built in 1269/1852. In 1913 Delvina came within the newly established principality of Albania, having formerly belonged to Greece (cf. L. von Thalliczy, Illyrisch-albanische Forschungen, i, Munich and Leipzig 1916, 360 (Delvina in 1847), and ii, 240 (transfer to Albania); also Edith P. Stickney, Southern Albania 1912-1923, Stanford 1926, passim.

**Bibliography:** In addition to references above: Rumeli und Bosna geographisch beschrieben von Mustafa Ben Abdalla Hadschi Challa, tr. J. von Hammer, Vienna 1812, 130 (whence the misspelling “Delonia”); M. F. Thien, Die europäische Turkey, Vienne 1828, 58 ff. (also “Delonia”); Fr. Babinger in Karl Baedeker, Dalmatien und die Adria, Leipzig 1891, passim. Delvina was seldom visited and described by travellers, but cf. W. Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, i, London 1835; cf. here the important statements made by Frasheri, Kâmus al-s’lâm, iii, Istanbul 1308/1889, 2153, with detailed information on Delvina up to 1890. For the 19th century the most important source is Ewliya Çelebi, Sevâhîname, viii, 668 ff., on the opposition of the Albanian population to the Ottomans at the end of the 19th century cf. Fr. Babinger, Das Ende der Arianiten, SBBayr. Ak., ms., there enumerated. On the Delvina basin cf. H. Louis, Albanien. Eine Landeskunde, Stuttgart 1927, 9 ff., esp. 102. See further ARNAWUTLUK. The modern town of Delvina was also a centre of the Khalwet order of dervishes, which was spread in the direction of Albania about 937/1530 by one Ya’qûb Efendi of Yanina, to be later supplanted by the Efkâns. The Khalwets attracted a considerable following there, and some of the 12 mosques, two madrasas, and baths owed their beginnings to the adherents of this order. Yusuf Sinan, son of the same Ya’qûb Efendi, has expatiated upon this point in detail in his Memâhî-i Sherîf [sic] we tarîhname-yi pîrân we mehmedisî-i tarih-i âlîsî-yi Khalwatisiye, Istanbul 1290/1873; cf. H. J. Kissling in ZDMG, ciii, 1953, 121.

Delvina is depicted as a sizeable colony by Ewliya Çelebi in the Sevâhîname, viii, 668 ff.; it had first come into contact with the Ottomans in 835/1432-2 through the incursions of Sinân Paşa (cf. Hâddidi Khalifa, Tabawim al-tawârîkh, Istanbul 1146, 104), but was not definitely brought under sujukte 941/1537, by the Albanian Ayâs Paşa [a. n.] in the reign of Sulaymân the Magnificent (cf. Fr. Babinger, Rumelische Streifen, Berlin 1938, 9 ff.). The pentagonal castle, open towards the east, in the interior of which was the residence of the fort governor, a mosque, powder-magazine, and granaries, made a deep impression on the Ottoman globe-trotter. Nothing has remained of all the Islamic places of worship of former times, with the exception of the mosque of Hzâddidi Ahmed Agha built in 1269/1852. In 1913 Delvina came within the newly established principality of Albania, having formerly belonged to Greece (cf. L. von Thalliczy, Illyrisch-albanische Forschungen, i, Munich and Leipzig 1916, 360 (Delvina in 1847), and ii, 240 (transfer to Albania); also Edith P. Stickney, Southern Albania 1912-1923, Stanford 1926, passim.

**Bibliography:** In addition to references above: Rumeli und Bosna geographisch beschrieben von Mustafa Ben Abdalla Hadschi Challa, tr. J. von Hammer, Vienna 1812, 130 (whence the misspelling “Delonia”); M. F. Thien, Die europäische Turkey, Vienne 1828, 58 ff. (also “Delonia”); Fr. Babinger in Karl Baedeker, Dalmatien und die Adria, Leipzig 1891, passim. Delvina was seldom visited and described by travellers, but cf. W. Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, i, London 1835; cf. here the important statements made by Frasheri, Kâmus al-s’lâm, iii, Istanbul 1308/1889, 2153, with detailed information on Delvina up to 1890. For the 19th century the most important source is Ewliya Çelebi, Sevâhîname, viii, 668 ff., on the opposition of the Albanian population to the Ottomans at the end of the 19th century cf. Fr. Babinger, Das Ende der Arianiten, SBBayr. Ak., ms., there enumerated. On the Delvina basin cf. H. Louis, Albanien. Eine Landeskunde, Stuttgart 1927, 9 ff., esp. 102. See further ARNAWUTLUK.
applied by the Turks to King Charles XII of Sweden. It is, however, also possible that the nickname is an ironic comment on his long frequentation of Turkish government offices.

Bibliography: BSLP, 1960/1, xxxiii. (Ed.)

DEMIR KAPI [see Dari Ahanin].

DENMAT [see Damnat].

DEMOKRAT PARTI, Turkish political party, registered on 7 January 1946. In the general elections held in July of the same year, the party put up 273 candidates for 465 seats; sixty one of them were elected, forming the main opposition group. The first party congress, held on 7 January 1947, formally adopted the party programme and charter. As a result of various internal disagreements, notably the secession of a group of deputies who formed the National Party (Millet Partisi) in July 1948, the strength of the Democrat Party in the Assembly had fallen by 1950 to 31. Their influence in the country, however, continued to grow, and in the general election of May 1950 they won a clear majority. The Democrat Party now took over the government of the country, and remained in power for the next ten years. A series of cabinets was formed, Celâl Bayar and Adnan Menderes retaining the offices of President and Prime Minister respectively. In the general elections of 1954 the D. P. won an increased majority, but in the election of 1957 they were able to win only a plurality, which, however, gave them a clear parliamentary majority over a divided opposition. After a period of mounting discontent, the Democrat Party was ousted from power by the reaction of 27 May 1960. It was formally dissolved on 29 September 1960.

Bibliography: K. H. Karpatic, Turkey’s politics, the transition to a multi-party system, Princeton 1959, 408-31 and passim; Tanik Z. Tunaya, Türkiye’dede Siyasi Partiler, Istanbul 1953, 646-92; B. Lewis, Democracy in Turkey, in MEA, x, 1959, 55-72; G. Lewis, Turkey: the end of the first Republic, in World Today, September 1960, 377-86; surveys of events in COC, MEA, MEJ, OM. (Ed.)

DEMOTIKA [see Dimetoka].

DENEB [see Nugum’s].

DENIZLI, chief town of the wilayet of the same name, in south-western Anatolia. Situated in a fertile plain which has been inhabited since the earliest times, Denizli in the 14th century replaced Ladik, the ancient Laodicea ad Lyicum, whose ruins stand at Eski Hişar, on the Çürük Şu, a tributary of the Büyük Menderes, near the railway station of Gondjiali, 9 km. from Denizli. Built in the 3rd century B.C. by the Seleucid Antiochus II on the site of the ancient Dionysos (Pliny, v, 195). Laodicea controlled an important meeting point of trade routes, and in Roman times was ranked as one of the principal towns of Phrygia (Strabo, xii, 578). Until the end of the 11th century Laodicea was Byzantine, but it was then disputed between the Comneni and the Saljukid Turks who took possession of it on several occasions. Alexis I captured it from them in 491/1009 and held it temporarily (Anna Comnena, ed. Leib, iii, 407). In 513/1129, it was recaptured and fortified by John Comnenus (Cinn., 5; Nicetas, 172); although sacked in 553/1158 and 585/1189 by Turkish tribes who had settled at about that time, in the district, it nevertheless remained in the hands of the Byzantines (Cinn., 198; Nicetas, 163, 523) until 602/1206, on which date Theodore Lascaris was forced to cede Laodicea and Chonae (now Honaz) to Manuel Mavrokomnes, father-in-law of Gıyâth-ad-Din Kaykhusraw I (Nicetas, 842; Houtsmans, Rec. de textes ré. à l’hist. des Saljûq, iii, 66-7; iv, 26). However in 653/1257 Izz-ad-Din Kaykhusraw II gave the town to Michael Palaeologus in order to secure his help against his brother Rukun ad-Din and the latter's allies, the Mongols; but the little Greek garrison could no longer hold out (Acropolitius, 238-4) and two years later the town was once again in the hands of the Turcomans. It is at about this time, in eastern documents, that together with Ladik one comes across the name of Tohuzlu; this name was later to be changed to Delik, and it was to take the place of Ladik in the 14th century. In 659/1261 the chief Turcoman of the district, Mehmed Beg—who must not be confused with the Karâmâni of the same name who died in 675/1277, nor with Mehmed Beg Aydınoglu who died in 734/1334—rose in revolt against Izz-ad-Din Kaykhusraw and conquered the district; then, refusing allegiance to the Seljukid princes, he asked Hülagü for a charter of formal investiture for the towns of Tohuzlu, Khônâs (Honaz) and Tâłâmanî (Dalarman). Thus the first Turcoman principality of Delik was founded, but it was short-lived: in 660/1262, at the request of Rukun ad-Din, Hülagü marched against Mehmed Beg who was defeated and put to death. His son-in-law All Beg became chief of the Turcomans of the region, while the towns of Lâdik and Khônâs were included in the possessions which were granted, in 669/1271, to the sons of the vizier Fâhîr ad-Din Allî. It was, no doubt, in order to regain his independence that All Beg took part, in 675/1277, in the revolt of Djimîrî and Mehmed the Karâmânî; but he was defeated by the sultan’s army and put to death. However, as a result of the weakness of the central authority, the Tohuzlu-Ladik region fell into the hands of the Turcoman amirs of Germîyan who in the last quarter of the 13th century seized the town of Kütaiya and lost no time in proclaiming their independence. According to the accounts of Al-Umarî and Ibn Baṭṭûṭa who visited the town in 730/1330 and 732/1332, Tohuzlu and the surrounding districts were at that time in the hands of an amir of the Germîyan family, Ynânî Beg. However the town, though still prosperous, was no longer the centre of a principality; for the conquests of the Turcoman amirs of Menteshe, who, at the end of the 13th century, took possession of the coast of Caria; Tohuzlu which was disputed between the amirs of Menteshe and the Germîyan thereby lost its position as a frontier post and could no longer remain the centre of a principality of any great importance. In 792/1390, the district of Tohuzlu-Ladik was restored to the Ottoman empire at the same time as the amirate of Germîyan. Temporarily given back to the Germîyan by Timûr who stayed in the town in the autumn of 1402, Tohuzlu served as a residence, in the reign of Bâyezîd II, for one of his sons; it was at that time the chief town of a liwâ† attached to the eydâ‡ of Anatolia. In the 17th century it was reduced to the rank of bâdî† attached to the sanâqâ* of Kütaiya. It was at that time that the name Tohuzlu was replaced by Delik, under which name the town was mentioned in the accounts of Ewilya Celebi and Kâtîb Celebi. According to these travellers, Delizli was then divided into 24 districts and included 7 mosques; a small fort protected the bazaar, whilst the population was housed outside the town proper, in gardens and fields; this situation still remains to the present day and, despite the allegations of European travellers
in the 19th century, it is not the consequence of the terrible earthquake which struck the town in 1702, when 12,000 people perished. Although Denizli has never managed to regain the position of importance it enjoyed in the Middle Ages, since the Republic was established it has once again become increasingly prosperous. In 1891 a railway line was built connecting Deliizi, via Gondjall, with the Izmirt-Egirdir line; Deliizi, which since the end of the 19th century had been the chief town of a sanjak attached to the district of Aydin, after the Republic was established it became the chief town of the sanjak of Deliizi. The population consisted of 19,461 inhabitants in 1940 (compared with 15,787 in 1927). Deliizi now possesses a Lycée and is a centre for agricultural products (fruit, cereals, tobacco, cotton, sesame, poppy-seed) and handicraft industries (tanning, weaving, carpet-making). The remains of the ancient towns scattered about the region (ruins of Laodicaea, Hierapolis, Hydrela, Kolossai, Chonae) also make it an important tourist centre.


**DEOBAND,** in the Saharanpur district of Uttar Pradesh, is a place of great antiquity but its early history is shrouded in myth and romance. In one of the many groves which almost surrounds the site there is an ancient temple of Devi. On this account the name is supposed to be a corruption of Devi-ban, 'forest of the goddess'. The earliest recorded reference to it is found in the Ā‘in-i Akbari where Abu ’l-Fadl refers to a fort of 'baked bricks in Deoband'. Monuments of Deoband are, however, found in Deoband. The Češa Masjddie, which is supposed to be one of the oldest monuments of Deoband, dating back early to the 12th century. According to tradition, Shaykh ‘Ali al-Din known as Shāh-i Dīngal Bâsh, who lies buried there, was a pupil of Ibn al-Djawzi and a disciple of Shaykh Shihâb al-Din Suhrwardi. Some mosques and other buildings constructed during the reigns of Sikandar Lodî (894-923/1489-1527), Akbar (933-1024/1556-1605), and Awrangzib (1668-1185/1668-1707) are still extant.

Deoband is known to-day for its great seat of Muslim religious learning, the Dâr al-‘Ulum, founded by Hâjí Muhammad ‘Abid Husayn with the support of three eminent scholars in the Education Department, and to which Mawlavi Muhammad Kâsim was appointed as patron-principal in 1824/1867. During the last 90 years this institution has accomplished a great deal for the advancement of Muslim religious institutions. It combines the characteristics of three different types of religious institutions which existed in Dihli, Lucknow and Kâhyrâbâd during the 13th/19th century. The institutions of Dihli emphasized the teaching of tasvîr and h âdîq; the institutions of Lucknow [see Dâr al-‘Ulum, (c), (d)] took to šîkh, while Kâhyrâbâd [q.v.] specialized in ‘ulm al-kâlam and philosophy. Deoband represents a synthesis of these three experiments, but its main emphasis has been on the traditions established by Sháh Wali Allah and his Dihli school of muhaddithin. It attracts students from many different parts of the Muslim world. Residential accommodation is provided for nearly 1500 students. The buildings of the Dâr al-‘Ulum include a mosque, a library, and a number of separate lecture halls for hadîth, tasvîr, šîkh etc. Its library, though without a catalogue, is one of the biggest manuscript libraries in India. It comprises 67,000 Arabic, Persian and Urdu books, both printed and manuscript. The system of instruction is traditional and the emphasis is more on building up a religious personality than on imparting knowledge with a view to fulfilling the requirements of the modern age. The institution has, therefore, produced mainly religious leaders though its contribution in the political sphere cannot be ignored. Many of those associated with it have been in the forefront of the national struggle for freedom. The principal officers of the Dâr al-‘Ulum are: Sarprast (patron), mukhamim (secretary), Šadr mudarris (principal) and Muftî. Very eminent persons like Mawlânâ Rashîd Ahmad Ganguhi, Mawlânâ Muhammad Ya’qûb, Mawlânâ Agha Ser ‘Allî, Shaykh al-Hind Mâhmûd Hasan, Mawlânà Anwar Shâh Khâshmiri and Sayyid Husayn Ahmad Mâdâni have filled these posts. The present secretary, Mawlânà Muhmmad Tayyib is a grandson of the founder of the institution. The Dâmiyat ‘Ulumâ-i Hind, a very influential organization of the Indian Ulmâ, derives its main ideological strength from the Dâr al-‘Ulum.

**Bibliography:** District Gazetteers of the United Provinces, ii (Lucknow 1921), 224-35; Sayyid Ma’hîbûb Riḍwî, Ta’rîkh Deoband, (Deoband 1372 A.H.); Mawlânà Muḥammad Ya’qûb, izarat-i Hakb, Part i (Morâddâbâd 1939) 49-8; S. M. Ikram, Ma’dî-i Ka’thur, Lahore n.d.; Imâd Şâbihî, Farangiyâd la ā‘il, Dihli 1949, 177-95; W. Cantwell Smith, Modern Islam in India, London 1946, 294-7; Muhammad Miyan, ‘Ulumâ-i Hakb, Mawârid Nâwâet al-‘Ulum, (Muhammad Kâsim), Deoband n.d., 14-5; Husayn Ahmad Mâdanî, Sânârânma Astr-i Mâllâ, Deoband n.d. (on the character and political activities of Shaykh al-Hind Mâhmûd Hasan, the first student and son of a co-founder); Mahbûb Riḍwî, Dâr al-‘Ulum Deoband kâ ta’lîmiha wujûyídât, Deoband n.d.; idem, Dâr al-‘Ulum Deoband eh nazar më, Deoband n.d.; M. O'Dwyer, India as I knew it, 1855-1905, London 1926, 178-81, 189; Manâzir Ahsan Gaylând, Sawâinih Kâsimi, Deoband n.d. (K. A. Nizâmi)

**Dârâdjdât,** name of a tract lying between the River Indus to the east and the Suleymán Mountains to the west, including the modern districts of Dêra Is‘mâ‘îl Kân and Dêra Ghâzî Kân. The name Dârâdjdât is a supposed Persian plural of the Indian word dera, "tent, encampment", and means the "country of the deras", that is, of the three towns Dêra Is‘mâ‘îl Kân, Dêra Ghâzî Kân and Dêra Fâth Kân, founded by Bâhâ’i leaders in the early 10th/16th century. (See BALO£ISTAN). These three towns were all close to the R. Indus, and have been liable to damage by erosion; hence the modern towns show much rebuilding, especially Dêra Is‘mâ‘îl Kân which was largely destroyed under Sikh rule. The mints of Dârâdjdât and Dêra under
the Durrani kings were at Dera Ismail Khan and Dera Ghazi Khan respectively; copper coins were also struck at Dera Fath Khan. Afghan coins form the most important element in the minting especially in the Dāmān or western part, and the Bałād are numerous in the south. (M. Longworth Dames*)

**DERBEND**, a town of Daghstān [q.v.], called Bāb al-Abwāb [q.v.] by the Arabs in the Middle Ages. Only the modern period is described under this heading.

Having belonged to Russia from 1722 to 1735, Derbend was restored to the Persians, and Nādīr Shah attempted to transfer to its former importance; but after the death of this sovereign it passed into the hands of the K̄ān of Kōba, Fath ʿAll (1765). Recaptured by the Russians in 1796, it was soon evacuated, to be ultimately occupied on 21 June/3 July 1806.

Under Russian domination the town has lost its former military importance. It has, however, retained traces of its past as a fortified town, care fully preserved. Of the two walls which formerly enclosed the town and the citadel, the one most badly damaged is the south wall, now reduced to four gates and three towers, whereas the north wall, with its 8 gates and 30 towers, is still intact over almost all its length.

To the north of the town lies the Arab cemetery of Ḳīrḵār, which dates from the 8th/14th century. The old congregational mosque constructed in 728/1328-2 is a Christian church, several mosques of the 17th and 18th centuries, and a few very old caravanserais, remain practically intact. Remains of the old irrigation system bear witness to a very advanced technical civilization.

The economic development of the old fortified city is very remarkable. It is favoured by a well cultivated soil (supporting vines and fruit-trees), a sub-soil rich in petroleum and natural gas, the proximity of the sea which makes it an important railway which allows for the transport of merchandise.

To the north of the town lies the Arab cemetery of Ḳīrḵār, which dates from the 8th/14th century. The old congregational mosque constructed in 728/1328-2 is a Christian church, several mosques of the 17th and 18th centuries, and a few very old caravanserais, remain practically intact. Remains of the old irrigation system bear witness to a very advanced technical civilization.

The economic development of the old fortified city is very remarkable. It is favoured by a well cultivated soil (supporting vines and fruit-trees), a sub-soil rich in petroleum and natural gas, the proximity of the sea which makes it an important fishing-port, and finally the Bākū—Mākhač—Kala railway which allows for the transport of merchandise and the multiplication of food industries which make use of the local produce.

At the beginning of this century Muslims made up about 57 per cent of the population, against 18 per cent of Russians, 16 per cent of Greeks, and 7 per cent Armenians. At that time there was a penetration of socialist ideas under the influence on the one hand of the Bolsheviki organizations of Tiflis and Bākū, on the other of political exiles like L. V. Maligine and some others. The first agitators at Derbend were the Russian railway workers, whose rôle became apparent in the 1905 revolution. In December 1917 Soviet power was established in the town and entrusted to the workers' and soldiers' Soviet set up in the February revolution. From July 1918 to March 1920 the town was stricken with civil war; the power was in the hands of local nationalists ranged against the Bolsheviki, who had to appeal to the Red Army to establish their authority. Since the creation of the Republic of Dāḫistān, Derbend has become the capital of the district of that name, and in importance the second town of the Republic. In 1956 its population was 41,800.


**DERDĪLĪ, Ibrahim**, Turkish folk poet (1106-1161/ 1772-1845). In Şahānlar, a forest village in the province of Bolu, born near the death of his father. Having lost his fortune in Istanbul but was soon forced to go back to his native province. He then spent ten years in Egypt and travelled extensively in Anatolia where he became one of the leading poet-singers of the period. Again in Istanbul under Mahμūd II, he became a popular figure of the coffee-houses frequented by folk poets and wrote his famous hasāda on the fez, praising this newly introduced headgear, which enjoyed for a short time the favour of the court.

Falling into disgrace, he left Istanbul and wandered again in Anatolia and, after an unsuccessful attempt at suicide, died in Ankara.

In his poems in ārād, written in an awkward language, he is an unskilled imitator of dīwān poets, particularly of Fuḍlū [q.v.]. His poems written in the traditional Arabic metre, though not perfect in language and style, echo in sincere tones his vagrant poet, popularly given to certain rulers in Asia Minor who, from the early 12th/18th century, made themselves virtually independent of the Ottoman central government in Istanbul. The Ottoman historians usually call them mutaghallibe, usurers, or, when a politer designation was needed, Khānādān, great families. The derebeyes became in effect vassal princes, ruling over autonomous and hereditary principalities. In time of war they served, with their own contingents, in the Ottoman armies, which came to consist to a large extent of such quasi-feudal levies. Though given, as a matter of form, such titles as muktablābe, officials, or, when a politer designation was needed, Khānādān, great families. The derebeyes became in effect vassal princes, ruling over autonomous and hereditary principalities. In time of war they served, with their own contingents, in the Ottoman armies, which came to consist to a large extent of such quasi-

**DEREBEY, 'valley lord',** the Turkish name popularly given to certain rulers in Asia Minor who, from the early 12th/18th century, made themselves virtually independent of the Ottoman central government in Istanbul. The Ottoman historians usually call them mutaghallibe, usurers, or, when a politer designation was needed, Khānādān, great families. The derebeyes became in effect vassal princes, ruling over autonomous and hereditary principalities. In time of war they served, with their own contingents, in the Ottoman armies, which came to consist to a large extent of such quasi-feudal levies. Though given, as a matter of form, such titles as muktablābe, usurers, or, when a politer designation was needed, Khānādān, great families. The derebeyes became in effect vassal princes, ruling over autonomous and hereditary principalities. In time of war they served, with their own contingents, in the Ottoman armies, which came to consist to a large extent of such quasi-

**Bibliography**: Dīwān, lithograph edition, 1329/1913; Ahmad Ṭalāt, Aşık Derdīlī, Hayāt-Dīwān, Bolu 1928; M. F. Köprüli, Türk Sazşairleri Antolojisi, xi, Istanbul 1940; Cahit Öztelli, Derdīl ve Seyrani, Istanbul 1953. (Fahır İz)
their rivals the Diânikli bitterly opposed them. While on the one hand the struggle between reformers and reactionaries in the capital was confused with the rivalries of the feudal chiefs, on the other the clash between the Capan-oglu and the Diânikli in central and eastern Anatolia assumed the appearance of a quarrel over the Sultan's New Order (see Niżâm-ı Diânî>). Where the derebey{s} did apply the New Order in their territories, they seem to have done so for their own purposes and to their own profit, using government money to strengthen corruption in the application of the New Order by their own armed forces. (For examples of abuse and corruption in the application of the New Order by the derebey{s} see Üşüm, i, 111-3; cf. Alaçura 140, Miller 100-101).

The leading derebeys played a role of some importance in the political struggles of 1807-8, and the victory of the Bayrakdâr Muṣṭâfa Pasha seemed to consecrate their power. One of his first tasks, after becoming Grand Vezir, was to convene a great imperial assembly in Istanbul, to which he invited dignitaries of various types from all over the Empire. The great derebeys from Anatolia came to Istanbul in person, with large forces of armed retainers, and seem to have played a considerable part in the proceedings. A deed of agreement (Sened-i Ittihat) confirmed their rights, privileges, and autonomies, which were now, for the first time, officially defined and ratified (Khânzâde, i, 66-73; Djewdet, Ta'rikh, ix, 3-7 and 278-83; Üzünçarşıli, Alemdar, 138-44; Miller, 283-91. On the Sened-i Ittihat see further A. Selçuk Özköçlik in Istanbul Univ. Hukuk Fak. Mec. xxiv, 1959, 1-12).

Sultan Maḥmûd II, who had thus been compelled, at the dawn of the 19th century, to recognize the privileges of a feudal barony, was determined to end them; the 19th century provided him with the means. After the conclusion of the war with Russia in 1812, he turned his attention to the task of establishing the authority of the central government in the provinces. By a series of political, military, and police actions he overcame rebellious pashas and autonomous derebeys alike, and replaced them by appointed officials sent from Istanbul. (For the impressions of a contemporary Western observer see A. Slade, Record of Travels in Turkey and Greece, etc., I, London 1832, 215 ff.). The work of centralization was continued under his successors; the last major military expedition was that of 1866, sent to subjugate the surviving derebey dynasties in the Çukurova district, such as the Menemendi-oglu, the Kükülü-oglu, and the Kozan-oglu of Kozan (Djewdet, Ma'raddî, in TTEM, 1491, 1926, 117 ff.). Though the autonomous principalities of the derebey{s} had disappeared, the term derebey remained part of the Turkish political vocabulary, used to designate large-scale hereditary landlords, especially in southern and eastern Turkey, who exercised quasi-feudal rights over their peasantry (for example for the remarks of K. H. Karpat in Social themes in contemporary Turkish literature, MEJ, 1960, 34-5).

The best known Derebe family{s} were:

1) The Kara Oğmân-oglu of Aydı'n, Manisa, and Bergama; they ruled the sanjak{s} of Saruhan and Aydı'n and their influence extended from the Great Menderes river to the coast of the sea of Marmara. [See KARA OĞMAN-OGLU].

2) The Capan (Çapar, Diabbârî)-oglu of Bozok, of Turkoman origin, practically contemporary with the Kara Oğmân-oglu. They ruled the sanjak{s} of Bozok (Vozgad), Kayseri, Amasya, Ankara, Niğde, and, at the height of their power, also controlled Tarsus. The first member of the family whose name is known is Ahmed Pasha, the mutasarrıf of Bozok, who was deposed by order of the Porter in 1178/1764-5. (Wsâli, i, 233 ff., 268). He was succeeded by his son Muṣṭâfa Bey, who was murdered by his body-guard in 1196/1781 (Djewdet, Ta'rikh, ii, 171-2); he in turn was followed by his brother Sulaymân Bey, the most powerful of the Capan-oglu, who played a rôle of some importance during the reign of Selim III, Muṣṭâfa IV, and Maḥmûd II. After his death in 1299/1884, his lands reverted to the direct authority of the Porter, who customarily held high offices under the Sultans as governors and generals. One of them, Çapanzâde Ağâh Efendi (1832-1885), played a pioneer rôle in the development of Turkish journalism (see ŞARDA). Another led an anti-nationalist band during the War of Independence. Their name survives in a Turkish proverbial phrase, with the meaning of a hidden snag.

3) The family of 'Alî Pasha of Diânik, in Trebizond and its neighbourhood. The founder of the family, Diânikli 'Alî Pasha [q.v.] was succeeded by his two sons Mikdad Ahmed Pasha (executed in 1206/1791-2) and Husayn Battâl Pasha (d. 1215/1801). After holding the offices of Kapîlî-bashi, governor of Aleppo, and governor of Damascus, Battâl Pasha became governor of Trebizond in 1202/1787-8. In 1201/1787 he led his forces against Russia, but in 1213/1803-4 was defeated and taken prisoner. The town of Battalpashinsk commemorates his name. After a period of disgrace, he was reappointed, thanks to Russian intercession, in 1215/1798-9. His elder son, Khâyır al-Dîn Râghîb Pasha, governor of Aţînân Kara Hisâr, was dismissed and executed in 1205/1792-3, when the independent political reforms of Selim III, which were supported by their rivals the Capan-oglu and the Kara Oğmân-oglu, ended. This family opposed the military reforms of Selim III, which were supported by their rivals the Capan-oglu and the Kara Oğmân-oglu. Ta'yûd Maḥmûd Pasha, a younger son of Husayn Battâl, was active against the reforms, and in 1805-7 was in exile in Russia. He returned to Turkey in 1809, and was appointed Karîma-ulmâmâk to the Grand Vezir during the brief interval of reactionary rule under Muṣṭâfa IV. A few months later he was dismissed and executed by Maḥmûd II.

These were the three most important derebey dynasties, and ruled in western, central, and eastern Anatolia respectively. Among lesser dynasties mention may be made of the İlyâs-oglu of Kugh Adasî (Scala Nuova, near Ephesus), who ruled the sanjak of Menteşe as far south as Bodrum from about the middle of the 18th century; the Kütûcük 'Ali-oglu, who ruled in Payas and for a while Adana, and the Yîlanı-oglu of Isparta and Eğirdir, and the region of Antalya.

Bibliography: The Ottoman chronicles pay some attention to the Derebey{s}, but tend to gloss over their independent status and represent them as servants of the Porter. More realistic information will be found in Western sources, notably in diplomatic and consular reports and in the writings of travellers and archaeologists. These may be supplemented, especially for names and dates, from the numerous local inscriptions. Some attention has been given to the derebey{s} in recent Turkish work on local history (as in the important studies of M. Çagatay Ulusay on Manisa), but the subject still awaits detailed examination.

On the Kara Oğmân-oglu, see Kgl. Museum, Altertümer von Pergamon, i, Berlin 1885, 84-91; F. W. Hasluck, Christianity and Islam under the Sultans, ii, Oxford 1929, 597-603; Ç. Ulusay,
so 8 DEREBEY — DERWISH PASHA

DERGÂH [see DARGÂH].

DERNA [see DARA].

The mountainous region of eastern Anatolia, densely wooded by oak, hornbeam, ash, chestnut and fir forests. Northwards the course of the upper course of the Dersim, the east by its tributary, the Piri Su. The area is of ancient origin with a line of prehistoric sites, the most notable being the Hozat and the Aşkale, which were already inhabited by Neolithic peoples. The district was in the possession of the Samarqand (3188 m.) and the Monzur Dagh (3166 m.). The Dersim had 63,430 inhabitants, of whom 15,460 were Protestant Armenians. In 1887 it became headquarters of the Vizierate. At this time, Ahmed Pasha—was born at Mostar in the Herzegovina and, after a course of his education, he revealed an interest and knowledge, could vie with the greatest of the scholars of the time. He was at this time Beglerbeg of Bosnia. Derwisch Pasha, again as Beglerbeg of Bosnia, shared also in the Ottoman conquest (1011/1602) of Istani Belgrade, which the Imperial forces had taken in the previous year (1010/1601). He was removed from the Beglerbeg of Bosnia in 1011/1602, the office being then given to Deli Hasan Pasha, lighthouse one of the Imperial Falconers. In 1015/1605, he was again as Beglerbeg of Bosnia, temporarily in the 11th century, the office being then given to Deli Hasan Pasha, lighthouse one of the Imperial Falconers. In 1015/1605, he was again as Beglerbeg of Bosnia, temporarily in the 11th century, the office being then given to Deli Hasan Pasha, lighthouse one of the Imperial Falconers...
DERWİSH MEHMEİ PASHA. (c. 993?-1065/1585? -1655?), Ottoman Grand Vizier, was of Çerkes (Circassian) origin. As kethêdd of Tabânî Yassî Mehmed Pasha, and from 1436, of the reign of Sultan Murâd IV (1233-40/1623-40), he shared in the Eriwan campaign of 1044/1635 against the Safawids of Persia and became there- after Beglerbeg of Şâm, an appointment that he held, according to Ibn Dümüa, in 1045/1637-6. At the time of Murâd IV’s campaign against Baghdad in 1048/1639 he was Beglerbeg of Diyarbekir, but in 1049/1638 he became Beglerbeg of Baghdad, resigning the following year to succeed Ahmed Pasha, who had died in 1639. Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha remained at Baghdad for three years. During the course of his subsequent career he served as Beglerbeg of Aleppo, of Anadolu, of Silistria and of Bosnia. Appointed to Silistria for the second time in 1059/1649, he held, according to Ibn Dümüa, in 1059-64/1649-54, when, disabled with paralysis, he was removed to it on 6 Ramadan 118/25 November 1774. On 3 Safar 118/5 April 1775 he became steward (kethêdd) to the Grand Vizier, being finally appointed Grand Vizier himself on 7 Dümüa I 1189/6 July 1775.

Having in this way come to power in the period which followed the conclusion of the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha made use of the authority which Sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd I was in the habit of granting to his Grand Viziers, to procure a pleasurable life for himself instead of trying to make good the damage suffered by the Empire during the war. The laxity of his conduct of State affairs combined with gossip about him led to his dismissal on 8 Dhu ‘l-Ka’dâ 1190/19 December 1776 and to his exile in Gallipoli. Nevertheless, he was appointed Grand Vizier again 9 Dhu ‘l-Valî 1193/20 February 1779, to be wâli (governor) of Khînya (Canea in Crete). He fell ill, however, during his voyage out and died in Sakiz (Chios), being buried in the mosque of İbrahim Pasha. Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha was a man of quiet disposition whose services to the State were negligible. Nevertheless, he built or, at least, repaired some pious establishments in Istanbul (in the districts of Ereğ and of Üskûdar-Scutari), in Bursa and in Egypt. The fact that some of these were tekkes (teykes) suggests that he had šâyi sympathies.


DERWİSH MEHMEİ PASHA (1142/1245-1837), Ottoman Grand Vizier, son of Rûstem Agha from Anapoli (Anapou) in Morocco (Pelopon- nesus). He received his training as seal-keeper (mûhûrdar) of the Grand Vizier Abd al-Waḥṣu, also of Peloponnesian origin, thanks to whose protection he was appointed mir-i mirdâr (Pasha of the second class) and şâniyâh-beyi. He became later tax- collector (mûšâṣipîl) of the land of Ḥamîd, while in 1233/1817 he served as muṭâṣaparî (with the rank of wâṣir or Pasha) of Khüdâwândîgâr, Eskişehir and Kôşâ-ili. The most influential functionary in the Empire, Ḥâleî Efendi, wanted at that time to see a weak Grand Vizier and he, therefore, advised Sultan Mahmûd II to appoint Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha, who became Grand Vizier on 27 Safar 1233/January 1818. During his two-year tenure of office Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha did not succeed in imposing his authority: he was even unable to ensure the security of Istanbul, where he refrained from punishing the gang leaders, preferring instead to propitiate every one. Although this conduct was agreeable to the leading functionaries and particularly to Ḥâleî Efendi, the Sultan realized the Grand Vizier’s impotence, but chose to keep him for some time in order to safeguard the honour of the office. Finally on 19 Rabî‘ I 1235/5 January 1820 the Sultan Efendi entered the service of the State as assistant seal-keeper to the defterdâr (treasurer) Ḥeṣîtân Efendi. He then became defterdâr (secretary or steward) of Nâṣîr ‘Abdulâh Pasha, Silâdâr ‘Alî Pasha and Şâdî Mehmed Pasha, in that order. Promoted defterdâr hesedârî (treasury cashier), he became finance clerk (mûliyye tekbûredî) during the expedition of 1181/1768. On 22 Dhu ‘l-Ka’dâ 1185/26 February 1772, while the army was camped at Şûnmû (Şumen), he became defterdâr of the first division (ghišâ). Although he left that post when the army was ordered to Istanbul, he was re-appointed to it on 6 Ramadan 118/25 November 1774. On 3 Safar 118/5 April 1775 he became steward (kethêdd) to the Grand Vizier, being finally appointed Grand Vizier himself on 7 Dümüa I 1189/6 July 1775.

Having in this way come to power in the period which followed the conclusion of the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca, Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha made use of the authority which Sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥamîd I was in the habit of granting to his Grand Viziers, to procure a pleasurable life for himself instead of trying to make good the damage suffered by the Empire during the war. The laxity of his conduct of State affairs combined with gossip about him led to his dismissal on 8 Dhu ‘l-Ka’dâ 1190/19 December 1776 and to his exile in Gallipoli. Nevertheless, he was appointed Grand Vizier again 9 Dhu ‘l-Valî 1193/20 February 1779, to be wâli (governor) of Khînya (Canea in Crete). He fell ill, however, during his voyage out and died in Sakiz (Chios), being buried in the mosque of İbrahim Pasha. Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha was a man of quiet disposition whose services to the State were negligible. Nevertheless, he built or, at least, repaired some pious establishments in Istanbul (in the districts of Ereğ and of Üskûdar-Scutari), in Bursa and in Egypt. The fact that some of these were tekkes (teykes) suggests that he had šâyi sympathies.


DERWİSH MEHMEİ PASHA (1142/1245-1837), Ottoman Grand Vizier, son of Rûstem Agha from Anapoli (Anapou) in Morocco (Pelopon- nesus). He received his training as seal-keeper (mûhûrdar) of the Grand Vizier Abd al-Waḥṣu, also of Peloponnesian origin, thanks to whose protection he was appointed mir-i mirdâr (Pasha of the second class) and şâniyâh-beyi. He became later tax- collector (mûšâṣipîl) of the land of Ḥamîd, while in 1233/1817 he served as muṭâṣaparî (with the rank of wâṣir or Pasha) of Khüdâwândîgâr, Eskişehir and Kôşâ-ili. The most influential functionary in the Empire, Ḥâleî Efendi, wanted at that time to see a weak Grand Vizier and he, therefore, advised Sultan Mahmûd II to appoint Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha, who became Grand Vizier on 27 Safar 1233/January 1818. During his two-year tenure of office Derwîsh Mehmed Pasha did not succeed in imposing his authority: he was even unable to ensure the security of Istanbul, where he refrained from punishing the gang leaders, preferring instead to propitiate every one. Although this conduct was agreeable to the leading functionaries and particularly to Ḥâleî Efendi, the Sultan realized the Grand Vizier’s impotence, but chose to keep him for some time in order to safeguard the honour of the office. Finally on 19 Rabî‘ I 1235/5 January 1820 the Sultan
dismissed him and banished him to Gallipoli. On 11 Rabî‘ I 1236/16 January 1821 he was appointed nevertheless, governor of Damascus with additional jurisdiction over the lands of Nabûs and with the additional function of amir al-halâdî (official responsible for the pilgrims). In this capacity he quarrelled with ‘Abdullah Paşa, the wâli of Şaydâ (Sidon), whom he besieged in Acre in accordance with the orders of the Sublime Porte. When, however, the latter was pardoned, Derwîsh Mehmed Paşa was transferred to the eyâlet (province) of Anatolia, where the tyrannical behaviour of his son-in-law Ilâmî Bey led to complaints by the people of Kütahya (Çotyleaum), as a result of which Derwîsh Mehmed Paşa was dismissed, stripped of the rank of wadir, deprived of his property and exiled to Afyûn-Kara-Hisâr, whence he was later transferred, at his own request, to Bursa. In Rabî‘ I 1235/June 1837 he was appointed Şeyîx al-Ḫânam (governor of Medina), but died in (Ramadan)December of the same year at Yanbî‘ on his way there.

A man of weak and kindly temperament, Derwîsh Mehmed Paşa is one of the least forceful of the Ottoman Grand Viziers. Some pious works in Bursa and in Istanbul are ascribed to him.

Bibliography: Şahîzade ʿAta’ullâh Efendi, Ta’rîxî (Istanbul 1290-1 A.H.) ii, 304, 331, 356 ff.; iii, 88 ff.; 149; Dîviet Paşa, Ta’rîxî (Istanbul 1301 A.H.), xi, 38, 72, 80; xii, 23, 43, 64 ff.; 125; Luṭfî Efendi, Ta’rîxî (Istanbul 1302 A.H.), v, 88 ff.; Rûf’at Efendi, Ward al-Ḫaddîbî (Ith. Istanbul), 15; (M. Câdî Baysun) Destour [see dûrût].

DEVE BOYNU, literally “camel’s neck”, a Turkish geographical term used to designate certain mountain passes and promontories. The most celebrated mountain pass known as Deve Boynu is that between Erzurum ce, Turkish geographical term used to designate certain localities and a mountain. Similar place-names occur in Syria and Teûrân, which has been interpreted as...

DEVEŞLİ, a Turkish word meaning cameleer, the name given to certain regiments of the corps of janissaries (see JANS). In the 16th century this corps was called the Dîmédia’t, and performing escort duties with the supply columns. They were also called by the Persian term şu’urân. The Devedsîs originally formed the first five orlas of the Dîmédia’t (four according to D’Ohsson), and were later augmented to include many others. They wore heron’s feathers in their crests (see sorgûc); when attending the dhûna they were veiled, trimmed with sable and lynx fur. Devedsî officers enjoyed high precedence among the orlas. According to Marsigli, the captains of the first five orlas were always preferred to the command of garrison centres. Their chief, the Başdevedsî, ranked high in the ladder of promotion, after the Hâşekî Ağa and above the Yaya-bâshî (q.v.).


DEVELÎ KARA HİSAR [see KARA HISAR].

DEVŞİRME, verbal noun of T. devşîr- ‘to collect’ (with various spellings, cf. TTS s.v. dersürmek), Ottoman term for the periodic levy of Christian children for training to fill the ranks of the Janissaries (see YENİ ÇERI) and to occupy posts in the Palace service and in the administration (Gr. παραδόματα). The same verb is used in the earliest Ottoman sources (Giese’s Anon. 32, i, 12 = Uredo 22, i, 4) for the ‘collection’ of the fifth part of prisoners from the dâr al-barb due to the Sultan as pendiş (q.v.), from whom, according to tradition, the Janissary corps was first raised in the early years of the reign of Murâd I; but the date of the institution of the devşîrme in its narrower sense of a levy of dînimî children is still uncertain (Idrîs Bîdîî’s attribution of it to Orkhan is certainly anachronistic, although, having been followed by Sa’d al-Dîn and Hammer, has been generally accepted). The earliest contemporary reference to the devşîrme so far known appears in a sermon preached in 1393 (i.e. in the reign of Bâyezîd I) by Isidore Glaßas, the metropolitan of Thessalonica, lamenting the ‘seizure of the children by the decree of the amîr’ (‘Omulî perî AMESPACE TÔN PÂXIOV KATÔ TÔ AMûRRA’ EÔÎXÔRÎA, first noticed by O. Tâfrais, in Thessalonique au XIVème siècle, 1913, 286 f., and discussed by S. Vroniaûjs Jr. in Isidore Glaßas and the Turkish Devşîrme in Speculum, 1956, 433-43); the second oldest appears in Sinân Paşa’s letter of 1430, to the inhabitants of Ioannina, promising them that if they submitted exemption from maclitî (see DERSIIR) they...

Boynu promonitory on the southern coast of Lake Van (q.v.). (Bêsmi Ḟâkot)


stated by Ṭaṭā'ī I 33) and as part of his re-organization of the Janissaries (Sphantzes 92).

Although İdris Bidlisi maintained, on the ground that most of the dhimmis had been conquered by force (be-ṣawā'īn), that the devşirme was in accordance with the qār, this argument seems not to have commanded itself to Sa'd al-Dîn (cf. V. L. Ménage in BSOAS, xviii, 1956, 181-3), and the devşirme does appear in fact to have been an infringement of the rights of the dhimmîs (see dhimmâ). It has been suggested however that a justification of the devşirme might have been drawn from the Shaffî doctrine that Christians converted since the Descent of the Kurān (and hence most of the rural population of the Balkans, but not the Greeks) were not entitled to the status of dhimmî (cf. P. Wittek, Devşirme and Şarâfi, BSOAS, xvii, 1955, 271-8).

With certain exceptions (see below) all the Christian population of the European domains of the Empire, and later the Asiatic domains as well, was liable to the devşirme. In the 16th century, the devşirme was entrusted to a Janissary officer, usually a yaya-başılı (for the ranks eligible for this duty cf. İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, Kapüşaksı Oculoarii, i [hereafter KKO], 15), who went to the district where the levy was to be made, accompanied by a kâthî, and taking with him a letter from the Agha of the Janissaries, a berâî of authorization, and (according to Navagero [see BiBi]) a supply of uniforms. In each kadî criers summoned the children to gather, accompanied by their fathers and by the priests, who brought the baptismal registers. Under the supervision of the kâthî and the sipâhi, or their representatives, the officer selected the best of the children of the ages eligible. The age-limits reported in European accounts vary greatly, from as low as eight years old to as high as 20 (cf. Lybyer 49); relatively late Ottoman documents (of 1601, 1621, 1622 and 1666) prescribe the limits 15-20 (KKO, 95, 98; A. E. Vakalopoulos [see BiBi], 286 f.). For each group of 100-150 children two registers were made, listing their names, parentage, ages and descriptions; one remained with the recruiting-officer, the other went with the sürîâ (drover) who conducted the impressed children to Istanbul (see especially documents of 1619, 1630, 1632 and 1666). The devşirme was made up not only of townsmen and dwellers on main roads, or to some dwellers on waqf-lands (KKO, 109-14; Ö. L. Barkan, Kanunlar, 72, 85; relazioni di Garsoni [1573] in Alberi, 3rd ser., i, 396); these exemptions were strictly checked and liable to be withdrawn (KKO, 97-101).

The Muslims of Bosnia were in a special position. According to a late Ottoman source (Shâm'dânâ-zâde, Marî al-tawārîh, Istanbul 1338, 454) the Christian population embraced Islam en masse upon the Ottoman conquest in 867/1463, but requested that their children should nevertheless be eligible for the devşirme. Though the Islamization of the peasantry was not in fact instantaneous (cf. B. D jurdev, Bosna, 1265 b above), there is a record of a recruitment of 1000 lads for the Janissaries from the Muslim populations of Bosnia and Herzegovina as early as 921/1515 (Ferîdîn, i, 472). Here the converted Bosnians are called Poturmâk (cf. A. V. Soloviev, in Bysantion, xxiii (1953), 73-86); they are called Pioter pîvînt in a document of 1667 (KKO, 105-6). The Christians were obliged to pay a special tax to meet the cost of the uniforms (KKO, 17 l, 22 n.).

On arriving in Istanbul the children were inspected both for their physique and for their moral qualities as revealed by the science of Physiognomy (kiyâfa, [q.v.]; cf. Âli, Kûnh, v, 14 f.; id., Melâ'dîn-Neîfa'îs, Istanbul 1956, 21; Postel, iii, 3). The best were taken directly into the Palace service or distributed to high dignitaries; the rest were hired (for 25 àkbs a head) according to Navagero [1553]: one ducat according to Busbecq; two ducats according to Koç Beg) to Turks in Asia Minor, and later—already by the middle of the 16th century (Navagero, Busbecq, Chesneau)—in Rûmeli as well, to work on the land for some years, learn Turkish and assimilate Muslim ways (the term for this training period was Türk ticerinde olmak, cf. KKO, 115 ff.). The lads were cared in as required to fill vacancies in the ʿâdami odâb (see Şâdiyîm Ocloan).

In principle the devşirme was not applied to children of townsfolk and craftsmen, as being sophisticated and less hardy than peasant lads (KKO, 18, 59), though these rules were often abused: devşirme were levied regularly in Athens in the middle of the 16th century (cf. the chronicle of Echthesis Chronica, ed. S. Lampros, 1902, 86). As married lads were not taken, the Christian peasantry often married their children very young (Gerlach, 306). Regions which had submitted voluntarily to the Ottomans seem to have been exempt from the devşirme (cf. Des Hayes): certainly exemption is specified among the terms granted, for example, to Galata (cf. E. Dalleggio d'Alessio in Ṭu'mmînî xî, 1939, 115-24), Rhodes (cf. Charrière, Négociations, i, 92; Fonanus in Lonicerus [1584 ed.] i, 423) and Chios (cf. P. Argenti, Chiusi Vincita, 1941, cxiii, 208 ff.). The inhabitants of Istanbul, perhaps as being townsmen, were in practice not liable (Gerlach, 48; and cf. the story in the Historia Patriarchica [Bonn ed. 167, discussed by J. H. Mordtmann in BZ, xxxi, 1912, 129-144] that Mehemmed II had granted them amân). Moldavia and Wallachia were never subject to the devşirme (Cantemir, 1734 ed., 38, and cf. KKO, 14 n., Jorga, iii, 188); the Armenians seem to have been exempt at first (Thevet, 799 b, but cf. KKO, 17), but were so no longer in later years (Koç Beg). Freedom from the devşirme, temporary or permanent, was also included occasionally among the exemptions from taxes and ʿawârid granted to various groups of râyâ in return for services rendered directly to the State, e.g., miners, guardians of passes and dwellers on main roads, or to some dwellers on waqf-lands (KKO, 109-14; Ö. L. Barkan, Kanunlar, 72, 85; relazioni di Garsoni [1573] in Alberi, 3rd ser., i, 396); these exemptions were not in fact instantaneous (cf. B. Djurdjev, Bosna, 1265 b above), there is a record of a recruitment of 1000 lads for the Janissaries from the Muslim population of Bosnia and Herzegovina as early as 921/1515 (Ferîdîn, i, 472). Here the converted Bosnians are called Poturmâk (cf. A. V. Soloviev, in Bysantion, xxiii (1953), 73-86); they are called Pioter pîvînt in a document of 1667 (KKO, 105-6). The lads Potur ogullari in a document of 998/1590 (KKO, 108), which defines them as 'circumcised but ignorant of Turkish', and which warns the beylerbey against recruiting boys who are 'Türkîlesmiş', i.e., Turkish-speaking. An undated list preserved in the Topkapı archives (published by R. M. Meric in 1st. Enst. Dergisi, iii, 1957, 35-40) gives the names and descriptions of 60 boys (whose ages range from 13 to 19) recruited from the kadî of Yanipazar; the names show that 44 of them are Muslim-born and 16 Christian-born, the latter being identified both by their (new) Muslim names and by their (former) Christian names. It is said that these Muslims of Bosnia were not distributed for training, but mostly drafted straight into the Palace or into the ağaş of the bosânit (q.v.) (KKO, 19, referring to the Kâusînî-ye Yenîcerrâyân, (Gerlach, 42; and cf. Ahmed I—see BiBi).

Many of the European reports suggest that the devşirme was made at regular intervals, estimates ranging from every five years to annually (references in Zinkeisen, iii, 216 and Lybyer, 51). More probably it took place on an ad hoc basis according to need—infrequently in the reign of Mehemmed II, when the Janissaries were relatively few and pêndît prisoners abundant (cf. Cippico [1472] in Sathas, Docs. in-
édis . . ., vii, 281: ‘se non possono avere prigioni’ = Basle ed. 1544, ii, 51; Iacopo de Promontorio-Campis (ca. 1480) ed. Fr. Babinger, 1957, 36: ‘manchandali [i.e., prisoners] preda rapa de jifolgi de christianis subdisi soi’, then at more and more frequent intervals throughout the 16th century, until at the end of the century the ranks of the Janissaries were in effect opened to all comers; thereafter, when recruitment was no longer dependent upon the devshirme, levies were spasmotic.

Again, many reports maintain, erroneously, that the devshirme was recruiting an extensive proportion of children, often stated to be a ‘tithe’, though estimates range as high as one in five (Spandugino, Thevet) and even one in three (anon. report of 1582 in Albéri, 3rd ser., ii, 245; Palerne [also 1582]). A fermán, said to be of the early 16th century (KKO, 92 ff.) shows that—at that time, at least—the number of boys to be levied was calculated beforehand on the basis of one boy (aged 14 to 18) from every 40 households.

Reports of the numbers taken also vary greatly. Postel’s being as high as 10,000,000 a year. According to Gerlach (34) a devshirme of 1573 (documents in KKO, 103 ff. show that it covered both Rúmeli and Asia Minor) produced 8000 boys. Sa’d al-Din calculated that in the 200 years and more that it had been in force the devshirme had produced over 200,000 converts to Islam (i, 41), i.e., an average of 1000 a year, which is the figure given by Šah-e’dán-ládžáde (loc. cit.). However, there was much abuse by the recruiting officers, who levied more children than their warrants permitted, selling the surplus for their private profit (Spandugino); they also grew rich on bribes, both from Christians who bought their children off, and from non-Christians who smuggled their children in (Gerlach, 48, 306; Roe, Negotiations, 534; Selaník 263 f., referring to the devshirme of 998/1589-90, for which cf. the documents in KKO, 102 f.)

When the devshirme was extended to Asia Minor is not clear. In 1456 the Greeks of the west coast appealed to the Grand Master of Rhodes for help against the Turks ‘who take (Trepvouv) our children as prisoners’ (Miklosich and Müller, c 257). In 981/1573-4 there was an extensive devshirme, according to Lithgow (257). In 981/1573-4 there was an extensive devshirme of 534; Selaník 263 ff., referring to the devshirme of 981/1573-90, for which cf. the documents in KKO, 102 f.)

The devshirme reached its greatest extent during the 16th century. By the beginning of the 11th/17th century, the ranks of the Janissaries had become so swollen with Muslim-born ‘intruders’ that frequent recruitments by devshirme were no longer necessary. Although according to Lithgow (Rare Adventures, 1906, 106 and 149) the devshirme was ‘absolutely abrogated’ by Ahmed I, levies were made throughout the century, but sporadically: according to the relations of Foscarini (1639) there had then been no levy for twelve years (Barozzi-Berchet, v, vii, 86). There was a devshirme however in the next year, 1048/1638 (Fedhleke, ii, 211), and it was not, as Hammer believed (GOR, v, 244, and hence Zinkeisen, iv, 166), the last; for according to Rycaut (Present State, i, ch. iv) the Janissary leader Bektash Agha demanded (in 1061/1651) that henceforth the ‘yearly’ collection of children should be abolished, and only the children of Janissaries be admitted ‘to serve in the Grand Signior’s service’; and Ewliya Celebi (i, 598) speaks of a devshirme in Rúmeli every 7 years, when 7-8,000 boys were collected at Úsküb, brought to Istanbul, and placed directly into the various oğlaqs (the preliminary training in Anatolia evidently being by now abandoned, cf. KKO, 24 f.). Rycaut found that in his time (he was in Istanbul from 1660) the devshirme was ‘a great part grown out of use’ (op. cit., i, ch. 18) and ‘wholly forgotten’ (iii, ch. 8); so too Quirini (1676) reported that there had been no devshirme since 1663 (Barozzi-Berchet, vii, 160, and cf. Hammer GOR, vii, 555), and Morosini (1680) spoke of it as taking place only every twenty years or so (op. cit., 219); article 3 of the Ottoman-Polish treaty of Buczacz (1683/1672) provided that the inhabitants of Podolia would be exempt if ‘a devshirme is ordered’ (Rágáth, ii, 88 f., Hammer-Purgstall, GOR, vii, 91); there may be a connexion between this and an attempt to carry out a devshirme in Greece in April 1705 (Vakalopoulos, 292). This is the latest record of a devshirme so far known, though Uzunçarşı has found a berad of 1150/1736 exempting a Christian subject from taxes and his son from the devshirme.

References in European travel-books etc. must be treated with caution, for authors frequently borrow without acknowledgement from their predecessors: thus the reference in Rycaut (Present State, i, ch. 10) to an annual devshirme of
2000 boys mostly from the Morea and Albania derives, presumably via Withers, from Bon (Barozzi-Berchet, vi/1, 77), who was writing 60 years earlier, as does that in Baudier, and the account in B. de Vigenère's Illustrations (1650 ed., col. 49) largely from Postel. The following references seem to be independent: Spandugino, Petit Traité, ed. Schefer 1896, 102 ff.; 144 f.; = Sathas, Documents inédits, ix, 212 ff.; 225; J. Chesneau, Le Voyage de M. d'Aramon, ed. Schefer 1887, 44 f.; A. Geoffroy, Brieve Description (appendix to preceding) 242 f.; G. Postel, De la République ... 1560, iii, 22 ff.; A. Thevet, Cosmographie Universelle, 1575, 799 b, 808 b, 817 b (engraving); N. de Nicolay, Navigations, 1568, 79 ff.; S. Schweiger, Neue Reisebeschreibung, 1608, 168 ff.; Busbecq, De Aece ... 1581, 152 f. = Engl. tr. by N. Tate, 1694, 400 f.; J. Palerne, Peregrinations, 1606, 412 f., 502 f.; H. de Beauvoir, Relation Journalière, 1629, 68; L. Des Hayes, Voyage de Lévant, 1624, 137 ff.

These accounts can be controlled from the archival-material given by I. H. Uzuncarsılı in Osmanlı Devleti tarihünden Kapıdkulu Ocaklar, i, 1943, 1-141 (this includes nearly all the documents published by Ahmed Refik in Edebiyatî Fakültesî Medînu'stâv, v, 1926, 1-14, and on it is based I. H. Uzuncarsılı's article Devşirme in IA); Uzuncarsılı refers frequently to a work Kâsâin-i Yeniletmiş in his private library: this seems to be identical with the work, composed under Ahmed I, which is described in Ist. Kit. Tarih-Cografya Yâzmaları Kataloqları, i/io, 813 (MS Esad Ef. 1968) and of which MS Revan 1350 contains another copy (cf. L. Forrer in Isl., xxvi, no. 62).

DEWE' [see DAWLA].
DEY [see DAY].

DHABIHA: a victim destined for immolation according to Muslim law, in fulfilment of a vow, najhr, for example, or for the sacrifice of 'abiba, or on the occasion of the feast of the 10th day of Dhu 'l-hijja (then called 'abiyya), or in order to make atonement for certain transgressions committed during the hadid (the victim in this case being known as auda).

This dhabiha must be slaughtered according to a strict ritual known as dhahi'a. Its form does not differ from the ritual slaughter of animals permitted as food: hence it is with this type of slaughter that we shall now concern ourselves. The differences between the various schools of law in this regard are comparatively unimportant. However, on this question, as with the rest of fikih, in order to adopt not only a theoretical but also a sociological point of view, it would be necessary to show what the actual practice on this matter has been throughout the world of Islam as whole. On this subject we shall limit ourselves to a single observation.

The matter is briefly referred to in the Kur'an (V, 4, vi, 147) and dealt with at greater length in the collections of traditions and the texts of fikih.

1. What animals are proper subjects for ritual slaughter? The list does not coincide exactly with that of the animals that are permissible as food. For in the first place there are those animals which may be eaten without any necessity of ritual slaughter—grasshoppers or fish, for example (these latter, indeed, may be eaten even if found dead); in the second place there are special rules, which are not our present concern, applicable to hunting, and finally the foetus which is almost at term is permissible as food if its mother has been ritually slaughtered. On the other hand it is recommended that animals which are not lawful food should be slaughtered according to ritual in order to avoid any prolonged suffering. Nevertheless it is, in general, with a view to being able to eat the animal concerned that a ritual slaughter takes place, and this is the more so since the dhabiha, the sacrificial victim, is normally eaten. It may be remarked that a ritual slaughter makes the flesh of the animal lawful even if the animal is already sick or mortally wounded and the slaughter does no more than accelerate its end.

2. Who may perform ritual slaughter? It is lawful, although blameworthy, for the people of the Book to perform it on behalf of Muslims. On the other hand it is in no way prohibited, nor, even, is it reprehensible (contrary to a curious superstition which prevails in North Africa, for example) for a woman to kill an animal such as a chicken. (One observer has reported that at Tangier, if women are of necessity obliged to do this, there is a place a symbolic symbol between their thighs). All those authorized to act as slaughterers must be in possession of their mental faculties.

3. How is the slaughter (dhahi'a) effected? Four methods of killing may be distinguished of which only the first two need concern us: the dhahiha; the nahr or nafr (see below); the wounding or 'udhr (which is important with regard to the theory of hunting); any other method of killing. For the dhahiha to be validly put to death and the animal concerned to be permissible as food then either the dhahiha or the nahr should be employed according to the circumstances. Otherwise the dead animal will be regarded as carrion (mayta) and therefore legally unfit for consumption except in the case of absolute necessity. At the moment of slaughter it is obligatory to have the nahr, for the nahr is applicable only to camels (there are some differences of opinion among the schools as to the obligatory or simply praiseworthy character of these provisions). The dhahiha consists of slitting the throat, including the trachea and the oesophagus; (as for the two jugular veins there are divergencies between the schools); the head is not to be severed. Preferably the victim should be laid upon its left side facing in the direction of the kibla. As for the nahr, it consists of driving the knife in by the throat without it being necessary to cut in the manner prescribed above, the camel remaining upright but at the same time facing the kibla. There are some casuistic discussions regarding the nature of the instrument to be used. More important is the fact that many provisions of fikih bear witness to an anxiety that the victims should be spared any unnecessary suffering. In particular the knife ought to be well sharpened; the practice of collective slaughter is condemned, as too is that of cutting off part of an animal or removing its skin (except in the case of fish) before it is dead.

Bibliography: The collections of traditions contain chapters on the subject—of a greater or lesser scope—such as Buhâri, tr. Houdas and Marçais, iv, 72; so too do all the books of fikih, usually in the context of hunting (e.g., Khalli, Mukhtasar, tr. Guidi, i, 315 ff., and tr. Bousquet, i, 85 ff.; Shirazi, Tanbih (tr. Bousquet, i, 108 ff.). We might also note the classical treatises of 'ishrail, which have not yet been translated—for example, Ibn Rushd, Bidâya; Shâ'ranî, Musâm,
DHABİHA — AL-DHAHABI


The natural properties of gold were studied by Muslim alchemists. Although they still accepted the theory of transmutation of metals (cf. G. Sarton, Introduction to the history of science, 2/ii, 1045), they were well acquainted with various chemical processes, such as cupellation, the separation of gold and silver by means of nitric acid, and the quantitative chemical analysis of gold-silver alloys (cf. E. J. Holmyard, The makers of chemistry, Oxford 1931, 77).

In the pre-Islamic period, the use of gold in jewellery, ornamental crafts, in manuscript illuminations and in calligraphy, was widely practised during the Middle Ages (Ahmad b. Mir-Munghl, Calligraphers and painters, transl. V. Minorisky [Erer Gallery of Art Occasional Papers, vol. 3, ii], Washington, D.C., 1959). A prominent place in the gold-smithing production was held by Bagdad (cf. C. Cahen, Documents relatifs à quelques techniques tirées de la période des onzième siècle, in Ars Islamica, xv-xvi, 1951, 23-8). Gold woven robes and gold vessels, whose use was condemned by Muslim tradition, were also in demand. The fashion of collecting such luxury objects prevailed particularly because he could not subscribe to the conditions made by the founder of the institute concerning the canon law school of the Professor of Tradition.

The fields of research he mostly excelled in were Tradition, canon law, and history. He had an indefatigable energy, having been at his studies day and night for many years. It is certain that he was the most learned of his time and is greatly missed by his disciples. His life and work are a source of inspiration to all those who seek knowledge and wisdom. His memory will always be preserved in the hearts of those who knew him and in the annals of Islamic history.
and night, even when he was struck by blindness which befell him, according to Abu '1-Fida and 'Umar b. al-Wardl, in 743/1342-3, or, according to others, as early as 741/1340-1. He had a great many excellent pupils among whom we particularly mention 'Abd al-Wahhab al-Subki, the author of the Tabakdt al-Shafi'iyya al-Kubra, whose father Tafruz al-Din al-Subki, the famous Shafi'i doctor of law, was his most intimate friend.

His many-sided qualities were acknowledged both by his contemporaries and his later biographers. By the latter he was commonly referred to as muhaddith discourse of the age and kutubi al-huffds ("the seal [i.e., the last] of the huffds"). Al-Kutubi praised him with select poetical phrases. According to Salah al-Dln al-Safadi, "he had nothing of the rigidity of the traditionalists or the stupidity of the historians; on the contrary, he was a lawyer of spirit, and was at home in the opinions of people". Ibn Haidar al-'Askalani composed a beautiful haflde in praise of his excellent qualities.

On the other hand, we also find opinions adverse to his reputation. His own most eminent pupil al-Subki reproached him with reviling even his own authorities. According to Ibn al-Aswad before him and or al-Suyuti after him; however, some of his works have attained a high standard in East and West alike. Like practically all the post-classical Arab authors he too was a compiler, but his works are distinguished by careful composition and constant references to his authorities. It is for these peculiarities that his works on Tradition, especially on the 4im al-rij'ul, have become very popular.

A) History. His greatest work is the Ta'rikh al-Islam ("History of Islam"), printed together with the Tadhkirat al-huffd, i.e., the biographical list of Muhammad's Companions, based chiefly on the Usd al-ghdba [q.v.] and the Tabakdt al-frurrd al-mashhurin, published in 7 parts in al-Hiddya (an Arabic periodical in Turkey), iv, 1331/1912-3 and ff.

The tabakdi-works; they have far greater historical value than the general narrative has.

The Ta'rikh al-Islam was continued by at least six hands; three of these continuations are extant: 1) from 701/1301-2 to 740/1340-40 by al-Dhahabi himself; 2) from 701/1301-2 to 786/1384-5 by 'Abd al-Rahim al-Subki and his son Ahmad (died in 826/1422-3), only the latter's work being extant; 3) from 701/1301-2 to 790/1388 by Ibn Kadi Shuhba (died in 851/1447-8) in his Al-S'adam bi-ta'rikh al-Islam.

Owing to the voluminous character of the Ta'rikh al-Islam it was abridged many times. Six abridgments were made by al-Dhahabi himself: 1) Kitab duwal al-Islam or Ta'rikh al-saghir ("Small History"), published at Haydarabad in 1337/1918-9. 2) al-'Ibar fi sakhbor al-bashar mimman 'abar (Muntakhab al-ta'rikh al-kabir), an abridgment of the biographical "classes".

Whereas these two works combined give a fairly good synopsis of the whole of the Ta'rikh al-Islam, the following are extractions from the biographical "classes" (tabaks) only.

3) Ta'dkirat al-huffds, published at Haydarabad in 1332-3/1914-5 in five volumes. The best known abridgment and continuation of the work was done by al-Suyuti [q.v.] under the title Tabakdt al-huffds, published by F. Wustenfeld at Gottingen in 1833-4. Al-Suyuti's continuation was also published at Damascus in 1342/1928-9.

The Ta'dkirat al-huffds is also the basis of the Tabakdt al-Shafi'iyya of Ibn Kadi Shuhba.

4) al-Islaba fi ta'ddiri asm al-'Sakiba, an alphabetical list of Muhammad's Companions, based chiefly on the Usd al-ghdba of Ibn al-Azhfr, printed at Haydarabad in 1353/1871-2.

7) Ta'rîkh al-Islâm wa 'l- 'Abbâbid wa 'l- 'Abbâsîd, printed in 2 vols. at Cairo n.d.  
8) Siyar a'lam al-nubalâ', printed in 2 vols. at Cairo n.d.  
9) al-Mukhtasar min Ta'rîkh al-Islâm wa 'l-Maghrib wa 'l- 'Abbâsid wa 'l- 'Abbâsîd, published at Lucknow in 1301/1883-4, at Cairo in 1325/1907-8, at Haydarabad in 1329/1911-1331/1913-1, and the letter kamza only at Istanbul in 1304/1886-7. It was extracted by Ibn Hadjar al-Adili al-Ayyubi.

Two other historical works of al-Dhahabi are extant:

Muhassar il-Ta'rîkh Baghda'di li 'bn al-Dubayth, a synopsis of the history of Baghdad according to Ibn al-Dubaythi (died in 637/1239-40).

Muhassar akhbar al-nawaziyyin li 'bn al-Kifti, a transcript, c. 699-700/1299-1301, in the late 8th/i4th century, and for the fine muslin industry, which has had throughout history a premier position in this province of rivers and flooded plains. The city is situated at the head of the waterways about a hundred miles from the sea, in a region which has had throughout history a premier position in this province of rivers and flooded plains. The Hindî capital was at Vikramapura, then favourably situated on the Dâhshehwarji river, where the line of old fortification can still be seen, but more important are the Mosque and Mausoleum of the Mongols in 651/1253, and the Mosque and Mausoleum built by him in the provincial Mughal style, wrongly called by the people the Shâyista Khân style of architecture. Though the Mughal seat of government was transferred to Murshidabad in 1717, Dacca never lost its importance. It remained the centre of the flourishing muslin industry and many other luxury arts of the East, which attracted the foreign merchants, and as early as the middle of the 17th century we find here factories being established by the Dutch, French and British.

With the introduction of British rule and the growing importance of the city of Calcutta, Dacca lost its premier place in Bengal. In 1905 it was again made the capital of the newly created province of Eastern Bengal and Assam—an administrative measure to favour the Muslims which was annulled because of the growing opposition from Hindî nationalists. In 1906 Dacca witnessed the foundation of the All India Muslim League with the object of protecting the rights of the Muslims of the sub-continent. Many of the red-faced buildings of the newly-developed Ramna in Dacca were built at this time. In 1921 the University of Dacca was founded mainly to meet the demands of the local Muslims. It became a centre of both education and political training for the rising talents of Muslim Bengal. Today Dacca (population 432,853 in 1951) is the second capital of Pakistan and is fast growing century, for the lively court maintained by the romantic Sultan Ghâyib al-Din A'tâm Shâh in the late 8th/i4th century, and for the fine muslin industry through the period. The place is full of ruined tombs, mosques and minarets, which are all associated with the names of the Mughal officers. Of the princely governors Shâh Shudâ, the ill-fated brother of the Mughal emperor Awrangzib, and Muhammad A'tâm, the latter's son, had a great reputation in Eastern India. From their time have been inherited the Bâg Khât (the great market quadrangle), the Idgâh and the fort of Awrangâbâd, commonly called Lâ' Bâgh, the last still showing its terraced walls, bastions, gateways, a mosque and a beautiful mausoleum (partly in marble) of Bibi Parâ, one of the wives of Muhammad A'tâm. Of the other governors Mir Dâjumâl is better known for his conquest of Assam, and Shâyista Khân for his twenty-five years' service in Bengal, his last conquest of Câltgân in 1076/1666, his lavishly kept harem, and above all the numerous mosques and mausolea built by him in the provincial Mughal style, wrongly called by the people the Shâyista Khânï style of architecture. Though the Mughal seat of government was transferred to Murshidâbâd in 1717, Dacca never lost its importance. It remained the centre of the flourishing muslin industry and many other luxury arts of the East, which attracted the foreign merchants, and as early as the middle of the 17th century we find here factories being established by the Dutch, French and British.
into a modern city with its industrial suburban town of Narayanganj. The old Mughal city still survives with its numerous mosques and mausolea, but its lanes and by-lanes are being broadened, in line with the city's developments. Dhaka shares fully in the rebirth of the Muslims of Pakistan.


**Dhakir**, Kasm Bey, the foremost Adharbaydjan poet and satirist in the first half of the 19th century. He was born probably in 1786, at Penahabad in the Khânate of Karabag (eastern Azerbaijan). His foster father, Prince Konstantin Tarkhanov, who took advantage of illegal actions in which a nephew of the poet was involved, had to have him deported to Baku for some time. Upon the intervention of his friends he was allowed to return to his family estate, where he spent most of his lifetime.

In his satirical poetry he relentlessly castigated the religious fanaticism of the Mollâs as well as corruption and all kinds of abuses by the beyzade—the local aristocracy—and the Czarist administration officials. His criticism of the latter resulted in his being persecuted by the governor of Karabagh, Prince Konstantin Tarkhanov, who took advantage of illegal actions in which a nephew of the poet was involved, to have him deported to Baku for some time. Upon the intervention of his friends he was allowed to return to his family estate, where he spent most of his lifetime.

There have been preserved and partly published (see M. A. Resulzade in the bibliography to this article) a number of complaints and appeals for help (zîkayat-nâma) which Dhâkir addressed, in brilliant verse, to influential fellow-countrymen such as Mirza Fa'iz 'Ali Akhund-zâda (q.v.) and the first Adharbaydjan novelist Isma'il Bey Kutkashinlî (who had risen to the rank of general in the Russian army). His much esteemed style was obviously influenced by the great 18th century poet Molla Pushâr (1704-94), but he preferred the simple, popular lyric forms applied by the 'âbâi folk literature, such as "Koîma" and "Kerayil" but he also wrote a number of poems in Persian and in traditional metric forms, as well as some pieces in rhymed prose (e.g., Darvish-i Mâ). His fables in verse (Tulhâ ke shir, shir, tâlûk ke shir, tâlûk ke shir etc.) followed the widespread oriental tradition set by the "Kalila va Dimna", but may be also influenced by Krolov's (1768-1844) genial adaptations. In his works a number of Russian words—mostly taken from the terminology of administration and selected to suit his satirical purpose—made their first appearance in Adhari Turkish.

The first publications of poetry by Dhâkir seem to have appeared in 1854 (in the official Tiflis newspaper Kanka) and 1856 (within an anthology published in Temir-Khan Shura—now Buiunaks, Daghistan—by Mirza Yusuf Nesersov Karabaghi).

Although there is reason to believe that Akhund-zâda had planned a complete edition of Dhâkir's works after the latter's death in 1857, no such edition was printed in the pre-Soviet era.
kdghadh (pron. kdghaz), 'paper', appears in early 16th century Hindi texts as kdgad, also in Marāṭhī, Dakhāl Urdu, and in the Dravidian languages Kannada and Telugu (kdghad'); similar variations in gunbādh: gunbad, 'dome' (Kann. gunbadā).

DHAMĀR (or DHMĀR, see Yākūt s.v.), a district (mīkhāf) and town in South Arabia, south of Ṣanʿa', on the Ṣanʿā'-Adan road, near the fortress of Hīrān. The district of Dhamār was very fertile and had rich cornfields, splendid gardens, and many ancient citadels and palaces. On account of its fertility it was called the Misr of Yaman. The town of Dhamar used to be the headquarters of the Zaydi Imams of Ṣanʿa'. A1I (the real prophet) but originally an agent of the MuḤāṣṣīnīyīn, and ascribed also to al-Shalmaghānī (Hamdānī mentions a Rūḍjma), al-Sam'āni, al-Kawna, Hirran, Baynun and Hakir.

Hofner, Beiträge zur hist. Geogr. des vorislam. Al-ʾIjhammiyya, "the people of the blame", in al-Malāʾiṣ; al-Dawṣīrī (or Asadi or Sadusī), in al-ʾIjhamīyya, says that while the 'Abābiyyīn and the Muṭaṣallītīn, whose niceties of psychological analysis led them into seeming to assert that a man could be condemned for a sin he had not yet committed, Multāhar al-Maḍūsī (K. al-ʾAbī b. al-ʾĪlaʾrāʾīk, ed. Cl. Huart, Paris 1916, v. 143) gives a different explanation of the same name. Also he ascribes the name to one group of Karrāniyyīn (145).

(D. J. BURTON- PAGE)

DHANAB [see NUDJUM].

DHĀR, an ancient town on the scar of the Vinḍyās overlooking the Narbādā valley, and since 1356 the headquarters of Dār district, Mādhyā Pradeś, India. It stood on the main routes from Dīhlī to the Dakhān and to Gudjarāt. From the 3rd/4th to the end of the 7th/13th centuries it was a capital of the Paramāras who ruled Mālāwī first as Rāshīrakāfī feudatories and then as independent monarchs. The most powerful of these, Vākapītī II (or Muḥāṣṣīn) and Bhīḍjadeva I, receive mention in many Muslim histories of India. Bhīḍjadeva's troops may have joined Anandapala in 399/1008 against Māhāmūd of Gharzmīn, while Dīgasdevī, 456/1067-492/1104, defeated Gharzmīnī forces in the Pāndjāb. Undermined by Cawluķya and Yādvā asonslaughters and attacked by Kuṭb al-Dīn Aybak in 566/1199, Iltutmīṣ in 632/1234 and Dīgal al-Dīn Khālīdī in 690/1291 and 692/1293, the Dīrām Paramāras broke up in confusion at the end of the 7th/13th century.

In 705/1305 ʿAlī al-Dīn's general ʿĀyn al-Mulḵ Multānī defeated the Paramāra Rāḍīlā Māhāladeva, and his minister Gogadeva, slaughtering both. Dār was taken and ʿĀyn al-Mulḵ appointed governor of Mālāwī. Until 804/1401 Dīrām remained the seat of the governors of Mālāwī appointed from Dīhlī. In 731/1330-31 Mūḥāṣṣīn b. Tughluk struck token coins at Dār. He himself was at Dār during the famine of 736/1335. His appointment of ʿĀzīz Khāmāmīr as governor of Dār, with instructions to curb the amārīn-i sāda, led to the massacre of over eighty of them at Dār and precipitated the fatal revolts of 745/1345 onwards. The last governor, Dīlāwār Khān [q.v.], was appointed prior to 793/1390.

From 801/1399 to 804/1401 Dīlāwār Khān entertained Sultan Māhāmūd Tughluk, a refugee from Timūr, at Dār, but on Mūḥāṣṣīn's return to Dīhlī Dīlāwār Khān declared himself independent at Dār. His son, Alp Khān, succeeded him in 805/1401, and his title Hūṣān Shāh. Accused of particide, he was attacked at Dār and carried off prisoner by Murāṣīf Khān of Gudjarāt, whose brother Nasrāt Shāh was appointed governor at Dār. His extortion provoked rebellion and he was expelled from Dār, where Hūṣān Shāh was reinstated in 812/1408. Thereafter Hūṣān Shāh made Māndū his capital, as did his successors. The importance of Dār consequently declined though during the struggle between the sons of sultan Ghīyāth al-Dīn, in 905/1499-50 Nāṣir al-Dīn made Dār his headquarters, as did his son, Shīhāb al-Dīn, when he rebelled in 916/1512.

In the Mughal period, though visited by Akbār and Dīhāṅgrī, Dār was merely one of the sixteen
Dhār — Dharrā
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māhāls of Māṇḍū sarkar, chiefly notable, as befitted Plrān-i Dharrā, for extensive suyurghal grants. Its importance, as a strong fort on the Dihl-Dakhan communications, revived with the Mughal-Māṇḍū struggle. South Māṇḍū was first invaded in 1125/1719 and in 1125/1703 the fawdvdar of Māṇḍū took refuge from the Māṇḍūs in Dhār. From 1125/1719 Şahhān granted mokāsās to his generals in southern Māṇḍū, and from 1125/1702 Dhār was allotted to Uddājī Pāwār. The Mughal governor Girdhā Bahādur and his cousin Dayā Bahādur refused Uddājī's demands and repelled Māṇḍūrā attacks until both were killed at the Amrābāra pass below Dhār on 25 Dūmādā 1 1141/29 November 1725.

From 1141-1279 the Māṇḍūs collected dues from Dhār māhāl, though the fort, strengthened by Girdhār's son and successor Bhawānī Rām, held out and Muhammad Khān Bangāsāng defeated the attacks made on Dhār from 6-18 Ramānād 1145-1727 March 1731 by Malhār Holkār. But on 15 Ramānād 1150/6 January 1738 Niẓām al-Mulk conferred Māṇḍū on the Peshwā, who allotted the Dhār territories to Yaghwānt Rāo Pāwār. (Dhār fort was only taken on 6 Shīriwāl 1153/25 December 1740). Dhār state, which came under British protection in 1234/1819, remained under Pāwār rulers until 28 May 1948 when it was merged in Madhya Bhārat, and in 1956 in Madhya Pradeś.

Bibliography: Central India gazetteer, v, 389-515; EIM, 1909-10, 1-29; D. C. Ganguly, History of the Paramara dynasty, Dacca 1933; H. N. Wright, The sullūns of Delhi; their coinage and mythology, Delhi 1936, 169; R. Sin, Māla in translation, Bombay 1936; History and culture of the Indian people, vi, the Delhi sultanate, Bombay 1960. See also Dilāwar Khān; Māṇḍū; Māṇḍūdār.

2. Monuments. From the architectural point of view the monuments of Dhār are important only as illustration of the earliest phase of the Māṇḍū style, one of the characteristic provincial styles of Indian Islamic architecture (see Hind, Architecture). The earliest building is a tomb enclosing a marble mābād of Kamāl al-Dīn Mālāwā (locally called Khāmāl Mālāwā), a disciple of Niẓām al-Dīn Āghātī of Dihlī; the oldest grave inscription in this enclosure is of 795/1392-3, which records that the ruling sovereign was Māhūmūd Tughlūk, whose local representative was Dilāwar Khān [q.v.]. The slightly later Dīlāwar Khān inscription is generally rendered as the dust which remains clinging to the hand after the slightest touch, and interpreters of this have explained dharrā by two images, both of which go back to Ibn 'Abbās, 1. From the most common phrase of the Qur’ān, its usual meaning of the root: powder, dust. The dharrā is the dust which remains clinging to the hand after the rest has been blown off (the sensecollected in tasfir, for example, by Khāzīn in xcix, 7-8); or the weightless dust, seen when sunlight shines through a window (id., iv, 40). The image of the “red (black) ant”, by a kind of equivalence dharrā-namāl (al-Zamānhāshari): “the weight of the head of a red ant”, (Khāzīn in xcix, 7-8); “little ant” (xcix, 7-8); “little red ant” (x, 61), etc.—The dharrā is also said to be equivalent to “the hundredth part of a grain of barley”.

In translation dharrā is generally rendered as “atom” (cf. R. Blachère: “weight of an atom”, except for iv, 40: “weight of an ant”). L. Massignon, Passion d’al-Hallādī, Paris 1922, 550, gives dharrā in the sense of atom with nātā ("point") in order to...
explain the diawhar fard ("elemental substance") of the kalâm and the falsafa. It is noticeable, however, that dharrâ was not generally used as the technical term for the philosophical atom, and is not of Democritus, Epicurus and the Muslim "atomists." Two technical expressions were used in preference: djus' [q.v.], "part" (indivisible), and djawhar fard. On the other hand, modern Arabic readily renders the atom of modern physics by dharrâ (djus' becoming "molecule").

Thus Arabic vocabulary is careful to distinguish between three terminologies: 1) physical sciences: dharrâ, atom; 2) mathematical sciences: mukhtâr, geometrical point (thus Ibn Sînâ, Risâla fi 'l-Hudâd); 3) philosophy: djus' and djawhar fard, "atom," in this way to emphasize that the last usage does not include the atom of modern physics. (L. GARDET)

DHÄRT. In Muslim philosophy this term is used in three terminologies: 1) philosophy: dhârât (from the point of view of this dhârti, is the conceptually and determinate. In this pantheistic world-view the mystic, as being constitutive of the substance which is a essence. The term dhârti, from the point of view of this ambiguity in meaning, is especially relevant to the philosophico-theological doctrine of God and His Attributes. The Mu'tazila and the philosophers deny Divine Attributes and declare God to be a simple substance or pure Essence; in this case simple substance and simple essence coalesce and are identical with one another. The Attributes are then construed either as negations or as pure relations. Although both the Mu'tazila and the philosophers agree in the denial of Divine Attributes, their reasons for doing so are very different. The Mu'tazila were moved to deny Attributes through the theological anxiety that affirmation of these would be contrary to strict monotheism. The philosophers' reasoning, on the other hand, is the result of the rational search for a simple being from which all multiplicity and composition—existential and conceptual—should be excluded, but which at the same time should "explain" the multiplicity of existing things. In this they were followers of Plotinus. The Islamic orthodoxy devised a formula according to which Attributes are "neither identical with God nor other than Him".

The Sûfî theosophy, which became widely influential during the later middle ages of Islam, found another way of reconciliation between philosophy and theo-poetry. According to this theory God, as absolute, is pure and simple Being without any Attributes; but through a series of "descents" or "determinations" He becomes progressively determinate. In this pantetheistic world-view the mystic, in his upward march towards communion with God, passes through a series of theophanies (tablîyât) from the levels of Names and Attributes to the final theophany of the Absolute.

Bibliography: al-Thânâwî, Dictionary of Technical Terms, s.v. (F. RAHMÁN)

DHÂT AL-HIMMA [see DHU 'L-HIMMA].

DHÂT AL-SAWARÎ [see SUPPLEMENT].

DHÂTî, Turkish poet, b. 875/1471 in Balikesir. The son of a modest bookmaker, as a boy he practised his father's craft but soon gave it up, moving to the capital during the reign of Bayezid I where, following his natural inclinations, he devoted his life to poetry. An easy and prolific versifier, he made a living from the gifts of the notables of the day, to whom he dedicated kaşîadas (among others, to the sultans Selim I, Suleyman I, to Djâfer Celibi and Ibn Kemâl). In his old age he practised geomancy in a shop which soon became a sort of literary club for men of letters, where Dhâtî helped and encouraged many young talents (such as Tâshîhdâlî Yâyâ

Apart from a voluminous diwan, his major work is Shām ʿe Pervane, a mathnavī of nearly 4000 couplets interspersed with ghazals, which develops one of the favourite themes of mathnavī literature (for a fairly good copy, see Süleymanîye (Lala İsmâ'il) no. 443).

With no regular education and training, Dhâti taught himself all the knowledge which was required by a diwan-poet. Much appreciated by his contemporaries and early tadhkīrī-writers, unduly neglected later, Dhâti was a poet of remarkable talent and skill, and contributed to the refinement of language and style of diwan-poetry, and thus became a link between Nejdâtî and Bâkî.

Bibliography: The tedkîriers of Latîfî, Khânal-zâde Hasan Çelebi, and the biographical section of Latîfî's Kunh al-Āqāb, s.v.; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, ii; M. Fuad Kopriilî, Dinân Edebehâtî Anlolojisi, Istanbul 1934, 133; A. Bombaci, Storia della letteratura turca, Milan 1956, 336. (FAHİR İZ)

DHAŅK — DHAWK

DHAŅK, "taste", is a technical term used in philosophy, in aesthetics (especially literature), and in Sūfism.

1. In philosophy [see FALSÅFÅ] dhawk is the name for the gustatory sense-perception. Following Aristotle, it is defined as a kind of sub-species of the tactual sense, localized in the gustatory organ, the tongue. It differs from tactual sense, however, in that mere contact with skin is not sufficient for gustation to occur: besides contact, it needs a medium of transmission, viz. the salival moisture. The salival moisture, in order to transmit tastes faithfully, must be in itself tasteless, otherwise it would impose its own taste upon the object of gustation, as is the case with patients of bile. The problem is discussed whether the tasted object "mixes" with the saliva and thus its parts are directly tasted, or whether the object causes a qualitative change in the saliva, which is then transmitted to the tongue. The answer is that both are conjointly possible and it is therefore held that if it were possible for the object to be transmitted without this moisture gustation could occur all the same, for example, vision, for which a medium is absolutely necessary.

2. In aesthetics, dhawk is the name for the power of aesthetic appreciation; it is something that "moves the heart". But although it is psychologically subjective, it nevertheless requires objective standards (ijdâf) for objectivity and verification, "just as the taste of sugar is private, nevertheless its sweetness is something universally agreed upon by consensus".

3. The aesthetic definition of dhawk already stands at the threshold of the mystic use of the term. In its mystical usage this term denotes the direct quality of the mystic experience. The Christian mystics have used this term e.g. in the ḥerôsis kardëlis and γένουσι of Bishop Diodochoe, although it would occur naturally to a mystic endeavouring to distinguish direct experience from discursive knowledge. The metaphor of "sight" is also often used, but dhawk has more qualitative overtones of enjoyment and "intoxication" (sukh) besides the noetic element which it shares with the term "sight". Thus, Djalâl al-Ḏin Rûmi says "you cannot appreciate the intoxication of this wine unless you taste it". Kamâl al-Ḏin in his Iṣâlahat al-sülahya states that dhawk is the first stage of wâdâd (ecstasy), the two further stages being shûk (drinking) and dhawk (bothering). According to some, however, wâdâd is a higher stage than dhawk. These distinctions, however, are later, and concern the doctrine of Sūfism rather than its practice.

Dhaṅk is also commonly used to denote insight or intuitive appreciation, generally of any phenomenon whatsoever, and implies the previous acquisition and exercise of a skill: a doctor, for example, on the basis of his previous experience be able to identify a novel disease by dhawk; or a historian, in face of conflicting evidence on a point, may be able to decide by a kind of "historical intuition".

Bibliography: In addition to the references above, and general works on philosophy and literary aesthetics, see al-THâNâWî, Dictionnary of technical terms, s.v.; al-Dîjmâgne, K. al-TâVîfâtî, F. RAHMÅN.

DHAŅK, MUHAMMAD İBRAHÎM ŞAYKH, Urdu poet b. Dihlî 11 Ḏhu l-Ḥijjah 1209/18 December 1790 (so Azâd; in 1203 according to a contemporary Calcutta newspaper, cf. Nawâ-i Adab, 45), the only son of Sh. Muhammad Ramadân, a trusted servant of Nawâb Lutf ʿAlî Kân of Dihlî. His early schooling in Persian and Arabic was in the mosque-school of Ḥâfiz Ḥulûm Rasûl Shawk, a poet and a pupil of Shâh Naṣîr (Shểtâ, 150), who inspired the young learner with a love for reading and writing poetry. Dhaṅk later became a pupil of Shâh Naṣîr and followed his style, but after some time, when a rupture had taken place between the pupil and the teacher, he began to write successfully in the style of the well-known masters of Urdu poetry, particularly Sawdâ. He was now attending madhâfâras and acquiring fame as a young poet (cf. Spranger, 222; Kazüm, Madmûd-aş-Nâgâ, ii, 385: Dhaṅk was about 17 when this was written). He intensified his study of the sciences (medicine, music, astrology, etc.) when an opportunity came for him to complete his education, and the technical terms of these stood him in good stead later when he came to write ḥâdîs. His reputation grew rapidly, and Mir Kazüm Husayn, an old class-fellow, introduced him to Aboz Şafaż, the heir apparent of Akbar Shah II, whose poetical compositions he was in due course appointed to correct, roughly from 1816 (cf. Karîm al-Ḏin, Tadkhîrâ-i Nâmânûn, 118; but cf. also his Tabâkâbî, 459). On presenting a ḥâsâda to Akbar Şah he received the title of Ḥikâm-i Hind, by which Şelta (between 1831-3) calls him. After the prince ascended the throne, as Bahâdûr Shah II, in 1837, Dhaṅk became his laureate, and his pay, formerly the first stage of wâdâd (ecstasy), the two further stages being shûk (drinking) and dhawk (bothering). According to some, however, wâdâd is a higher stage than dhawk. These distinctions, however, are later, and concern the doctrine of Sūfism rather than its practice.

Dhaṅk was of rather small stature, with a dark pock-marked face (the result of a childhood attack), a good memory, and knew a large number of Persian and other ceremonial court odes in the style of Akbar Shah he received many other favours after reciting his Tadhkīrâ-i Naṣîhâ, and thus became a link between Nejdâtî and Bâkî.

Dhawfr was of rather small stature, with a dark pock-marked face (the result of a childhood attack), bright eyes, and a loud but pleasant voice. He had a good memory, and knew a large number of Persian verses by heart. He was a religious-minded man, of a persuasion according to Karîm al-Ḏin's conflicting evidence on a point, may be able to identify a novel disease by dhawk; or a historian, in face of conflicting evidence on a point, may be able to decide by a kind of "historical intuition".

Bibliography: In addition to the references above, and general works on philosophy and literary aesthetics, see al-THâNâWî, Dictionnary of technical terms, s.v.; al-Dîjmâgne, K. al-TâVîfâtî, F. RAHMÅN.
He was a prolific writer, as his contemporaries (Sābir, Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Anwar, Azad and others) testify, but much of his work was lost in the disturbances of 1857-8. According to Shīfīna, who used to meet him occasionally, 106, and Sābir, 223, he did not arrange his poems in the form of a diwan; according to Azad Dhwak compiled a diwan when 15 or 16 years old, though its fate is unknown. Zafar also refers to a diwan of Dhwak (Hindustānī, April 1945, 40). The earliest edition of the diwan, 186 pp., was lithographed in Dihlī in 1859; no reference to it occurs in the subsequent editions. An attempt to collect his work was made by Hāфиз Gholām Rasūl Wārān (the blind pupil of Dhwak, who had associated with him for some 20 years and who knew a large number of his poems by heart) and his co-editors Zahir and Anwar (for whom see Saksena, 156 ff.; Bailey, 74 ff.); as well as taking dictation from Wārān, Zahir and Anwar made use of various tadhkiras and of the note-books of the poet’s pupils. This diwan (259 bayts) was lithographed in Dihlī in 1299/1862-3, with an Urdu colophon and Anwar’s Persian preface (20 pp.) appended to the book; it was later lithographed several times, without the Persian preface, in Kānpūr, Dihlī, Mīrāt, etc. The largest edition was produced by Azād, in his old age (1858-9 ?) just before his mind became finally deranged; he states that soon after Dhwak’s death he and the poet’s son, Muhammad Iṣmā’īl, collected Dhwak’s poems after the labour of many months. This collection was published from Lahore in 1890 (Blumbhart, Suppl. Cat., 319), and is composed mostly of ghazals, 24 or 25 bayts, and some fragments (500 bayts in all), with interesting prefatory and marginal notes. Several pages of rare verses of the poet have been quoted from a Nāgārīṣṭīn-i Shawkān in the Mu‘āṣir. More of his unpublished verses can be collected from old tadhkiras. This and what follows would justify a new critical edition of the diwan.

In a critical examination of Azād’s edition (Ph. D. thesis, 1939) Muhammad Sādīk claims that Azād revised and improved Dhwak’s juvenile work, in some cases slightly, in others drastically; later, in 1944-7, Professor Mahmūd Shīrānī proved the interpellations throughout the diwan even more fully and conclusively; and the same is shown by Iṣmā’īl’s ed. of the diwan (edition of 1279 A.H.; now in Dr. Saksena, 156 ff.; Bailey, 74 ff.); as well as taking dictation from Wārān, Zahir and Anwar (for whom see Saksena, 156 ff.; Bailey, 74 ff.); as well as taking dictation from Wārān, Zahir and Anwar (for whom see Saksena, 156 ff.; Bailey, 74 ff.) a supplementary catalogue . . ., London 1909, 323; Muhammad Husayn Azād, Diwan-i Dhwak (the life of Dhwak as given in this and the following work is to be used cautiously); idem, 1887, 402; Sri Rām, Kāmhāna-i Diwād, Dihlī 1947, 175 ff.; Shah Muḥāmmed Sulaymān, Fadillāh-i ghazals (with Mu‘āṣir-i Dhwak wa Chālib), Budayyin 1925 (?); T. Grahame Bailey, History of Urdu literature, Calcutta 1932, 70 and index; Muhammad Rafīq Khwārā, Khākhāni-i Hind (24 mu‘āṣirāt) Lahore 1933; Muhammad Sādīk, Mu‘āṣir (sic) Muhammad Husayn Azād: his life, works and influence (Ph. D. thesis, 1939, Appx. viii, VII, now in the Punjab University library); Rām Bābā Saksenā, History of Urdu literature, Allahābād 1940, 152-6, 16-29; Kādī Čulmān Āfīr, Biḥātār ghasal-gō, Lucknow 1941; Fīrāk Gorakhpur, Andāz, Allahābād, xxii (1937), ci (1944); Kālīm al-Dīn Ahmad, Urdā ghā’irī par 2 ek nazar, Patnā 1952, 113; Hindustānī (Urdu quarterly), Allahābād, 1944, i, iv; 1945, all issues; 1946, i, 1947; i, Sayyid Mas‘ūd Hasan Rīdāwī, Bī‘ai Hayāt kā ṭandkiyat mu‘āṣira, Lucknow 1953, 29, 59; Nāvās-i Adab (Urdu quarterly), Bombay, i/x (July-September 1958), 41; Sayyid Imām Āṭār, Kākhīs al-khadāb, Lahore 1959, i, 29 ff., 258 ff., 280 ff. (Muhammad Shafi)

**DHAWAK** [see CĂȘENĂGHIM]

**AL-DHĪBĀB**, “the wolves”, a South Arabian tribe whose lands lie between the territory of the Lower ʿAwwālī [q.v.] and the Lower Wahīdī [q.v.]. There are also considered to be elements of the Dhībāb in the country of the Lower Wahīdī itself, the villages of which are largely occupied by them. The soil is unfertile and mostly prairie-like pasture land. In the east of the district is a mountain of some size, the Dībal Hamrā, over 4000 ft. high. The chief place is the fishing village of Hawra (al-Ulyā) with an important harbour.

The Dhībāb are a very wild, warlike tribe of
robbers, and are therefore feared throughout South Arabia. They are Kabd'il (free, independent tribes) and are considered as genuine Himyars; their slogan (qarkhe, tamsen) is: and Dhihnl (Dhib) Hmyar (Himyar), "I am the wolf of Hmyar". They have no common sultan, and the various branches of the tribe are ruled by Shayykh, called Aba "father", whom they heed only in case of war. The most influential Shayhakh of the Dhihlb lives in 7rka (Friga).


DHPB, the wolf. Most of the cognate forms in other Semitic languages have the same significance. Numerous synonyms and sobriquets are found in Arabic, such as sirkan, usaya, sid, abd dja'da, etc. In local usage, dhi'b may also denote the jackal (Jayakar, Malouf), yet Hommel's assumption (203, n. 1) that this was the only meaning of the word in ancient Arabic (so also Jacob) is inconsistent with its use in the Sura of Joseph (Kur'an, XII, 13, 14, 17), where it stands for the biblical 'evil beast' (Gen. xxxviii 20, 33).

Ample mention of the dhi'b is made in ancient Arabic poems, proverbs, popular traditions and hadiths, some of which are quoted in later zoological writings. Other information given by Arab zoologists goes back to foreign sources, such as Aristotle's Historia Animalium and the ancient Physiologus literature.

Since dhi'b, in the Arabic script, is similar to dubb (= bear), the two words were easily confused and, consequently, the behaviour and properties of one animal have sometimes been attributed to the other.

The dhi'b is described as extremely malignant, quarrelsome and cunning. It is quick of hearing and possesses a powerful sense of smell. It feeds on flesh only but eats herbs when ill. It can go without food for a long time, whence the proverb: "More hungry than a wolf". Dab al-dhi'b (lit.: the wolf's disease) is a metaphorical expression for hunger. Its stomach may become so engorged that some of its contents (possibly the liver) is able to dissolve a solid bone but not a date stone. Its penis consists of bone. The female is robuster and more courageous than the male. If a hyena is killed or caught, the dhi'b takes care of her young. Some authors state that the wolf goes single and does not associate, while others describe its behaviour in aggregation; no one separates from the pack, as they do not trust one another. When one becomes weak or is wounded, it is eaten by the others. When asleep, they keep the right and left eye open alternately to keep watch on one another. The wolf is always prone to attack men in contrast to other wild animals which do so only when old and unable to hunt. It assails a person from behind, not from the front. A man who shows no fear of it remains unmolested, but is attacked when afraid. Only ravenous wolves are aggressive. When a wolf has designs on a flock of sheep, it howls so that the dog hears and runs in the direction of the sound; the wolf then goes to the other side where there is no dog and snatches the sheep away. It makes its raids preferably just before sunrise when shepherd and dog are both tired from the night watch.

Some of the information on the wolf belongs to the field of superstition, e.g.: If a man carries with him thefang, skin or eye of a wolf, he will overcome his opponents and be loved by all people. The wolf may also have played a part in Arabic onerramony. Its blood, brain, liver, bile, testicles, dung and urine were used for various medicinal purposes.


DHIHNL, Bayburdlu, Turkish folk-poet, b. towards the end of the 12th/13th century in Bayburt. Educated in Erzurum and Trabzon, he spent ten years in Istanbul and later travelled in the provinces on minor governmental duties; he was for a short time in the service of Mustafa Reshid Pasha. He spent the last four years of his life in Trabzon and died in a village outside town. He made a journey while on his way to his home town (1275/1859).

His background, somewhat different from that of the usual folk poet, led him to imitate classical poets, and he even composed a complete dwn of traditional poetry in arud. But he remained a poor and awkward imitator of dwn poets and his fame rests entirely on a few poems, written in the folk tradition, which he himself tried to ignore and did not include in his dwn. Dhihnl, as a folk poet, is strongly under the influence of classical poets and his poems are full of the figures, images, and similes of dwn poetry. In spite of this he succeeds in capturing the spirit of the genuine folk poet of the early 19th century. His famous koshma about his home town was written when he saw Bayburt in utter ruin, after its devastation by the Russians in 1828.

Bibliography: Ziyaeddin Fabri, Bayburdlu Zihni, Istanbul 1928; Ibndilemin Mahmud Kemal, Bayburdlu Zihni, in Turk Tarik Encimens Mec., i, 1929; M. Fuad Koprului, Turk Sazsiirleri Anlotljos, Istanbul 1940, iii, 450. (Faktir Iz)

DHIKR, reminding oneself. "Remind thyself of (udhkur) thy Lord when thou forgettest" (Kur'an, XVIII, 24). Thus: the act of reminding, then oral mention of the memory, especially the tireless technique of this mention. In dhikr is the above-quoted text Kur'anic basis of the dhikr in poetry. In spite of this he succeeds in capturing the spirit of the genuine folk poet of the early 19th century. His famous koshma about his home town was written when he saw Bayburt in utter ruin, after its devastation by the Russians in 1828.

Bibliography: Ziyaeddin Fabri, Bayburdlu Zihni, Istanbul 1928; Ibndilemin Mahmud Kemal, Bayburdlu Zihni, in Turk Tarik Encimens Mec., i, 1929; M. Fuad Koprului, Turk Sazsiirleri Anlotljos, Istanbul 1940, iii, 450. (Faktir Iz)

DHIKR, reminding oneself. "Remind thyself of (udhkur) thy Lord when thou forgettest" (Kur'an, XVIII, 24). Thus: the act of reminding, then oral mention of the memory, especially the tireless repetition of an ejaculatory litany, finally the very technique of this mention. In tasawwuf the dhikr may be possibly the most frequent form of prayer, its muhabbal ("opposite correlative") being fikr (q.v.), (discursive) reflection, meditation. In his Fawsat, in connexion with Muhammad's "nocturnal ascension", al-Hallali declares that the road which passes through "the garden of dhikr" and that which is described as the "way of fikr" are equally valid. For the Sufis the Kur'anic basis of the dhikr is the above-quoted text (cited, among others, by al-Kalabadi) and XXXIII, 41: "O ye who believe! Remember (udhkur! Allah with much remembrance (dhikr** kafi**)". Hadiths are often quoted in support and in praise of the practice. As an ejaculatory litany tirelessly repeated the dhikr may be compared with the "prayer of Jesus"
of the oriental Christians, Sinaitic then Anthonic, and also with the *dhyā-yoga* of India and the Japanese *nembutsu*, and this quite apart from historical threads which may have played a rôle in one direction or another. One may recognize in these modes of prayer, without denying possible influences, a universal tendency, however climates and religious beliefs may differ.

**Traditions of the Brotherhoods:**—The *dhikr* may be uttered aloud (*dā'ūl*) or in a low voice (*khās*). At the beginning the formula must always have the sign of the cross, either in动荡 (star-shaped) [q.v.]: there is a double tradition: that of solitary *dhikr* (aloud or whispered), and that of collective *dhikr* (aloud). It is the first which the major texts of the great spiritual writers envisage: "The Şīfī retires by himself to a cell (zāmiya) ... After sitting in solitude he utters continuously "God (Allāh)" being present with his heart as well" (*al-Ǧhazzālī, Iḫyā',* III, 16-7). Several brotherhoods (the *Shadhiliyya* and their offshoots, Khawāṣṣ, Darkawa, etc.) stress the advantages of solitary *dhikr* and seem to make it a condition of the *dhikr al-khawan* (of the "privileged"), those well advanced along the spiritual path. Others (Ramānīyya, etc.), without excluding the entry into solitude, stress the dangers of it and recommend, at least for a long time, "sessions" (*ḥadīr*) or "circles" (*kalbā* of collective *dhikr*. The latter is without doubt as old as the solitary *dhikr*; but in its liturgico-technical form, with prescribed attitutes regulating the respiratory rhythm as well as the physical posture, it seems to have been born at a relatively late date, about the 8th/13th century, betraying Indo-Iranian influence among the Mawlawiyya ("Whirling Dervishes") of Konya, and Indian through Turko-Mongol influence (cf. the descriptions by the Mongol ex-functionary Simnānī, 13th-14th centuries). This technicality, which must have been introduced progressively, extends its influence to the experience of the solitary *dhikr* itself (cf. in the Christian Orient the connexions between the "prayer of Jesus" and the hesychastic technique).

The "sessions" generally take the form of a kind of liturgy which begins with the recitation of Qur'ānic verses and prayers composed by the founder of the in the Middle Ages, and later by the *shāhīd* or the *wird* [q.v.], often accompanied by the "spiritual oratorio" (*samāt*). *Wird*, *samāt*, and physical posture during the recitation of the *dhikr* vary with the brotherhoods (see, for the Maḥrīb, Rinn, *Marabouts et Khouan*). For the *dhikr* itself the best summary is the *Ṣaḥālib al-mu'īn* (*fī l-tādhīb al-ḥawbah al-arba'in* of Muḥammad al-Sanūsī (d. 1276/1859) printed on the margin of the same author's *Masābih al-ṭāhir*, where there is a condensed account of the essential characteristics of the *dhikr* practised by the forty preceding brotherhoods, of which the Sanūsīyya claim to have adopted the essential. The collective *dhikr* sessions described by Western writers are generally classifiable as "*dhikr* of the commonality (*al-'awdūm*)*. One of the best-observed accounts is that of the Ramānīyya by W. S. Haas. It requires correction and completion (e.g., in connection with the "condivisi" [q.v., which may be used in solitude and by "a man aware of what the result will be". (It appears that the modern *Alliwīyya* brotherhood of Mostaghmem has re-adapted this procedure).

Other formulae are proposed by Ibn 'Āta' Allāh of Alexandria, Simnānī, Bāsh Tārzī, etc. in accordance with gnostic hierarchies where spiritual progress is matched with the vision of "coloured lights" which is the sign of it: *Huwa, al-Lāh, al-Ḥaqq, al-Ḳayyūm, al-Ḳahhār*.

The duration of the experience is regulated either by the *sha'yār*, or, in solitude, by numbers, with or without the help of a rosary (*suḥbā*): 300, 3,000, 6,000, 12,000, 70,000 repetitions (cf. the 6,000 or 12,000 "prayers of Jesus" daily of the "Russian Pilgrim" and the Japanese liturgy "of the million" (*nembutsu*). The invocation may finally become unceasing, without care about the exact number. Control of the respiration seems mostly to be concomitant, but it appears more deliberate in the Hamayyīl *dhikr* (6th/12th century) and Simnānī's descriptions and also in the counsels of Zayn al-Mīla wa'l-Dīn (no doubt Khāwāfī) the commentator on Anāfīr's *Manāsī*.

The *dhikr* as an internal experience:—One of the best sources is the *Miftaḥ al-falāḥ* of Ibn
DHIKR

Ata: Allah of Alexandria, the second Grand Master of the Shadhill order. Reference may also be made, on the one hand, to Al-Kalâbâdhî's chapter on the ghîr and the matter-of-fact description of Ghazzâlî, and, on the other hand, to the numerous gnoses of later times (Zayn al-Dîn, Bâsh Târzî, Amin al-Kurdi Nakshbandî, etc.). Three main stages may be distinguished, each being subdivided; it is to be noted that these progressive stages are found again in the writings of Malay Sûfism.

(1) Dhiir of the tongue with "intention of the heart" (cfr. the matter-of-fact description of Ghazzâlî, and the passage of his "sûfî as a tongue" without nâyâ). The name wâyet is rejected, for it would be "just routine, profitless", says Bâsh Târzî. (a) At the first step, there is a voluntary recitation, with effort, in order to "place the One Mentioned in the heart" according to the exact modes of utterance and physical postures taught by the shaykh; it is firstly to this level that the foregoing descriptions apply. (b) At the second step the recitation continues effortlessly. The disciple, says Ghazzâlî (Ibydî, iii, 17), " leaves off the movement of the tongue and sees the word (or formula) as it were flowing over it". Cf. the similar testimony of those who have experienced the "prayer of Jesus" as it were flowing over it. The "effortless" step may be compared with the dhârâyâ stage of Yoga experience, "fixation" (of mental activity).

(2) Dhiir of the heart

The Sûfî reaches a point where he has effaced the trace of the word on his tongue, and finds his heart continuously applied to the Dhiir (al-Ghazzâlî, ibid. Same testimony in Account by a Russian Pilgrim). Here also there are two steps: (a) with effort (cfr. Ibn 'Ata Allâh, Miftâh, 4), i.e., with the obscure desire to "maintain the formula" which results in something like a pain felt in the physical heart; (b) effortless: this presence is expressed in a sort of hammering of the formula by the beating of the physical heart (same in Russian Pilgrim) and by the pulsation of the blood in the veins and the arteries, with no utterance, even mental, of the words, but where the words never appear. This is a move of "necessity of presence", where the "state of consciousness" dissolves into an acquired passivity. Cf. the step of "absorption" (dhyâna) of Yoga. Al-Ghazzâlî's analysis in the Ibydî halts at this stage. "It is in his (the disciple's) power to reach this limit, and to make the state lasting by repulsing temptations; but, on the other hand, it is not in his power to attract to himself the Mercy of the All-High". This important distinction is reminiscent of al-Hâllâdî's exclamation to God: "You are my ravisher, it is not the Dhiir which has ravished me!" (Dhârdân, 53). Later traditions no longer draw this distinction. Ibn 'Ata Allâh's monograph speaks of a third stage, for which the second is an effective preparation.

(3) Dhiir of the "inmost being" (sîrû)

The heart (kârî) was the seat of the "knowledge of God"; the "inmost being" (sîrû), "a substance more subtle than the spirit (ruh)" will be the place of the "vision" (muṣâdhâda) of them. It is also the place where the tâwhîd takes place, the declaration of divine unity and the unification of the self with the self, and the self with God. The writers often associate this third stage of the Dhiir with the state of iṣâm, spiritual perfection and beauty. The "arrival" of the Dhiir of the inmost being is known by this, that "if you leave off the Dhiir it does not leave you, and the whole being of the Sûfî becomes 'a tongue uttering the Dhiir'." (Miftâh, 6). The slave of God "has disappeared (ghâ'ib) both from the Dhiir and the very object of the Dhiir" (ibid.). Thus no duality must remain. But a twofold step is distinguished even here: (a) fana? 'an al-Dhiir wa 'l-madhkur ... ûd 'îlah, annihilation away from the Dhiir and its object ... towards God; (b) fana? 'an al-fand*. ... bi'lldh, annihilation away from the annihilation ... in God. It seems that this state may be compared with the entry into samâdiy al-Dhiir of Indian Yoga (or at least the "samâdiy with seed"; any equivalence with the "samâdiy without seed" should be more closely examined): "becoming one alone!" (cf. the Indian kâhiyâ) conceived as abolition in God, generally in the line of "monism of the Being" (wahdat al-wujûd). The personality of the Sûfî has, as were, "disappeared" in the abolishing of all acts. Ibn 'Ata Allâh's description of the Dhiir al-sîrû goes as far as possible in expressing this.

Accompanying phenomena and explication gnosos:—Ibn 'Ata Allâh describes the Dhiir of the tongue as sounds of voices and rhythms "within the periphery of the head". Explanation: "the son of Adam is a mixture of all substances, noble and base", and the sounds heard come from each of the "constituent elements" of these substances (Miftâh, 5); the Dhiir liberates the harmony established between the microcosm and the macrocosm (cf. the period of "cosmization" of Yoga). The Dhiir of the heart resembles "the buzzing of bees, without a loud or disturbing noise" (ibid.) and is accompanied by luminous and coloured phenomena, at this stage intermittent. Al-Ghazzâlî drew attention to this as the "apparition of lights" which "sometimes pass like a flash of lightning and sometimes stay, sometimes last and sometimes do not last, sometimes follow each other different from one another, sometimes blend into one single mood" (loc. cit.). He explains them as "gleams of truth" released by God's good will, but other authors later describe them as intrinsically and obligatorily bound up with the Dhiir experience. Later writers describe these luminous phenomena as being even more brilliant at the step of the Dhiir of the inmost being, of which they become the particular mark. This time "the fire of the Dhiir does not go out, and its lights do not flee ... You see always lights going up and others coming down; the fire around you is bright, very hot, and it flames" (Miftâh, 6). Yoga describes similar phenomena. Moreover it would be rewarding to make a comparison and a distinction between the Sûfî analyses and either the Buddhist "objective" illumination or the "uncreated light of the Thabor" of the oriental forms of Christianity. Various late authors establish other successive stages from the Dhiir of the inmost being which are also marked by variously coloured luminous phenomena. The descriptions vary with the texts and do not seem to affect the structure of the experience. This hierarchy proposed by Simnâni: grey smoke (corporeal envelope); blue (physical soul); red (heart); white light ("inmost being"); yellow spirit (ruh); black (subtle and mysterious principle, hâfisyya); green (reality hâkîhâ), the state of the perfect soul "which sums up all the other states" as Bâsh Târzî states.

These rising and falling lights are held to be "divine illumination"; no longer a gift from Mercy, Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
as al-Ghazzālī believed, but an effect linked to the experience according to the extent to which the dhikr of the tongue and its “cosmization” effects entry into the world of ḥabārūl, All-Power. The higher stages introduce into the domain of malakūt “angelic substances”; they may even lead to lāhāl, the world of the Divine Essence. "If you recite the dhikr with your inmost being, recite with yourself the Throne with all its worlds until the dhikr unites with the Divine Essence (dālīh) (Mīṭlāk, 7). One is reminded here of the entry into the "Pure Land" of the Jōdo promised to the disciples of the Japanese nembutsu.

These gnostic visions, which in Ibn ʿAṭā Allāh are relatively sober, later become involved in the effort (as in the above-quoted text of Ibn Amin al-Kurdi).

Interpretations:—Al-Hallāj, al-Kalābādī, etc., speak of the dhikr as a method of reminding one’s self of God, of helping the soul to live in God’s presence; but without for this reason understimating the discursive method of fiṣḥ. Al-Ghazzālī portrays the dhikr as the way of the Sufis, but still preserves, so it seems, the method aspect of its nature: a method of unifying the disciple’s spirit and preparing him to receive, if the Lord wills, the supreme Mercies. Ibn ʿAṭā Allāh informs us at the beginning of the Mīṭlāk that to the best of his belief no monograph has yet been devoted to the dhikr. If this is true, then the developments ex professo in the theory and practice of the dhikr, and the absolutely capital importance assigned to it, may be dated from the 6th/12th century. Ibn ʿAṭā Allāh no longer speaks of it as a preparatory or concomitant method, but as an effective technique, up to its consummation: entry into the domain of lāhāl. Later works insist even more on technique—voice, breathing, posture, etc., give themselves up to long discursions on the gnostic theme, and never cease to see in the dhikr pursued to its last steps a "guarantee" of attainment. This emphasis on technique (where non-Muslim influence is much in evidence) dates from the 8th/14th century onwards. A very important stage in this development is the Šūfism dominated by the One-ness of Being (waḥdat al-ʿudwāfīd); man, in respect of his most "spiritual" aspects, is considered to belong by nature to the divine.

Now the direct effect of experiencing the dhikr seems to be a monolimism working on the One Mentioned, “realizing” that perpetual (conscious) “re-membering” which the first Šūfīs demanded of their disciples (cf. the “prayer of Jesus” of the Sīnātic Fathers). But as techniques progressed the ever more numerous analyses are marked by the “cosmization” of the dhikr of the tongue, the influence of the dhikr of the heart on the circulatory system, and the probable influence of the dhikr of the inmost being on the para- and ortho-sympathetic systems, and it seems as though we are in the presence of a control by this monoideism on the individual’s conscious, unconscious, zones. In this case we are dealing with an equivalent of the dīṣṭa-yoga, almost certainly bringings about a twisting-back of self on self towards an ineffable grip of the first act of existence. The conceptualizations of the waḥdat al-ʿudwāfīd remain faithful to their monist view of the world by calling this movement of "enstasy" janāa ... bilāla.

This “attainment” is the fruit of a difficult technique of natural spirituality based on long asceticism. It is understandable that certain brother-hoods should have sought the equivalent (or what they thought to be the equivalent) by purely physical procedures: the sacred dances of the Mawlawiyya, the cries of the “Howlers”, not to mention stimulating and stupefying drugs. Thus one arrives finally at veritable counterfeits which have not been without effect on the opposition by the naḥda of contemporary Islam to the brother-hoods and its distrust of Šūfism.

To sum up: in the course of the history of Šūfism, two distinct lines of utilization of the dhikr. The first and oldest makes it simply a method of prayer, without excluding other methods, where technique appears only in rudimentary form. The second, which became dominant, sees in it a guarantee of efficacy in attaining the highest “states” (abūl) by virtue of a seeking after lāhāl conceived as a (substantial) identification with the divine. This latter tendency often yields to the attraction of “procedures” and gnosces which become ever more extravagant. The testimony of Ghazzālī in the Iḥyā stands at the hinge of the two lines—nearer to the first, and yet bearing witness already to the appearance of technique.


II. Western works: A. le Chatelier, Les conférences musulmanes du Hedjaz, Paris 1887; Depot and Coppolani, Les conférences religieuses musulmanes, Algiers 1897; Goldziher, Vorlesungen, index s.v. Dīkhīr; J. P. Brown, The Dervishes, or oriental spiritualism, London 1868; Hughes, Dictionary of Islam, s.v. Zikr; D. B. Macdonald, Religious attitude and life in Islam, Chicago 1909, index s.vv. Dīkhīr and Dhikr. For the primary meaning of dīkhīr as an arm, remembrance, see for example, M. Gaulouf-Demonbynes, Mahomet, Paris 1957, 517-9; for the technical meaning: Louis Rinn, Marabouts et Khouan, Algiers 1884; W. S. Haas, The zikhr of the Rahmanīya-Order in Algeria, in MW, January 1943; Louis Massignon, Passion d’al-Hallāj, Paris 1922, Index; idem, Recueil de textes inédits, Paris 1929, 143, ref. to Fleischer,

(L. Gardet)

DHIMMA, the term used to designate the sort of indefinitely renewed contract through which the Muslim community accorded hospitality and protection to members of other revealed religions, on condition of their acknowledging the domination of Islam. The beneficaries of the dhimma are called dhimmis, and are collectively referred to as ahij al-dhimmia or simply dhimma. An account of the doctrinal position of Islam vis-à-vis the religions in question, and of the polemics between the two sides, is given in the article AH1 AL-KITAB, for a detailed account of the various religious communities see MADINAS, NABAAR, SARIPON and YAHUD. Mention is made here only of the general characteristics of the Muslim attitude to non-Muslims, as expressed in their institutions and social practices.

The bases of the treatment of non-Muslims in Islam depend partly on the attitude of the Prophet, partly on conditions obtaining at their conquest. Muhammad is known to have first tried to integrate the principal Jewish groups at Medina into a rather loose organization, then opposed them violently, and finally, after the expansion of his authority across Arabia, concluded agreements of submission and protection with the Jews of other localities such as Khaybar, and with the Christians of, e.g., Najran; this last action alone could and did serve as precedent in the subsequent course of the Conquest. The essential Qur’anic text is IX, 54: “Fight those who do not believe ... until they pay the dzuya ...” which would imply that after they had come to pay there was no longer reason for fighting them. The conditions at the time of the conquest consisted essentially of the enormous numerical superiority of non-Muslims over Muslims in the conquered countries, and of their generally favourable bias towards the Muslims. Food-supply, intelligence, and security against espionage (it is as an example of this that we must understand the prohibition, on which later rigorists were to insist, of the wearing by dhimmis of Arab dress, since in fact the natives and the Arabs dressed differently). But the essential—and lasting—stipulation concerns the payment of the distinguishing tax or dzuya (q.v.), which was later to develop into a precise poll-tax, and which, expressing subjection, was to inaugurate the definitive fiscal status of the dhimmis; this was in conformity with the usual custom of all mediaeval societies where non-dominant religious communities were concerned. Precautions must have been taken to avoid clashes between different communities, which at first enjoyed such friendly relations that buildings could be divided between Christians and Muslims; but it was only in the ummar that restrictions on the right to construct new religious buildings could already from that time be maintained. The preservation by each community of its own laws and customs, as well as its own leaders—this also in conformity with the attitude of all mediaeval societies—must have resulted in the first place from the situation as it was rather than from any formal decision. The autochthonous non-Muslims, who were often un-acustomed to bear arms, were only exceptionally called upon for military services.

The dhimma is defined as against the Muslim and the idolater (with reference to Arabia, but this is scarcely more than a memory); also as against the harbi who is of the same faith but lives in territories not yet under Islam; and finally as against the musta’min, the foreigner who is granted the right of living in an Islamic territory for a short time (one year at most). Originally only Jews and Christians were involved; soon, however, it became necessary to consider the Zoroastrians, and later, especially in Central Asia, other minor faiths not mentioned in the Kur’ân. The Zoroastrians, by committing to writing the previously orally transmitted Avesta, attained the status of Ah1 al-kitab; but more generally the Muslims, without waiting for such a step, and whether or not there existed recognized communal chiefs to guarantee the unbroken performance of the agreements, in fact accorded to the subject believers of most religions an effective status comparable to that of the dhimmis properly so-called, except for a few points of inferiority of which one or two examples will be given.

However, the precise nature of the earliest regimes, which varied according to the conditions obtaining at each conquest, is difficult to determine exactly, since the relevant texts have often been altered, and sometimes fabricated from the whole cloth, then opposed them violently, and finally, after the expansion of his authority across Arabia, concluded agreements of submission and protection with the Jews of other localities such as Khaybar, and with the Christians of, e.g., Najran; this last action alone could and did serve as precedent in the subsequent course of the Conquest. The essential Qur’anic text is IX, 54: “Fight those who do not believe ... until they pay the dzuya ...” which would imply that after they had come to pay there was no longer reason for fighting them. The conditions at the time of the conquest consisted essentially of the enormous numerical superiority of non-Muslims over Muslims in the conquered countries, and of their generally favourable bias towards the Muslims. Food-supply, intelligence, and security against espionage (it is as an example of this that we must understand the prohibition, on which later rigorists were to insist, of the wearing by dhimmis of Arab dress, since in fact the natives and the Arabs dressed differently). But the essential—and lasting—stipulation concerns the payment of the distinguishing tax or dzuya (q.v.), which was later to develop into a precise poll-tax, and which, expressing sub-
But indeed, on the other hand, we must recognize that current practice fell very much short of the preeminent, which was hardly ever implemented except in the great Muslim centres and in the capitals, and was even then incomplete and sporadic; the different juridical schools are moreover not at all in agreement, and some of them reiterate rules without any practical effect. On the whole the condition of the dhimmis, although unstable in its minor practical aspects, was until about the 6th/7th century in the west, and the 7th/8th in the east, essentially satisfactory, in comparison with, say, that of the admitted smaller Jewish community in the neighbouring Byzantine empire.

The principal directions in which the strengthening of Islamic control operated were as follows. On the one hand people like the sindis, Manicheans and those under their influence, who were suspected of wishing to propagate false doctrines within Islam, were excluded from the category of dhimmis, and, of course, were those who, like the Mazdakites of Bâbak, called in question the very political domination of Islam. As far as the dhimmis in the traditional sense are concerned, their rights held good, and it could even be said that their financial situation had become closer to that of the Muslims than it was at first, since the converted possessors of kharâj lands had to continue to pay this kharâj, which the Arabs from the time of the conquest had not paid, and, though they did not pay the diyâya, had to pay the sakât on their other income. The dhimmis moreover retained the autonomy of their own internal law, the stipulations of which formed the subject of treatises compiled at that time, and although they were able, if they wished, to apply to a Muslim judge (who would then often adjudicate according to Muslim law), they continued normally to resort to their own chiefs where these existed. Nevertheless, in relations between dhimmis and Muslims, the two parties were not treated equally; thus, the Muslim could marry a dhimmî woman, but a dhimmî could not marry a Muslim woman; a dhimmî could not own a Muslim slave, although the converse was permitted; at the frontier the dhimmis were regarded as dhimmimûn, to wear distinguishing articles of dress, in particular the sumâr belt, the original intention of which was perhaps merely to prevent administrative errors but which gradually came to be regarded as a sign of humiliation, and was accompanied by complementary restrictions such as the prohibition of fine cloth, noble steeds, uncut forelocks, etc.; in fact, it would appear that these regulations, often variable in their detail, had never been respected for any length of time (with the exception of the application to dhimmis of any kind. On the contrary, it was the close association of Muslims and non-Muslims in everyday life that provided the raison d'être of the restrictions mentioned above. Similarly, although there may have been some professional specialization, such as the trade of dyeing in the hands of the Jews, in general the mixture of faiths among all trades is the striking characteristic of society in “classical” times.

Although there was obviously no “liberty of conscience”, as it would now be understood, in any Muslim society, Islam tolerated the religions of the dhimmis according to the following restrictions: it was forbidden to insult Islam, to seek to convert a Muslim, and apostasy was forbidden (all this, in principle, subject to the death penalty). The child of a mixed marriage was Muslim. As regards places of worship, the jurists are almost unanimous in interpreting restrictively the undertaking made on behalf of Muslims to uphold them, in the sense that this promise could apply only to those buildings which were in use at the time of the advent of Islamic power; hence new building was forbidden, and rigorists opposed even the reconstruction of buildings fallen into decay. The practice of earlier centuries shows that these prohibitions were rarely made absolute, and that as long as money was available the construction of new buildings was usually possible, even in Muslim centres like Fustûn and Cairo, and a fortiori in the regions where there was a non-Muslim majority during the greater part of the middle ages, such as certain districts in Upper Mesopotamia. Yazid II had forbidden figure-representations in these buildings, but this order—linked with the iconoclastic movement, regarded favourably by many monophysite Christians, which was shortly afterwards to show itself so strongly at Byzantium—was certainly not enforced in any lasting way. There were also various limitations on the outward expressions of worship, such as processions and the use of bells, though these were never general in the earlier centuries of Islam. Only in Arabia, most strictly in the Holy Cities, was permanent residence by dhimmis forbidden, following measures some of which go back to ‘Umar—although temporary exceptions made under the Umayyads and ‘Abbasids were numerous. Indeed Jews lived in the Yemen until a few years ago.

Of course, those Muslims who interpreted the early precedents on the dhimmia restrictively endeavoured to find textual authority for their attitude, as did the Christians who opposed them. Thus appeared the allegedly ancient Pact of ‘Umar on the one hand—which in its complete form is not attested before the end of the 6th/7th century—and on the other the Edict of the Prophet to the Christians, a pious fraud of Nestorian monks of the 3rd/4th century. In addition there came gradually into prominence a person, the muštâsib [q.v.], who, entrusted with the maintenance of order in the streets and markets, was to include within its province the control of the dhimmis.

The domain from which one might have expected, from a doctrinal point of view, to see dhimmis excluded is that of government; but in fact this is not the case. Originally the Arabs would, without their assistance, have been unable to carry out the duties of an administration which was primarily the administration of the non-Muslim population. Later Christian bureaucrats, Nestorians in ‘Irân and, more permanently, Copts in Egypt, were able to uphold family positions acquired in the face of the
competition of Muslims, who turned more readily towards other professions, and to whom authority would in any case have found it difficult to entrust duties whose Islamic legality was questionable; the dhimmis, whose situation depended more on the favour of prince or vizier, were more faithful to them. Nowhere had Jews and Christians played a more important part in these matters than in Egypt under the Fatimids; much the same position, however, at certain periods in Spain, and even in the east, al-Mawardi, the theoretician of Caliphal revival, admits—legitimizing past instances—that even a dhimmî vizier was possible, provided that his vizierate was 'executive' (tanfidh) and not with power to command, i.e., that in practice he should neither exercise explicit political responsibility for major political decisions nor, in particular, sit in judgment over Muslims or take the initiative in matters where Islam was concerned. Obviously, it happened on many occasions that the condition upon which a dhimmî could secure or retain a high post was that he should become a convert to Islam; but the bonds of clientship and patronage still held, and the official new Muslim could protect the dhimmî staff to whom he was used.

Moreover, since the dhimmî remained to some extent under the jurisdiction of their own leaders, it followed that the latter were officially invested by the Muslim ruler—to whom the community did not hesitate to appeal when they disagreed on a candidate. The Jews thus came officially under the government of their Exilarch, and the Christians of different denominations similarly under that of their respective Catholicosoi and Patriarchs; in this respect the position of the Zoroastrians is less clear. In Iran, the Catholicos of the Nestorians had some precedence within the entire Christian community. One single persecution of the dhimmî has been recorded in the classical centuries of Islam, that of the Fâtimid al-Hâkim [q.v.], which made a considerable impact in both East and West, because of its severity and of the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre; this was, however, the work of a visionary caliph, whose decision, difficult to explain, may not derive from ordinary processes of reasoning; he himself, at the outset of his mission, retracted his measures, and his successors until the end of the dynasty restored the previous tradition of an extremely broad toleration. Even the Ayyûbid conquest, which adversely affected the Armenian community, hardly impaired the administrative position of the Copts. The restriction of dhimmîs in special quarters in Jerusalem was an exceptional move on the part of the Fâtêmids, and was intended to ensure their safety.

One cannot, therefore, say that it was persecution which led in some cases to the diminution and in others the complete disappearance of non-Muslim communities. The factors, essentially social, involved in this process cannot be discussed here; it must, however, be emphasized that the general position of the dhimmîs was gradually transformed by the fact that they passed almost everywhere from the position of a majority to that of a minority community. Moreover, instead of consisting, as previously, of a variety of communities, the gradual disappearance of Christians (foreigners excepted) in the Maghrib, of Christians also in Central Asia a little later, and of Zoroastrians in Iran, bring it about that in some regions the category of dhimmî had practically ceased to exist, while in others it had come to comprise only the Jewish community, more tenacious but by now almost exclusively urban. These proportions were of course to be reversed after the establishment of the Ottoman empire in Europe, but this represented a new phenomenon which was to lead to no modification in the rest of the Muslim world.

It cannot be denied that from the last three or four centuries of the Middle Ages there was a general hardening against dhimmîs in Muslim countries, helped materially and morally by the change in numerical proportions. Before proceeding further, however, it must be emphasized that the opinion was contemporary with that which appeared in Christendom against the Jews and against Muslims where there were any, without our being able to say to what extent there was convergence, influence, or reaction. On the other hand it must be emphasized that the populace were more easily excited as a result of the deterioration in the economic climate, and that generally changes in the Muslim attitude had been occasioned more by political than by religious considerations. Hitherto there had been scarcely any difference in the treatment accorded to Christians and Jews (at most they were distinguished by prescribed differences in dress); but it later came about that some categories of dhimmîs were looked on as friends of foreign powers and were worse treated, and naturally some Christians were in this respect more of a target than the Jews. There is nothing in mediaeval Islam which could specifically be called anti-semitism.

Although it has sometimes been considered that the formation of the Saljûq empire aggravated the condition of the Christian community, this is only very marginally true. The Saljûqids, partly because the numerical proportions of the various communities made it less of a natural conclusion, employed Christian functionaries less than their predecessors, whence doubtless there were a few less safeguards in the life of the community; nothing, however, was directly changed in the régime of which they were the beneficiaries. In Asia Minor the Turkish conquest evidently caused much suffering and loss to Byzantine Christendom, but inter-denominational relations became singularly good once a stable political situation had been established. Contrary to what might have been expected, the Crusades had at first no noticeable effect on the condition of the dhimmîs, because the eastern Christians were not of the Latin rite and maintained on the whole an attitude of correct loyalty to their masters—except for the Armenians, who were only to be met with locally. The first suspicions seem to have mounted against the Copts at the time of the Frankish expeditions into Egypt; there may also have been some in Syria and the neighbouring lands after the penetration of Latin missionaries, whose ministries were in vain precisely because it was impossible for the local Christian communities to come into contact with them without becoming politically suspect. The climax came with the Mongol invasions which, wherever they occurred, were of temporary advantage to the Christians, as there were Christians in the Mongol ranks, and because the Mongols held the balance between the various faithful; several acts of excess by Christians against Islam followed locally; but finally Muslim reaction made the Christians pay for their behaviour, and the expansion of intolerant nomads to the detriment of cultivators was a grave blow to rural Christian communities in Armenia and Upper Mesopotamia even when these were under Mongol
control. Timur’s massacres, and the rivalries between Turkomans even more than the Copts, suffered the repercussions of the struggle against the Mongols, the perpetuation of the state of war maintained against the Franks on the Mediterranean coastline, and the growing supremacy of western merchants over their eastern rivals. The Mamluk government tried in general to uphold the earlier legal system, but it was able neither to prevent popular violence stirred up by the old hatred of the Franks nor to resist the pressure of jurists, such as Ibn Taymiyya, who insisted on an increasingly vexatious interpretation of the law regarding dhimmis. Not only were the regulations on dress periodically renewed, though still with doubtful efficacy, but the regulations on mounts were narrowed so as to allow the dhimmis nothing better than inferior donkeys, and in some places, even less. This has an Italian parallel—which forbade them to possess houses higher than those occupied by Muslims (thus indicating incidentally that they did not live in special quarters). Care was in general taken that nothing in their everyday social comportment might tend to conceal the evidence of their inferiority vis-à-vis Muslims; an attempt was made to embarrass the dhimmis’ trade by regulations, always temporary, against the sale of wine; there was a growing repugnance on the part of certain Muslims to associate with non-Muslims, and their religious buildings were destroyed on various pretexts; there was a partial exclusion of dhimmis from the administrative offices themselves. From this period date also treatises specially written against the dhimmis (no longer merely religious polemics), to say nothing of chapters inserted in works of fiqh.

In the West the Almoravids, and even more the Almohads, had adopted, earlier than the East, an intolerant policy, which is partly explained by the suspicions entertained of their Christian subjects of complicity with the Spaniards of the Reconquista (it is impossible to say how the Maghrib would have tolerated Christian communities there while Spain was expelling its Muslims, since except for foreigners there were none). What one may emphasize is that, although religious factors obviously contributed to the intolerance shown in particular by the Almohads, it is political factors which in general outweighed strictly religious intolerance in Islam. Finally, it was at the time of the expulsions from Spain and the religious wars in the West that the constitution of the Ottoman empire restored—albeit without modifying the situation of Islam in those Islamic countries—the spectacle of an Islamic dhimmis symbiosis which was none the less remarkable for having been indispensable for the maintenance of the régime, as it had been for the Arab conquerors in the 1st/7th century. The Jews found asylum there, the Armenians and Greeks, in the 18th century, backed by Christian Europe, attained to positions of the highest importance. The later deteriorations are connected with the history of nationalist movements and the change in the notion of the State, which, gradually reaching all Muslim peoples, has emptied the concept of dhimmis of its traditional content. No more can be done here than merely to mention this last phase.[see Khawmiyya, milla wa watan].

Bibliography: It is obviously impossible to enumerate here all the sources, which might include almost all Islamic legal and historical literature, with additions from the geographers, the adab authors, etc. An extensive, but incomplete, list will be found in Fattal, cited below. One might notice the importance, for the earlier period, of Baladhurī and Abū Yūsuf; later of Mawardī; then of the works on hisba, omitted by Fattal (see Gaudefroy-Demombynes, in JA., cxxviii, 1936, and ʿArifī’s edition of Shayzari, Cairo 1946); and in general the Christian chronicles, either Arabic, like the History of the Alexandria Patriarchs and the historical chronicle of Mari (ed. Gismondi, 1909), or non-Arabic, like the Syriac chronicle of Michael the Syrian (ed. Chabot); mention may also be made of the Jewish documents, mainly in Arabic, of the Geniza. Some smaller works specially directed against the dhimmis date from Ayyūbīd and Mamluk times, such as al-Nabulusī’s fragment (fragments edited by Cl. Cahen in BIFAO, lxxv, 1960; complete edition in preparation by M. Perlmann); Ghāsī 2 b. al-Wasīṭī, Radd ʿalā aḥī al-dhimmīs, ed. and trans. R. Gottheil, in JAOS, xli, 1921; the Festa on la condition des dhimmis, etc., trans. Belin, in J. A. 4e série, xviii-xix, 1851-2; the Tract against Christian officials of al-Asnawi, ed. M. Perlmann, in Goldscher Mem., ii, 1958. On this literature in general see Perlmann, in BSOAS, 1942.

In the modern literature there are two general studies worthy of notice: A. S. Tritton, The Caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects, London 1930 (Arabic trans. Hasan Habashī, Cairo n.d.), and Ant. Fattal, Le statut légal des non-musulmans en pays d’Islam, Beirut 1958. Neither however can be considered as complete, nor to have sought to portray and explain the evolution and the differentiation in the condition of the dhimmis. Deeper studies, but limited to the category of the Jews, are: S. D. Goltein, Jews and Arabs, New York 1955; the numerous but scattered passages relevant to the world of Islam in S. Baron, History of the Jews, iii-vii (up to the 12th century), New York 1957-9; E. Strauss-Ashtor, History

**DHIMMA.** The term *dhimma*, in its legal sense, bears two meanings, the first of which, that of the works on *Usul* (legal theory), is equivalent to the notion of capacity, and such is the definition of it given by the classical doctrine. The *dhimma* is the legal quality which makes the individual a proper subject of law, that is, a proper addressee of the rule which provides him with rights or charges him with obligations. In this sense the *dhimma* may be identified with the legal personality. It is for this reason that every person is endowed with a *dhimma* from the moment of birth. Equally it follows that the *dhimma* disappears with the person at death.

But the *dhimma*, an attribute of the personality, is never used exclusively, by the Muslim legal theoreticians, in relation to a person's estate. It embraces all kinds of proprietary and extra-proprietary rights. Thus the duty of the ritual prayer binds the person insofar as it is endowed with a *dhimma*. So completely is the *dhimma* identified with the legal personality that certain authors have been able to assert that it is a useless notion and even devoid of any real meaning (Taftazani, *al-Talwih*, Cairo 1914, index; Tāftāzānī, *al-Talwīh*, Cairo 1304 H., and other works on *usūl*; Ibn ʿAbīdīn, *Radd al-muhātar*, 4; Ibn Niṣāyīm, *al-Bahr al-rūḍūk*, vi, 204; Kāsānī, *Baddāl al-qamās*, v and vi; Miḥārīl ʿīd al-Bustānī, *Mardūq al-tūlūb*, Beirut 1914, index).

**DHIMMA.** The term *dhimmī*, in its legal sense, bears two meanings, the first of which, that of the works on *Usul* (legal theory), is equivalent to the notion of capacity, and such is the definition of it given by the classical doctrine. The *dhimma* is the legal quality which makes the individual a proper subject of law, that is, a proper addressee of the rule which provides him with rights or charges him with obligations. In this sense the *dhimma* may be identified with the legal personality. It is for this reason that every person is endowed with a *dhimma* from the moment of birth. Equally it follows that the *dhimma* disappears with the person at death.

But the *dhimma*, an attribute of the personality, is never used exclusively, by the Muslim legal theoreticians, in relation to a person's estate. It embraces all kinds of proprietary and extra-proprietary rights. Thus the duty of the ritual prayer binds the person insofar as it is endowed with a *dhimma*. So completely is the *dhimma* identified with the legal personality that certain authors have been able to assert that it is a useless notion and even devoid of any real meaning (Taftazani, *al-Talwih*, ii, 726).

In its second sense, that of the legal practitioners, the term goes to the root of the notion of obligation. It is the *fīdes* which binds the debtor to the creditor. The bond of the obligation requires the debtor to perform a given act (*fīlī*), and this act will be obtained at the demand of the creditor, *mušālāba*. In the case of a real right (*hāqīqī*) *ayn*, on the contrary no bond exists: there will be no case of exacting any performance from a specified person. For this reason the question of contract or *dhimma*. Some authors have so completely identified the idea of *dhimma* with that of obligation that in their view *dhimma* is properly undertaking, *ʿakd*, or guarantee, *dāmān*. Others restrict the term to contractual obligations (al-Nasafi, *Iṣlāḥāt al-ḥanāfīyya*, 65).

But in actual fact *dhimma* is never identical with obligation: it is properly the basis of an obligation. Once *fīdes* has been brought into existence the object of the right will exist in the seat of rights which is the person. It is at this stage that the second sense given to the term by the legal practitioners merges with that of the theoreticians of Islamic law. The *dhimma* is not only the bond which ties the creditor to the debtor but is, in particular, the seat of it. But here it embraces only rights of debt properly so-called. Thus it is that the obligation to give alms to those in need is held to exist in the *dhimma*. It must be particularly noted that, as distinct from Western law, in a right of debt with which the *dhimma* is charged is restricted to the right which exists in relation to a sum of money or other fungible goods. It is therefore only the obligation termed *dāyīn* that has its basis in the *dhimma*. The case will be the same if the obligation is one of future performance (iṣlāmāʿ). But if the obligation exists in respect to a specific object it will be termed *ʿayn* and this obligation will lie outside the *dhimma*. In this case indeed the obligation cannot be in *futūr* and on the other hand is not discharged, in case of non-performance, by payment of damages.

It results that the idea of obligation in Islamic law is of a quite different structure according as to whether it is or is not directed towards a specific object.

In the first case it does not create a legal bond since it cannot be in *futūr*. In the second case the creditor's purpose is to bind his debtor, and this bond is established on the basis of the *dhimma*. Obligation, then, will properly be, as it has been defined by Muslim lawyers, an incorporeal right existing in the *dhimma* of the debtor. Thus the *dhimma* becomes, in the final analysis, the equivalent of what is termed in modern law, the debtor's estate.


**DHIMMI** [see AḤ L-AL-DHIMMI]

**DHIRĀ**; originally the part of the arm from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger, then the measure of the cubit, and at the same time the name given to the instrument for measuring it. The legal cubit is four handsbreadths (baḥda = index finger, middle finger, ring finger, and little finger put together), each of six fingersbreadths (asaʿ = middle joint of the middle finger) each the width of six barley corns (qāṭrā) laid side by side. A considerable number of different cubits were in common use in Islam. Roughly speaking they can be grouped around the following four measures: the legal cubit, the “black” cubit, the king's cubit, and the cloth cubit. The point of departure for all these calculations is the cubit of the Nilometer on the island of al-Rawḍa of the year 2478/621, which, on an average, measured 54.04 cm. The average of the cubits of the countries of the Near East and the Maghreb, and of the codices, is 52.6-53.2 cm.

1) The legal cubit (al-ḥirār al-ḥarāṣiyya), which is the same as the Egyptian hand cubit (dhirāʾ al-yaḏ), also called al-ḥirār al-bīšīm, the Joseph cubit (al-ḥirār al-Yūṣufiyya), called after Kālī Abū Yūsuf, who died in 138/758, the post cubit (dhirāʾ al-bāṭīr), the “reed” cubit (al-ḥirār al-marsaḥ), and the thread cubit (dhirāʾ al-galṭ), measuring 49.8 cm. (In ʿAbdāsī’s times, a cubit measured only
232 DHIRAC — DHC, DHI, DHA

of the cubit: the bā‘ or ‘fathom’, also known as kāma, is basically 4 legal cubits = 199.5 cm., or approximately 2 metres, and thus the thousandth part of a mile (mil). Today in Egypt, the bā‘ = 3 millimetres = 3.5 inches. The bāsha, or measuring rod (Persian nāb; bāb is a reading error) is predominantly used in surveying.

The Fatimid al-Hakim bi-amrillāh (375-411/985-1021) introduced the bāsha Hākimīyya, which measured 7½ ‘black’ cubits, on the norm of 3.85 metres, established by a French expedition to Egypt.

In 1380, the bāsha was established at 3.55 metres. The aḥār or ‘rope’ (Persian tandbāb) equals 20 bā‘ = 60 Hākimī cubits = 80 legal cubits = 95.5 metres; 150 tandbāb or 3 mil equal one parasang (farsāb) = 958 metres = approx. 6 km.


**DHLKĀ** (see GUDJĀRAT).

**DĀH, DHI, DHA,** demonstrative forms based on the demonstrative element ḏā. The variety of their uses precludes these forms from being regarded as a single declined word; thus:

Dāh was the relative pronoun, invariable, of the Tāyyl; corresponding to the Hebrew ẓêt, the poetic form of the relative pronoun.

Dī forms part of the masc. relative pronoun al-lāḏīḥ; but al-liḥ in the feminine. The opposition ḏāh marks the gender. Corresponding to ḏāh are the Aramaic biblical relative, invariable, di (ḏī in syr.), the Geez masc. demonstrative ze, acc. za.

Dāh masc. sing. demonstrative (near object), diminutive ḏāyyā; ḏāh for the feminine, the opposition ḏī then marking the gender here. J. Barth understood it as ḏī, maintaining the existence of an ancient sound ẓī, from which followed his sharp controversy with A. Fischer (ZDMG, 1905, 159-61, 443-8, 633-40, 644-71; J. Barth, Sprachwissen- schaft. Untersuch., in, Leipzig 1907, 30-46). Dāh occurs most often either reinforced with hā‘: ḥiddāḥ, or combined with other demonstratives: ḏāḥa, ḏāḥa. Corresponding with ḏāh are the Geez feminine sing. demonstrative su, Hebr. zōb (= ẓōb + i), the Geez masc. rela. ẓōb.

Once in the nominal form with the sense: “he of”, then “who has”, “possessor of”, dāh follows the 1st declension, taking the dual and the external plural. But it is always followed by a noun in the dependent grammatical phrase (common noun, according to the requirements of the Arab grammarians: al-Zamakhshārī, Mutfl, § 130, 2nd ed. Broch; al-Harlīl, ed. H. Thorbecke, 158). Thus dāh mālū‘ “possessor of money”, pl. ḏāḥāt mālū‘ or (elegantly) jālū mālīn; for the feminine with the same construction: ḏāḥa mālīn, pl. ḏāḥātūt mālīn (or ʿulūt mālīn). See W. Wright, Ar. Gr., i, 205 D, in Līṣān the art.: ḏāh wa-ḥādād, xx, 344/v, 456; Mutfl, § 122, for expressions like ḏāḥa yawmā ‘a day’, ḏāḥa ʾl-yaḥmīn “on the right”.

Dāh, having this meaning of “possessor of” or “who has”, was suited to provide surnames or nicknames (lakab), e.g. Dāh ʾl-Karnayn (for Alexander), which have sometimes become the most commonly known name for some individual, e.g. the poet Dāh ʾl-Rumma. For the kings or princes of the Yeman (such as Dāh Ṭazān) it has become an autonomous word with internal plural; these are the ḏāḥād al-yaman (see Wright, ibid., 206 A and Līṣān, ibid.),
[see ADHWA?]. In addition, two Muslim names of months: Dhu 'l-hididia, Dhu 'l-ka'da [see TA'RIKH, i]. In addition, two Muslim names of months: Dhu 'l-hididia, Dhu 'l-ka'da [see TA'RIKH, i].

The main subject of this romance is the Arab [see ADHWA?]'. In addition, two Muslim names of months: Dhu 'l-hididia, Dhu 'l-ka'da [see TA'RIKH, i].

As b. Munabbih, killed in the battle. It is mentioned in the Sīra [ed. Sakkā, etc., 1375/1955], ii, 100, and in several hadiths [see for example Ibn Sa'd, ii, 2, section: fi suyuf al-Nabl]. The expression Dhu 'l-Fakar is explained by the presence on this sword of notches (ju'ra) or grooves [cf. the expression sa'yi mufakkar]. According to a tradition, the sword bore an inscription referring to blood-money which ended with the words lā yaktal Muslim bi-kāf "no Muslim shall be slain for an unbeliever". The proverbial expression lā sayy ilā Dhu 'l-Fakar has often been inscribed on finely engraved swords, from the middle ages down to our own times, throughout the Muslim world. The words wa-lā jatā ilā 'Alli are sometimes added, because, although Muhammad's sword, after belonging to 'Alli, passed into the possession of the 'Abbāsid caliphs, it became an attribute of 'Alli and an 'Allād symbol. Islamic iconography represented it with two points, probably in order to mark its magical character (the two points were used to put out the eyes of an enemy; for a representation of a sword with two points, among other magic objects, see V. Monteil, in REI, 1940-ii, 22). Dhu 'l-Fakar became a proper name which is found more particularly among Shi'is.
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war against the Byzantines from the Umayyad period until the end of al-Wāḥīk’s caliphate, that is to say it covers in principle the first, second, and third centuries of the Hijra, but also reflects later events. Though this is the general character of the romance, it also has an equally important but individual character as the history of the rivalry between two Arab tribes, the B. Kilaab and the B. Sulaym, the key to a whole series of vicissitudes in the Sīra and to the course of action taken by the leading figures, and it may indeed be regarded as the epic of the B. Kilaab tribe. In the edition noted above it covers a total of 5084 pages in 8vo with 27 lines to the page, in 7 volumes of 10 sections (djuz) each, with 64 pages in each section except for sections 69 and 70 which have 92 and 158 pages respectively.

The name of the heroine appears in different forms. She is often called simply Dalhama or al-Dalhama, and this might be her original name, the feminine of Dalham, a well-known proper name and appellation in the romance. It is by the name Delhemma that the romance is most generally known. But whilst several of the characters have a historical prototype, the heroine herself seems never to have existed historically.

Contents of the romance. The starting point is the history of the Umayyad period of the rivalry between two Kaysi tribes in the Iḥjād, the B. Kilaab and the B. Sulaym, the former belonging to the Amur b. Saṣaṣa group, a section of the Hawāzīn who, with the Sulaym, are one of the two principal branches of Kays Ayyān. The head of the Kilaab was Dījandaba b. Hārīth b. Ṭāmir b. Khiḑāl b. Saṣaṣa b. Kilaab, while the head of the Sulaym was Marwān b. Ḥayrām. It was the latter, a favourite of the Umayyad caliph, who, despite the superiority which Dījandaba had won by his exploits, held the ʿimāra (command) over the Arab troops. But after Dījandaba’s death his son al-Ṣaḥābī, having saved the caliph from assassination in Damascus, was given the name of Dījandaba’s brother and sister, and also, near Malatya, an ally of the B. Kilaab and the B. Sulaym at that time, ʿAbd Allāh (ʿUbayy Allāh) b. Marwān, supported the ʿAbbasīd cause and obtained from al-Manṣūr ṭarādī, the crown and ʿAbbasīd successor. Delhemma persuaded the Kilaab, despite their initial reluctance, to support the new dynasty. The Byzantines having taken advantage of the change of dynasty to regain the initiative, war broke out again and the two tribes, Kilaab and Sulaym, took part in it at the caliph’s request, acquiescing in ʿUbayy Allāh’s leadership. They freed Amid, captured Malatya and took up positions to defend the frontiers, the Sulaym at Malatya, the Kilaab in the nearby fortress of Hisn Kawkab.

It was as head of the Kilaab and the Black tribe, the Sulaym, that the romance is most generally known. But whilst several of the characters have a historical prototype, the heroine herself seems never to have existed historically.
have him put to death, and, as the Sulaym, their amir and the caliph supported and defended 'Ukba whose treason they refused to acknowledge despite the proof provided by Delhemma, 'Abd al-Wahhāb and al-Batṭāl, in consequence the Kilāb only took part in the war to save Byzantium, since it had been rendered critical by the Byzantines' successes in capturing and even advancing beyond Malatya, or else to fight against the emperor and the caliph who were linked together in an unnatural alliance against the Kilāb, or else to go off into far distant lands beyond Byzantium to rescue 'Abd al-Wahhāb's wife and daughter. Adventures which cannot be related here led al-Batṭāl into the West, whence he brought back a Frankish king whom he converted, and a little later to the Maghrib, returning with a contingent of Berbers. Subsequently the two tribes were reconciled and secured victories over the Byzantines near the Cilician Gates, recapturing Malatya from them and imposing a truce.

The narrator then tells, after the death of Hārūn al-Rashīd, of the war between al-Amin and al-Ma'mūn. Once again the Kilāb and the Sulaym supported al-Ma'mūn, whilst the Sulaym supported him. The amirs of the Kilāb who had been summoned to Baghdād, with the exception of al-Batṭāl who had escaped, were arrested by 'Amr at the instigation of Zubayda, she in turn being inspired by 'Ukba. A fratricidal struggle then broke out between the Sulaym, reinforced by troops from 'Irāq, and the Kilāb and 'Amīr. The Kilāb overcame the Sulaym and the 'Abbaṣīd troops, reached Baghadād, attacked the palace, set free the Kilābī amirs and took al-Amin prisoner, but were persuaded by 'Abd al-Wahhāb and Delhemma to release him. However, some of the Kilāb still continued to support al-Ma'mūn.

The emperor Michael, Manuel's successor, taking advantage of the civil war between al-Amin and al-Ma'mūn, on 'Ukba's advice renewed hostilities. Al-Ma'mūn, who had been supported by al-Batṭāl, came to the throne but had Delhemma, 'Abd al-Wahhāb and the Kilābī amirs who had helped al-Amin arrested. The caliph, following the not disin- terested advice of 'Ukba, the emperor's ally, set off in the direction of al-Raḳṣa and was captured, together with the Kilābīs whom he had taken with him, and they were all carried off to Constantinople. Delhemma was released and freed by al-Batṭāl. The others regained their liberty upon the outbreak of a war against the emperor that had been launched by a king named Kashānā, grandson through his father of the king of the Bulgars (al-Burdjān) and through his mother descended from Nestor, king of the Maghlabites (sic). Kashānā captured Constantineople, and then in his turn renewed the struggle with Islam and penetrated as far as Baṣra. He was finally captured by the Kilāb and beheaded by Delhemma herself. Thanks to the Kilāb, the emperor was freed and restored to the throne, and he decided for the future to give them the tribute which, in the past, he had paid to the caliph, a step that the latter returned to favour, set out an expedition, and was defeated. Finally Aḥmad was overcome and surrendered. He was soon compelled to seek help from the Muslims against his enemy king Karfanās who, with the Saḵārīḵa and the Malāfīta (Amalīfāns) captured Constantinople. The caliph sent the Sulaym against him. Karfanās captured 'Amr, defeated the caliph al-Mu'taṣīm and reached Aẓīm. At that point 'Abd al-Wahhāb intervened. Karfanās was killed and Aḥmad regained the throne.

The narrator, who is not unaware that al-Mu'taṣīm led an expedition against Amorium in 223/838, does not fail to describe it in a fanciful way, with certain characteristics which recur in an already legendary account by Ibn al-'Arabī in his Muḥādarat al-ḥabr wa-muslimarāl al-akhyār, ii, 64. Then he had Aḥmadūn dethroned by his own son Bīmūn. The latter maltreated al-Batṭāl, who had fallen into the hands
of Armanus, and thereby provoked 'Abd al-Wahhab and 'Amr to intervene. The latter was made prisoner. Delhemma then came to the rescue, killed Binund and restored Armanus to the throne.

'Ukba's mosque at Ankara was then burned down, but his tomb, still hidden by the caliph, was then nearly crucified in Constantinople, but he managed to escape. He then seems to have been sick and was retired to a hermitage, where he was again decoyed by the caliph; he hatched a new plot against the Kilab and procured the arrest of 'Abd al-Wahhab and al-Battal, and it was only by the vizier's help that they escaped from the sentence of death by drowning in the Tigris. Nevertheless, 'Amr and the Sulaym continued to fight against the Kilab.

A new emperor named Michael twice sent expeditions against the Muslims, the second time with a Frankish king Takafur. He took Malatya but it was recaptured by the caliph and 'Abd al-Wahhab, who had the support of a son of Delhemma, then her son al-Djarrah. Nevertheless, 'Amr also of being a Christian.

We come now to the final section of the romance, section 70, which like the preceding one is almost three times longer than the others. It is given up to a description of two important events: the pursuit of 'Ukba through various countries from Spain to the Yemen, his capture and crucifixion in Constantinople in spite of the intervention of a vast army of Christian peoples led by 17 kings; the murderous ambush into which the Muslims fell on their way back, in the Defile of the Anatolians, from which the caliph Maslama had been repulsed with 400 men, al-Battal and some of his companions, as well as Delhemma, 'Abd al-Wahhab and a number of men who had been shut up in a cave and given up for lost, but were miraculously saved by a genie. Soon afterwards al-Mu'tasim died.

His successor al-Wathik decided on a reprisal expedition against Constantinople. The emperor was captured and executed. Until then, Muslim conquerors had limited themselves to making the emperors pay tribute. From that time, a Muslim governor was appointed in Constantinople in the person of a son of 'Abd al-Wahhab who had the mosque rebuilt with great splendour. The amir 'Amr had been killed in the disaster of the Defile of the Anatolians, and was succeeded at Malatya by his son al-Djarrah.

At this point the narrator describes the deaths, first of Delhemma, then her son 'Abd al-Wahhab, after their return from Mecca, in a state of piety, while al-Battal ended his life at Ankuriya (a coral city in Andalusia, and the Masamida (Almohads) all appear. The incident of the founding of Samarra by al-Mansur. The incident of the founding of Baghdad by al-Mu'tasim.

Elements in the romance. Different elements enter into the creation of Delhemma. Firstly, a bedouin element which might be described as "antarian", since it is what occurs in the Sira 'Antar, which may have served as a model, as comparisons sometimes appear between some personage and ' Antar, whose horse Abjadi is mentioned. In the preamble of a Berlin manuscript the narrator, after giving al-Shaibah's genealogy, says that the events which he is about to describe took place after the death of ' Antar b. Shaddad. To this element belong, in the first part, the romance, the princes, the battles, the exploits of al-Haruh, his son Djandaba, and later of al-Shaibah and Delhemma herself, tales of pursuits and horse-stealing, al-Shaibah's romantic encounters with first Layla, then Amama, then ginniyya. In the last analysis these bedouin tales go back to pre-Islamic antiquity. It is noteworthy that Islam only plays a subsidiary part (doxology, Muslim talismanic formulae) although the importance of the djinn is stressed from the start.

The most important element is the pseudohistorical, for the romance claims to be an accurate history of the Arabs. This element appears as the often very vague recollection of a certain number of facts and historical personages, garbed in romantic trappings and presented in an imaginary way, with constant disregard for chronology and probability. In the internal history of the Umayyad period we find traces of the history of Maslama b. 'Abd al-Malik and of the eulogy of him spoken by 'Abd al-Malik on his death-bed; Maslama's renunciation of the throne in favour of al-Walid rests on a historical basis, Maslama as the son of a non-Arab mother having been barred from the caliphate for that reason. The 'Abbasid propaganda and the story of 'Abd Muslih ibn Maslama and of Dunwaites, called the son of Dunwaites, the founding of Baghdad by al-Mansur. The incident of the Zindik in al-Mahdi's time is transformed into a meeting of 22,000 zindiks with renegade Arabs acting in the service of Byzantium. It would be fruitless to reveal the improbabilities and inventions in the story of al-Mahdi's succession, or the account of the Barakids interwoven with 'Ukba's intrigues. Similarly a Khalid, in revolt against Harun al-Rashid, is endowed with the same characteristics as the Karmati in al-Muktadir's time, for he carries off the Black Stone. In the account of al-Battal's adventures in the West there is an incredible farrago in which the Spanish Umayyad called Hisham al-Mu'tayyad and described as the imam mahdi, the Mulaghthama (Almoravids) whose king 'Abd al-Wadid (a recollection of the 'Abd al-Wadids of Themen) pays tribute to the Frankish king of Andalusia, and the Ma'samida (Almohads) all appear. Turks are mentioned in the Muslim army from the time of Harun al-Rashid. We have seen how the war between al-Amin and al-Ma'mun is described in terms of the rivalry between the Kilab and Sulaym. There is only a very brief allusion to the founding of Samarrā by al-Mu'tasim.
As regards the Arabo-Byzantine war, it is the historical element which plays the chief part. Thus, in the first part Maslama’s expedition against Constantinople in 237/852-3 is the central event, around which all the romantic episodes are grouped. Al-Baṣṭāl who in actual fact took part in it is not mentioned here because he has been relegated to the second part of the romance. This part, which is based primarily on the Arabo-Byzantine war, reflects several important events of the ʿAbbāsid period, above all the establishment of a group of fortresses west of the Euphrates, with Malatya at the centre, which is alluded to again and again in the romance as a fact well known from al-Baladhuri. Then came al-Muʿṭasim’s great expedition against Amorium, which inspired several episodes in the romance, either under Harun ar-Rashid’s caliphate or under al-Muʿtadid. This must originally have been the epic of the B. Sulaym and their famous amir.

The description of land-battles is full of clichés, but the part of the romance which has inspired prose or verse accounts seems to be more realistic. There is, for example, (sect. 18, 35) a detailed description of the use of Greek fire, hawadir al-naft, boarding with the help of grappling-irons and several names of ships.

Folklore element. As in all romances and Pusi̇k works, Delhemma contains a mass of features derived from folklore, of which we shall only specify a few: tricks to make the enemy kill each other, the description of wonderful objects (automatic birds, talismanic statues), amazons, the use of the bandaje, etc. In the story of the queen of Georgia, Bakhtūs, which occurs in the first part, one can detect features which go back, through the legend of queen Thamar, to that of Zenobia. The theme of the camel-skin cut into strips in order to obtain a larger area for the building of the mosque in Constantinople is the same as the legend of Dido. Certain names (Kaykbūs, Kiliği b. Kābus) suggest an Irano-Seldjukid influence, rather than the Iranian legend.

The composition of the romance. I have tried to show, in an article entitled Delhemma, Sayyid Baṭṭal et Omar al-No̱mān, in Byzantion, xii (1937), 183 ff., following an article by H. Grégoire in Byzantion, xi (1936), 571 ff., on the subject of the relegation of the personage of al-Baṭṭal, the hero of the second part of the romance, to the legend of ʿAmr b. Ubayd Allāh, amīr of Malatya in the ʿAbbāsid period, that the romance of Delhemma is made up of two parts which are each a version or fragment of two cycles of different periods and origins. The first and shorter part goes back to a bedouin and Syro-Umayyad cycle (other fragments of which are incidentally extant) describing the adventures of the Umayyad amīr Malāma b. ʿAbd al-Malik and of personnages of the B. Kiļāb tribe related to Malāma through his wife. Though this part does not include the historical heroes of the Umayyad period, al-Baṭṭal and his companion ʿAbd al-Wahhāb who have been relegated to the second part, al-Baṭṭal’s exploits have been put under the name of the Kiļāb amīr al-Sabīs. The second, the principal and longer part, constitutes the part of the romance which goes under the name of the Turkish Sayyid Baṭṭal, represents not only the Turkish romance but also a cycle which H. Grégoire and I have called a Melitenian cycle on account of the part played by Malatya-Melitene and its amīr ʿAmr b. Ubayd Allāh, of the B. Sulaym tribe in the ʿAbbāsid period. This must originally have been the epic of the B. Sulaym and their famous amīr.
As a result of al-Battal's popularity the Sulaym must have appropriated the personage who is described in the romance as being of Sulaym origin. In H. Grégoire’s opinion, this change in respect of al-Battal was determined by the fact that in the expedition during which he was accompanied by an amir of Malatya named Ghamr, a name easily confused with 'Amr, and his delegation has also involved a similar change in respect of 'Abd al-Wahhab. A later stage in the development of the romance was the fusion of the two cycles and the appropriation of the Melitenian cycle by the Kilab, to their advantage, for the reasons I have given in the article under reference (the submission of the amirs of Malatya to Byzantium in the 10th century, which was frowned upon by Islam; and, on the other hand, the important rôle played by the B. Kilab in the Byzantine war in the 10th centuries, and their eminence in north Syria). It is in this way that the end of the first part, in which we see the birth and childhood of Delhemma, the Sulaym granddaughter, and then of her son 'Abd al-Wahhab, is a translation of the second part where the Kilabis take their place in the Melitenian cycle, that 'Abd al-Wahhab, historically an Umayyad was of unknown origin, becomes a Kilbi and the principal character, with his mother, that al-Battal is represented as voluntarily leaving the B. Sulaym in order to join the B. Kilab, and that 'Amr b. Ubayd Allâh, the central hero of the Melitenian cycle as he is in the Turkish romance under the name 'Umar b. al-Nu'mân (cf. also the story in the 1001 Nights of the same name) becomes a personage not only less important than 'Abd al-Wahhab but also less attractive, since the narrators give all their sympathies to the B. Kilab. Moreover, it is known from Kalkashandl, Şîbâ, i, 340 and iv, 251, that in his time the romance was regarded as having been written to glorify the B. Kilab of north Syria who claimed to be adherents of 'Abd al-Wahhab.

Date of composition of the romance. It goes without saying that it is impossible to give an exact date for the composition of this romance as we have it in the published edition and in the manuscripts which differ little from it. It is probable that, if the first outlines of the Syrio-Umayyad cycle were traced as early as the Umayyad period, then, those of the Melitenian cycle shortly after the death of 'Amr in 249/863, it was at a much later date, and under the inspiration of the spirit of hostility to the Crusaders, that an epic of the Arabo-Byzantine wars followed by the Islamo-Frankish wars finally took shape. Positive references to an epic of this sort do not go back beyond the 12th century. The Egyptian historian al-Kurītī, writing at the time of vizier Shīwār and the Fatimid caliph al-Qādir (555-67/1160-72), speaks of the Akbaḍīth al-Battal and the 1001 Nights as being known in his time (al-Maqrīzī, Khitat, i, 485, ii, 182; cf. Macdonald, in J. R. A. S. 1924, 381), a detail which should be added to the article al-Battal. Sama‘wal b. Yalāyā al-Maghribī, a Jew converted to Islam in 558/1163, says that before his conversion he took pleasure in reading stories and romances and collections of legendary histories like the Dīwān 'Abd al-‘Antara, the Dīwān Delhemma wa l-Battal (see Bibl. to al-Battal). If we can accept a tradition from al-Mughūlī reported in the Ta‘ṣīm, al-aswād by Dāwūd al-Antākī (ed. Bālāk, 1279, 55), a Maghribī Shaykh was said to have heard the Strat al-Battal recited in Cairo, at the time of al-Hākim. Thus a romance dealing with al-Battal, or with both Delhemma and al-Battal, was known in the Fāṭimid period, and it is difficult to tell if it is a question of one and the same romance, or of two separate romances. A Strat al-Battal is also mentioned by al-Kalkashandl, xiv, 149, l. 9. Can we go back further? According to H. Grégoire (ZDMG, lxxviii, 1923), the basis of Delhemma's history and the tale of 'Umar al-Nu'mān (see also my article Un personnage . . .) must have been known in about 390/1000 in north Syria since it served as a source for the Byzantine epic Digenis Akritas. In this period we find other mentions of Delhemma. In the 8th/14th century Ibn Kahlīr (see Bibl. to al-Battal), repeating what Ibn ‘Asākir had said of al-Battal, adds that the Sīra put out under the name of Delhemma, al-Battal, 'Amr 'Abd al-Wahhab and hādī 'Ukba is no more than a tissue of lies, like the Sīra of 'Antara or the one (on the Prophet) by al-Bakrī [q.v.]. In the 17th century, the jurist al-Wangārīshī, in his Miṣ'yar al-mughrīb (see the analysis by Amar, in Arch. Marocaines, xi (1908), 435-7 and the lith. ed. vi, 52), says that it is not permitted to sell historical romances like the one on 'Antar or the "Dalhama". Today, the disfavour shown by the most critical circles has become even more marked: see the modern contempt for this literature, in Brockelmann, S ii, 62.

The author or authors of the romance. In the edition, no author is named, but there is a list of rawīs. A manuscript analysed by Ahlwardt begins: bālia Naǧīd b. Ḥishām al-Ḥākimī al-Ḥāṣid, as though in reference to the author. But in another, six rawīs are listed, Naǧīd being the third. The edition gives ten rawīs, of whom Naǧīd, with the ethnic al-‘Āmirī, that is to say, of the tribe of ‘Āmir who plays a large part in the romance with the related Kilab, is the last. These persons are unknown and one can scarcely draw any conclusions from the fact that the one has the ḥisba at al-Shimshāt, and the other at al-‘Aṣrā q, that is to say, lands situated on the Arabo-Byzantine frontier. The fact that a rawī is stated to have been present at the event described (sect. 18, 64), dated 190 A.H. is merely a device by the narrator.

Conclusion. Such then is this long romance of which our analysis gives only an incomplete idea, so complicated are the adventures of the characters, prolonged at will by the author by means of repetition, the confounding of similar situations, the artificial duplication of characters with identical rôles etc. Such as it is, this epic of the Arabo-Byzantine wars and of the B. Kilab succeeded in pleasing a popular Muslim public by exalting the mujāhidūn and their successes in battles and against adversaries that were often imaginary. A simple-minded audience accepted all this with enthusiasm as though it were fact. In addition to the epic character, with its accounts of combats and great feats of arms, the dramatic or melodramatic element is not lacking; the narrator is adept in holding his listeners spell-bound waiting for some climax, through agonizing changes of fortune whether happy or unhappy, and by various means rousing sympathy or antipathy. The comical element, at times of a somewhat crude sort, appears fairly frequently, or antipathy. The comical element, at times of a somewhat crude sort, appears fairly frequently, particularly in scenes portraying disguise, abduction or theft, and in the more or less childish devices employed by al-Battal and ‘Ukba, the use of various mountebank tricks of which al-Battal is past master, when for example he appears as a Christian king with his ghulām, in the guise of Christ and the
twelve apostles (cf. a similar story in Murudi al-
dhahab, viii, 175).
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part as in the 1001 Nights is relatively infrequent,
but section 70 contains a passage of 472 lines of
receptions, processions). The language
pretends to seem learned by making a show of
in descriptions (horses, arms, clothing, combats,
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protection (see Ibn Kemâl, VII, defter [facsimile], ed. Ş. Turan, 429-33). The Egyptians retaliated, took him prisoner to Cairo and executed him (877/1472), and re-installed Şâhiş-budak. (Şâhiş-suvâr alone of the Dhu 'l-Kadr rulers is said to have struck coins, cf. 'Arifî [see Bibli., 430, 765].

Another brother, 'Ali al-Dawla (whose daughter was married to Prince Bayezîd and had borne him the future sultan Selim I), sought Mehemmed's protection (Ibn Kemâl, 433-47) and in 884/1479 drove out Şâhiş-budak. During the Ottoman-Mamlûk war of 890-6/1485-90, 'Ali al-Dawla began to incline towards Egypt, so that the Ottomans made an unsuccessful attempt to depose him in favour of Şâhiş-budak, who had changed sides and was now sandjak-bey of Vize (Şâhişgazhâzade, ed. ‘Ali, 234-8; Sa’d al-Dîn, ii, 63-5). During the next twenty years ‘Ali al-Dawla remained at peace with the Ottomans, but came into conflict with Şâhiş Isma’il, who in 913/1507 sacked Elbistan (destroying the monuments of the dynasty) and Mar’ash. When Selim I marched against Şâhiş Isma’il the aged ‘Ali al-Dawla refused to assist the Ottoman army, so that on his return Selim sent against him Khâdîm Sinan Pasha and ‘Ali, the son of Şâhiş-suvâr, an Ottoman sandjak-bey. ‘Ali al-Dawla was defeated and killed (Râbî‘ II 921/June 1515) and his head sent to Cairo (Sa’d al-Dîn, ii, 293-7; Ferdîndân, Munsha’dt, i, 407-413).

‘Ali Beg, appointed in his stead, distinguished himself in Selim’s Egyptian campaign; but by playing the major part in suppressing the Djalall and re-installed Shah-budak. During the next twenty years ‘Ali al-Dawla remained at peace with the Ottomans, but came into conflict with Shah Isma’il, who in 913/1507 sacked Elbistan (destroying the monuments of the dynasty) and Mar’ash. When Selim I marched against Shah Isma’il the aged ‘Ali al-Dawla refused to assist the Ottoman army, so that on his return Selim sent against him Khâdîm Sinan Pasha and ‘Ali, the son of Shah Isma’il, an Ottoman sandjak-bey. ‘Ali al-Dawla was defeated and killed (Rabî‘ II 921/June 1515) and his head sent to Cairo (Sa’d al-Dîn, ii, 293-7; Ferdîndân, Munsha’dt, i, 407-413).

Under Ottoman suzerainty the Dhu ‘l-Kadr-

---

2. Gâhars al-Dîn Khâlîl (754-788)
3. Sha’hân Sûli (788-800)
4. Nasir al-Dîn Muhammed d. of Kâdi (801-846)
5. Sulaymân (846-858)
6. Malik Arslan (858-870)
7. Sha’h-budak (870-872, 877-884)
8. Sha’h-suvâr (872-877)
9. ‘Ali al-Dawla (892-928)
10. Selim I

---

1) Şâhişgazhâzade, ed. Giese, 66; her name was perhaps Misr Khatun (Kh. Edhem, TOEM, v, 456).
2) Perhaps named Emfine, see Kh. Edhem, Düetl, 305fn.

This table shows only the ruling members of the line and their dynastic alliances; for a full genealogy see the table in IA, art. Dulkadirlar, 660, which corrects and expands those of Khalil Edhem (Düetl-i Islâmîyye, 312) and E. de Zambaur (Manuel de Généalogie . . ., 158 f.).

(J. H. Mordtmann [V. L. Ménage])
DHO KAR — DHU 'L-KALASA

DHO KAR, name of a watering-place near Kufa, in the direction of Wasit (Yakut, iv, 10), where one of the most famous Arab ayyâm [s.v.] took place. In contrast with most other clashes between Arabian tribes, this one had a historical importance because the Bakr b. Wâlî tribe (a coalition of all its clans except the Banû Hanifa) put other Arabs to flight (Taghib, Ityâd, etc.) among whom, significantly, were regular Persian troops. Even if the battle was no more than a skirmish (though sources speak of several thousand combatants) it showed the Arabs that the Persians were not as invincible as had been supposed. Caetani points out that it was not mere coincidence that several years later, the same Bakr b. Wâlî tribe, led by al-Mu'tanând b. Harîgha, took the initiative in making the first incursions into 'Irak; it was henceforth well aware of the Persian weakness when faced with an Arab coalition. The date of the battle is uncertain (variously put at the year of Muhammad's birth[1], or when he began preaching, i.e., ten years before the kîdâra, or immediately after the flight to Medina, or some months after Badr, i.e., 2-3/623-623) but the account left of it allows us to place it within a very restricted period. Details vary, and are partly legendary; some of them however can be accepted as authentic, and indicate that the battle occurred soon after certain well-known historical facts. These details attribute the cause of the conflict to the imprisonment of the last Lakhmid leader, al-Nu'mân b. al-Mundhir, by Khusraw Parwiz (Abarwiz in Arab sources) From them it is possible to reconstruct the train of events: the Sâsând made an error of judgment in replacing the Lakhmid monarchy by a system of direct government. The Bakr b. Wâlî were either incited by al-Nu'mân's imprisonment followed shortly by his death, or else, suddenly freed from their fear of this guardian of the frontiers, they devoted themselves to plundering, and the Sâsând resolved to punish them. His troops, however, were defeated and pursued as far as the Sawâd, and through a combination of circumstances the expected reprisal did not ensue. The end of al-Nu'mân's reign has been put at 602 A.D. (605 by Caetani), and the government of the Taghibid Ityâs b. Ka'bisa, who followed the Lakhmid so peacefully as to remain sovereign until 611. The date of the battle can therefore be restricted to the years between 604 and 611 A.D. (Caussin de Perceval, Essai, ii, 185, puts it at 611; Noeldeke, Geschicchte, 347, n. 1, between 604-610; Goldziher, Muh. Stud., i, 103, at 611; Caetani, Annali, Intr. § 230 & Note 1; year 12, §§ 135 and 136; I. Goldzihcer, Muh. Studien, i, 103 ff; Diad, Badjawi and Abû Faqîl Idrîshîm, 'Ayyâm 'al-'Arab, Cairo 1361/1942, 6-39. (L. VECIA VAGLIERI)

DHO 'L-KARNAYN [see ISKANDAR].

DHU 'L-KHALASA (or KULASA). Dhu 'l-Khalaşa refers to the sacred stone (and the holy place where it was to be found) which was worshipped by the tribes of Daws, Khabš'am, Badjîla, the Azd of the Sarât mountains and the Arabs of Tabâla. "It was a white quartziferous rock, bearing the sculpture of a white man's imprisonment followed shortly by his death, or else, suddenly freed from their fear of this guardian of the frontiers, they devoted themselves to plundering, and the Sâsând resolved to punish them. His troops, however, were defeated and pursued as far as the Sawâd, and through a combination of circumstances the expected reprisal did not ensue. The end of al-Nu'mân's reign has been put at 602 A.D. (605 by Caetani), and the government of the Taghibid Ityâs b. Ka'bisa, who followed the Lakhmid so peacefully as to remain sovereign until 611. The date of the battle can therefore be restricted to the years between 604 and 611 A.D. (Caussin de Perceval, Essai, ii, 185, puts it at 611; Noeldeke, Geschicchte, 347, n. 1, between 604-610; Goldziher, Muh. Stud., i, 103, at 611; Caetani, Annali, Intr. § 230, at 610).

A famous hadîth bears witness to the great importance which the Arabs attached to this military success; the Prophet is recorded as having said "It is the first time that the Arabs have got the upper hand of the Persians, and it is through me that God has helped them (mursûr)". Poets and story-tellers of the ayyâm have perpetuated the fame of this battle; many poems are recorded by al-Tabarî and in both the Aghâni and the 'Idâd, the traditions of which have been collected together principally by Abû 'Abd Allah al-Badîl [n. 2] and in the works of other authors. Even in the material of popular romances, such as (according to Goldziher, xvi, 6-43) the romance of 'Antar, and (according to Mittwoch, EI, s.v. Dhu Kâr) the romance entitled K. Harî Banû Shaybân ma'a Kîsîrâ andgâbirân.

The youm of Dhu Kâr is also known by the names of other places situated near the watering-place, such as al-Hinw (i.e., the hinw, "the curve"), of Dhu Kâr or of Kurâkir, al-Dhibâbât, al-'Udâr or Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
about the idol according to which the prophet said: "The hour will not come until the women of Daws worship the idol about which the prophet said: "The hour will not come until the women of Daws worship the idol."

Dhu 'l-Kifl, a personage twice mentioned in the Koran (XXVI, 85 and XXXVIII, 11, probably second Meccan period), about whom neither Kur'anic contexts nor Muslim exegesis provides any certain information. John Walker (Who is Dhu 'l-Kifl?, in MW, xvi [1926], 399-401) would like the name to be understood in the sense of "the man with the double recompense" or rather "the man who received recompense twice over", that is to say Job (Ayyûb [q.v.]; cf. Job xlii, 10). Without being certain, this explanation does not lack probability; in any case, no better suggestion has been put forward. Muslim exegesis either adopts a similar opinion in making Dhu 'l-Kifl the second name of Ḥizkîyâ [q.v.] = Ezekiel, or else identifies him with an imaginary Bishr (Bashîr), son of Ayyûb (as early as Tabârî, Annales, i, 364). "Etymological" speculations about the meaning of kifl or the derivatives of the root KFL (double, caution, subsistence) have helped to swell the legends that have been woven round the rather insignificant figure in the Korân; thus, for example, Dhu 'l-Kifl assumes the role of Obâdiah, Ahab's pious major domo who, according to the Bible (I Kings, xviii, 4) kept and fed a great number of prophets.

The figure of Dhu 'l-Kifl reappears elsewhere in certain edifying accounts in which another person of the same name is presented as typical of the sinner who, having overcome some particularly strong temptation, gains his eternal reward. As with many other historical or legendary personages, various local traditions attribute to Dhu 'l-Kifl burial places far removed from each other.

Dhu 'l-Nun used the word ḥubb for love to God, which means, he says, to love what God loves and to hate what God hates. But the love of God must not exclude love to man, for love to mankind is the Will of God.

Dhu 'l-Nun was a practical mystic, who describes in detail the journey of the soul on its upward way to the goal, and gives the Suffi conception of the unitive life in God.

Dhu 'l-Nun was the first to teach the true nature of gnosis (maʿrîj), which he describes as "knowledge of the attributes of the Unity, and this belongs to the saints, those who contemplate the Face of God within their hearts, so that God reveals Himself to them in a way in which He is not revealed to any others in the world". "The gnostics are not themselves, but in so far as they exist at all they exist in God". The gnostic needs no state, he needs only his Lord in all states. Gnosis he associates with ecstasy (waḍâdî), the bewilderment of discovery. Dhu 'l-Nun used the word ḥubb for love to God, which means, he says, to love what God loves and to hate what God hates. But the love of God must not exclude love to man, for love to mankind is the foundation of righteousness. He is one of the first to use the imagery of the wine of love and the cup poured out for the lover to drink.

He was called "the head of the Sûfis", a great teacher who had many disciples during his lifetime and afterwards. A few books on magic and alchemy, attributed to him, have survived, but his mystical teaching is found only in what has been transmitted by other writers, including his great contemporary, al-Muḥâsibî. There are many of his prayers recorded and also some poems of fine quality. He was the first to explain the Sûfi doctrines and to give systematic teaching about the mystic states (akhwâl) and the stations of the mystic way (makâmât). He taught the duty of repentance, self-discipline, renunciation and otherworldliness. Self, he considered, was the chief obstacle to spiritual progress and he welcomed affliction as a means of self-discipline. Sincerity in the search for righteousness he calls "the sword of God on earth, which cuts everything it touches". Solitude helps towards this end, "for he who is alone sees nothing but God, and if he sees nothing but God, nothing moves him but the Will of God'.

Dhu 'l-Nun was the first to teach the true nature of gnosism (muʿrâj), which he describes as "knowledge of the attributes of the Unity, and this belongs to the saints, those who contemplate the Face of God within their hearts, so that God reveals Himself to them in a way in which He is not revealed to any others in the world". "The gnostics are not themselves, but in so far as they exist at all they exist in God". The gnostic needs no state, he needs only his Lord in all states. Gnosis he associates with ecstasy (waḍâdî), the bewilderment of discovery. Dhu 'l-Nun used the word ḥubb for love to God, which means, he says, to love what God loves and to hate what God hates. But the love of God must not exclude love to man, for love to mankind is the foundation of righteousness. He is one of the first to use the imagery of the wine of love and the cup poured out for the lover to drink.
ruled, with Tulaytula (Toledo) as their capital, from Wadi '1-Hidjara (Guadalajara) and Talablra (Talara) in the N. to Murcia in the S.

The original territory of the Banu Dhí 'I-Nún lay E. of Toledo in the kūra (administrative district) of Shantabariyya (represented by modern Santaver near the confluence of the Guadiela and the Tagus) where as early as the amirate of Muḥammad I (236-73/852-86) we find established Sulaymān b. Dhí 'I-Nún, a descendant in the fourth generation of a certain al-Samḥ, who is said to have been present at the conquest of al-Andalus. In this region of the Middle Frontier (al-thaghr al-awsat) or, as is also given, of the Northern Frontier (al-thaghr al-djawf), the family played an active part, frequently in opposition to the reigning dynasty, until the end of the Caliphate of Cordova.

In the troubles of the Fiina (literally 'sedition') after 399/1009 the Dhí 'I-Nunids rallied at first to Sulaymān al-Musta'āl (died 409/1019), but soon 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Muẓābī b. Dhí 'I-Nún and his son Isḥāq, who is said to have received from Sulaymān the double vizirate and the title Nāṣr al-Dawla (Ibn Hayyān, quoted Ibn Bassām, iv/1, 110), struck out a line of their own. According to Ibn Hayyān, Ismā'īl was the first of the 'Party Kings' to break with the central authority and was inimitated by this in the others, but when and how he actually did so are not known. It is usually said that he began to rule in Toledo after the death of Ibn Ya'qūb in 477/1085. But this is evidently too late. The date of the death of Ibn Ya'qūb is given by Ibn Bagkuwāl (ed. Codera, 628) as 419/1028-9. We also have an inscription of Ismā'īl in Toledo dated 432/1042 with the titles Dhí 'I-Rāsātayn (cf. above) and al-Zafīr, 'the Triumphant', which must be placed after his accession (E. Lévi-Provencal, Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne, 66). As king in Toledo Ismā'īl was beset by difficulties on all sides, including war with the Christians (Ibn Sa'īd, ii, 15-16), but he made good his position and survived till 435/1043, when he was succeeded by his son Yaḥyā, called al-Ma'mūn.

Early in his reign al-Ma'mūn was attacked by Sulaymān b. Hūd of Sarakūsta (Saragossa), and subsequently both he and Ibn Hūd at different times abandoned the allegiance of the Andalus, to operate practically unopposed in Muslim territory. The death of his rival in 438/1046 put an end to these anxieties, at least temporarily, and al-Ma'mūn was free in the next decades to occupy himself elsewhere. He intervened profitably in the E. of al-Andalus, wresting Valencia from the hands of a descendant of al-Ma'sūr b. Abī 'Amīr in 457/1065 (see art. Balansiva). In 464/1072 he received Alfonso VI, who had been defeated by his brother Sancho of Castile at the battle of Volpejares (Golpejera), and retained him as guest in Toledo for 9 months. The main object of al-Ma'mūn's ambition was Cordova, the former seat of the Caliphate, held by the Djahwarids till 461/1070. To secure help against Ibn Hūd, he had been obliged to support the claims to the Caliphate of the pseudo-Hīḏām, maintained by the 'Abbāsid of Seville, which his father al-Zāfīr had always denied. But even though thus compromised, he was able to gain possession of Cordova, which had passed to the 'Abbāsidīs, in 467/1074-75, shortly before his own death in the same year.

Al-Ma'mūn was succeeded at Toledo by his grandson Yaḥyā al-Kādir, whose iniquity was speedily shown by the assassination of the wāṣir Ibn al-Hadīdī, hitherto a principal supporter of the Dhí 'I-Nunid regime. Al-Kādir lost Cordova and Valencia and, faced by dissension at home and by the hostility of the other 'Party Kings', he took the disastrous decision of applying for help to Alfonso VI. He was brought back to Toledo, which he had been obliged to leave, by Christian arms and later installed by Alfonso in Valencia, in return for the cession of Toledo, but was assassinated in 485/1092. With al-Kādir ended the rule of the Dhí 'I-Nunids. Toledo itself had passed into the hands of the Christians in 478/1085.

Less well-endowed than the 'Abbāsidīs, the family produced perhaps only one man of literary distinction, Arḵām b. Dhí 'I-Nún, brother of Ismā'īl al-Zāfīr (Ibn Sa'īd, ibid., 14), and at first their court appears to have been deficient in poetical talent (Ibn Bassām, ibid., 111, 114). This state of affairs must have radically altered under al-Ma'mūn, since we know the names of many literary men and scholars who flourished under Dhí 'I-Nunid protection, among them the hādi Sa'īd, author of the well-known Ṭabābāṭ al-Ūmām, valuable for the history of science, and the famous astronomer al-Zarkālā (Azarchiel), who may have been employed as engineer by al-Ma'mūn in some of his constructions at Toledo. The luxury of al-Ma'mūn's court became proverbial in the expression the 'cumbustion-feast of Ibn Dhí 'I-Nun (al-Thāfir al-Dhunnānī), given in honour of his grandson (an eye-witness description of his grandson's (an eye-witness description of his grandson's hand in the Spanish Muluk al-Tawḍīf, Hispanic Numismatic Series, no. 3, American Numismatic Society, New York 1954, 122-34; Daniel of Morley, Liber de naturis inferiorum et superiorum, ed. K. Sudhof, t. xii, 1931, 33-49; D. M. Dunlop, The Dhunnānīs of Toledo, in J.R.A.S., 1942, 77-96; ibid., Notes on the Dhunnānīs of Toledo in the 11th century, J.R.A.S., 1943, 170-5, and Al-Andalus y Los Reyes de Taifas, Madrid 1926, 52-5, 335-5, 231-3 (chiefly numismatics); G. C. Miles, Coins of the Spanish Muluk al-Tawḍīf, Hispanic Numismatic Series, no. 3, American Numismatic Society, New York 1954, 122-34; Daniel of Morley, Liber de naturis inferiorum et superiorum, ed. K. Sudhof, Archiv für die Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik, vii, 1918, 33 (12th century Latin reference to architectural works of the Dhí 'I-Nunid period).


DHÚ NUWĀS, YUSŪF AŠ'ĀR, pre-Islamic king of the Yemen. According to a tradition probably deriving from Wahb b. Munabbīh (Tījānī, ii, 2 ff.) and repeated by the Arab chroniclers (Ibn Kutayba, Ma'ārif, 277; al-Dinawarī, Aḥhār, 65; al-Tabāri, 540 ff.; Ibn Khaldūn, 'Ibar, i, 90; al-Maṣūdī, Muʿjam, i, 129 etc.), he was a descendant of Zurrātī, author of Inšālīdat Dhū Nuwās, who in Arab traditions is generally known as Zurāt's b. Tibbān Aš'ād, and who took the name Yūsuf after his conversion to Judaism (Ibn al-ʿAṭhir, vi, 252, calls him Yūsuf Shurābbīl), was placed on the throne by the Himyarites after he had
assassinated Labay'a b. Yanuf to escape from his attentions. On the subject of his reign, which is said to have lasted 38 years, tradition tells in particular of the persecutions to which the Christians of Nadjaran [see Ashâb al-Asbâha] and the invasion of the Yemen by the Negus at the request of the emperor of Constantinople. Dhu Nuwas was conquered by Aryan, (who had Abrahah under his command, and threw himself into the sea. In the Martyrium St. Arethae he is called Dhououas (nom.) and Dhououas (accus.) (Noldeke, Geschichte, 274, 3) (Theophanes calls him Dimianus, which Noldeke says is incorrect, the name of an Abyssinian king). Thus the epithet Dho Nuwas does not seem to be an invention of Arab traditions which explain it by his curly hair (al-Hamdani, Kitb, viii, 137); but a certain Dhu Ghamman and Nuwas, lord of a fief, is mentioned in CTH, 68, li (cf. M. Hartmann, Islamische Orient, ii, 292 ff.). However, The Book of the Himyarites (A. Moberg, ibid. 451, stanza 5) "is authentic, Yusuf Dhu Nuwas must be his predecessor's son. The two inscriptions Ry 446 = Ry 510, (Musdon lxv, lxvi), discovered in 1952 by G. and J. Ryckmans confirm the historical existence of Yusuf Dhu Nuwas; they describe the operations conducted against the Christians and Abyssinians in Zufar and Nadjaran. Sumayya Asha (Ist. 7608 bis li. 1-2) whom the Abyssinians chose as king of Saba' after the defeat of Dhu Nuwas (G. Ryckmans, lix; J. Ryckmans, Musdon, lxvi, 337-8; The Book of the Himyarites, 544 and cxxvii-ix) see also Smith, Events, 459) was grandfather of Sharahl Yakbul Dhu Yazan; this tribe must be the same as king Yusuf's (J. Ryckmans, Musdon, lxvi, 337). At the beginning of his reign, Yusuf Ash'ar invited the king of Hira, al-Mundhir, just when the latter was leading a campaign against Byzantium in the Syrian desert, to follow his example and exterminate all Christians who would not deny Christ. Then Yusuf Ash'ar began a savage onslaught on the Christians of Nadjran, first of all at Zufar where he destroyed and burnt the church (Ry 508 li. 2-3; Ry 507 l. 1; cf. The Book of the Himyarites, 7b). Then turning to the neighbouring Christian tribe of al-Ash'ar, he ordered his commander Sharahl Yakbul Ya'azan to march against Mukha (Ry 508, 3-4). In the operations in the two regions casualties in the battles amount to 14,000 killed, with 11,000 prisoners. At Nadjaran, where the siege was said to have lasted some months, the king asked the Nadjarans for guarantees to prevent any invasion by the South. Meanwhile a certain Daws Dhu Thu'luban fled and informed the emperor Justinian I. Simeon Beth Arsham arranged that the news of the coming of the new king and his persecutions (cf. Philby, Musdon, lixii, 271 ff.). The Book of the Himyarites, 18-22 and the Negus occupied the Yemen (see Bury, Later Roman Empire, ii, 324; Smith, Events, 451) at the head of 120,000 men (70,000 according to al-Tabari, i, 548) who came down from Bâb al-Mandab (J. Ryckmans, lxvi, 334-5; Budge i, 262; Smith, 458). According to Christian evidence, Dhu Nuwas Ash'ar was killed (A. Moberg, Ch. XLII; Philby, Background, 120). We can see from what ensued that a split occurred among king Yusuf's allies (cf. Smith, 549; Ibn Khaldun, 'Ibar, i, 92). Sumayya Ash'a, viceroy to the Negus in 525, was among Yusuf's supporters in 524. Inscriptions and The Book of the Himyarites are in agreement about the Jewish king's
successor, whom Ella Asbaha gave to the Himyarites (see Smith, 459, B.H. 54b); it is a question of king Sumaya's Ashwa (in Procopius, Wars, i, xx, 3-6; he is called Esimiphaeus) of just. 760 hajj, 1. 1, a Christian convert of the royal family. J. Ryckmans and A. F. L. Beeston think that RES 253 = CIH 621, the date of which, 640 A.D., must indicate his death, but that of Dhu Nuwās Yūsuf (Persécution, 8-9). This inscription must relate to Abraha's revolt against king Sumaya's Ashwa in about 330 A.D. (see also Procopius, Wars, supra). According to this theory, it was composed in about 100 B.C., and not in 115. It is by this system of dating, which conforms better with the evidence of inscriptions and traditions, that the inscriptions quoted in this article have been dated.

**Bibliography:** J. B. Bury, Later Roman Empire, ii; A. Moberg, The Book of the Himyarites, Lund 1942; Sidney Smith, Events in Arabia in the 6th Century, in BSOAS, vi, 3, 1954, 425-68; Ibn Kathiya, 334). According to a story originating from two sources in Basra, an unknown Aghdni b. Abl Burda of the shameless plagiarism of his own poems (see Aghānī, xvi, 121 and 123-5; also Kutayba, 339). The controversies with Dīārīr (q.v.) were a result of the open preference which Dhu 'l-Rumma showed for the poetry of al-Parazdaḳ; his diatribes with the Tamīmi Ḥīṣām seem to have given rise to some of the choicest anecdotes in Basra (see Aghānī, vii, 55, and ibid., xvi, 117). We have only a few facts of doubtful authenticity on his love affairs with Mayya and a certain Kharka3; they were later developed into a sort of novel. His thoughts on religion also remain obscure, there being but a few references to the Kurān in his poems, e.g., Divān no. 7 verse 30, no. 22 verses 35 & 79 (cf. anecdotes in Aghānī, xvi, 128). His death, at a relatively young age, has been put at about 117/735 (for other estimations see Schaade in EtH, s.v., and references). According to a story originating from two sources in Basra, an unknown person reported his burial at Huzwā, on the borders of Dahmā.

As was normal for the times, Dhu 'l-Rumma's works were diffused orally by rāwīs, one of whom is known by name (see Aghānī, xvi, 112, l. 27). Many stories attributed to him circulated among the nomads of eastern Arabia (ibid., xvi, 112), and, although often of doubtful authenticity, they have helped preserve his poetry for later generations. In time, oral accounts were written down in the form of a Divān, and by the end of the 3rd/9th century two collections existed, one by Thalab and the other, a more complete edition, by al-Sukkari (e.g., Fihrist, 158, l. 20). In Macartney's work, the collection attributed to Dhu 'l-Rumma is extensive, comprising 87 complete poems to which the author has added 140 fragmentary works. Most of the poems are exceptionally long. Sometimes they are improvised for a particular occasion, e.g., nos. 31, 33 (in praise of Muhāджir), 57 (traditional ُbaṣīda in honour of Bilāl), 81 (an allusion to events of which nothing is known historically). More often than not they are lyrical odes written in a style common to Bedouin poets of his time, beginning with a description of deserted camps, followed by some reflections on the poet's lover, and ending with a description of his camel and its wanderings across the desert. His beloved Mayya is mentioned in nearly all of them (nos. 4, 7, 10, 11, 17, 22, 28 etc.). The study of his works poses several well-known problems. Some pieces are fragmentary (e.g., the end of no. 60, ُbaṣīda, is missing), others are of dubious origin because of the inconsistent sequence of themes treated in them. Some seem to have no more than a lexicographical inspiration, and were no doubt composed to meet the demands of certain learned men of Basra and Kūfā. If we are to believe Ḥammād 'the Transmitter', many poems full of pathos were written in Kūfā by persons using Dhu 'l-Rumma's name (see Aghānī, xvi, 122, l. 156 ff.). Moreover, it may well be asked whether certain elegant poems were, as was often the case, in fact, included in the collection simply because they contained references to Mayya. From the 3rd/9th century onwards, the historical character of Dhu 'l-Rumma began to change and he took his place among those famous Arab lovers who were victims of unrequited passion; in this case, the hero pines away for Mayya, who is married to a rich sayyid, and his songs addressed to Kharka3 are designed only to arouse his Lady's
jealousy (ref. Aqhdhî, xvi, 113, 114, 119 ff., 125, quoting Ibn al-Nattâh; cf. Ibn Kutayba 334-6, where the story, from an unknown source, is in a very conventional romantic manner).

Although this epic of love has been much elaborated (cf. mention of title in Fihrist, 306, l. 22), it has nevertheless retained traces of its Bedouin origin, as is shown by comparison with a story in al-Hamadhâni's [q.v.] Mâkâmât [q.v.] (Beirut 1924, 43), which the author adapted from an old story of central Arabian origin.

Dhu 'l-Rumma's prestige stood particularly high with the Basra grammarians (see Aqhdhî, xvi, 115 ff.), although this assumption must be qualified, with some reservations (see Ibn Sallâm, 125, & Ibn Kutayba, 333). It was the profuse richness of the poet's descriptions of the camel, onager and oryx and the desert which aroused admiration; the great beauty of his elegies was also acknowledged, hence the large number of his verses which were set to music (Aqhdhî, xvi, 129 ff.), of which we may mention a Kitâb al-ghâb Dhu 'l-Rumma composed by Ishâq al-Mawsill (title in Fihrist, 142, l. 19). But it was nevertheless the lexicographers whom Dhu 'l-Rumma interested most, and, to give but one example, numerous verses of his are quoted in the dictionary Lisân al-‘Arab. This is due to the great number of rare expressions used by the poet. On the other hand, he is quoted only 6 and 20 times respectively in the Bayân of al-Dîhîs and the ‘Idh of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih. Set in the perspective of his age and society, Dhu 'l-Rumma is one of the great figures in the tradition of eastern Arabian poetry. His excessive use of rare terms was a common tendency in poets (e.g., Ru'ba, [q.v.]) who were in close contact with the philologists and grammarians of ʿIrâk; the frequent appearance of the radjâz tendency in poets (e.g., [q.v.]) who were in close contact with the philologists and grammarians of ʿIrâk; the frequent appearance of the radjâz metre in his Diwân underlines his close relationship with certain of his contemporaries. He terminates a line of poets who, even in their own age, were considered 'behind the times'.


DHU 'L-RUMMA — DHU 'L-SHARÂ

Ramûs: Dhu 'l-shârâ fêhâm daws. The tradition arose from among the Arabs between Duserani, "the worshippers of Dusares", a naming for the Nabataeans, and the tribe of Dawes (R. Dussaud and P. Macler, Mission dans les régions désertiques de la Syrie moyenne, 67, n. 3).

Dhu 'l-Sharâ is attested in Thamudic and Saifatic. Its only trace in Thamudic is on an inscription from the region of Tabûk, in the Aramaic form dhâr (Jauuss-Savignac 648), according to the reading of A. van den Brauden, Les inscriptions thamoudennes, Louvain 1950, 451. Saifatic has the name of this god in the form dhâr (CIS, v 57, etc.) and in the Aramaic form dhâr (CIS, v 57, etc.) and dhâr (CIS, v, 395). The name Dhu 'l-Sharâ means "The One from Sharâ", the local god of the Sharâ range, the southernmost tip of the chain of mountains to the south-east of the Dead Sea (A. Muls, The Northern Hedjâ, New York 1926, 252-5; R. Dussaud, La pénétration des Arabes en Syrie, 30; W. Caskel, Die alten sem. Gottheiten, 109). The name of this god was A'âra, as is shown by several Nabataean inscriptions (D. Sourdel, Les cultes du Hauran à l'époque romaine, 59; R. Dussaud, Pénétration, 40 and n. 4; J. Starcky, Palmýrâniens, Nabatâniens et Arabes du Nord, 222). The confusion of Dusares with the god Ares is due to Suidas who "takes ōkôpâqâp, a defective form of Dusares, for the god Ares" (M.-J. Lagrange, Études sur les religions sémitiques, 1, 210, n. 1).

From the fifth century B.C. the god A'âra was identified with Dionysoos, according to Herodotus: "Dionysoos, with Urania, is the only god whose existence they [the Arabs] recognize ... They call Dionysoos Orotalt, Urania Alitat" (Hist. iii, 8). A'âra can be recognized in the part Oro, whatever Oro may be, as second part of the name Ao (C. Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil d'archéologie orientale, V, Paris 1903, 109-15; R. Dussaud, Pénétration, 45). Alitat, clearly, is the goddess Alât. Hesychius (s.v.) identifies Dusares with Dionysoos: Δοουςιος του Διονυσου Ναβαταίος A'âra Dhu 'l-Sharâ being none other than Dionysoos the god of vegetation, "it may be concluded that during the occupation of Djebel esh-Sharâ by the Edomite Arabs the vine prospered in Dusares and that before the arrival of the Greeks the god of vegetation Orotal (A'âra) had soon been identified with Dionysoos" (R. Dussaud, op. cit., 56). J. Perrot's excavations in the Negev and the recent experiments of the botanist M. Evenari, who has restored a Nabataean agricultural settlement dating from early in the Christian era, on the site of the former city of Subeta, prove that the fertility of the land in that desert area was ensured by the construction of terraces, dams and channels, irrigated by periodic rainfall and flooding. This explains why Dionysoos-Dusares came to be represented on reliefs decorated with vine-branches, particularly on the lintels of Kaanawât and Suwayda (R. Dussaud, Pénétration, 57-61; see M. Dunand, Le musée de
Soudia, Paris 1934, nos 1, 2 and 3; D. Sourdel, *Les cultes du Hawran*, 64, expresses certain doubts on these identifications). Similarly, the statue of a bearded god at Gharria-Shubayr, holding a horn of plenty filled with bunches of grapes, seems indeed to represent Dusares (R. Dussaud, op. cit. 60). As we see, D. Sourdel, *op. cit.*, 64, who does not share this opinion.

An eagle with outspread wings was probably the symbol of Dusares. It figures above the entrance to numerous Nabataean tombs at Hegra (see particularly Jaussen and Savigac, *Mission*, i, pl. xxxvvi and fig. 160; ii, Atlas, pl. xlii, xlv and xlv). Jaussen and Savigac see in it the symbol of Dusares, who might have been assimilated in Zeus the sun god (*Mission*, i, 490-491). An eagle figures also on one of the lintels of Suwayda (M. Duand, *op. cit.*, 2); attributing it to Dusares in this relief is "not subject to doubt" (R. Dussaud, *op. cit.*, 60). R. Dussaud sees Dusares on an altar relief from a Nabataean temple to that god in Si' (formerly Sela in the Hawrân; see R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale*, Paris 1917, 388-390), dating from early in the Christian era (D. Schlumberger, *La Palmyrène du Nord-Ouest*, Paris 1951, 97 n. 3). But the altar is dedicated to Zeus Kyrios (R. Dussaud, *Pètrification*, 57). This assimilation, as does also the assimilation of Dusares to Hellos in the Roman era, nevertheless raises problems which are far from resolved (D. Sourdel, *op. cit.*, 63-5), and it should be noted that, while Strabo may associate Dionysos with Zeus Ouroanos, he never identifies them with each other in any way (Strabo, xvi, 1, 11).


DHÛ YAZAN [see SAYF].

DHUBAB, the fly. Some authors state that word is used also for other insects, such as bees, hornets, butterflies or moths (jarâdâ, etc). According to Arab lexicographers, it is either a singular or else a collective noun, in which case dhubbâb is used for the singular. Cognate synonyms are found in other Semitic languages, e.g., Hebrew יזון, Aramaic יזון. The fly is of ten mentioned and described in ancient Arabic poems and proverbs. A kadîth has it that there are flies in hell to torture the condemned. Numerous kinds are mentioned by Arab zoologists, some of them bearing specific names and some being distinguished by their colour (black, blue, red, tawny [salaw]). Another distinction is in the size of the different varieties: Some are said to be produced by spontaneous generation, in putrescent substances or in the body of certain animals (lion, dog, camel, horse, cattle, etc.), to
which they adhere exclusively; others are born by sexual procreation. The flies that molest man are also capable of expressing a fine sentiment and an appreciation of nature. The simplicity and directness of the early Abbasid age. The plain was once famous for its gazelle hunting. The term dabdbta (pl. dabdbt) is applied by some of the Bedouins to any flat, firm-surfaced area and is related to the classical dabdaba, referring to the drumming sound of hooves on hard earth. Maps: Series by the U.S. Geological Survey and Arabian American Oil Company under joint sponsorship of the Ministry of Finance and National Economy (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia) and the Department of State (U.S.A.). Scale 1:500,000 (geographic); Wadi al-Batin, Map I-203 B (1959); Northern Tuwayk, Map I-207 B (1957).

**Djab**

poetic nickname of Abū ʿAli Muḥammad b. ʿAli b. Rażīn al-Khwāzī, ʿAbbāsīd poet, born 148/765 and died 245/860. His birthplace is uncertain; the cities of Kūfah and Karkisīya are given as his places of birth. According to the accounts in the Kitāb al-Aʿīd, he spent his youth in Kūfah from which he was forced to flee because of some mischievous activity. Dībīl's apprenticeship as a poet was under the tutelage of Muslim b. al-Walīd [q.v.]. However, he soon made a reputation for himself as is indicated from his relationship with Khalaf al-Ḥāmar (d. 180/796) and Marwān b. Abī Ḥāfa (d. 181/797). The most probable date for Dībīl's entry into the circle of Ḥārūn al-Rašīd (d. 193/809) lies between 795-809. Being pro-Shiʿite and famous for his poem praising ʿAli al-Riḍā [q.v.] he generally attacks the ʿAbbāsīd caliphs from Ḥārūn to al-Mutanabbi (d. 247/861). However, Dībīl's loyalty appears to be motivated also by monetary considerations so that we find him praising them on occasion. If Dībīl is famous for his satire—at times of the vilest content—he is also capable of expressing a fine sentiment and an appreciation of nature. The simplicity and directness of his expression share and give additional evidence of this tendency which has become characteristic of the early ʿAbbāsīd age.

Ibn Rashīk places him in the Ṭabaqāt of Abū Nuwās [q.v.] and al-Ḥubayrī rates him above Muslim b. al-Walīd. Dībīl's rivalry with Abī Tammān [q.v.], whom he excluded from his Kitāb al-ʿarbāb (Brockelmann, S I, 179).

**DHUBAB — DI'BIL**

which they adhere exclusively; others are born by sexual procreation. The flies that molest man are also capable of expressing a fine sentiment and an appreciation of nature. The simplicity and directness of the early Abbasid age. The plain was once famous for its gazelle hunting. The term dabdbta (pl. dabdbt) is applied by some of the Bedouins to any flat, firm-surfaced area and is related to the classical dabdaba, referring to the drumming sound of hooves on hard earth. Maps: Series by the U.S. Geological Survey and Arabian American Oil Company under joint sponsorship of the Ministry of Finance and National Economy (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia) and the Department of State (U.S.A.). Scale 1:500,000 (geographic); Wadi al-Batin, Map I-203 B (1959); Northern Tuwayk, Map I-207 B (1957).

(J. Mandaville)
is based not only on literary grounds but also on political-religious foundations, since Abu Tammam was lukewarm to the Shi'a and was pro-North-Arab. Dibil's Book of the Poets, whose date of final composition is post 231/846, and whose fragments are based in the 12th century, is important in Arabic literary history since it forms a link between the Tabakat al-Dimma (d. 230/845) and the Kitab al-Shir of Ibn Kutayba (d. 276/889), Dibil's pupil. Moreover, since Dibil was chiefly interested in the minor poets of the Islamic period—including those of the category of Hârûn al-Rasîd, 'Abd Allâh b. al-Zayyât (d. 235/847), and Ahmad b. Abû Dâud (d. 240/854)—his work can be regarded as a defence of the "modern poets" which preceded and anticipated that of the Kitab al-Shir by Ibn Kutayba.

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, I, 78, S I, 121-2; Fihrist, 161; Aghâni, xvi, 29-60; Ibn Kutayba, al-Shir (De Goeje), 593-541; Young Baghdad, vii, 325-2, ii, 324, iv, 245; Ibn al-Dzeichâ, al-Wasaqa, Cairo 1273/1853, 17, 142; Ibn al-Mâlii, ‘Tâbâh al-sha’r ‘ala al-mu’dâqân, ed. A. Eghbal, London 1939 (GMS, NS., xiii), 124-7; Masûfûdî, Murûdî, index; al-Marzubâni, Mu’âd, Cairo 1345/1935, 244; al-Mâdî, Mu’talif, Cairo 1354/1935, 168; Ibn Rashîk, al-Umda, Cairo 1350/1937, 1, 64, Ibn Hâdzar, al-Ishā, Cairo 1358/1939, ii, 102; idem, Lisân al-mâ’ilân, ii, 430-2. (L. ZONDEK)

**DID,** word for "contrary" is one of the four classes of opposites, ûtvîlîmakûn, mutâkabâlât, as discussed by Aristotle in his Categories x (and also in his Metaphysics v, io). There are four classes of opposites: 1) relative terms; 2) contraries; 3) privation and possession; 4) affirmation and negation. The fact that there are contraries implies that there must be a substratum in which they inhere, for it is impossible, even for God, to change, e.g., the White into the Black, although a white thing may become black. There are things which have necessarily one of two contraries, e.g., illness and health, for every animal is either sick or healthy (Galen, however, distinguishes three conditions of the body, corpus salubre, corpus insalubre and corpus neuter) and there are contraries which allow an intermediate term, for not all bodies are necessarily black or white. The question whether there is an intermediate term between virtue and vice was much debated by the Stoics who originally denied this, for whether a man is a hundred stadia from his aim or only one stadium, he is equally not there. In Islam the question whether there is a medium term between faith and unbelief was much discussed and those theologians who asserted that belief is based only on tasdiq (assent), for faith as a 0eoCTe(3e£a<; auyxaTaOeaic; see for example, Clemens Alexandriaus, Strom, ii, 2.8) held that faith can be neither increased nor diminished. Didd is used also as a translation of the Greek prefix ãvti. So ãvtîlîtos is translated by didd al-samm or simply by al-didd.

**Bibliography:** See, e.g., Ibn Rushd, Talhîs Kitab al-Ma’alâdî (ed. Bouyges), Beirut 1932, 92; Ibn al-Hadhâ’ Tharhîs al-Ma’alâdî, ed. C. A. Peet, London 1925, 241. See also ADDAD. (S. VAN DEN BERGH)

**DIJLA,** the Arabic name (used always without the article al-) of the easterly of the "Two Rivers" of ’Irâk, the Tigris. The name is a modernized and Arabized form of the Diglat of the Cuneiform, and occurs as Dihekel in the Book of Genesis. The river (Dicle Nehri in modern Turkish) rises in the southern slopes of the main Taurus, south and south-east of Lake Golekî. Its upper course, with its many constituent tributaries, drains a wide area of foothills and plain, which formed the northern half of the ’Abbasid province of Dijzâra in which stood the important towns of Amîd (modern Deyr Bakr), Mayyâfîrisîn, and many others. Among the early tributaries the Arab geographers (Ibn Sarîbîyûn, Mu’addâs, Yakûtî) name the Nahir al-Kübî (alternatively Nahir al-Dîbî‘b), the Wâdî ’Sâbî, Wâdî Sâdîmadan and Wâdî al-Sarba. Identifications of these are not certain with the modern tributaries which are notably (in their Turkish forms) the Zulkarnayn Su, the Ambagh Suyu, the Batman Suyu and the Garzan Suyu. At the point where the river bends from eastward to southward, at the modern Til or Till (medieval Tall Fâfân) the Bohtan Çayi enters from the east, and at least doubles the discharge of the Dijlîa: this, the Wâdî al-Zarm of the Arab geographers, drains the high mountains south of Lake Vân including the areas of Diblis (modern Bitlis), and Siîrîd (modern Sûrît). Above this junction there are therefore two major streams, the Tigris boundary. The town of Hasaniyya (probably the modern Zakho) contained a famous bridge. No main tributary except the Abu Maryâ (modern Wâdí al-Murr, joining the Dijlîa at Eskî Mosul, the former Balad), and many small left-bank flood-channels, comes in south of the Kübûr till the Greater Zâb is reached, 30 miles below the great city of Mosul (al-Mawşul), itself a Sâsânîd city which grew to greatness under the Umayyads.

The Greater Zâb (al-Zâb al-A’çâm) which rises partly in the Hakari mountains and partly in those which form the Perso-Irâk frontier, contribute a highly important volume to the Dijlîa. The same is true of the Lesser Zâb, which joins the river some 60 miles to the south, having drained a wide sector of the Perso-Irâk frontier region. The junction of the Greater Zâb and the Kübûr in the middle ages marked by the town of Hadîtha, that of the Lesser Zâb by Sinn; neither of these survives. There are no immediate tributaries, but it is possible that a stream or streams, rising in Dijbal Sinîdar, may in some periods have found an outlet for their flood water into the Dijlîa near Ka’a Sharî’a.

Below the point where the river cuts through Dijbal Hamrîn (at al-Fathâ) it appears that, at or above Takrit, the Wâdî Thrardîr (which may in some flood seasons have drawn water from the western Kübûr drainage-area, which belongs more naturally to the Uprhersates) poured its waters into the Tigris passing by al-Hadr: Yakûtî speaks even of a formerly navigable Uprhersates-Tigris channel in this area. Lands in the Dijlîa drainage area above Takrit have at all periods been rain-irrigated, and have therefore risked drought but not floods; skin-bucket water-lift devices (the modern karad) assured crops along the river-banks. The great mediaeval (and in part much more ancient) canal-system of ’Irâk began below Takrit. The Nahir al-’Ishkâb, doubtless a partially-controlled spring-flood channel, took off from the right bank and after the expenditure of its waters in irrigation
poured the remainder into the river below Sâmarra. South of the latter the Didjla took off also from the right bank, and (it is said) was sometimes aug-
river channel; the modern head of the Gharra' canals, its canals, returned to the river at varying points south of Ükbarâ. The course of the main river between a point south of Sâmarra and one not far north of Baghdâd (that is, for some 70 miles) lay in 'Abbâbî- times some five to twelve miles west of its modern channel, with the towns of Kâdîsiyya, al-'Alîh, Ükbarâ and Rahdîlîyya on its banks. Many flood-
seasing his river, which by the turn of the 8th/15th centuries, until it was substantially destroyed by the Mongols in the middle of the latter. The 'alignment and degree of water control, and the discharge of the canals, varied from century to century; most were seasonal flood-channels without head-works, and the solution if any found for disposal of the devastating annual floods does not satisfactorily appear. Nevertheless, irrigation from the Didjla—and rain cultivation in the north—undoubtedly supported a population perhaps three times more numerous than that of today, in a host of cities and villages now forgotten. During the centuries following the ruin caused by Hulûgî (656/ 1258) conditions fell to a low point of disorganization, misery and stagnation, during which the régime of the river deteriorated and all control was lost. No serious study of its problems was made thereafter until the 14th/20th century.

The efforts of the modern 'Irâk Governments have been concentrated on such irrigation works as will stabilize the course of the river, prevent the extremely serious annual flooding of the country side—and almost of Baghdad itself—and regulate and conserve the water for summer irrigation upon which, in central and southern 'Irâk, all cultivation other than precarious spring crops must depend. Many control works have been built, notably in 1357/1938 the Kût Barrage which regulates the supply into the Hayy (Gharra') river; many more, and major flood-disposal arrangements—for instance, on the Greater Zâb, and by utilizing the Wâdî Tharthâr—are in hand or planned. But the immense difference between the high water and the low water discharge of the river, varying between some 6000 to 300 cubic metres a second at Baghdâd, due to seasonal melting of snow in the north and to winter and spring rains, and the inadequacy of the river bed to take the flood water, combine to render the Didjla peculiarly difficult to control or utilize. The important extension of irrigation by mechanical pump from the modern heads, has been a striking feature of the period since 1346/1927.

The river contains large quantities of indifferent or low-quality fish. In modern as in ancient and mediaeval times, all the traditional types of river-craft—skin-borne rafts floating downstream from Mosul or the Zâbs, bitumen-covered coracles, sailing-craft and paddled
skiffs of every size have been and are in use. They have been supplemented regularly between Basra and Baghdad (and rarely and precariously between Basra and -al-Amara, Amara and Basra).

Bibliography:
Istakhrl, 1, 72-7, 90; Ibn Hawkal, 138, 162; Mukaddad, 20, 124, 156, 1464; Ta'rikh al-Suddn, trans. Houdas, 23, 70.1. Didjla — Dienne
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1. The Dido proper (Tsez Tsunta), numbering 18,000. Ethnically close to the Andi, they are well-known for their craftsmanship: goldsmiths' work among them, except for the Beleta, than among the Andi; and their integration within the Avar nation is less advanced. Russian linguistic influence is barely noticeable.

2. The economy of the Dido remains traditional; they subsist by fodder-production (maize, potatoes), by sheep-raising over changing pasture-lands, and by terraced horticulture. They are well-known for their craftsmanship: goldsmiths' work among the Dido and the Beleta, and leatherwork among the Khunzal.

Bibliography:

(D. QUELQUEJAY)

DIENNE, a town in the Sudan Republic, 360 km. SW of Timbuctoo and 200 km. ENE of Segou. Geographical position: lat. 13° 55' N.—long. 4° 33' W. (Gr.). Altitude: 278 m.

The etymology of this name (often wrongly spelt Djenné) is unknown but the most likely is Dianna = the little Dia (Dia is an ancient Sudanese town, 70 km. to the NW.). Djenné was mentioned for the first time in 1447 by the Genoese Malfante, under the name Geni.

The town is situated in the flood-area of the Niger and the Bani, 5 km. from the left bank of the latter river, to which it is connected by a navigable channel. It is built on a hill of sandy clay not subject to flooding, though surrounded by water particularly during the flood season, which normally lasts from August to February; and it is then that movement in the district is easiest, owing to the network of navigable channels between the Bani and the Niger, the most important and most freely used being the Kouakourou channel. In the dry season the town is linked up with surrounding districts by tracks which can be used by motor vehicles.

In area, Djenné extends for 900 m. from east to west, and 600 m. from north to south. Until the end of the 19th century it was surrounded by a brick wall; this was destroyed by the French who also cleared and laid out a large square in the town.

The population which has remained the same since 1900 is about 6,300; of these, 3,000 are Diennénké, 1,600 Fulani and 1,600 Bozo. Several languages are spoken, Songhai, Boro and Fula among others.

The date on which the town was founded is not known. The Ta'rīkh al-Suddn, trans. Hourdas, 23, mentions a first settlement at Zoboro, the foundation of the town in about 1507/67 and the conversion to Islam in about 500/1106. It seems more likely that the actual date of founding was later: M. Delafosse puts it at about 648/1250 and attributes it to Soninke merchants, the Nono; according to him, the inhabitants' conversion to Islam is followed in about 700/1300. Legend has it that a Bozo virgin, Tapama, was immersed alive in the wells at the instigation of magicians, in order to ensure the future prosperity of the town.

When chief Konbore was converted he pulled down his palace and, on the foundations, built the great mosque which remained standing until about 1830 when it was destroyed by Shaykhu Ahmadu.
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1. The geographical position of the Dido peoples has remained the same since 1900 is about 6,300; of these, 3,000 are Diennénké, 1,600 Fulani and 1,600 Bozo. Several languages are spoken, Songhai, Boro and Fula among others.
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When chief Konbore was converted he pulled down his palace and, on the foundations, built the great mosque which remained standing until about 1830 when it was destroyed by Shaykhu Ahmadu.
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Konboro’s descendants remained in power until the Songhai conquest. In spite of the well-known passage in Ta’rikh al-Suddان (26) stating that from the time the town was founded the inhabitants of Dienné were never conquered by any king until the day when Sonni Ali imposed his authority over them, there is a strong possibility that, after 735/1335, the city belonged to Mali. It must have regained its liberty fairly soon, before being captured by Sonni Ali (872/1467).

The Songhai domination was very favourable to Dienné and it seems that it was from this time onwards in particular that it became a commercial centre of the greatest importance to the Sudan. In direct communication with Timbuctoo by river, it was also situated at the edge of the overland routes leading to the gold mines of Bitou (Bonduku region, Ivory Coast), Lobi and Bouré. It was the great entrepot for salt from Teghaza on its way via Timbuctoo to the countries in the south.

The first account to speak of the town is the Descriptam . . . . by Valentin Fernandes (1506): “Gyni is a large town built of rock and limestones, surrounded by a wall. To it come the merchants visiting the gold mines. These dealers belong to one particular race, the Ungaros (Wangara), who are red or brownish . . . . When these Ungaros come to Gyni, each merchant brings with him 100 or 200 or more negro slaves to carry salt on their heads from Gyni to the gold mines, and to bring back gold. Merchants who trade with the gold mines deal in considerable sums. Some of them undertake a deal which may amount to 60,000 mithkâl; even those who are content merely to take salt to Gyni make 10,000 mithkâl . . . . The Ungaros only come to Gyni once a year”.

Leo Africanus (1525) repeats the theme of the town’s prosperity, describing it under the name Ghinea (ii, 465-485).

This prosperity was maintained throughout the 16th century, and even to the beginning of the Moroccan domination. In fact Dienné followed the fate of her sister town, Timbuctoo, which from 1000/1591 was occupied by the Moroccans of Dj handled. The bâids of Timbuctoo had no difficulty in compelling Dienné to recognize their overlordship. In Dienné the Moroccan authority was represented by a pasha, a bâkim assisted by an amin or treasurer and a mukhtar or military commander. It was at this time (1828) that René Caillé visited the town.

In the middle of the 17th century the Ta’rikh al-Suddan once again described (22 ff.) a town at the height of prosperity: “This town is large, flourishing and prosperous; it is rich, and enjoys Heaven’s blessing and favour . . . . Dienné is one of the great markets of the Muslim world. It is the meeting-place for merchants with salt from the mines of Timbuctoo and other bringing gold from the Bitu mines. Almighty God has drawn to this blessed town a certain number of scholars and men of piety, strangers in this country who have come here to live”.

The town’s two-fold reputation for commerce and religion continued even after the decline of Timbuctoo in the 17th and 18th centuries; protected by its marshes, Dienné was able to hold its own in spite of the attacks of the Bambara [4.5] for a time even in hiding in making themselves masters of the Diennéri but were unable to take the capital. After 1818, Šhaykhu Ahmadou founded the Fulani empire of Massina and took Dienné after a well-conducted siege. He drove out part of the population and built a new mosque (on the site now occupied by the school) in place of the old one which he allowed to fall into ruin. He left the administration of the city to the people of Dienné, but he was represented by an Ambru mangal, military commander. It was at this time (1828) that René Caillé visited the town. The Fulani rule lasted until 1862-1862 when al-Hâdi ’Umar conquered Dienné. In 1893, Colonel Archinard took possession in the name of France. By bringing peace to the Sudan, French rule paradoxically enough led to the decline of Dienné, for what had previously been the source of its strength, its isolated position surrounded by flood-waters, in the 20th century became a source of weakness. The town’s commercial functions were taken over by Mopii which is situated at the confluence of the Bandi and the Niger, and is connected by a dyke with dry land. Dienné is no more than a second-rate local market and centre of the administrative sub-division.

The town has kept its beautiful old houses, built in the style which was peculiar to itself, now widespread and known as the “Sudanese style”; the old mosque, built before the 19th century, has been rebuilt in the old style on the same foundations.

Bibliography:


(R. MAUNY)

DâRGAL (see Dârgal).

DIGLAL, the title of the hereditary ruler of the Banî Âmir tribal group in the Agordat district of western Eritrea and in the eastern Sudan; he is also senior member of the aristocratic Natabt class or caste, who, for historical reasons no longer possible to elucidate, form the superior stratum in every Banî Âmir section. The title is believed of Fundji origin, and may recall days when the tribe was, in the 10th/16th century, intermittently tribute-paying to the Nilotic but Muslim Fundji dynasty of Senar. The insignia of the Diglal’s position include notably a red velvet three-cornered hat of unique design. The Diglal, whose relations with Ethiopian, Italian and British rulers of Eritrea have varied in the manner usual with feudal or tribal potentates, has at his best exercised good control over the lawless, scattered and wholly nomadic Banî Âmir, themselves numerous (some 60,000 in Eritrea in 1936-44, and 30,000 in the Sudan), varied in origin (containing an original Hamitic base with large admixtures of Sudani, Ethiopian and Nilotic stocks), and speaking the Beja or Tigre languages according to subtribe or section. Indeed, the Diglal’s traditional position, unchallenged for four centuries, has been a main unifying force in a group otherwise highly heterogeneous.

He lives normally in a main settlement of the Dagga (Dega, Dâga), a term which, by origin the “camp” of himself and his immediate circle, now signifies that section of the Banî Âmir (numerically the largest) which contains the Diglal’s family,
retainers and slaves, and the descendents and numerous accretions of these.

Bibliography: A. Pollera, *Le Popolosini indigene dell'Eritrea*, Bologna 1935; ed. V. Minorsky (1937), 60, mentions the peninsula Dhishistān Dar Sār (?), inhabited by fishermen and birdhunters, which W. Barthold takes to be the modern Cape Hassan Kull (to the north of the mouth of the Atrek). This is hardly possible, if *Istakhri's* data (219) are correct: he states that there are 50 parasangs between the mouth of the river Dirjūn and this peninsula, and this would get on to the region of the Bay of Keli Suwu (to whom the Ghaznawids, Krasnovodsk, and the Tashirs finally sold it). V. Minorsky, *Ḥudud*, 386, connects the name of Dihistān with the name of the ancient *Dakār* (concerning these, compare W. Tomaschek in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopdie*, iv, 12 [1901], col. 1456 ff.). Today, the ruins of Ribāt Dihistān (as can be gathered from an inscription in a mosque of the beginning of the 13th century) are known as Masbaḥ-ad-i Mihrāb. 

**DIGURATA** [see ossettes].

Dihistān, name of two towns, and their respective districts in north-eastern Iran:

1) A town north-east of Harāt, the capital of the southern part of the Bāḏḡās (q.v.) region, and the second largest town in that region ("half the size of Bāḵšāndān") and, according to Ṭabūt (i, 461), the capital of the whole of Bāḏḡās around the year 596/1200. The town was situated upon a hill in a fertile area, and near a silver mine; it was built of brick. In 98/716-7, Dihistān is mentioned as the seat of a Persian ḏihkān (Ṭabarī, ii, 1320; ca. 426/1035), it came into the possession of a Turkish ḏihkān (these titles persisted amongst the Turks (see the agency of the GHORIDS, to whom the Ghaznawids had left it). In 552/1158, it was the residence of the Oghuz prince Iḫṭilār-īn Ṭabūt-īn-Ṭaybak, who, as the only ruler of this district, became subject to Khorāzmshāh II Arslan (Baybaki, *Ta'rikh-i Bayhalz*). The Ḫūrāzmshāh Sulṭān Sháh was robbed of his succession by his brother Tekeqh, and fled with his mother Teken (Islamicized: Turkan) to Dihistān, in 569/1174. Following this, Tekeqh, occupied the town of Dihistān, and had Teken executed; Sulṭān Šah succeeded in escaping further to the Ghurids (Ibn al-Athīr, xi, 247/4th/ioth century, the area was a border region limited by that of the monarchy and the Zoroastrian clergy, the local rulers as well as the landowners were converted to Islam and largely retained their lands (von Kremer, *in view of the derivation from Dārāz—contradicts Yakūt and the other Islamic sources*); Samʿānī, K. al-ansāb, 1922 (GMS xx), fol. 23v v (gives the correct vocalization); Nikbī (in Nāshākī, ed. Ch. Schefer), 144; Gg. Hoffmann, *Syr. Ahien pers. Mātryr* (1856), 277-81; W. Barthold, *K istorii orosheniya Turkestana* (History of irrigation in Turkestan) (1914), 31-7; Le Strange, 337-82; Spuler, *Istan*, 430, 455, 464*; Ḫudud al-ʿĀlam, index. (B. Spuler)

**DIHKAN**, arabized form of ḏihkān, the head of a village and a member of the lesser feudal nobility of Sasanian Persia. The power of the ḏihkān derived from their hereditary title to the local administration. They were immensely important class, although the actual area of land they cultivated as the hereditary possession of their family was often small. They were the representatives of the government vis-à-vis the peasants and their principal function was to collect taxes; and, in the opinion of Christensen, it was due to their knowledge of the country and people that sufficient revenue was provided for the upkeep of a luxurious court and the cost of expensive wars (Christensen, *Histoire de l'irrigation en Turkestan*, 122-3). Masʿūdī divides the ḏihkāms into five classes, distinguished from one another by their dress (Murūdī, ii, 241). Persian legend imputes their origin to Vēghard, brother of the legendary king Ḥūghang (Christensen, *Le premier homme et le premier roi dans l'histoire légendaire des iraniens*, i, 144, 150, 151, 153, 155, 159). After the Arab conquest the ḏihkāms continued to be responsible for local administration and the collection of tribute from the protected communities; many of them were converted to Islam and largely retained their lands (von Kremer, *Culturgeschichte*, ii, 160). In Transoxania, where immediately before the Arab invasion the ḏihkāms had enjoyed perhaps greater influence than in Persia in that their power was not limited by that of the monarchical and the Zoroastrian clergy, the local rulers as well as the landowners were designated by the term ḏihkān (Barthold, *Turkestan*, 180-1; and see Nāshākī, *Ta'rikh-i Buhkārd*, ed. Muddaris Ripavi, 7, 72). The power of the Tāhīrs and Sāmānids was largely founded on their community of interest with the ḏihkāms; but by the end of the Sāmānīd period the ḏihkāms had become discontented and were in part responsible for few nomad tribes between Khārīm and the Ūst Yurt, as by then, Islamization—even of the Mongols of Transoxania—was complete. The *Ḥudud al-ʿĀlam*, ed. V. Minorsky (1937), 60, mentions the peninsula Dhishistān Dar Sār (?), inhabited by fishermen and birdhunters, which W. Barthold takes to be the modern Cape Hassan Kull (to the north of the mouth of the Atrek). This is hardly possible, if *Istakhri's* data (219) are correct: he states that there are 50 parasangs between the mouth of the river Dirjūn and this peninsula, and this would get on to the region of the Bay of Keli Suwu
for the eventual overthrow of the Samanid dynasty by Bughrā Khān Ḥafrūn b. Mūsā, the Ṣāk Khan (Bartold, 457, 307). With the spread of the šahād system in the 5th/11th century and the depression of the landowning classes the position and influence of the diḥkān diminished. With this the term diḥkān became debased and by the 5th/11th century it was also used to denote a peasant, in which sense it is used by Nāṣīr-i Khusraw (Dīwān, Tehran 1304-7 A.H. solar, 357) and Kōhā b. Iskandar (Kabās nāma, G.M.S., 297). On the other hand under the Sūluks the diḥkān appear to have continued to exist in the eastern part of the empire as village heads or landowners. The term would appear to have this sense in a document issued by the dīwān of Sandjār (‘Atabat al-kataba, ed. Ibkāl, Tehran 1950, 53, 55) and in a diploma for the muʾāmār of Khūrāzim belonging to the latter half of the 6th century A.H. (Bahāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad Muʿayyad Baḡdādī, al-Tuṣar al-Shāfī‘i ‘alā al-Tuṣar, ed. was born in 1114/1703 at Dīhli, four years before Shah Walī Allāh, which form part of the extraordinary military campaigns of Sāvyd Ṭāhir Bārsdāli [q.v.] and Ṣāḥib Ṣāghīr, the grandson of Wall Allāh, revolted round his concept of mašĀhīk, i.e., the establishment of a kind of welfare state based on the “relationship of man’s development with the creative forces of the Universe”. The time and the environment were both unsuited for the success of such a revolutionary movement. The inevitable result was that the movement, although launched with a great deal of fervour, soon lost impetus when faced with realities. On the other hand, the Waḥhābi movement launched by his contemporary, Muḥammad b. Ṣāḥib al-Waḥhābi, [q.v.] succeeded, as it sternly refused to accept the idea of compromise, which constitutes the kernel of Shah Wall Allāh’s thought; he even attempted to reconcile such antithetic theories as the waḥdat al wujūd [see IBN AL-ʿARABI] and waḥdat al-šahāda [see ṢĀḤĪḤ BĀḤRĪ]

His mission failed because both he and his successors failed correctly to assess the impact of contemporary forces and the increasing conflict of the East and West consequent on the growth of European influence in India, especially those parts of the country where Muslims dominated.

His chief works are: (a) Arabic, (i) al-ṣuyūṭī al-baḥrī, his magnum opus, a unique work on the secrets of religion (asrār al-dīn), also dealing with various other subjects such as metaphysics, politics, finance and political economy. It was in this book (ed. Bareilly 1285/1868; Cairo 1322-3/1904-5), now prescribed as a course of study at al-Azhar and in the Sudan, that he propounded his revolutionary theory of “fākh huwā liyām” (down with all systems!). The book has also been translated into Urdu (Lahore 1953, Karachi n.d.); (ii) al-Musawwī, a commentary on the Muṣafat of Mālik b. Anas; (iii) al-Fāth al-kabīr . . . . . the fifth and the last chapter of his Persian work al-Fawās al-kabīr jī wāsī al-tasrīr, but on the supreme independent title (Lucknow 1289/1872); it is a pithy but highly useful dissertation on the principles of the science of Kur’ānic exegesis; (iv) and (v) al-Budār al-bāzīgha and al-Kayr al-baḥrī, both on the same subject, also a unique work on jurisdictional differences between the various sects of Islam and the evolution of Islamic jurisprudence; (b) Persian, (vii) Tafḥīḥat-i ʿIlāhīyya, partly in Arabic, contains inter alia addresses to the various

AL-DILAWI, SHAH WALI ALI, the popular name of Khūt al-Dīn Ṭāhir Bārsdāli, a revolutionist Indian thinker, theologian, pioneer Persian translator of the Kur’ān, and traditionalist, the first child of the 60-year-old Shah Ṭāhir Ṣāḥib al-Raḥīm al-Umarī of Dīhli, by his second wife, was born in 1114/1703 at Dīhli, four years before Shah Walī Allāh, which form part of the extraordinary military campaigns of Sāvyd Ṭāhir Bārsdāli [q.v.] and Ṣāḥib Ṣāghīr, the grandson of Wall Allāh, revolted round his concept of mašĀhīk, i.e., the establishment of a kind of welfare state based on the “relationship of man’s development with the creative forces of the Universe”. The time and the environment were both unsuited for the success of such a revolutionary movement. The inevitable result was that the movement, although launched with a great deal of fervour, soon lost impetus when faced with realities. On the other hand, the Waḥhābi movement launched by his contemporary, Muḥammad b. Ṣāḥib al-Waḥhābi, [q.v.] succeeded, as it sternly refused to accept the idea of compromise, which constitutes the kernel of Shah Wall Allāh’s thought; he even attempted to reconcile such antithetic theories as the waḥdat al wujūd [see IBN AL-ʿARABI] and waḥdat al-šahāda [see ṢĀḤĪḤ BĀḤRĪ]

His mission failed because both he and his successors failed correctly to assess the impact of contemporary forces and the increasing conflict of the East and West consequent on the growth of European influence in India, especially those parts of the country where Muslims dominated.

His chief works are: (a) Arabic, (i) al-ṣuyūṭī al-baḥrī, his magnum opus, a unique work on the secrets of religion (asrār al-dīn), also dealing with various other subjects such as metaphysics, politics, finance and political economy. It was in this book (ed. Bareilly 1285/1868; Cairo 1322-3/1904-5), now prescribed as a course of study at al-Azhar and in the Sudan, that he propounded his revolutionary theory of “fākh huwā liyām” (down with all systems!). The book has also been translated into Urdu (Lahore 1953, Karachi n.d.); (ii) al-Musawwī, a commentary on the Muṣafat of Mālik b. Anas; (iii) al-Fāth al-kabīr . . . . . the fifth and the last chapter of his Persian work al-Fawās al-kabīr jī wāsī al-tasrīr, but on the supreme independent title (Lucknow 1289/1872); it is a pithy but highly useful dissertation on the principles of the science of Kur’ānic exegesis; (iv) and (v) al-Budār al-bāzīgha and al-Kayr al-baḥrī, both on the same subject, also a unique work on jurisdictional differences between the various sects of Islam and the evolution of Islamic jurisprudence; (b) Persian, (vii) Tafḥīḥat-i ʿIlāhīyya, partly in Arabic, contains inter alia addresses to the various...
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The earliest settlement was Indrapat, Sanskrit

The usual Romanized form of the name is Delhi,

It has become popular to speak of "the seven cities of Delhi"; but the number of centres of government
in the Dihli area has in fact been nearer double that
number. These are here described in approximate chronological order; all appear on the accompanying
map, on which those which are no longer in existence
are marked with an asterisk.

The earliest settlement was Indrapat, Sanskrit Indrabrshatra, a tell on which the present Puranā
Khila's stands, supposed to have been built in legen-
dary times by the Pandavas; the site is certainly old,
and potsherds of Painted Grey ware and Northern
Black Polished ware, types dating back to the 5th
centuries B.C., have been discovered
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extensive are the remains of the Cawhan Radjput town, dating probably from the 10th century A.D., which existed immediately prior to the Muslim conquest. On a small hill in the south-west of this region a citadel, Lâlkot, was built circa 1052 A.D. by Anang Pâl, and around the town an outer wall was thrown, as a defence against the Muslim invaders, by Prithwi Râj in about 576/1180 (Cunningham, residence of the Dihli sultans until Mu'izz al-Dîn Kaykubâd built his palace at Kilökhâf, then on the banks of the Djamna (Briggs, Ferishta, i, 274), in about 688/1289; this was occupied, completed, and its suburbs extended, by Djalâl al-Dîn Firuz Khaldji in and after 689/1290. It has now fallen completely into desuetude. Even in Djalâl al-Dîn’s case the older city seems to have had a higher prestige value, and he moved his court there as soon as it was politically practicable so to do. The sultan ‘Allâ al-Dîn Khaldji effected many improvements and repairs, including the west gate (Randjit darwâza) of Lâlkot (Amir Khusraw, trans. in Elliott and Dowson, iii, 561); he commenced also the extension of the citadel of Lâlkot, see Beglar, loc. cit., and Fig. 1. As a protection against the invading Mongols he first established a camp on the plain of Siri to the north, later encompassed it by entrenchments, and finally walled it, in about 703/1303. The location of Siri has been questioned (e.g., by C. J. Campbell, Notes on the history and topography of the ancient cities of Delhi, in JASB, xxxv, 1866, 206-14); but the descriptions of Ibn Baṭṭûṭa, iii, 146, 155, and Timûr, Malfūsāt-i Timûrî, trans. in Elliott and Dowson, iii, 447, and the ruins and lines of defences on the ground, enabled Campbell’s views to be correlated with the historical narrative.

ASI, i, 183). Subsequent to the conquest a mosque, known as Masjid Kuwwat al-Islâm, was built in 588/1192 by Kutb al-Dîn Aybâk, who later commenced the building of the adjoining minâr not only as a ma’dhâna but also as a commemoration of his victory; for these, their extensions by Shams al-Dîn Iltâmish and ‘Allâ al-Dîn Khaldji, and other buildings in this so-called “Qutb site” see Monuments, below. The systematic refortification and extension of these old Hindu walls was effected by the earliest governors and monarchs to form the first Muslim city of Dihli, known by the name of its former occupant as Kil‘â Rây Pithorâ. An indication of the extent of these walls and of their periods is given in the sketch-map, Fig. 1; for a discussion of the archaeological evidence see J. D. Beglar, ASI, iv, 1874, 6 ff.

Kil‘â Rây Pithorâ remained the only regular city of Dihli, and its inhabitants retained their Hindu religion; but it did not attain the political importance of other cities at the time. The present approach to the old town is by a modern road, built by the British, which follows the line of the ancient walls. The old city is now inhabited by a mixed crowd of Hindus and Muslims, and the central streets are lined with shops and mosques. A new city, Dîhlî (Dheli), was founded by Khâlid, the governor of Delhi, in the 12th century, and later became the capital of the sultans. The old town is now known as Dîhlî and is the seat of the governor of the city. The entrance to the old town is through a massive gate, built in the time of Alâ al-Dîn Khaldji, which is now covered with rows of shops. The old town is surrounded by a wall, with gates at the north, south, east, and west. The walls were raised in the time of Khâlid, and repaired and strengthened by Alâ al-Dîn Khaldji.

Fig. 1

Old Hindu walls
Walls removed by ‘Alâ al-Dîn
Extension of ‘Alâ al-Dîn, c. 700/1300
T = Tomb

B-P.
convincingly refuted by Cunningham in *ASI*, i, 207 ff. All that now remains within the walls is the comparatively modern village of Shāhpur.

Hardly a "city of Delhi", but an important site in its history, is the group of buildings, the earliest of which date from Khaldūn times, surrounding the shrine of the Chishti saint Nizam al-Dīn Awliya, which make up what Pigott has described as the "squalid but entertaining complex" now known officially as "Nizamuddin" (for plan, and description of these buildings, see *Monuments*, below).

Some of the most ambitious building projects in the time of the Dihli sultanate were conceived during the rule of the following Tughluk dynasty. Firstly, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq selected a site some 8 km. to the east of Kīlā Rāy Pitthorā, immediately after his defeat of the converted Hindū Nāṣir al-Dīn in 720/1320, for the building of his capital Tughluk-ābād. The trace of the outer enceinte is approximately a half-hexagon, within which are a more strongly defended palace area, and an even stronger citadel; there are the ruins of a mosque in the city area, and the layout of the streets and houses of the streets and houses of the city, which shows it to have been well populated, can be seen from the aerial photograph in *Ancient India*, i, Plate IX. On the south of the city was formerly an artificial lake, in which stands the tomb of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, connected to the citadel by a fortified passage supported on arches, itself fortified. Connected with Tughluk-ābād by a causeway on the south-east, which formed a band to retain the waters of the lake, is the subsi-

![Fig. 2. Tughluk-ābād](image-url)
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diary fort of 'Adilābād built by his son Muḥammad b. Tughlūk c. 725/1325, but abandoned by him, together with Tughlūkābād, in 729/1329 on his transfer of the capital to Dawlatābād [q.v.]. For these sites see Fig. 2, and the excellent article of Hilary Waddington, 'Adilābād: a part of the “fourth” Delhi, in Ancient India, i, 60-76, with photographs and survey plans. A small fort, known as the “Barber’s” or “Washerman’s” fort, to the east, machicolations, containing a palace complex, the remains of a fine mosque, and an extraordinary pyramidal structure built as a plinth for a column of Ashoka brought from near Ambalā; the isolated Kādam Sharīf and the nearby ʿIdgāh show the western extent of the city to have been no further than the later Shahdājahānābād. The extent of Fīrūz Shāh’s building activity around Dihīl would indicate that the suburbs in his time were still well populated,

Fig. 3. Shahdājahānābād

possibly a madrasa or a shrine in origin, was fortified and presumably used as a residence for Ghiyāth al-Dīn while Tughlūkābād was in building.

About contemporary with the building of ʿAdilābād was Muḥammad b. Tughlūk’s more grandiose project, the walling-in of the suburbs which had grown up between Kīl‘a Rāy Fīthorā and Sīrī (see Map) to form yet another city, called Dīlahānānābād. The extent of Firūz Shāh’s building activity around Dihīl would indicate that the suburbs in his time were still well populated,

as evidenced by the two large mosques in Dīlahānānābād, another in Nizamuddīn, and smaller ones in the northern suburbs and in Wazrābād. A further occupied site was around the old reservoir built by ʿΑlāʾ al-Dīn, the Hawd-i ʿAṣāsī, later known as Hawd-i Khāṣṣ, where he established a large madrasa and built his own tomb.

The Timurid sack caused the eclipse of Dihīl as a capital city for some time, and although the Sayyid governor Khīḍr Khān established his court at Khīḍrābād, and Mubārak Shāh his at Mubārakābād, both on the Dāndā, and the latter sultan built also his own tomb in the fortified village Mubārakpur (also Mubārikpur, Mubāzik [sic] Shāh Kōfī), the Sayyids and their successors the Lōdis built no further cities at Dihīl. The Lōdis, indeed, moved their seat of government to Agra, and Dihīl became little more than a vast necropolis, the plains between Sīrī and Firūzābād being covered with tombs and mausolea of this period; especially Khayrāpur, 2 km. west of Nizamuddīn, a region 1 km. west of Mubārikpur ("Tīr Burdh").
During the Mughal invasions in the early 10th/16th century, Dihli was renamed Shahdijahan and started the building of a new city, Dinpangh, on the mound of the old Indrapar in 940/1533, but was dispossessed by the usurper Shir Shoh Kottla, and the southern gate, opposite the citadel, was the most of the stone which was preserved for the building of Shahdijahbabad. His son and successor Isalm Shoh, popularly called Salm Shoh, built the Diwana the fortress Salimgarh as a bulwark against the return of Humayun. Humayun’s return five years later added nothing to the Dihli buildings, and the two Mughal rulers preferred to reside at Agra and Lahore; some buildings at Dihli date, however, from their time, especially the complex of monuments around Humayun’s tomb (see S. A. A. Naqvi, Humayun’s tomb and adjacent buildings, Dihli 1947). Shahdijahan also reigned at Agra for 11 years, but the inconveniences there caused him to remove to Dihli (‘Aml-i Sait, fol. 375-6; Manucci, Storia do Mogor, i, 183) and found there on 12 Dhu l-Hijja 1048/14 April 1639 (so the contemporary historians and inscription in the Kh Sabgh; 9 Muharram 1049/12 May 1539 according to the Ma’dhir al-Umar), iii, 452, and Sayyid Ahmad Khn) a new fort, the citadel of his new city (Fig. 3) Shahdijahanabad, known as the “Red Fort”, Lali kil’f, which was completed after 9 years. The waling of the city proceeded at the same time, and it was enriched with many more buildings in the reign of Shahdijahan and his successors (notably the Dami masjid, commenced two years after the completion of the fort), who made no further expansions of any of the successive cities. Shahdijahanabad continued to be the capital of the Mughal rulers—except for Awrangzbl, who spent much time in the Deccan and died at Awranggabad [q.v.]—although other sites around continued to be used; e.g., the Humayun’s tomb complex, Nizamuddin, and the arqas of Roshan Ghazi Dihli in Dihangh, and of Kutb al-Din Khil’s Mirawli were all used as burial places for the later Mughal rulers, and at Mirawli is a small summer palace used by the latest Mughals.

With the fall of the Mughal dynasty in 1858, the destruction of many buildings by the British during and after the mutiny, and the transfer of the capital to Calcutta, Dihli became a town of less importance, and as it was there that the first characteristic Indian Islamic styles developed, the influence of which was to spread far and wide from Dihli itself, the account of the monuments given here is confined to a simple description of the major works, arranged chronologically, and an account of the architectural features of the monumental complexes of buildings of different periods.

Fig. 4. Masjid Kuwwat ul-Islam

Plinth of Hindu temple  
Kutb al-Din Aybak  
‘Ali al-Din

For a treatment of the styles, with plates and detailed drawings, see MIND, Architecture. The earliest phase of Muslim building in Dihli is represented, as in the earliest stages in other sites (see ADBNKR, BHRK, DIBNPR, DAWLATB, DHAR, DAWNPUR, GAW, GUDJR, MANSO, TRIBN) by the re-utilization of pillaged Hindu temple material. This applied to the first mosque constructed in Dihli, Kutb al-Din Aybaks’s Masjid Kuwwat ul-Islam, earliest inscription 587/1192-2, in Kils’s Ray Pitohra on a temple plinth 37.8 m. by 45.4 m. is constructed the central court, 65.2 m. by 45.4 m., with colonnades of three bays on the east and there on the north and south; the western Iwan is four bays in depth, originally with five domes covering voids in front of the mirhab recesses, its roof raised at the north end to accommodate a saninna gallery. The Iwan is separated from the mosque courtyard by a great arched screen, added 595/1199, whose arches
do not conform with the spacing of the columns and mihrābāt behind. The columns of the arcades were taken from some twenty-seven Hindu and Dījān temples, arranged in such a way as to give one another the necessary height, ranged to support a roof made from ceiling slabs of similar temples, the sculptured figures mutilated and roughly covered with plaster, sometimes turned face inwards. The screen arches are corbelled, ogee at the top, some 2.5 metres thick, the central arch 13.7 m. high with a span of 6.7 m. The whole surface of this maqṣūra is covered with carving, Hindu floral motifs and the various lines of naskh. In the court-yard stands a pillar of rustless malleable iron from a temple of Vishnu of the Gupta period (4th century A.D.), doubtless placed there by the builders not only as a curious relic but also as a symbol of their triumph over the idolaters. At the south-east corner of the mosque Kubṭ al-Dīn commenced, after the completion of his mosque, the minaret known as the Kubṭ minār, described below.

The reign of Kubṭ al-Dīn’s successor, Shams al-Dīn Iltutmīsh, saw an increase in building, not only at Dīlī. To the Dīlī mosque he attempted to give greater scale and dignity by extensions of the colonnades and the great maqṣūra screen—symmetrically disposed as regards the new mihrābāt, columnar bays, and the arches of the maqṣūra, thus indicating a design of homogeneous conception; the new sahn included the minār, to which he added also, and its entrances were arranged co-axially with those of the old mosque. The colonnade is composed of relatively plain columns, and the screen decoration, including Kūfic character and tughrā devices, is more obviously the work of a craftsman familiar with his material than is the earlier example. The arches, still corbelled, differ in contour from those of the earlier screen by the absence of the ogee counter-curve at the apex. Immediately west of his northern extension of the mosque is the Tomb of Iltutmīsh (c. 632/1235 ? No dating inscriptions), a square chamber, originally bearing a circular dome, supported on corbelled squinches, the whole interior surface intricately banded with arabeques, diaper-work, and naskh and Kūfic inscriptions (entirely Kufic); the exterior is of dressed stone with the arched openings on north, east and south in red sandstone; red sandstone is also used for the interior, with marble on the mīrab wall and the cenotaph; the true grave is in a subterranean tahkhdna.

The Kubṭ minār was extended by Iltutmīsh by the addition of three further storeys, to a total height of 69.7 m. (Cunningham, ASI, i, 193, completed c. 626/1229). The angle of slope is about 4°25' degrees from the vertical, and the four storeys are separated by balconies supported by stalactite corbelling. Each storey is fluted—developing probably the technical advance in construction but also a strengthening of Islamic building tradition, as opposed to that of the impressed Hindu craftsmen.

4Alā’ al-Dīn Khuldī’s extensions to the citadel of Lālkot, and the building of Sīrī, have been mentioned above. He started a grandiose plan of extension to the Kuwwat al-Īslām mosque to the north and east; a few columns remain, and the foundations of the north gateway, to show the extent of this, and of the great arched maqṣūra screen which was intended to be twice as long as the two previous screens combined, and of twice the scale; in the northern court-yard stands the incomplete first storey of a gigantic minār, its diameter at base twice that of the Kubṭ minār. The most notable feature of these extensions is the southern minār of Alā’i darwāza, of exceptional architectural merit: a square building of 10.5 m. internal dimension, with walls 3.4 m. thick, is surmounted by a flat dome, with lofty (10.7 m. from ground level to apex) arches on east, south and west, and a smaller trefoil arch on the north leading to the new eastern extension of the court-yard. The three large arches, and the squinches which support the dome, are of pointed horse-shoe shape, vousoired, with on the intrados a fringe of conventionalized spear-heads. A similar style is seen in the Dīmāsāt Khāna mosque at the dargāh of Nīṣām al-Dīn, the first example in India of a mosque built with specially quarried materials, not improvised from Hindu material. (For a discussion of this mosque see M. Zafar Hasan, A guide to Nīṣāmū-d-Dīn (= Memoir ASI, xi, 1922). Apart from the early building (madrassā?) at Ḥawī ‘Alā’i (= Ḥawī-i Khāṣṣ), the only other structure of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn at Dīlī is his tomb and madrasa to the south-west of the Masjid Kuwwat al-Īslām, now much ruined; the series of small cells on the west wall show for the first time in India domes supported by a corbelled pendentive. The location of this building and all others in the “Qutb site” is shown on Fig. 4; for an extensive description of all the monuments and archaeological work see J. A. Page, Historical Memoir on the Qutb, Delhi (= Memoir ASI, xxii), 1925; idem, Guide to...

The achievements of Ghiyath al-Din, the founder of the Tughluq dynasty, are confined to the building of the city of Tughluqabad (see above, History), and his own two tomb buildings; for the first of these see MULN; the second, commenced after leaving the Pandjâb and coming to Delhi as sovereign, forms an outwork on the south side of Tughluqabâd (see Fig. 2 above), an irregular pentagon with barracks at each angle, with the tomb-building placed diagonally at the widest part of the enclosed court-yard. This mausoleum is of red sandstone faced with white marble, its walls with a strong batter (25° from the vertical), with a recessed archway in the north, east and south sides (the west side closed for the mihrâb) with the "spear-head" fringe introduced under the Khalâjis and a slight ogive curve at the apex. Here the old Hindu trabeate system is joined with the newer arccuate by a lintel being imposed across the base of the arch.

Muhammad b. Tughluq's foundation of Adilabad and Djahanpanah has been mentioned above; in the walling of the second of these is a sluice or regulator of seven spans, the Sât pulâh, with subsidiary arches and end towers, its two storeys of seven arches holding the mechanism for regulating the level of a lake contained within the walls. Another building of his time, near the village of Begampur, is the Bidiyây Mandâl, which has been supposed to be the remains of his Kâsâr hazâr sitûn, with the first example of intersecting vaulting in India; close to this is a superb but nameless tomb, and the Bârah Khâmâ (see below).

Muhammad b. Tughluq's act in transporting the entire elite population of Delhi to Daulâtâbâd (q.v.) resulted in the dispersal of the northern craftsmen, and the introduction of a rubble-and-plaster phase under the enthusiastic patronage of his successor Fîruz Shâh (752-90/1351-88). A list of the numerous building projects sponsored by this monarch is given by Shams-i Sîrâdî 'Alî, Ta'rîkh-i Fîruz Shâhî, and by Firshah, and in his own Fu'tashâ-i Fîruz Shâhî he describes the monuments of his predecessors which he had rebuilt or renovated. These numerous building and restoration projects demanded a strict economy; plans for every undertaking were submitted to the Khâlid-i sadra, and the more expensive building materials, red sandstone and marble, were no longer used. Of Fîruz Shâh's cities, Fîruzabad has been mentioned above; see also DAIWNPUR, FATHABAD, NIŞâR FîRûZâ, and for the fortification of the kûltâ and the introduction of machicolation see BURDI, iii. The Dâjmî masjid within the kûltâ stands on a high plinth and the main gate is on the north; the sâhn was surrounded by deep triple aisles, and around the central octagonal haued was inscribed the record of the public works of Fîruz. Only the shell of the building remains, much of the stone having been built into the walls of Shâhjahanâbâd by British engineers. The other building standing within the kûltâ is a three-storied rectangular structure on which is mounted a pillar of Ashoka (3rd century B.C.) brought from the Mêhrâb district. For these and other ruins in the citadel see J. A. Page, A memoir on Kolâ Firoz Shâh, Delhi (= Memoir Asi, iii) Delhi 1937. The mosque style of the period is better shown by half a dozen mosques of approximately the decade 766-76/1364-75; all are rubble-and-plaster, presumably originally whitewashed, with pillars and Hindu-style brackets and eaves in local grey granite, with prominent gateways, many-domed roofs, and tapering ornamental pillars flanking the gateways. The simplest is the mosque in the dargah of Shâh 3'Amî at Wazirâbâd (= Timânpûr), a simple west liwan of five bays, with three domes, within which is the earliest example in Delhi of a sanâna gallery in the rear corner of the liwan; the large (court-yard 68.0 by 75.3 metres) Begâmîpûr mosque in the north of Dijhânpanâh has the sâhn surrounded on all sides by a domed arcade, and the west liwan has a tall arched pylon in the centre of its façade which completely masks the large central dome; the Sandjar mosque (also called Kâlî maqâm-i masjid) at Nizamuddin has the central court-yard divided into four smaller courts each 13.1 by 10.2 metres by a cruciform arcade one bay in depth, as well as the domed arcading on all sides (Asi, Annual Report, xxvii, Plate I); the Khîrîtî mosque, at Khirki village in the south of Dijhânpanâh close to the Sât Pulâh, has a similar arrangement, but the crossing arcades are of three ranks of arches, as are the side liwâns; hence only the four courts, each 9.8 metres square, are open in the total area of about 52 m. square; the Kalân (this also sometimes miscalled 'Kâlî' masjid, within the walls of the later Shâhjahanâbâd, is smaller with a single open court and surrounding domed arcades. This, the Khirki mosque, and the Dâjmî masjid in the kûltâ, are all built on a high plinth over a lakshâna storey, and the mosques themselves are approach by high flights of steps. The Kalân masjid was no doubt the main mosque of the new Firuzabad suburbs, but the size of the Begampur and Khirki mosques implies that the older cities still maintained a considerable population. The northern suburbs were further provided for by the Cawbujârî mosque on the Ridge, now so altered through various uses that its original plan is hardly discernible; near the mosque is the remains of Fîruz Shâh's hunting lodge, Kughk-i Shikâr or Djahan-numâ, to which he repaired for consolation after the death of his son, Fath Kâhî, in 776/1374. This is a fortified enclosure (see burdâ, iii, and Asi Annual Report, xxii, 4 and Plates III c and d) in which is a domed arcade surrounding the grave, over which is a stone print of the Prophet's foot set in a small tank of water. Fîruz's own tomb is coupled with the madrasa he built on the site of 'Alâ-al-Dîn's structure at the Hawd-i Khâs; the madrasa buildings on the east and south of the haued, double-storeyed on the lake front and single behind, are colonnades, several bays deep, of arches or lintel-and-bracket construction, connecting square domed halls at intervals, extending about 76 m. on one shore and 120 m. on the other; at the south-east corner is the 13.7 m. square tomb, with plastered walls slightly battering, the two outer (south and east) with a slight projection in which is an arched opening in which the entrance is framed by a lintel-and-bracket; there is a single dome on an octagonal drum, supported by interior squinches, and the west wall, in which is a door to the adjacent hall, has a small mîhrâb. The building stands on a short plinth extended southwest to form a small terrace, which is surrounded by a stone railing of mortice and tenon construction resembling woodwork. Another tomb, of great architectural significance, is that of Fâriz's Prime Minister Kânî-i Djahan Tilangânî, d. 770/1368-9, within the kât at Nizamuddin; this is the first octagonal tomb at Delhi (although the tomb-
chamber at Sultan Ghari is octagonal also), and is surrounded by a verandah, each side of which has three arched openings surmounted by a wide chadda or eaves-stone; there is a central dome, and eight smaller dome-like cupolas, one over each face. The prototype of this tomb has been sought in the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem; it formed the model for many royal tombs of the subsequent “Sayyid”, Lodí and Suri dynasties. One of the latest buildings of the Tughluks is the tomb of the shaykh Kabir al-Din Awliyá’ (probably of the time of Nasir al-Din Mahmúd, after 796/1394); although an indifferent is early 11th/12th century; and others); outside the east wall of the court is the square polychromatic tomb of Atga Khan, foster-father of Akbar, d. 989/1582, of a style similar to that of Humáyún (see below). Some 60 m. south-east of this tomb is the Čawnsaṭ Khambe, a grey marble pavilion of excellent proportions forming the family burial place of Atga Khan’s son, Mirzá ‘Aziz Kókaltash, d. 1033/1624. The adjoining kót and Tilangání tomb have already been described. For a full account of all these buildings see M. Zafar Hasan, A guide to

Fig. 5. Nizamuddín

and half-scale copy of the tomb of Ghiyáth al-Dín Tughlúk, it is of interest in indicating a revival of sympathy for the earlier polychromatic style, a reaction against the Firuzian austerity.

On Firúz Sháh’s tunnels at Díhlí, see H. Hosten, in JASB, n.s. vii (1911), 99-108; viii (1912), 279-81; ix (1913), lxxxiii-xci.

Since the major structures at the shrine of Nizám al-Dín are of this time the complex is described here (Fig. 5). The entrance gate bears the date 780/1378-9, within which is a large ba’dal [q.v.] flanked by two tombs and a two-storeyed mosque, all of Firuzian appearance; the ba’dal is named Čashma-i dil kushá (= 703/1303-4 by abjad). A further gate leads to the shrine enclosure; the shaykh’s tomb dates from the time of Akbar, replacing an earlier one built by Firúz Tughlúk, but has been much restored since, the dome being an addition of Akbar Sháh II in 1823; the Diamá’t Khamá masjid is early 11th/12th century; and others); outside the east wall of the court is the square polychromatic tomb of Atga Khan, foster-father of Akbar, d. 989/1582, of a style similar to that of Humáyún (see below). Some 60 m. south-east of this tomb is the Čawnsaṭ Khambe, a grey marble pavilion of excellent proportions forming the family burial place of Atga Khan’s son, Mirzá ‘Aziz Kókaltash, d. 1033/1624. The adjoining kót and Tilangání tomb have already been described. For a full account of all these buildings see M. Zafar Hasan, A guide to

Nizám-u-d-Dín ( = Memoir ASI, X), Calcutta 1922. Another dargáh largely dating from Firúzian times is that of Nasir al-Dín Čirágh-i Díhlí, d. 757/1356 (see čýt váya); the east gate is of 775/1373, but the tomb has been much modernized; the walls enclosing the shrine and village were built by Muhammad Sháh in 1142/1729; beside stands one of the alleged tombs of Bahól Lodi.

The “Sayyid” and Lodí dynasties produced no great building projects; their monuments consist entirely of tombs, except for one significant mosque, and the principal ones are concentrated in three sites: Khayrpur, Mubarakpur, and south of Muđahidpur on the road to Hawd-i Kháshs. The tombs are of two distinct types, square and octagonal, in both cases with a large central dome, frequently also with open chattris above the parapets. The earliest octagonal example is that of Mubarak Sháh, d. 838/1434, in Kótá Mubarakpur, an improvement on the style of the Tilangání tomb although the dome is not high enough and the octagonal chattris over each face are too crowded. The tomb of Muhammad Sháh, ten years later, removes these defects by raising the drum of the dome and the chattris, and
adding a guldasta at each angle of the verandah parapet. The tomb of Sikandar Lodī, c. 924/1518, at the north end of Khayyāpur, is of similar proportions but without the chatris, and the dome has an inner and outer shell; the mausoleum stands in a fortified enclosure, on the west wall of which is an arrangement of arches resembling an iqḍāḥ, presumably an outdoor mihrāb. The tomb of Mubārak has a detached mosque, but that of Muhammad has none. All tombs have sloping buttresses at the angles.

The square tombs probably all date from the last quarter of the 9th/15th century, but they lack inscriptions and are known only by very uninformative local names. The finest is the Barā Khānā gumbad, “Big Khān’s dome”, the largest (height 25 m.) of the three known as Tin burdā, west of Mubārakpur, apparently of three storeys from the exterior, but actually a single hall; this and the adjoining “Little Khān’s dome” have octagonal chatris in the angles of the square below the drum, as had the Dādī Khānā (“Grandmother’s”) and Potī Khānā (“Granddaughter’s”) gumbads of the Mudiāhjidpur group. At Khayyāpur are the best preserved, the Bařā Gumbad (“Big dome”), date 899/1494, which has no graves within and is locally said to be a gateway to the attached mosque, court-yard and madālis-khānā (?). The mosque has massive tapering and sloping pillars at each rear angle, each with a band of fluting, alternately rounded and angled, reminiscent of the lowest storey of the Khūṭ minār; the east façade has wide central arches whose spandrels are filled with the best cut-plaster decoration in Dihlī. Near is the Shīkh gumbad, very similar to the Bařā gumbad, but with courses of dark blue encaustic tile work.

Apart from the mosque mentioned above, the Lodīs produced one major example of this class, the isolated Moṭhī kā masjid south of Mubārakpur, built by the wazīr of Sikandar Lodī c. 911/1505; the west wall shows similar tapering pillar-turrets, but at the angles of the projecting mihrāb, and the external angles are provided with two-storeyed open towers; the side walls have trabeate balconies; the façade of the west liwān has the contours of the arches emphasized by the recession of planes of the intradoses, and the central arch is emphasized further by a pylon-like structure of the same height as the remainder; the liwān side domes are supported on stalactite pendentives; white marble, red sandstone, and coloured encaustic tiles are used in the decorative scheme, as well as fine cut-plaster; it is aesthetically one of the liveliest buildings in the whole of Islamic art in India. Other buildings of the Lodīs are few: a structure (madrasa ?), incorporating a small mosque, known as the Dāhār maḥāl, on the east of the Hawāi-’i reliq at Mirwālī, a small bārdarī of 952/1546, and a mahālī near Nizamuddin, and the residence (Barāh Khānā), with enclosed court-yard and three-storeyed tower, at Begampur.

In the unsettled days of the early Mughal conquest the Lodī mode seems to have continued: the Dījamālī mosque, of 943/1536, in the south of Khīlā Rāy Pithorā, has fine ashlar masonry, five liwān arches with recession of planes in the intradoses, and the central archway sunk in a larger arch, with a spearhead fringe, in a central propylon rising above the general level of the façade, with a single central dome; to the north is the insignificant-looking oblong building over the tomb of Fadl Allāh [g.v.], tabghalīs Dīamālī, with the best colour decoration in Dihlī on its ceiling. A continuation of the octagonal tomb style is in that of ‘Īsā Khān Niyāzī, of 954/1547-8 and hence in the reign of Islam Shāh Sūrī; the construction is similar to the preceding examples, including the closed west wall and mihrāb, but more on encaustic tile remains; a separate mosque stands on the west of the octagonal court-yard, of grey quartzite and red sandstone, the central bay of the three set in a projecting portico, with a central dome and chatris over the side bays. The tomb-building has sloping buttresses at each angle, and is the last building in Dihlī so treated. (For these buildings see S. A. Nāqīvi, Humayūn’s tomb and adjacent buildings, Dihlī 1947, 21-4).

The first two Mughal emperors, Bābur and Humāyūn, built in Dihlī in their first period no sand nothing to Dihlī’s monuments, except perhaps the commencement of the Purānā Khīlā; this, however, was mostly the work of the usurper Shīr Shāh Sūrī, as a citadel for his new city. Of the city only two gateways remain, the northern (Lāl, Kābulī or Khūnī darwāza), opposite Fīruz Shāh Kūtī, and the southern, with a short stretch of walling, near Purānā Khīlā (see ASI, Annual Report, xxii, 6 and Plate II). Of the citadel the walls remain, and two major structures within, the Shīr Māndāl, a two-storeyed octagon of red sandstone of unknown original purpose but used by Humāyūn as a library and from which he fell to his death; and the mosque, with no distinctive name, which has the Dījamālī mosque as its immediate prototype: but each of the five façade bays has a smaller recessed archway, and every other feature of the earlier mosque is improved and refined in this later example. The external construction is in courseed ashlar, and the liwān façade in red sandstone, some of it finely carved, embellished with white marble and polychromatic encaustic tile work; inside the dome is supported by a second stage of squinches, and in the side bays stalactite pendentives support the roof; the rear wall has tapering turrets on each side of the mihrāb projection, and an open octagonal turret at each angle.

The first major building of the Mughals in Dihlī is the tomb of the emperor Humāyūn, of a style already prefigured in the small tomb of Atga Khān at Nizamuddin; the foundations of it were laid in 1566-7 (so Sanghīn Beg, Siyāsī al-Mandali, MS in Dihlī Fort Museum; 1565 according to Sayyid Ahmad Khān, followed by most later writers) by his widow, employing the Persian architect Mirzā Ghīyāth, although the enclosure wall had been started some five years before. In a large square garden enclosure (540 m. side; this is the first tārbedgān garden in India still preserving its original plan) stands the mausoleum building, 47.5 m. square on a plinth 95 m. square, 6.7 m. high; each face is also in its third period, angular fronton containing an immense arch, flanked by smaller wings each containing a smaller arch; these wings are octagonal in plan and project in front of the main arches. The central chamber is surmounted by a bulbous double dome on a high collar, around which are chatris over the corner wings and portals. The
entire building is in red sandstone, with a liberal use of white and coloured marble. Neighbouring structures are the small Nārī kā gumbad, "Barber's dome"; the Nīlā Gumbad, "Blue dome", earlier than Humāyūn's tomb and therefore not the tomb of Fahīm Kān, d. 1035/1626, as often stated; the "Af sarwālā" tomb and mosque; the 'Arab Sarā'ī; and the tomb of Isā Kān already described (see Fig. 6 for plan of this complex; full description of these buildings in S. A. A. Naqvi, Humāyūn's Tomb and adjacent buildings, Dihlī 1947). Not far to the south is the tomb of Abd al-Rahīm Kān-ī-Khān, d. 1036/1626-7, a similar structure but smaller and without the octagonal corner compartments—hence a more obvious forerunner of the wards to the river. The diwān-i ʿamm is of red sandstone, with slender double columns on the open sides; this and the palace buildings on the east have encausted arches, stand on low plinths, and most have open chajrīs at each corner of the roof. Through the palaces runs an ornamental canal, the Nahr-i Bihīsh, which flows south from the Shāh Burdāi, water being brought from a point thirty kās on the Djamnā (through the Western Djamnā canal; for the history of this, which dates from the time of Firūz Shāh Tūghlūk, see J. J. Hatten, History and description of government canals in the Punjab, Lahore n.d., 1-3); this has a plain marble channel, which in the Rang mahāll flows into a large tank in which is set a marble lotus, having previously passed, in the royal

Fig. 6. Humāyūn's tomb

Tāдж Mahall than Humāyūn's tomb; the white marble of this building was later stripped off by ʿAsaf al-Dawla, wazīr of Awadh. Other early Mughal buildings are the Lāl čawk or Khayr al-ma'nāzīl (the latter name a chronogram, 969 = 1561-2), a mosque built by Māhmān Anaga, foster-mother of Akbar, with double-storeyed chambers on east, south and north forming a madrasa (ASI, Annual Report, xxii, 6 and Plate I a and b; inscr., Memoir ASI, xlvii, 10); and the mosque of Shāykh ʿAbd al-Nabī, ṣadr al-sudār of Akbar, between Firūz Shāh Kōtla and the Purānā Kīlā, built 983/1575-6 (see M. Zafar Hasan, Mosque of Shāykh ʿAbdu-n-Nabī (= Memoir ASI, ix), Calcutta 1921).

The main phase of Mughal building in Dihlī was the construction of Shāhjahanābād and the Red Fort, Lāl Kīlā, founded 1048/1638. The main features of Mughal palaces and other buildings will be described in MUGHALS; a brief account only is given here. Within the palace enclosure, about 950 by 505 m., are a central court, containing the Diwān-i ʿamm; flanking this, two open spaces containing gardens; and, on the eastern wall, the range of palaces facing inwards to the gardens and outside private apartments, under a screen bearing a representation of the "Scales of Justice", Mizān-i-ʿadī. Off these apartments is the external octagonal balcony, the Muḥammān Burdāi, from which the emperor gave the darshan [q.v.]. The Rang mahāll and the Diwān-i khāss are the most lavishly ornamented of these palaces, built and paved in white marble, the piers of the arches inlaid with floral designs in pietra dura; the latter building contained the fabulous Peacock Throne (Takht-i ṭūs), taken to Persia by Nādir Shāh in 1152/1739 and there broken up (G. N. Curzon, Persia and the Persian question, i, 321-2). The disposition of these and the other buildings is shown in the plan, Fig. 7.

The fort originally contained no mosque; the Motī masjīd was added by Awrangzīb in 1073/1662-3, entirely of white marble, with a curved "Bengali" cornice over the central bay. For the fort and its buildings, see G. Sanderson, A guide to the buildings and gardens, Delhi Fort, Delhi 1937.

The Diwān-i masjīd of Shāhjahanābād (named Masjīd-i Diwān-nūmā), built 1057/1648-50, stands on an open plain to the west of the Lāl Kīlā, its high basement storey, with blind
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Arches on all sides, built on an outcrop of the local Aravalli ridge. The gates on north, east and south have an external opening in the form of a half-dome with a smaller door in the base of each. The east gate, used as the royal entrance, is the largest. The gates on north, east and south, and the western sanctuary is a detached compartment 79 m. by 27.5 m. with the court-yard (99 m. square), with a wide central arch flanked by five smaller bays of enframed arches on each side, and a three-storeyed minaret at each front angle; above are three bulbous domes of white marble surrounding the court is open to the outside, gate, used as the royal entrance, is the largest. The have an external opening in the form of a half-dome
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DIHLÍ SULTANATE, the principal Muslim kingdom in northern India from its establishment by Iltimāsh (608/1211-1236) until its submergence in the Mughal empire under Akbar (963-1014/1556-1605). The establishment of the Dihlī sultanate was made possible by the Indian campaigns of the Ghurid al-Muzzaffar Dīn Muhammad b. Sam, father of Asaf Dīn, in a hornwork outside the Ağmār gate of Shahrāh-ñābād (1122/ 1710), and where the Arabic school is still maintained; the Kudhhāsh gate of the Kashmiri Gate, c. 1163/1750, and the elegant diminutive mosque (Sohnabīl masjid) of Dīwān-ī Khán, of fawn-coloured sandstone, of the same time; and the finely-proportioned fawn sandstone tomb of Saifdār Dīng, d. 1166/1753, standing in the last great Mughal garden. One British building is worth mention, St. James's church, built by Col. James Skinner in Palladian style in 1824. The vast building projects of New Delhi (Naqī Dihlī) show occasional reminiscences of the glory of Mughal building, but have no further Islamic significance.
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Adjmer and Mu'izz al-Din had to enter India himself in 592/1195-6 to take Bayana, the stronghold of the Indo-Aryans. In 593/1196, the latter defeated an attempt by the Mhers, in alliance with the Calukyas, to take Adjmer and in the following year defeated the Calukyas near Mt. Abu without however attempting permanently to occupy their territory. Turning his attention to the upper Ganges, Aybak occupied Bada'un in 594/1197-8 and Kanawdi in 595/1198-9. In 597/1200, Gwalior was taken and the Bundelkhand area was penetrated in 599/1202-3 with the capture of Kálandjar (Kálandjär).

When, in 602/1206, Mu'izz al-Din was assassinated at Damyak on the Indus (on the identity of the assassins see Habibullah, *The foundation of Muslim rule in India*, 79), the Ghüríd position in India was that of a precarious military occupation. Holding only the chief towns of the Pandjab, Sind and the Ghurids, the Ghurids, the Ghorids, the Mongols had slipped out of Dihll's feeble grasp. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun. The Râjputs clans had but melted into the countryside hoping to re-emerge and take control when the Turk Ish invasions had passed on. Indeed, by accepting Prthvîrâja's son and the Râjputs in Bundelkhand (Kâlandjär had been retaken by the Candelas) and around Gwalior which had been retaken by the Parhrâs. Moreover the Gâhadâvâlas were still active in the districts around Farrukhabâd and Baddà'nun.

The consolidation of the Ghûrid position in Hindustân was still a secondary consideration even after Mu'izz al-Din's death is evident from the subsequent career of Kutb al-Din Aybak. Said by his panegyrist and son-in-law, Shams al-Dîn Iltutmish, an Ilbarl Turk, may be regarded as the founder of an independent sultanate of Dihll. (The correct form of the name is Iltutmish, as shown by Hikmet Bayurır in *Bilelten*, xiv, 1950, 567-88). His reign saw three main political developments—the severance of political ties between the Turks and the Afgâns in Hindustân and Central Asia, the achievement of primacy in Muslim India by the ruler of Dihll, and the firm grasping of the main strategic centres of the north Indian plains by the forces of Dihll. Such was the successful conflict between Arâm Shâh and Iltutmish to occupy Lahore, Tâdj al-Dîn Yildiz had not abandoned his claim to the Ghûrid conquests in India and numerous Hindû chiefs were threatening the Turkish hold over Bada'un, Kanawdi and Banaras. Râjdîstân also had slipped out of Dihll's feeble grasp.

Placing Yildiz by acceptance of the statû and dârâbîkh of sovereignty and not stirring when the latter's troops drove Kabâca from Lahore, Iltutmish tightened his hold over Sarosût and Kushrâm east of the Satlándj and when, in 612/1215, Yildiz was forced out of Ghaznl into the Pandiab by the forces of the Khârazm-Shâh, Iltutmish was able to defeat and capture him at Târa'n (Târho). He still did not hasten, however, to occupy Lahore.

Cîngiz Kân's attack upon the Khârazm-Shâh hastened the political isolation of the Turks in India. Iltutmish refused to be drawn into the struggle between the Mongols and Dihll al-Din Khârazm-Shâh [q.v.], watching the latter erode Kabâca's position in the Pandiab and Sind. Taking advantage of Kabâca's difficulties, Iltutmish occupied Lahore and in 625/ 1228 drove Kabâca from Multân and Uc to a death by drowning in the Indus. Although Iltutmish occupied Sidâkof (and Lahore when he could), by drawing back his effective frontier east of the Beâs, he managed to avoid a head-on clash with the Mongols before his death.

In the east, where Muhammad Bakhtiyâr Kâhdîjî had overcome the Sena kingdom in Bengal in 600-2/1203-6, Iltutmish repelled Ghiyâth al-Dîn Iwâz Kâhdîjî's raids in the east and his attempts in the west in the following year the latter was slain by Iltutmish's eldest son Nâsr al-Dîn Mahmûd. Toward the end of 627/1230, Iltutmish invaded Lakhnawtî and slew the Kâhdîjî chief Balka.

Against the Râjputs, Iltutmish was successful in capturing, at least temporarily, Ranthambhor in 624/1226, Mandor in 625/1227, Gwâliyûr in 629/1231, and in plundering Bhilsâ and Ujdîâjan (Ujjain) in 630/1234-5. Nevertheless his lieutenants were worsted in encounters with the Câwânns of Bundî and the Cândelas of Narwar and even in the Dâ'sh Hindû chiefs needed constant overawing.

The appearance of an independent Muslim power in north India was however signalized by Iltutmish receiving, in 626/1229, a robe of honour and the title of Nâsr â Mir al-Mu'mînîn from the 'Abbâsid caliph, al-Mustansîr.

That the Dihll sultanate had 'settled in' in northern India by the end of Iltutmish's reign is suggested by its capacity to survive faction, Mongol pressure and sapping by Hindû chiefs during the years immediately following. Within ten years of Iltutmish's death, the mu'ta's and officials had accepted and deposed four of his children or grand-children, Rukn al-Dîn Firûz (631/1234-6), Râdiyyû (634-7/1236-40), Mu'izz al-Dîn Bahrâm, (637/1240-2) and 'Ala' al-Dîn Mayûd (639/1242-4).
Stability was not achieved until the reign of Nasir al-Din Mahmud (644-64/1246-66) during whose time effective authority was exercised by Ghiyath al-Din Balban as na`ib. Most sources picture Nasir al-Din as a pious recluse, but from the evidence of Fisamis Futuh al-Salatin, it is possible that this is an exaggeration. (See also K. A. Nizami, Balban, the regicide, in bibli.).

The ceaseless struggle required of the Turks and Afghans in Hindustan to maintain Dihli as the principal, let alone the paramount, power at this time, is emphasized by the career of Balban both as na`ib and as sultan. His activities, though not always demanded, in 645/1247, Balban plundered the areas between Kalingar and Karra; in 646/1248, he led an unsuccessful raid against Ramthambhor and in 649/1251 he marched against Cachardeva, the Diadjiapella ruler of Gujjarai and Narwar. In 652/1254 he campaigned against the Karehriyas whose activities always threatened the hold of Dihli over Badi`un and Sambhal, north of the Ganges. Depredations by the Yaduvanshi Kaldjils of the northern Alwur area, the 'Mewati', were endemic in the last days of Nasir al-Din Mahmud's reign, with raids against Hansl in 655/1256 and even as far as the environs of Dihli itself.

Early in Balban's own reign (664-86/1266-87), he cleared the forests near Dihli of marauders and pacified the Bodjoin, Patyaiil and Kampil districts, stationing garrisons of Afghans there. One historian of the next century, Diyal` al-Din Barani, depicts Balban as consciously pursuing, in his own reign, a purely defensive policy and as concerned mainly to hold the western marches against the Mongols. That this is probably an ex post facto rationalization, provoked by the contrast with the succeeding period, is suggested by the fierceness of Balban's reaction to trouble in Lakhnawt in the 620's when he put forth a great military effort to suppress Tughril; who had assumed independence under the title of Sultan Mughilt al-Din. Dihli was not always so mindful of events in Bengal. Although Balban strengthened the frontier strongholds of Dipalpur, Sama`na and Bhatinda and posted his favourite son Muhammad to Multan and Lahore, the Mongols were too preoccupied with the quarrels between the Caghatays and the Il-khans and their rivalry in Afghanistan and India. Nevertheless, threats to the Dihli sultanate in Balban's time.

As Muhammad was killed in a skirmish with the Mongols in 684/1286, and Balban's second son Bughra Khahn preferred his title of of Lakhnawt, Balban was succeeded by his grandson, Mu`izz al-Din Kaybubad who, young and frivolous, proved incapable of withstanding the intrigues of ambitious ministers and the faction struggles between groups of Turks and Kaldjils. Eventually, succumbing to paralysis, he was displaced by his infant son, Kayumart, a puppet in the hands first of the Turks and then of the Kaldjils. The Kaldjl leader, Djialal al-Din, accepted the status of na`ib to Kayumart; after about three months, finding that, in order to protect himself against the jealousies of other nobles, he needed the title to as well as the reality of power, Djialal al-Din assumed the sultanate himself (689/1290).

By Muslim historians of a later generation, the end of Balban's dynasty was regarded as signaling the end of the Turkish sultanate of Dihli. In the sense of the race of the sultan this is so, but not in the sense that the ruling elite had hitherto been exclusively Turkish. Djialal al-Din Kaldjl had been Balban's mu`aht of Sama`na before becoming ard-i mamdilkh under Mu`izz al-Din; and Balban's ard-i mamdilkh, 'Imad al-Mulk Rawat, was a converted Hindu. The outcome of the diversification of the Muslim ruling groups through immigration, inter-marriage and concubinage with the subject population was to become more evident under the Kaldjils, but Barani's rhetoric, for example, cannot conceal the fact that the process had already gone a considerable way under Balban.

Djialal al-Din Kaldjl's assassination by his nephew, 'Ala' al-Din, has enabled Barani, against the evidence of events and the testimony of Amir Khurasis's Mi`rath al-Futuh, to fasten upon him the character of an ageing, indulgent and gullible valetudinarian. Actually, he suppressed a revolt by Balban's former officers in Shabban 689/August-September 1290, besieged Ramthambhor (though unsuccessfully) in 690/1291 and defeated a Mongol foray in 691/1291-2. He also pillaged Mandor and Uddinayn (Ujjain) at the end of 691/1292.

But it is clear in the Kaldjl's reign (695-715/1296-1315) that, for a brief period, the Dihli sultanate attained an imperial status in the sub-continent. 'Ala' al-Din was probably born about 666/1267-8. A participant in the Kaldjl coup against Balban, the Kaldjl's family and the other military officers, he was appointed mu`dja of Karra in 690/1291 from whence he raised Bhilsa and then, in 695/1295, unbeknown to Djialal al-Din Kaldjl, the Yadava kingdom of Devagiri (Dwegir). Loaded with booty, he was met on the Ganges near Manikpur by Djialal al-Din who appears to have been so based to share the spoils that he was careless of his own safety. Fear of the influence of powerful enemies at court feeding his ambition, 'Ala' al-Din had his uncle slain.

Supported by his brother Alma` Beg, 'Ala' al-Din bought over many mulaks and amirs by money and promotion. Within a few months of his accession, he had captured the surviving sons of Djialal al-Din Kaldjl and their supporters and blinded, imprisoned or executed them.

The reign was noteworthy in that serious attacks upon Hindustan by the Caghatays Mongols of Transoxiana were repulsed, the influence of Dihli over Rgdjasthan was greatly extended and profitable raids, which made possible the introduction of a Muslim ruling class in other contemporary or near-contemporary evidence. It is not clear from the evidence why 'Ala' al-Din should have succeeded in winning the co-operation of the military and official classes for reforms which adversely affected them.

The rivalry between Daw` Khahn, great-great grandson of Caghatay and ruler of Transoxiana, and the Great Khans in the east in alliance with the Il-Khans in the west, led to an effort by Daw` to expand in the direction of Afghanistan and Hindustan. The first Mongol invasion of 'Ala' al-Din's reign, into the Pandjs in 697/1297-8, was worsted at Djialandhar and the second, into Siwishkan in 698/1299 was equally abortive. A third, later the same year, under Kutlug Kh Kh`ada, son of Daw`, reached Kil near Dihli before it too was defeated. The invasion of Tarht in 702/1303 invested Dihli and appears to have
been thwarted of success only by Ala’ al-Din Khaldil’s entrenchments at Siri. (On the location of Siri, see A. S. I., i, Simla 1871, 207-12.) Other insurrections were defeated at Umraba in 705/1305, and near the Rawal in 706/1306 by Malik Kāfir and Malik Tughluk. But although Dihill was almost uniformly successful against the Čaghatai Mongols, the cessation of major attacks during the latter half of ‘Ala’ al-Din’s reign was probably caused more by an intensification of antagonism between the Il-Khāns and Dāwa’s successors than by discomfiture in Hindūstān; Malik Kāfr, for instance, is known to have kept busy combating minor forays as muḥāfaẓ of Dīlāpur.

‘Ala’ al-Din had not waited upon security from the Mongols before expanding the sultanate in India itself. In 698/1299, Gūḏarrison was invaded and Khambāyat plundered. (See K. S. Lal, History of the Khalīfs, 83, on the date of this expedition.) In 700/1301, Ranthambhor, in 702/1303 Cittor, in 703/1305 Māndū were captured, to be followed in 708/1308 by the capture of Siwāna and in 711/1311–2 of Dīlāhor. These victories in Rājāstān were essential to the success of ‘Ala’ al-Din’s expeditions south of the Narbādā. The Yādava kingdom of Devagirī was laid under tribute in 706/1307, the Kākātya kingdom of Telengāna in 709/1309-10. In 710/1311, with the help of the Hīosāla Ballālādeva of Dwārasamudrā, Malik Kāfr invaded the Pāṇḍya kingdom in the far south, returning laden with spoils to Dīlāh in 711/1311.

The successes of ‘Ala’ al-Din Khaldil’s reign may be attributable partly to the personal drive of a sultan requiring, as his uncle’s murderer, to go on living dangerously, partly to the financial appeal of his earliest Deccan raid and the conquest of Gūḏarrison to the soldiery, and partly to the services of Indian-born Muslims and converted Hindū slaves. Moreover, he treated defeated Hindū rulers in a conciliatory way, receiving them at court and marrying into their families. (He himself married a daughter of Rāmadeva of Devagirī and his son Khādir Ḳān married “Dīwāl Rānî” (correctly Devadevi), daughter of Rāy Ḹaran of Gūḏarrison.) It is significant that he was content to reduce the Hindū kingdoms of south India to a tributary status. His administrative measures will be mentioned under a general reference to the political institutions of the sultans of Dīlāh, which have left few traces.

‘Ala’ al-Din Khādir did not however succeed in perpetuating the sultanate in his family. On his death, his adīb Malik Kāfr raised ‘Ala’ al-Din’s six-year-old son Ḍūrā Kān to the throne as Shihāb al-Din Umār al-Khalīf, blinding Ḍūrā Khān and Shāhīd Khān before himself being murdered by the palace pāyakhs. ‘Ala’ al-Din’s third son Kūṭb al-Din Muḥārak Shāh Khādir then ascended the throne. During his reign (716-20/1316-20), a revolt in Gūḏarrison was suppressed, Devagirī was garrisoned and Telingāna and the far south raided again. However, Kūṭb al-Din was murdered by a Hindū convert, his favourite Khusrav Khān Barwār (on his name and origin see: Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, i, 369-71, who assumed the title of Sultan Nāṣīr al-Din Khusrav Shāh.

Tradition formed under the Tughlucks depicts his rule of four months as that of an avowed Hindū infidel; it is evident however that Kūṭb al-Din was unpopular among important elements of the military classes (there had been plots against his life in 718/ 1318 when coins were struck in favour of one Shams al-Din Mahmūd Shāh (see R. B. Whitehead, Some rare coins of the Pathan sultans of Delhi, in J.A.S.B., 1910, Numismatic Supplement iv, 566-7; Shamsuddin Mahmūd of Dīlāh, in J.A.S.B., 1912, Numismatic Supplement xxxv, 123-4; H. N. H. Wright, The sultans of Dīlāh; their coinage and metrology, Dīlāh 1936, 109-10; K. S. Lal, ed. cit. 330-2, 337-8). Historians favouring the Tughlucks state that many Muslims either accepted office under him or refused to join Malik Tughluk’s revolt, or fought energetically on the Barwār’s behalf. It is stated that Hindū Khokhar chiefs also supported the Tughlucks, however, Ghusrav Shāh, encouraged by his son Malik Fakhīr al-Din Dīlāhor, marched on Dīlāh, defeating the forces of Nāṣīr al-Din Khusrav Shāh twice, capturing and executing him.

According to Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, (Rihla, ed. Defremery and Sanguinetti, iii, 201), Ghusrav al-Din Tughluk was a Karawna Turk. (On this see Wolseley Haig, Five questions in the history of the Tughluk dynasty of Dīlāh, in JRAS, July 1922, 319-21. He appears to have risen to the appointment of Īd-dīn under Muṣīz al-Din Kavkubāb and first to have obtained the post of muḥāfaẓ under Dīlāhor al-Din Khādir. His reign (720-5/1320-5) saw a further campaign against Telingāna, the repulse of a Mongol raid, a raid into Dījāṅnagar and an expedition to Lakhnawtī to reassert Dīlāhor’s suzerainty. Ghusrav al-Din Tughluk met his death under a collapsing hunting pavilion at Afgānūr. The complicity of Muhammad b. Tughluk in his father’s death has been exhaustively argued (see Syed Moinul Haq, Was Muhammad bin Tughlak a parricide?, in Muslim University Journal, Aligarh, v/2, October 1938, 17-48). In the light of Dīyā’s al-Din Baranī’s apparently genuine mystification at the event, the absence of condemnation of Muhammad b. Tughluk (whom he condemns fiercely on other counts) and the unnecessarily elaborate and haphazard method of killing alleged, Muhammad b. Tughluk is, in this article also, adjudged innocent of his father’s death.

The reign of Muhammad b. Tughluk (725-52/ 1325-51) appears to have been a watershed in the history of the Dihlī sultanate. At the outset, Dihlī’s authority was, according to Dīyā al-Din Baranī, recognized in twenty-three provinces, and the picture drawn by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in the 730s is one of Dihlī’s Muslim and non-Muslim population set by 752/1351 the power of Dihlī south of the Narbādā was clearly forfeit and revolt endemic elsewhere. Baranī’s interpretation of Muhammad b. Tughluk’s troubles is too redolent of his general philosophy of history (see P. Hardy, Historians of medieval India, 36-9, 124-5) to be acceptable as it stands (it hardly explains the military support the sultan enjoyed until his natural death, for instance).

Perhaps the decision which did most, in the long term, to undermine the sultan of Dihlī’s authority was Muhammad b. Tughluk’s attempt to make Deogir (Dawlatābād [q.v.]) a second capital and to settle numbers of Muslims belonging to the ruling ālite in the Deccan. During the two previous reigns, the temptation among Muslims of the Deccan armies to plot against the Dihlī sultan had been shown to exist. By changing the Khādir policy of suzerainty by right to a tributary status, Muhammad b. Tughluk unilaterally ensured that such temptations would be successful. The relationship of other projects of the sultan—an expedition said to have been aimed at the conquest of Khurāsān, but probably at the seizure of Peshāvar or Ghāznī (Baranī’s geographical statements are
vague and uncorroborated, while Ḩamāṣi speaks of a Peshawar expedition about the same date), a permanent loss of hegemony, were in 754/1353-4, Multan (754/1353-4) and in 760/1359, Nāgar (746/1345), Gīljānī (748/1347). The latter led to the proclamation, in 748/1347, of an independent sultanate under ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Bahān Shāh [see Bahānmands]. Muhammad b. Tughluk died near Thaffīnā while in pursuit of one Ṭaghī, a Turkish rebel, who had taken refuge with the Sammas of Sind. It is noteworthy that tradition in ṣīfī or ṣīfī-influenced writing is generally hostile to Muhammad b. Tughluk. (He is known to have welcomed a pupil of Ibn Taimiyya to his court [see K. A. Nizami, Some aspects of Ḥanafī life in medieval India, in Stud. Isl., viii, 1957, 60].)

Muhammad’s successor, his cousin Firkār b. Ṭaghājār, selected by the army in Sind, was apparently personna grata to the ṣīfīs of the time; the extant accounts of the reign are mainly panegyrical and in the manākīb idiom; they depict him as pious and benevolent, shunning war and devoting himself to building. Nevertheless, before old age came upon him, he seems to have been no more pacific than Dīlī sultans usually were. He led expeditions to Lakhnawtī in 754/1353-4 and in 760/1359, followed by a foray into Dāhdūn in 761/1360 and Nāgarzāf in 762/1361. Other campaigns followed to Thaffīnā in 765-6/1366-7, Etāwā in 770/1370 and Khatārī in 782/1380. Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūk did however refrain, despite an invitation, about 767/1366, from disaffected leaders in the Bahānī sultanate, from attempting to recover Dīlī’s former possessions south of the Narbādā. The impression of prosperity and contentment among all sections of the population given in Ḥārī’s Taʾrīkh-i Muḥammadī, Fīrūz Shāh was probably heightened by the contrast with the period after Timūr’s incursion into Hindūstān, when the work was written.

Perhaps Fīrūz’s longevity (he died in 790/1388) had removed all restraint from the frustrated ambitions of his descendants, for after his death his sons and grandsons fell to struggling for the throne without regard for the consequences for the sultanate. By 790/1393-4, there were two would-be sultans, Māḥmūd, son of Muhammad the third son of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūk, with headquarters in old Dīlī, and Nusrāt Khān, son of Fakhr Khān the eldest son of Fīrūz, with headquarters in Fīrūzābād, the new capital built by Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūk to the north-east of old Dīlī. It was not surprising that the muḥāfīdhs of the provinces seized their opportunity to become independent or to raise their terms for supporting one or other of the contestants.

Upon the scene of political disintegration burst Timūr’s invading army. Crossing the Indus in Muharram 801/September 1398, capturing Bhatnagār but by-passing Dālpūr and Sāmānā, Timūr defeated the forces of Sūltān Māḥmūd before Dīlī and occupied and sacked Dīlī itself. The consequent political anarchy is reflected in the purely local scale of the events recorded in the histories of the period. The possessor of Dīlī itself became merely one of many military chiefs, both Muslim and Hindū, struggling to widen the area in north India from which they drew revenue, or to increase their military following. Some of Dīlī’s former officers succeeded in assuming complete independence of Dīlī. In 808/1406 Hūshān Shāh put the seal on his father Dīlāwār Khān’s independent rule in Mālwā with a proclamation of an independent sultanate; in 810/1407 Zafar Khān did the same in Guḍjārāt. In the east, the area of Awadh and Tirhut became the centre of the independent power of Dāwanpur under the eunuch Mulk Sarwar (Dāwanpur appears to have become formally independent of Dīlī in 803/1400). Khīndegh in the valley of the Tāptī, Kālpī and Māboba in eastern Rādūstān also became independent in the period immediately after Timūr’s invasion.

Dīlī itself, a capital city without an empire, came in 817/1414 into the possession of the ‘Ṣayyīd’ Khīđr Khān, governor of Multān, Māḥmūd, the last of the Tughlūks, having died the previous year. He lay claim to a title no higher than ‘Rayāt-i A’lā and, according to the Taʾrīkh-i Muḥammadī, (B.M. Or. 137, folios 311b-312a) acknowledged the suzerainty of Shāh Rūkh, Timūr’s son. Khīđr Khān and his ‘Ṣayyīd’ successors, Mubārāk Shāh (824-37/1421-34) and Muhammad b. Farīd (837-49/1434-45) were obliged to play the part of provincial rulers, struggling with the Rāys of Khatārī, Etāwā, Candwar, Bāyānā, Gwālīsār for the acknowledgment of suzerainty by the payment of tribute. The possession of Dīlī and its historic claims was worth so little at this time that in 855/1451 the last of the ‘Ṣayyīds, ‘Alī’ al-Dīn ‘Alā’ī Shāh, peacefully relinquished Dīlī to the Lōdī Afgān, Bahālū, contenting himself until his death in 883/1478 with possession of the district of Bādānīn, a possession which, illustrative of the particularist outlook of the time, Bahālū was equally prepared peacefully to allow.

There are now extant no records strictly contemporary with the Lōdī period of the sultanate; moreover some authors in Mughal times tend to romanticize the Lōdīs in the influence of the Afgān sentiment. It is incontrovertible that considerable Afgān immigration into India occurred (it is said with the deliberate encouragement of the Bahālū) and that during Bahālū’s reign (855-94/1451-89), the Lōbāns, the Sūrs, the Sarwāns, the Niyažīs and the Karrāns came into prominence as settlers in India.

Bahlūl Lōdī was the grandson of Malik Bahrām who had migrated to Multān during the reign of Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūk. Bahālū succeeded his uncle Malik Sūltān Shāh as governor of Sīrhīn and acquired Lahore becoming Khaṇ-i Khaṇān under Muhammad b. Farīd. He was invited to take over at Dīlī by Hāmid Khān, the waṣīr of ‘Alī’ al-Dīn ‘Alā’ī Shāh. Bahālū succeeded in widening the area of Dīlī’s influence. He pacified the Dōbāb, reduced Etāwā, Candwar and Rēwarī and, in 856/1452, defeated an attempt by sultan Māḥmūd Shārkhī of Dāwanpur to seize Dīlī itself. Another attempt by sultan Ḥusayn Shīh in 850/1457 was also defeated. Desultory warfare between Dīlī and Dāwanpur continued until, in 884/1479 Bahālū succeeded in occupying Dāwanpur itself and seizing his son Bārbak Shāh on the throne. Much of Bahālū’s success is attributed to his dexterous handling of his Afgān amis; he is reputed to have avoided any extreme assertion of the authority of the sultanate and to have limited his demands upon his ḡāṣfīrārīs to military service.
Bahlul’s third son, Nizām Khān (Sikandar Lodi), was preferred as successor by the Afghan chiefs. Sikandar completed the incorporation of Dīnwarp into the Dīlhī kingdom, deposing Bārbak Shāh, and campaigned in Bihār where the fugitive Husayn Shāh had taken refuge. In order to control the Ėtawā, Koyl, Gwālīyār and Dholpur areas more effectively, he founded Āgra in 910/1504, but the latter years of his reign (894-923/1489-1517) saw incessant military activity in this region.

His successor, Ībrahim (923-32/1517-26), was soon faced by a Lowānī, Pārmūlī, and Mūgālī rebellion under the nominal leadership of Dīlūn Khān, a younger brother, in Dīnwarp and Bihār where the tradition of independence of Dīlhī at that time was still strong. Although Ībrahim enjoyed some successes, Dāwlī Khān, governor of the Pāндīlī Āmm, appealed to the Mughal Bābūr to intervene in Dīhūndīn, as also did Īlām Khān, Ībrahim’s uncle who claimed Dīlhī for himself. Bābūr, proving more adept at using them than they used at using him, marched on Dīlhī to defeat and kill Ibrāhīm Lodi at Pāndī at Rādīd 932/April 1526. But this victory merely established Dīlhī as one of the serious contenders for empire in Hindūstān. The Afghāns melted into the countryside or withdrew into Bihār out of Bābūr’s immediate reach, waiting on events and by no means reconciled to Mughal supremacy.

The Dīlhī sultanate of Dīlhī was temporarily restored by Šīhr Khān and his son Īsā Shāh. Farīd Khān’s (Šīhr Shāh’s) grandfather had migrated to Hindūstān during the reign of Bahlūl Lodi; his father Miḥiyn Ḥasan Khān receiving under Sikandar Lōdī the pārganās of Sahṣūrān, Ḥāḏīlpūr and Ḥarkpur Tāndā near Bankās in Ėḍūr for the maintenance of 500 horsemen. Šīhr Shāh, who was born about 1472 (see F. Saran, The date and place of Šīhr Shāh’s birth, in Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, xx, 1934, 108-22, and Ishwari Prasad, Life and times of Humayun, Calcutta 1955, 96 fn.) was given the management of his father’s pārganās about 917/1511. Losing them to his half-brother Sulaymān, in 933/1527 he took service with Bābūr only to leave him the following year to place himself under Bāhār Khān Lōhānī who had set himself up as sultan of Mūgālānī Khudrānī in southern Bihār. In 936/1529, after Muḥammad Khudrānī’s death, Šīhr Khān ruled in co-operation with Duḍū, the mother of the boy successor Diālī Khān. Šīhr Khān temporarily lost his position in Bihār to the Lōdī claimant Māḥmūd b. Sikandar Lōdī. His rivals were however discomfited by the Mughal Humayūn at the battle of Dāwra 937/1531, with the help of Šīhr Khān’s neutrality. His spiritual defence of Ėndūr rallied the Afghāns of Bihār around him and he consolidated his position in Bihār by defeating an invasion by the forces of the Bāṅgālī ruler Māḥmūd Shāh at Sūrālgīrār in 940/1534. Counter-attacking, by Dhu ‘l-Ka’dā 944/April 1538, the sultānate of Bāṅgāl was at his feet with the occupation of the capital Gāwūr.

Alarmed at the rise of Šīhr Khān, Humayūn moved eastward from Āgra in Safar 944/July 1537 only to lose six months besieging Ėndūr. Losing an opportunity to secure Šīhr Khān’s submission as a tributary, Humayūn marched on to Bāṅgāl only to meet defeat at Ėtwānī in Safar 946/June 1539. He was again defeated near Kānawdī in Mūharrām 947/May 1540 and forced to flee to Lahore and then via Mūlānī to Sind from whence he eventually made his way to Kāżwīn.

Šīhr Shāh secured his position in the west by occupying the Pāндīlī, founding a stronghold, Rohtār, near Bāṁlāt; Mūlānī was also occupied in 950/1543. Šīhr Shāh took up Dīlhī’s perennial struggle with the Rāḍīpūṭs with the capture of Ḳāyṣā in 950/1543 and campaigns against Mārwār in 950-1/1544. He was killed while besieging Kālīndīr in Rabī’ 1 952/May 1545.

His successor, Īṣlām Shāh Sūr (952-60/1545-53), the younger son of Šīhr Shāh, though far from adroit in handling the Afghān chiefs, managed to hold Šīhr Shāh’s dominions together until his death. He is criticized by later Afghān historians for attempting to curb the powers of the Ėḍūrgārīs.

On his death the throne was seized by Muḥārīz Khān, a nephew of Šīhr Shāh who took the title of Muḥammad Ādīl Shāh. This was the signal for the collapse of any unifying authority in the area of the Dīlhī sultanate. Tāḏī Khān Karranī in Gwālīyār, Ībrahim Khān Sūr, Adīm Khān Sūr in Lahore and Muḥammad Khān Sūr in Bāṅgāl threw off their allegiance. Upon this scene of political confusion Humayūn re-entered in 962/1555, occupying Lahore in Rabī’ II 962/February 1555, defeating the Afghāns at Sirhind in Shā’bān 962/June 1555 and entering Dīlhī the following month. It was not however until after Humayūn’s death (Rabī’ I 963/January 1556) that the Mughal victory at Pāndīpāt over Ḳemūlī, the Hūndī general of Muḥammad Ādīl Shāh, guaranteed that the Mughals would not be expelled from India against their will.

Under Ḳabār, the Dīlhī sultanate merged imperceptibly into the Mughal empire, distinguished from that empire less by the character of its institutions (for Ḳabār built more upon Ḳhāḷḍī and Tūḡlūk foundations than his panegyrists acknowledge) than by the narrower extent of its authority, its failure to guard the north-west marches and its failure to hold Rāḍījāstān for any appreciable period.

Despite the rhetoric of Muslim historians of the period and the undoubted achievements of the Ḳhāḷḍīs and the early Tūḡlūkūs, the Dīlhī sultanate made no violent break with the later Rāḍīpūṭ political tradition that rulers in Hindūstān sought paramountcy rather than sovereignty, that is, acknowledgment of their superior rights in the spheres of military service and revenue enjoyment rather than a general control over the people at large. This is hardly surprising when it is remembered that at no time did the Turks and the Afghāns succeed in reducing the Hindū chiefs to disarmed impotence. The panegyrics of Muslim historians require correction by the inscriptional evidence cited, for example, in H. C. Ray, The dynastic history of Northern India, i, Calcutta 1931, 544-7, and ii, Calcutta 1936, 729-35, 908, 1096-93, 1132-4, 1190-5 (see also Cambridge History of India, iii, Turks and Afghans, Chapter xx), which shows clearly that the Rāḍīpūṭ clans remained politically active away from the principal centres of Turkish military occupation; the emergence of the Hindū chiefs into prominence in the 9th/15th century is explicable only on the basis that they had been there all the time, concealed from view by the earlier Muslim historians. It is important to recall that except for a short period under the Ḳhāḷḍīs and Tūḡlūkūs, Rāḍījāstān was generally independent of Dīlhī. Moreover the Ḳhūrīd conquest of Hindūstān was undertaken by a military dīla of Turks, Ḳhāḷḍīs and Afghāns, accustomed at home to a predatory relationship with the economically productive sections of the population but leaving them a large measure of autonomy in law and custom. Although
there was a large and continuing (though imperfectly documented) migration of Muslims to India during the sultanate period. It was largely a movement of professional classes and did not involve economic and social displacement of the mass of the Hindustan population. The bulk of the Muslim ‘working’ population consisted of converts made in the group or the products of intermarriage and concubinage. Neither their own political traditions nor their political necessities would suggest more than the minimum interference, political and administrative, between the Muslim and the Hindu or a unit of Indian social life, the village community. (It is probable that the Muslim 
\[dj\]aglardar contingents living in the villages near the larger towns had some social and cultural impact upon the local population).

The relations of the Dihli sultanate with the Hindustan population were dominated usually by considerations of policy rather than of religion. Hindu chiefs were accepted as tributaries and Hindu cultivators as tax-payers. Hindu clerical assistance in levying the land revenue and Hindu bankers’ services in providing sultans with ready cash were indispensable. The description of the place of the 
\[R\]agîpguts at Muhammad b. Tughluk’s court by Ibn Battûta, following upon Khal'dî marriages with Ragîpgut families, suggests that Akbar’s policy of conciliating the Ragîpguts was not without precedent in the sultanate period. It cannot be regarded as established, without question, that the sultans of Dihli normally levied 
\[d\]ijîya as a discriminatory tax on non-Muslims as such. It is suggested that many statements in Indo-Muslim historians to that effect may be discounted as attempts to depict, for the comfort and edification of the pious, an ideal Muslim ruler. Moreover, where the terms 
\[Kh\]ardî and 
\[d\]ijîya are found together, it is suggested that they are being used as conventional legal terms, with emotive intent, for what was in fact the tribute or land revenue customarily paid to a paramount ruler. In support of this latter hypothesis, it may be noted that in his 
\[F\]atâwa-yi 
\[D\]iâhândîrî, 
\[D\]iyâ’ al-\[D\]în Barâni speaks of Hindu Râys taking 
\[Kh\]ardî and 
\[d\]ijîya from Hindu 
\[m\]ugârs and 
\[k\]âftîrs (India Office Library MS. 1149, f. 119a). However, for a contrary (and indeed more plausible) view of this controversial question, see, e.g., Ishwari Prasad, 
\[H\]istory of mediaeval India, 475–6: A. L. Srivastava, The sultanate of Delhi, Agra 1950, 443–5; and The advanced history of India, index, s.v. 
\[d\]ijîya, 1951.

The Muslim ruling 
\[d\]îte was ethnically heterogeneous. Turks from the steppe, Afghan and Khal’dîs were dominant until Balban’s time, but Hindu converts soon made their appearance in important offices (see P. Saran, Politics and personalities in the reign of Nasir-uddin Mahmud, the Slave, in Studies in medieval Indian history, Delhi 1952) and later, under the Khal’dîs and Tughluqs, sometimes played a dominant rôle (e.g., Malik Kâftîr, Khusraw Kâhan Barwârî and Khan-i Dihâh Mâkbul, wazir of Firuz Shah Tughluq). Muhammad b. Tughluq was reported to have encouraged Muslims to come to India to take service under a Muslim sultan. The Indian-born Muslims of Hind stock did not enjoy the same prestige as did descendants of the original conquerors or Muslim immigrants. Although Kûtîb al-\[D\]în Aybâk, Iltutmish and Balban, their principal commanders and mukhtârs, and the Khal’dîs favourite Malik Kâftîr and Khusraw Kâhan, began as slaves in the royal household, the position of slaves in administration and war under Dihli followed the 
\[G\]haz-nawid and Sâmânid precedents. Slavery was not the only or indeed the principal road to power; slaves formed merely one source of recruitment to the ruling 
\[d\]îte.

The headquarters administration of the Dihli sultanate followed familiar Sâmânid and Ghaznavid lines. The wâkîl-i 
\[d\]ar and the amir-i 
\[h\]âdîgî were to be found managing the sultan’s household and regulating access to him; the wâstî, the ‘ârîq-i 
\[m\]amâlîk, the bardî-i 
\[m\]amâlîk and the 
\[h\]âdîl al-
\[m\]amâlîk appear to have exercised broadly the same functions as under the Sâmânids and Ghaznavids.

The administrative, the military and the salary 
\[i\]tâdâl (cf. A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant in Persia, London 1953, 61–64), are clearly discernible under the Dihli sultanate. The provincial governor, in the period from Balban to Firuz Shâh Tughluq, 
\[d\]ulî or 
\[m\]ukhâ’ was an official, transferable at will, commanding the local military forces and paid personally by the grant of a revenue assignment or by a percentage of the provincial revenues. He was supposed to remit the revenue, surplus to local expenditure, to headquarters, where a record was kept of the numbers of the provincial contingents and the anticipated revenue. This system broke down after the Tughluqs when the distinction between the administrative and the military 
\[i\]tâd became blurred, governors became semi-independent tributaries with their own private armies, and the process of revenue audit also became spasmodic. The military assignment, or grant of the revenue from villages for the recruitment and upkeep of a body of cavalry, is reported to have existed under Balban; ‘Alâ’ al-\[D\]în Khal’dî is said to have resumed many such assignments and to have paid his soldiers in cash. An Arabic source (Masâlik al-\[a\]bâdî fî mamâlîk al-\[a\]msâ’r of Shâh al-\[D\]în al-\[U\]marî, trans. Otto Spies etc., Muslim University Journal, Aligarh, March, 1943, 28–9) written in Egypt during the reign of Muhammad b. Tughluq states that the troops of the Dihli sultan were paid in cash from the 
\[d\]îwar. The encomiast ‘Affi clearly indicates that during the time of Firuz Shâh Tughluq the military assignment was common, though there are passages which suggest that the assignee was not always allowed the personal management of his assignment. In the ‘Sâyîd’ and Lâdî periods payments of troops by the grant of 
\[d\]jâftr or assignments, which the 
\[d\]jaglardar managed himself and over which the sultan’s 
\[d\]îwar exercised minimal supervision, was usual. It is clear that there was throughout the sultanate period a tension between the sultan, like ‘Alâ’ al-\[D\]în Khal’dî, with a preference for an extension of the 
\[k\]hâlsîa land, or area under direct revenue administration from which the troops could be paid in cash, and the Muslim military class with a preference for assignments which they managed themselves. Neither the sultan nor the military class ever wholly succeeded in obtaining their wishes throughout the whole area of the sultanate. Probably ‘Alâ’ al-\[D\]în Khal’dî succeeded more in managing the assigned areas than in abolishing all such grants of revenue. The accounts of Shîr Shâh give a vivid picture of the opportunities open to the provincial ruler in the Afghan period to become the 
\[d\]efacto ruler of the area of the 
\[d\]jâftr and aspire to a provincial sultanate or even to the throne of Dihli itself. Shîr Shâh did not himself, as sultan, abdolish 
\[d\]jaglardar but set a limit to their influence by maintaining a large army recruited by himself and financed by a more extensive 
\[k\]hâlsîa area.

Evidence on the sub-organization of a province
DIHLI SULTANATE 273

(tāqī or wilāyat)—which in any event denoted that area around the principal town which the wall or murāk could control rather than a clearly defined administrative area—la šahī. There are references to ǧāhidārī in the time of Muhammad b. Tughluk and favūdīs rather later; these probably represented military commands subordinate to the wāli or murāk rather than regular heads of a definite administrative subdivision. Shir Shāh is said however to have appointed a ǧāhidār and an amīn to each pargana to control the police and the revenue aspects of its work respectively. Below the pargana was the village community with which the Muslim official dealt through its muhaddam or headman and patwāri or village accountant. In the 9th/15th century ǧāhid is sometimes used to denote a province—a sign perhaps of the smaller political scale of that period.

In the collection of the land revenue, the Dihli sultanate, its revenue officers and assignees, did not depart seriously from the principles and practices of the pre-Muslim period—of demanding a proportion of the gross produce of the soil assessed either by sharing the harvest (hukm-i māsābād), by estimating its probable yield (hukm-i muṣābaḍa) or by measurement of the area under cultivation and assessment according to a standard rate of demand per unit area according to the crop sown (hukm-i mīšāhād). For the best account of the known changes and permutations in the sultanate period, see W. H. Moreland, The agrarian system of Moslem India, Cambridge 1929; see also Darība, 6(a).

DIHLI SULTANATE — DIHYA


DIHLI SULTANATE, ART. With the exception of the coinage [see SIKKA], and a very few ceramic fragments (a few described in J. Ph. Vogel, Catalogue of the Delhi museum of archaeology, Calcutta 1908; for the pottery fragments of the 'Adulâbad excavations see H. Waddington, in Ancient India, i, 60-70), the only body of material for the study of the art of the Dihli sultanate is monumental. Most of the monuments are in Dihli itself and are described s.v. Dihli. The remainder are mostly described under the appropriate topographical headings, and are listed here in more or less chronological order.

The first major undertaking outside Dihli was at Adivar (q.v.), where the Kaftân Dîn Aybak built the mosque, known as Afsî-dîn ka dâjhîmî ("Hut of two-and-a-half days"), at about the same time as the Masqîêt Kûwat al-islam at Dihli, to which itetsmîsh added a mabûsra screen as he had done to the Dihli example. Other buildings attributed to Ietsmîsh include a large masonry tank, the Qadî al-Isfahân and an 'îdâkah and madrasa at Badî-udîn (q.v.); for the last, one of the largest mosques in India, see J. F. Blakiston, The Jame Masqîêt al-Badaun and other buildings in the United Provinces (= Memoir ASI, xix), Calcutta 1926, and Cunningham, ASI, xi, 1880. In Nagawr (q.v.) is a fine gateway, the Atarkîn kâ darwâza, c. 627/1230, and at Bayanâ, about 80 km. south-west of Agra, is a mosque made out of temple spoil with corbelled arches similar to those of the Dihli mosque; known as the Ukhâ mandir, it was later reconverted to temple use. Of the time of Balban is a minâr at Koyîl (see ALGaKH), demolished in 1868, described in 'AlGarh Gazetteer', v, 218.

Noteworthy buildings of the Khâldî dynasty include the bridge over the Gambîrî river at Citawr built by 'Alî-ud-dîn in c. 703/1303, and the Ukhâ masqîêt of 'Alî-ud-dîn Mubârak (716-20/1316-20) at Bayanâ, with colonnades of temple pillars but typical Khâldî arches with their "spare-head" fringe.

Ghiyâsh al-Dîn Tughluk's buildings after his accession were confined to Dihli; for his previous buildings see MüSTAN. His son, Muhammad b. Tughluk, carried the Dihli craftsmen south to Dowlatâbâd (q.v.), whence the Dihli style spread to the Deccan (see BAHMANIS, monuments). Furûz Shâh Tughluk was responsible for the early buildings of the towns of Dwânpur, Fatehâbâd, Hîyâr and Lalitpur (q.q.v.), and the last Tughluk, Maḥmûd Shâh, for the Dîmâshqî masqîêt at Irîc (q.v.), the arches of which anticipate the recession of planes characteristic of the Lôdîs (there is not general agreement about the date of this building; the interpretation of Blakiston, op. cit., seems the most plausible).

The Lôdî dynasty's buildings outside Dihli are mainly at Agra, Kâlpî, Lalitpur, and Hânsi, (q.q.v.), to which must be added the fine tomb of Muhammad Ghâwth at Gwâlîyâr (q.v.), of c. 972/1564, which is Lôdî in spirit if not in date. The Cawrâsch Gumbad at Kûlpî is said to be the mausoleum of one of the Lôdî sultans, who is not further identified (cf. Blakiston, op. cit.).

For the buildings of the Suri dynasty see especially RûSTâS, RûSTâSâRî, SAHSâRâM, and the bibliography to BÎHAR.

See also MîND, Architecture.

See J. BURTÔN-PAGÉ

DIHYA (or DARYA) b. KHALİFA AL-KALBI, Companion of the Prophet and a somewhat mysterious character. He is traditionally represented as a rich merchant of such outstanding beauty that the Angel Gabriel took his features; and, when he arrived at Medina, all the women (mu'Âsir, see LÂ, root, 97) came out to see him (Kur'ân, LXXI, 15, may be an allusion to this occurrence). There is no reason to accept the suggestion put forward by Lammens (EP, s.v.) of some commercial connexion with Muhammad; we only know that a sudden death put
a stop to a projected marriage between a niece of Dihya and the Prophet, that the latter died just as he was about to marry a sister of the Kalbi and that Dihya, to whom Safiyya [q.v.] had been allotted after the capture of Khaybar, had to renounce her, to receive instead a cousin of the young captive.

After being present, if not at Udhâ, at least at the Khandâk, Dihya commanded a small detachment at the battle of the Yarmûk, but it was his "diplomatic" activities in particular which have been pointed out. As a Kalbi he was bound to have an influence on Arab wars among the Syrian times, and his business allowed him to move freely everywhere without arousing suspicion; for this reason, he was probably used as a secret agent.

Tradition however simply reports that, in 6 or 7, he was given the task of conveying to Heraclius a message from the Prophet inviting him to be converted to Islam, and that on his return the caravan was plundered by the Pdhdâm, against whom Muhammad was compelled to send Zayb b. Hârijta. Several orientalists have noted legendary characteristics in the account of these events and have called into question the authenticity of the letter addressed to Heraclius; M. Hamidullah has recently applied himself to the task of refuting their arguments and even of finding evidence concerning the fate of the original document which may still be in existence (see Arabic, 1955/5, 97-110).

After the conquest of Syria, it is surprising that Dihya should disappear from the scene; one source makes him withdraw to Egypt, but most biographers state that he settled in Damascus (al-Mizzâ = Mezze), where he died in the caliphate of Muâwiya, in about 50/5670.

Bibliography: Diâhis, Hayawân, i, 299, vi, 221; Mu'âtib. b. Bahib, Sahâbâr, 65, 75, 90, 121; Ibn Kutayba, Ma'drif, 114; Ibn Sa'd, Tahâbih, ii/3, 173, ii/2, 52, iv/2, 184-5, viii, 46, 114, 115; Tabari, i, 175 ff., 1741, 2154, ii, 1836, iii, 2349; Ibn Hanbal, Musnad, i, 262, ii, 107; Ibn Hishâm, Sîra, index; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Ḥilalâb, s.v.; Bakri, Muqaddim, 530; Aghâni, vi, 95; Nawawî, Tahâbih, 239-40; Ibn Hadîjar, Isbâb., no. 2390; Caetani, Annuale, s.v. for sale; Goldziher, Tâhirî, Den Lehen Muhammed, 245; Gesch. des Qurî, i, 22-4, 186; H. Lammens, Mu awa, 1st 292-3; Gaedtrey-Demombys, Ma komet, Paris 1957, 74, 180; M. Hamidullah, Le prophète de l'Islam, Paris 1959, 2 vol., index (with complementary bibl.).

(H. Lammens-[CH. Pellat])

DIK, the cock. The word is perhaps of non-Semitic origin. No cognate synonyms seem to exist in the other Semitic languages except in modern South Arabian (Leslau, Lexique soughri, 1938, 126).

The cock is mentioned quite often in ancient Arabic poems and proverbs and in the hadîth. In zoological writings it is described as the most sensual and conceited of birds. It is of feeble intelligence, as it cannot find its way to the hen-house in the other Semitic languages, except in modern Semitic origin. No cognate synonyms seem to exist for it. Its medicinal properties, however, are mentioned by Ibn al-Baytâr and Dâwûd al-ANTAKI in the chapters of hadîth. Mainly its flesh and a gravy soup prepared therefrom, its bile, brain, comb and blood were put to medicinal use.

Diâhis, who mentions quite often a dispute between sâhîb al-dik and sâhîb al-kalb, seems to quote from an anonymous work belonging to that kind of literature which has been treated by Steinhauser, Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft (DÄO), Wien, phil.-hist. Kl., 155, Abb. 4, 1908.


(L. KÖPP)

DIK AL-DJINN AL-HI MÎṢ, surname of the Syrian Arabic poet ʿAbd al-Sâlâm b. Râghbân b.
DILAWAR KHAN, founder of the kingdom of Malwa [q.v.], whose real name was Hasan (Firigha, Nawalkishore ed., ii, 234); or Husayn (Firishta, iv, 169). Dilawar Khan did not, however, live long to enjoy the fruits of freedom, and died suddenly in 808/1405; his sudden death gave rise to a suspicion, shared by some of the high-ranking army commanders, that he had been poisoned by his ambitious son, and Murza Affar Shah I, ruler of the neighbouring kingdom of Gudjarat, long had the same impression and ultimately made the desire to avenge his old friend and sworn brother-in-arms the reason for his attack on Malwa.


DILAWAR PASHA (71051/1622), Ottoman Grand Vizier, was of Croat origin. He rose in the Palace service to the rank of Caghnigl Bashl,
becoming thereafter Beglerbeg of Cyprus and then, in Dhu 'l-Hididja 1022/January 1614, Beglerbeg of Bagdad. As Beglerbeg of Diyarbekir—an appointment new—of the Ottoman-Safavid war (1024-7/1615-8), was shared in the Erivan campaign of 1025/1616 against the Safawids of Persia. His subsequent career until 1030/1621 is somewhat obscure. The Ottoman chronicles (cf. Pecewl, ii, 356; Hâdîdî Khaâlâfa, i, 392; Na'mâ, ii, 166) state that a certain Muşafa Paşa, killed in action during the last hostilities of the Ottoman-Safavid war (1024-7/1615-8), was buried in Bagdad. Dilawar Pasha was present at the death of Othman II (d. 1027/1618). A Venetian "relazione" of July 1620 mentions the removal of Dilawar Paşa from the Beglerbeglik of Diyarbekir (cf. Hadidii Khalifa, i, viii, 267). Dilawar Pasha fought—once more as Beglerbeg of Diyarbekir (cf. Hâdîdî Khaâlâfa, i, 406; Na'mâ, ii, 194)—in the Choczm (Hştin) campaign of 1030/1621 against the Poles. It was on 1 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1030/17 September 1621, in the course of this war, that Sultan Othman II (1027-31/1618-22) raised Dilawar Paşa to the Grand Vizierate. His tenure of the office was destined to be brief. He lost his life on 8 Radjab 1031/19 May 1622 during the revolt of the Janissaries which led to the deposition and death of Othman II. Dilawar Pasha built a large mausoleum for himself between the Kânî Rüha (Urfa) and Halrik, and another khan-ı- wie completed until the time of Sultan Murad IV (1032-49/1623-40)—at Sûlî Gazi (Seyyid Gâzi).


DILSIZ, in Turkish tongueless, the name given to the deaf mutes employed in the inside service (enderin) of the Ottoman palace, and for a while also at the Sublime Porte. They were also called by the Persian term bâbâdî, with the same meaning. They were established in the palace from the time of Mehemmed II to the end of the Sultanate. Information about their numbers varies. According to 'Atâ', three to five of them were attached to each chamber (Koçguzhî); Rycuats speaks of 'about forty'. A document of the time of Meşufa II (d. 1115/1703), cited by Uzunçarşılı, dealing with the distribution of cloth to the palace staff, mentions one mute in the harem, two mutes and one dwarf (âidîdî) in the Privy Chamber (Kâhzî oda), a chief mute, chief dwarf, six mutes and two dwarfs in the Treasury Chamber (Khasine Koçguzhî), a chief mute, chief dwarf, and ten mutes in the Campaign Chamber (Seferi Koçguzhî). The mutes received pay and pensions, and had special uniforms and ceremonial dress. Their chiefs were called bashdilsiz—chief mute. Though deaf mutes from birth, they are said to have been men of intelligence, and to have had an elaborate sign language in which they communicated among themselves and received orders from their superiors. According to Bon, many of them could write 'and that very sensibly and well'. Their duties were to act as guards and attendants, and as messengers and emissaries, in highly confidential matters, including executions.


There are descriptions and pictures of the deaf mutes in a number of western accounts of the Ottoman court (B. Lews).
the shadow. At the end of November the first heavy showers wash the dust from the leaves; it is autumn. In this semi-desert type of climate vegetation suffers from a constant shortage of water, and maintenance of animal life is only possible with the help of the nomads who constantly move from one oasis to the next. The oasis of Dimashq enters into history with the mention made in Genesis, X, 22, XIV, 15; even today Muslims venerate the Masjid Ibrahim at Berzé, to the north of Damascus, which according to tradition was the birthplace of Abraham. It seems that it was at this time that the Aramaeans introduced its grid-like plan with straight streets and rectangular intersections, similar to that which existed in the second millennium in Babylon and Assyria. The city owed the development of its canal system to the Aramaeans; we know from the Old Testament history of Na'amân the Leper (II Kings, V) that the Abâna was already flowing alongside the Barâdât before the 10th century B.C., while the Nahâr Tawrâ with its Aramaean name, which had been dug along the slopes of the Kâsiyûn, irrigated the region to the north and north-east of the city and played an important part in the agricultural economy of the oasis. The town was conquered by David (II Kings, vii, 5-6) but in the century of Solomon, the king of Dimashq fought successfully the Assyrian kings to the north and the kings of Israel to the south. In 732 B.C. the Assyrian troops of Tiglathpilezer III put an end to the kingdom of Dimashq; they took the town and despoiled the temple and palace, part of whose furniture was rediscovered in 1930 in Upper Mesopotamia. For this period of the city's history, as for the successive occupations by the Assyrians in the 8th century, the Babylonians in the 7th century, the Achaemenids in the 6th century, the Greeks in the 4th century, and the Romans in the 1st century B.C., see K. Wulzinger and C. Watzinger, Damascus, i, Die Antike Stadt, and the articles of J. Benzingier in Pauly-Wissowa, iv, 2042-48, Jalalbert in the Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie de Cabrol and Lederer, art. Damas, iv, 1920, col. 119-46. R. Janin in the Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques of R. Aulbert and E. van Donkerenbergh, xiv, 1957, col. 42-71.

The conquest of Alexander the Great in 333 B.C. is an important date, for Dimashq had the Achaemenid city of Tawrâ with its Aramaean name, which had been dug along the slopes of the Kâsiyûn, irrigated the region to the north and north-east of the city and played an important part in the agricultural economy of the oasis.
Rome brought internal peace and administrative order, which in their turn brought amazing prosperity to the town. The upward trend of its economy led to the construction of an aqueduct, al-Kawdnut, to provide drinking water which functions up to the present time. New blocks of houses in the southern part of the rectangle settled the problem of finding homes for the newcomers. Two great colonnaded streets were new features of the urban picture. One of these important thoroughfares, 25 metres wide, could be entered by seven gates: to the east, the Eastern Gate (Bāb Sharkī), to the south the Kaysān Gate and the Little Gate (Bāb al-Saghīr), to the west the al-Diābiya Gate, and to the north the Gate of the Gardens (Bāb al-Parādīs), the Dīnīk Gate and the Thomas Gate (Bāb Tūmā). Important remains of these walls and gates are still visible today. The growth in the population necessitated the construction of an aqueduct, al-Kawdnut, to provide drinking water which functions up to the present time. New blocks of houses in the southern part of the rectangle settled the problem of finding homes for the newcomers. Two great colonnaded streets were new features of the urban picture. One of these important thoroughfares, 25 metres wide and with arcades on either side, joined Bāb Sharkī to Bāb al-Diābiya, crossing the city from east to west and corresponding with the decumanus of Roman cities. This road, the present Sūk Midḥat Pāgha, is still referred to by foreigners as the 'Street called Straight' from the allusion to it in Acts, IX, n. 25. In the middle we can still see to-day one of the three arches which used to stand there, and in a little semi-circular tell on its south side, crossed obliquely by a small alleyway, is the site of the ancient theatre. The second colonnaded street was the ancient road joining the temple and the agora, which was now turned into a forum. The temple, which was dedicated to Jupiter of the Damascenes, the successor to Hadad, god of storms, was partially rebuilt and altered on several occasions, especially in the second and third centuries A.D. Part of the peribolus (enclosure), two of whose corner towers serve as bases for minarets, is to be found in the outer wall of the Great Mosque. The eastern propylaea are to be seen in the present day Diayrūn to the east of the Great Mosque, while the western propylaea, which are ornamented with a wide pediment, are visible at Bāb al-Barid to the west of the sanctuary. Finally it is also known that the Circus, which perhaps replaced the Stadium, was situated on the site of the present Boulevard de Baghādād, north of a cemetery outside the Gate of the Gardens, where Roman sarcophagi have been found.

Medieval Arab nomenclature has preserved in other ways the memory of certain Roman districts such as al-Dinām, corresponding with the ancient demōsion, al-Fūrānak which recalls the furnaces or pottery kilns, and again al-Furskār, which seems to show that at this end of the Street called Straight there once stood the fœscaron where the juscā was made and sold. Many of the ancient remains must have disappeared beneath the earth whose level has risen by more than four metres in some places since the Roman period, but the plan of the city as it was laid out at the beginning of the 3rd century A.D. was hardly altered up to the arrival of the Muslims. The Roman city, in fact, formed the skeleton of the mediaeval town. The Romans therefore imposed a new urban plan and set about combining the original Aramaean town with the Hellenistic one to form a new city. The state occupied mainly with projects of general interest such as the city walls and additional canals to provide extra water.

Rectangular walls measuring 1500 by 750 metres were built on the right bank of the Barada, to protect the inhabitants against pillaging nomads. Strengthened by a castrum in the north-east corner, the entry took on the appearance of a vast quadrangle which could be entered by seven gates: to the east, the Eastern Gate (Bāb Sharkī), to the south the Kaysān Gate and the Little Gate (Bāb al-Saghīr), to the west the al-Diābiya Gate, and to the north the Gate of the Gardens (Bāb al-Parādīs), the Dīnīk Gate and the Thomas Gate (Bāb Tūmā). Important remains of these walls and gates are still visible today. The growth in the population necessitated the construction of an aqueduct, al-Kawdnut, to provide drinking water which functions up to the present time. New blocks of houses in the southern part of the rectangle settled the problem of finding homes for the newcomers. Two great colonnaded streets were new features of the urban picture. One of these important thoroughfares, 25 metres wide and with arcades on either side, joined Bāb Sharkī to Bāb al-Diābiya, crossing the city from east to west and corresponding with the decumanus of Roman cities. This road, the present Sūk Midḥat Pāgha, is still referred to by foreigners as the 'Street called Straight' from the allusion to it in Acts, IX, n. 25. In the middle we can still see to-day one of the three arches which used to stand there, and in a little semi-circular tell on its south side, crossed obliquely by a small alleyway, is the site of the ancient theatre. The second colonnaded street was the ancient road joining the temple and the agora, which was now turned into a forum. The temple, which was dedicated to Jupiter of the Damascenes, the successor to Hadad, god of storms, was partially rebuilt and altered on several occasions, especially in the second and third centuries A.D. Part of the peribolus (enclosure), two of whose corner towers serve as bases for minarets, is to be found in the outer wall of the Great Mosque. The eastern propylaea are to be seen in the present day Diayrūn to the east of the Great Mosque, while the western propylaea, which are ornamented with a wide pediment, are visible at Bāb al-Barid to the west of the sanctuary. Finally it is also known that the Circus, which perhaps replaced the Stadium, was situated on the site of the present Boulevard de Baghādād, north of a cemetery outside the Gate of the Gardens, where Roman sarcophagi have been found.

Medieval Arab nomenclature has preserved in other ways the memory of certain Roman districts such as al-Dinām, corresponding with the ancient demōsion, al-Fūrānak which recalls the furnaces or pottery kilns, and again al-Furskār, which seems to show that at this end of the Street called Straight there once stood the fœscaron where the juscā was made and sold. Many of the ancient remains must have disappeared beneath the earth whose level has risen by more than four metres in some places since the Roman period, but the plan of the city as it was laid out at the beginning of the 3rd century A.D. was hardly altered up to the arrival of the Muslims. The Roman city, in fact, formed the skeleton of the mediaeval town. The Romans therefore imposed a new urban plan and set about combining the original Aramaean town with the Hellenistic one to form a new city. The state occupied mainly with projects of general interest such as the city walls and additional canals to provide extra water.
by proposing to substitute the name of Yazíd b. Sufyān for that of Abu ʿUbayda. In any case, Lammens has shown the unlikelihood of a division of the town, a legend which seems to have come into being only at the time of the Crusades.

The Muslims guaranteed the Christians possession of their land, houses and churches, but forced them to pay a heavy tribute and poll tax.

In the spring of 15/636, an army commanded by Theodoros, brother of Heraclius, made its way towards Dimashq. Khalid b. al-Walid evacuated the place and reformed his troops at al-Dābiyya before entrenching himself near the Yarmūk to the east of Tiberias. It was there that on 12 Radjab 15/20 August 636 the Byzantine army was put to flight by Khalid who, after this success, returned to Medina. This time the conquest of Syria and Dimashq was to be the work of Abu ʿUbayda b. al-Dāhrāb. The town capitulated for the second time in Dhuʾl-Kāʿaḍā 15/December 636, and was finally integrated into the dominion of Islam.

The fall of Dimashq was an event of incalculable importance. The conquest put an end to almost a thousand years of western supremacy; from that time on the city came again into the Semitic orbit and turned anew towards the desert and the east. Semitic by language and culture, Monophysite and hostile to the Greek-speaking Orthodox Church, the people of Dimashq received the conquerors with unreserved pleasure, for they felt nearer to them by race, language and religion than to the Byzantines, and, regarding Islam as no more than another dissident Christian sect, they hoped to find themselves more free under them. At Dimashq more than elsewhere circumstances seemed as if they ought to have favoured Arab assimilation to Greek culture but in fact Hellenization had not touched more than a minute fraction of the population who for the most part spoke Aramaic. While the administration continued to maintain Byzantine standards, religious controversies arose and contributed towards the formation of Muslim theology. Assimilation took place in the opposite direction so that the positive result of the conquest was the introduction of Islam, which within half a century succeeded in imposing itself. Arabic to replace Greek as the official tongue.

The change of régime was reflected in the urban plan only by the erection of two buildings closely connected with each other: the palace of the Caliph and the mosque, which did not alter the general aspect of the city. Muʿawya was content to remodel the residence of the Byzantine governors to the south-east of the ancient peribolus on the site of the present-day gold- and silversmith's bazaar; it was called al-Khādrā, 'the Green (Palace)'. This name must in fact have been given to a group of administrative buildings as was also the case in Constantinople and later at Baghdaḍ. At the side of the palace, which under the ʿAbbasids appears to have been transformed into a prison, was situated the Dār al-Khayl or Hostel of the Ambassadors. The Caliph Yazīd I improved the water supply by reconstructing a Nabataean canal on the slopes of the Djabal Kāsīyān above Nahr Tawrā which was given the name of Dār al-Khās. The palace of al-Malik al-Hādīdjādi, the son of the Caliph ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān, built a palace outside the walls to the west of Bāb al-Dābiyya whose memory is preserved in the name of the district of Kaṣr al-Hādīdjādi.

It is to Caliph al-Walid I that we owe the first and one of the most impressive masterpieces of Muslim architecture, the Great Mosque of the Umayyads. The Church of St. John of Jerusalem continued to exist under the Sufyanids and Muʿawīya did not insist on including it in the masjidī. The Gallic bishop, Arculf, passing through Dimashq about 50/670, noted two separate sanctuaries for each of the communities (P. Geyer, Itinera Hierosolymita, Saeculi ivrviii).

Conversions grew in number and the primitive mosque, which was no more than a musāllā situated against the eastern part of the south wall of the peribolus, became too small. ʿAbd al-Malik laid claim to the church and met with its purchase but the negotiations failed. "By the time that Caliph al-Walid decided to proceed with the enlargement of the mosque, the problem had become difficult to solve. There was no free place left in the city, the temenos had been invaded by houses and there remained only the agora where the Sunday markets were held. In spite of previous agreements, he confiscated the Church of St. John the Baptist from
the Christians, giving them in exchange, however, several other places of worship which had fallen into disuse'. A legend which tells of the division of the Church of St. John between Christians and Muslims springs from an error in translation. The text of Ibn al-Mu'allā which Ibn 'Asākir and Ibn Ḍubayr have helped to spread, speaks of a division of the kanisa where the Christian sanctuary adjoined the masjid of the Muslims. We must take the word kanisa in a broad sense as meaning place of prayer, that is to say the open-air haram of the ancient sanctuary (J. Sauvaget, in Syria, xxvi, 353) which can also be called masjid. Fascinated by the plan of the mosque in which they hoped to discover an ancient Byzantine basilica, certain authors, of whom Dussaud is one, have stated that the Christian hall of prayer was divided between the two communities. Lammens admits, however, that the construction of the cupola must be attributed to al-Walid. All those who have studied it on the spot, such as Thiersch, Strygowski, Sauvaget and Creswell, agree with only some slight differences of opinion in regarding the Great Mosque as a Muslim achievement. In 86/705, al-Walid had everything within the peribolos of the ancient temple demolished (al-Farażdāk, Dimān, 107-109), both the Church of St. John and the little chapel which stood over the three cubits square crypt, in which there was a casket containing the head of St. John the Baptist (Yahyā b. Zakariyya?). Only the surrounding walls made of large stones and the square corner towers were allowed to remain. In this framework, approximately 120 by 80 metres in size, the architects placed to the north a court-yard surrounded by a vast covered portico with double arcades. "Along the whole length of the south wall of the peribolos, extended in the same direction as that in which the faithful formed their ranks for prayer, an immense hall made a place of assembly for the Muslim community". In the middle was an aisle surmounted by a vast cupola. In the east the "mihārāb of the Companions" served as a reminder of the primitive masjid. In the west a new door, Bāb al-Ziyāda, was opened in the wall to replace the central portica which had been blocked up. "Finally, in the centre of the north wall a high square minaret showed from afar the latest transformation which had come to the old sanctuary of Damascus". The walls of the building were hidden in some places under marble inlays, in others under mosaics of glass-paste. The Great Mosque was built in six years and "by the vastness of its proportions, the majesty of its arrangement, the splendour of its decorations and the richness of its materials" it has succeeded in impressing the human imagination down the centuries. A Muslim work in its conception and purpose, it was to be "the symbol of the political supremacy and moral prestige of Islam".

Two new Muslim cemeteries were made in addition to that of Bāb al-Farādis: the first was situated at Bāb Tūmâ but the one in which most of the Companions of the Prophet were to lie was to the south of the city outside Bāb al-Saghīr. The ʿAbbāsid period.—ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAli, uncle of the new Caliph Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās al-SAfraḥ, having put an end to the Umayyad dynasty, took Dimashq in Ramaḍān 132/April 750 and became its first ʿAbbāsid governor. Umayyad buildings were sacked, the defences dismantled, tombs profaned. A sombre era began for the city which dwindled to the level of a provincial town, while the Caliphate installed its capital in ʿIrāq. A latent state of insurrection reigned in the Syrian capital. Under al-Mahdī (156-68/775-85), a conflict between Yamāni and ʿAbbāsid governors, who resented the introduction of a certain amount of fire and destruction in the town. The Fatimid domination only aggravated the situation for the city, where the Maghrabī soldiers in the pay of Cairo exasperated the population. It was a century of political anarchy and decadence. The riots sometimes turned into catastrophe, for the majority of the houses were built of unfired brick
with framework and trusses of poplar trees, and any fire could have grave consequences; such was the case in 461/1069 when one which broke out owing to a brawl between Damascenes and Berber soldiers caused serious damage to the Great Mosque and the city.

The Turkish domination.—A Turkoman chief, Atsîz b. Uvâk [q.v.], who had been in the pay of the Fâtimids, abandoned their cause and occupied Dimâshq on his own account in 468/1076, thus putting an end to Egyptian rule. Threatened by his former masters, Atsîz hastened to strengthen the city and endeavoured to form an alliance with Malik Shâh [q.v.] whom he asked to help him. In reply, the Saljûkian sultan gave the town in appanage to his brother, Tutush [q.v.]. He arrived in Dimâshq in 471/1079, re-established order and got rid of Atsîz by having him assassinated. The era of violence continued. In 476/1083, Muslim b. Kuraysh besieged the city; the Fâtimid aid which he expected failed to arrive and Tutush succeeded in setting the city free. He died fighting his nephew, Bârkyârûk [q.v.], in 488/1095. His sons divided his domain. Ridwân installed himself at Halâb and Duûkâk at Dimâshq. The latter put the direction of his affairs into the hands of his atabeg, the Turk Zâhîr al-Dîn Tughtakin, who from that time on seems to have been the real ruler of Dimâshq. His political position was a delicate one for he had against him the Fatimids, the Saljûkians of Baghâdâd and, after 490/1097, the Franks as well.

On the death of Duûkâk (Râmâdân 497/June 1104), Tughtakin exercised his power in the name of the young Tutush II who died soon afterwards. From then on, the atabeg was the only master of Dimâshq and his dynasty, the Bûrids [q.v.], remained there until the arrival of Nûr al-Dîn in 549/1154. During the quarter of a century of Tughtakin's reign, there was a remarkable improvement in the state of the city, both morally and economically. On his death in Safâr 552/February 1158, he was succeeded by his son, Tâdj al-Mulûk Burl. The Bâtiniyya [q.v.], who had already made themselves felt in Dimâshq by killing the Amir Mawdûd in 507/1113, re-established order and got rid of this vizier killed. This was the signal for a terrible massacre, the population, out of control, exterminating some hundreds of Bâtiniyya. The survivors did not long delay their revenge; Tâdj al-Mulûk Burl was the victim of an attempt on his life in 525/1131 and died as a result of his wounds a year later in Raqîb 536/November 1141. The two succeeding princes were also assassinated, the one, Ismâ'îl, by his mother in 539/1145, the other, Shîhâb al-Dîn Mahmûd, by his enemies in 553/1159.

In 534/1140 the military leaders brought to power the young Abû Sa'îd Abâk Mûdîrî al-Dîn, who left the direction of his affairs to his atabeg, Mû'în al-Dîn Unûr. On the atabeg's death ten years later Abâk took over the power himself but was obliged to accept the guardianship of Nûr al-Dîn who finally chased him out of Dimâshq.

The situation of the Bûrids was not easy. Invested with their power by the Caliph, they defended an advance position on the road to Fâtîmid Egypt, while the replenishment of their grain supplies was dependent on two regions, the Hawrân and the Bîjkâ, which were threatened by the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. It was necessary at certain times to negotiate with the Franks, while at the same time they had to account for this conduct to Baghâdâd.

A new threat hung over Dimâshq from the beginning of 524/1130, that of the Zangîds, who at that time became masters of Halâb. In order to cope with them, the Bûrids on more than one occasion obtained the help of the Franks, but as the latter threat the Zangîds attacked Dimâshq in 543/1146, new agreements with them became no longer possible. The city was obliged to seek other alliances in order to safeguard its recently re-established economy.

Before Tughtakin succeeded in restoring order, Dimâshq had known three centuries of anarchy. Delivered up to the arbitrary power of ephemeral governors and their agents, the population lived under a reign of terror and misery. Hence the quest for security which haunted them determined the lay-out of its streets. They had to live among people whom they knew and who knew each other and be near to those who lived a similar kind of life. It was from this starting-point that they were able to make a new beginning in their corporate life.

The plan of the city, which had changed very little since Roman times, from the beginning of the 4th/5th century on became broken up into numerous water-tight compartments. Each district (bâra) barricaded itself behind its walls and gates and was obliged to form itself into a miniature city provided with all the essential urban constituents such as a mosque, baths, water supply (âdiî), public bakery, and little market (sawayka) with its cook-shop keepers; each had its own chief (shaykh) and group of militia (ahâddh [q.v.]).

This breaking up of the ancient town was accompanied by a complete segregation since each community had its own sector of the city, the Muslims in the west near the citadel and the Great Mosque, the Christians in the north-east and the Jews in the south-east. The whole appearance of the city changed, houses no longer opening directly on to the streets. From this time on, there sprang up along the ancient roads of the city streets (darb) each of which served as the main thoroughfare of its own district and was closed at both ends by heavy gates. It branched out into little lanes (jâzîh) and blind alleys.

Nevertheless there still existed in the city some elements of the old town. Thus, for instance, the fortified outer walls which protected the town, the Great Mosque of the Umayyads, its religious and political centre which were threatened by the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, became masters of Halâb. In order to cope with them, the Franks as well.

When tranquillity returned under Tughtakin, new districts were built, al-'Ujayba to the north, Shâhâr to the south, and Kusir al-Hâdâdî to the south-west. At the gates of the city, Tanneries produced raw
materials for the leather workers, two paper-mills functioned from the beginning of the 9th century, and many water-mills ground various fatty substances.

Of the period preceding the Būrids, the only monument which still exists is the cupola of the Treasure-house (Bayt al-Mal) built in the Great Mosque in 616/1218 by a governor of the Caliph al-Mahdī.

During the reign of DuŠāk, the city's oldest hospital was built to the west of the Great Mosque, and there also in 491/1098 the first madrasa, the Ṣādiriyu, was constructed for the Ḥanafis.

The first ḥānakāb of Dimashk, the Tawṣūsyya, once contained the tombs of Dušāk and his mother, Șafwat al-Mulk, but the last traces of it disappeared in 1398. Intellectual activity and Sunnī propaganda developed in the city under the Būrids. The Shafiʿīs had their first madrasa, the Amlīyya, by 514/1120, whereas the first Ḥanbalī one, the Sharaflīyya, was not built until 536/1142. On the eve of Nur al-Dīn's capture of Dimashk seven madrasas were to be found there but was still none for the madhhab of the Imām Mālik.

Dimashk under Nur al-Dīn.—A new era began for the city with the arrival of Nur al-Dīn in 549/1154. In establishing his residence at Dimashk, this prince, already master of Ḥalāb, set a seal on the unity of Syria from the foothills of Cilicia to the mountains of Ǧallīlī. For the first time since the Umayyads, Dimashk was to become once again the capital of a vast Muslim state, unified and independent. Nur al-Dīn's politics impressed his character on the city which assumed the rôle of rampart of Muslim orthodoxy as opposed to the Fāṭimid heretics and the infidel Franks. A rerudescence of fanaticism showed itself at this time; its one and only aim was the triumph of Sunni Islam and all efforts were concentrated on the diṭḥād [g.v.]. Great centre of the Sunnis, its fame was heightened by a large number of new religious buildings, mosques and madrasas. Dimashk retrieved at this time both its military importance and its religious prestige.

Works of military defence were carefully planned and carried out. The surrounding city walls were strengthened, and new towers built, of which one can still be seen to the west of Bāb al-Saghlī. Some gates such as Bāb Șārqi and Bāb al-Dājjabiyya were merely reinforced, others provided with barbican gates such as Bāb Sharkī and Bāb al-Dajbiyya were provided with barbicans (Bāb al-Saghlī and Bāb al-Salām). A sector of the north part of the city wall was carried forward as far as the right bank of the Ǧarādī, and a new gate, Bāb al-Faraj, was opened to the east of the citadel, while Bāb Kaysān to the south was blocked up.

Nur al-Dīn carried out works at the citadel itself, strengthening Bāb al-Hadīl and building a large mosque. Finally, in keeping with the military life of the city, two great plots of ground were reserved for the training of cavalry and for parades, the Maydān al-Aḥqāf to the west of the city and the Maydān al-Ǧahṣa to the south.

Religious and intellectual life was very highly developed. The two families playing leading rôles, the Shafiʿīs Banū ʿAṣākir and the Ḥanbalīs Banū Ḥudāma who came originally from the now district of al-Ṣalāḥiyya, outside the walls on the slopes of the Kāṣyūn, in 556/1161. Places of prayer multiplied; Nur al-Dīn himself had a certain number of mosques restored or constructed. An especially energetic effort was made to spread Sunnī doctrine and traditions and Nur al-Dīn founded the first school for the teaching of traditions, the Dār al-Ḥadīl.

There remain only ruins of this little madrasa whose first teacher was the Shafiʿī historian, Ibn ʿAṣākir. Other new madrasas were built, for the most part Shafiʿī or Ḥanafī. It was at this time that the first Mālikī madrasa, al-Ṣalāḥiyya, was begun, to be finished by Șalāh al-Dīn. It was to the initiative of Nur al-Dīn that we owe the construction of the great madrasa, al-ʿĀdīliyya, now the home of the Arab Academy. Begun about 567/1171, it was only finished in 619/1222.

Another new institution owed to Nur al-Dīn was the Dār al-Ṣadīq, which later on became the Dār al-Saʿāda. A high court of justice occupied the building to the south of the citadel; there, in the interests of equity, the prince grouped representatives of the four madhhab around the Shafiʿīs hadī ʾl-kudūdī.

New forms showing an ʿIrāqī influence appeared in Damascus architecture, notably the dome with honeycomb construction outside, to be found on the funerary madrasa of Nur al-Dīn which was built in 567/1171, and in the cupola over the entrance to the Mārisīdīn whose portal is ornamented with stalactites. This hospital, one of the most important monuments in the history of Muslim architecture, was founded by Nur al-Dīn to serve also as a school of medicine. An accurate inventory of the 12th century monuments of Dimashk is to be found in the topographical introduction drawn up by Ibn ʿAṣākir for his Taʾrīḥ madinat Dimashk. By the end of Nur al-Dīn's reign the number of places of worship had risen to 242 intra muros and 178 extra muros.

The Ayyūbīd period.—In 569/1174 on the death of Nur al-Dīn his son, al-ʾMālik al-Ṣalāḥ Ismāʿīl, whose atabeg was the Amir Shams al-Dawla Ibn al-Mukaddam, inherited his father's throne. In Dimashk, where a powerful pro-Ayyūbīd party had been in existence since the time when Ayyūb, father of Șalāḥ al-Dīn [g.v.], had been governor, plots were hatched among the amirs. The young prince was taken to Ḥalāb while Ibn al-Mukaddam remained master of the city. To ensure its stability, the amir negotiated a truce with the Franks, an agreement which upset one section of public opinion. The agents of Șalāḥ al-Dīn presented him as the champion of Islam and the population of Dimashk to their side. The former Kūrīdish vassal of Nur al-Dīn took over the waging of the Holy War and entered Dimashk in 571/1176. During the years which followed fighting hardly ever ceased; it was the time of the Third Crusade and the Muslims were dominated by a desire to throw the Franks back to the sea. At last, in 583/1187, the victory of Ǧaṭṭīn [g.v.] allowed Islam to return to Jerusalem. Some months after having made peace with the crusaders, Șalāḥ al-Dīn, founder of the Ayyūbīd dynasty [g.v.], died on 27 Ṣafar 589/4 March 1193 at Dimashk. Buried first at the citadel, his body was to receive its final sepulture in the al-ʿAẓīziyya madrasa to the north of the Great Mosque. After the sovereign's death fierce fighting broke out between his two sons and his brother, al-ʾAdīl [g.v.], who in 582/1186 had received Dimashk in fief from his father, tried to retain his property, but in 592/1196 he was chased out by his uncle, al-ʾĀdīl, who recognized the suzerainty of his nephew, al-ʾAẓīz, successor of Șalāḥ al-Dīn in Cairo. Al-ʾAẓīz died three years later and after lengthy disputes, al-ʾĀdīl was recognized as head of the Ayyūbīd family in 597/1200. Under the rule of this spiritual heir of Șalāḥ al-Dīn there began a period of good organization and political
relaxation. Cairo from that time on became the capital of the empire but Dimashk remained an important political, military and economic centre.

Al-‘Adl died near Dimashk in 615/1218 and was buried in the al-‘Adiliyya madrasa. Al-Malik al-Mu’azzam ʿIsā, who had been his father’s lieutenant in Syria since 597/1200, and who had received the province in fief in 604/1207, endeavoured to remain independent in Dimashk, but the twists and turns of political life brought him at the beginning of 623/1226 to mention in the ḥadda the Khārizm-shāh, disputed the succession and thus became nominal suzerain of the city. When al-Mu’azzam ʿIsā died in 624/1227 his son, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Zāwad, succeeded him under the tutelage of his atabeg, ʿIrāz al-Dīn Aybak. Very soon afterwards, the Amir al-Ḥaṣrāf arrived from Diyar Ḍuar, eliminated his nephew, Ẓāwad, and installed himself in Dimashk in 625/1228.

On the death of al-Kamil, who had succeeded al-ʿAdl in Cairo in 635/1236, there had begun a period of decline. Fratricidal disputes started again. In order to hold on to Dimashk, al-Malik al-Salih ʿIsaʿī allied himself with the Franks against his nephew, al-Ṣalih Ayyūb, master of Egypt. With the help of the Khārizm-shāh, Ayyūb was victorious over him in 643/1245 and once again Dimashk came under the authority of Cairo. Ayyūb died in 646/1248, his son, Turanshāh, disappeared presumably assassinated a few months later, and in 648/1250, the prince of Ḥalab, al-Malik al-Nāṣir Dawūd, succeeded him under the command of the Amir al-Ẓāfīn Ayyūb, seized Dimashk of which he was the last Ayyūbīd ruler. The Mongol threat was, indeed, now becoming more imminent; Baghdād fell in 656/1258 and less than two years later the Syrian capital was taken in its turn.

The arrival of Nūr al-Dīn had undoubtedly brought about a renaissance in Dimashk, but the circumstances of the reign of Ẓāfīn al-Dīn had put a stop to the evolution of the city. Progress began again under the Ayyūbīds when Dimashk became the seat of a princely court. The growth in population and new resources which such a promotion implied had repercussions on its economic life, all the more appreciable since the citadel was burnt down and dismantled by the Mongols, two of these 7th/13th century towers still remain almost intact.

The general prosperity allowed the Ayyūbīds to practise an exceptionally generous patronage of writers and scholars. Dimashk at this time was not only a great centre of Muslim cultural life but also an important stronghold. The Sunni politics of the dynasty showed themselves in the encouragement of the Islamic faith and of orthodoxy. Civil architecture flourished at this time also. Princes and princesses, high dignitaries and senior officers rivalled each other in making religious foundations and Dimashk was soon to become the city of madrasas; the number of these—twenty are mentioned by Ibn Dūbār in 1164–70—was to quadruple in a single century. (On the Ayyūbīd madrasas, see Hefzbed in Aris Islāmiska, x-xii, 1-71.) From then on, the madrasa with its lecture-rooms and its lodgings for masters and students, began, like the mosques, to be combined more and more often with the tomb of its founder (see, for example, the al-ʿAdiliyya and the al-Mu’azzamyya). Linked with the funerary madrasa, there appeared also at this time the turba of a type peculiar to Dimashk. The mausoleum consisted of a square chamber whose walls were decorated with painted stucco, above which four semi-circular niches and four flat niches symmetrically placed formed an octagonal zone surmounted by a drum composed of sixteen niches of equal size upon which rested a sixteen-sided cupola. This was the typical way of erecting a cupola over a square building. The first example whose date we know is the mausoleum of Zayn al-Dīn, built in 567/1172. Among the monuments of this kind which can still be seen to-day are the following of the 6th/12th century: the Turbat al-Ḥaḍrī, the al-Nāṣimiyya madrasa, the al-ʿAzīziyya madrasa and the al-Mu’azzamyya. Linked with the funerary madrasa, there appeared also at this time the turba of a type peculiar to Dimashk. The mausoleum consisted of a square chamber whose walls...
of Egypt's troops. The Christians of the city suffered reprisals for their attitude with regard to the Mongols, and the Church of St. Mary was destroyed at this time. From then on Cairo, where since 656/1258 the shadow Caliphate had been maintained, supplanted Dimashq which became a political dependency of Egypt.

It was still to be the most important city of the Syrian province, the mamlika or nizâbât of Dimashq. (For its administrative organization, see Gaudrefoy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, 135-201). The first great Mamlûk sultan, Malik al-Malik al-Manṣûr Baybars b. Kalâwûn, who had revolted against the Sultan. Master of Syria, torn apart by the rivalries of the amirs, fell as far as Dimashq and it was in his camp near the Rubâba on the Euphrates. Ladjûn, now freed, was imprisoned, and proclaimed himself sultan. The possibility of rivalry between the governor of Dimashq and the Sultan was diminished by the presence of the governor of the citadel. There were, in fact, two governors, the nādir or the person of Tankiz, a governor of true quality who resided to the south of the citadel at the Dâib. The succession of Barkuk in 734/1338 brought a new line of Circassian Sultans to power who are also called Burdûj.

Although warned of the progress of Tîmûr, Barkûk did not have time to reinforce the defences of his territory for he died in 801/1399. In Dimashq, Sayf al-Dîn Ta'âbir who had governed the city since 792/1389, revolted against Farâdî the new Sultan, and marched on Egypt. He was defeated in his turn but in Shâbâb 792/July-August 1390 we find him once again governor of Dimashq.

From 791/1389 Dimashq fell for some weeks into the power of Yîlbûgha al-Nâşirî, a governor of Halab who had revolted against the Sultan. Master of Syria, he penetrated the walls of Dimashq, overthrew an army sent by Barkûk and made his way towards Egypt. He was defeated in his turn but in Shâbâb 792/July-August 1390 we find him once again governor of Dimashq.
of fires which caused serious damage. The Great Mosque itself was not spared nor the Dār al-Saʿāda. In 805/1401, Tīmūr left Dimashk, taking with him to Samarkand what remained of qualified artisans and workmen. This mass deportation was one of the greatest catastrophes in the history of the town. After the Mongols' departure, the Amīr Taghrībrīdī al-Zāhīrī became the governor of a devastated city, despoiled and depopulated. The exhausted country had to face a thousand difficulties. Two long reigns gave Dimashk the opportunity of rising from its ruins: that of Sultan Bārbāry (827/1422-38) and, more importantly, that of Kāhīb b. Shabīb whose tenure lasted from 872/1274 until 904/1295 brought a long period of tranquillity. Moreover between 16 Shābān 871 and 10 Ramāḍān 882/883 November and 16 December 1472 this Sultan paid a visit to Dimashk where the post of governor was held by the Amīr Kiqīmās, whose capacity remains legendary. The civil strife had swallowed up large sums of money and the amirs did not hesitate about increasing the number of taxes and charges. The Sultans themselves would often use violent means of procuring a sum of money with which the taxes could not provide them, nor did they scruple about reducing their governors to destitution by confiscating their fortunes. Under the last Mamlük corruption even won over the kādīs who, in return for a reward, were willing to justify certain measures against the law. After Kāhīb b. Shabīb, there began once again a régime of violence and extortions which ended only with the reign of Kānsūh al-Ghawrī (905-22/1500-16). This last Mamlük Sultan had to defend himself against the Ottomans who had invaded Syria. He died in battle in Ramāḍān 922/mid-October 1516, and the troops of Selīm I made their entry into Dimashk.

Paradoxically enough, a large number of buildings were constructed in the city during this tragic period. The Mamlikūs, who lived uncertain of what the next day would bring, tried at least to secure themselves a sepulchre, so that mausoleums and funerary mosques multiplied although they built few madrasas.

There were no innovations in the art of this period, for any lack of precedent frightened these parvenus. At the beginning of Mamlik times they built according to the model of al-Zāhīrīlsī, now the National Library, where Baybars's tomb is situated, was originally the house of al-Aqţī, where Ayyūb, father of Šalāh al-Dīn, had lived, and the modifications made in 676/1277 were limited to the addition of a cupola and an alveoled shafts, loaded with balconies and corbelling whose silhouettes were to change the whole skyline of the city. The first example was the mausoleum of the Dāmīnī Hīshāmī, built in 830/1427. Polychromatic façades grew in popularity and even inlays were added. The al-Sabīniyya mosque, finished in 868/ 1464, and the funerary madrasa of Sīhay called the Dāmīnī al-Kharrātīn, built in the very early years of the 9th/16th century, are two striking examples of the decadence of architecture under the last Mamlikūs.

It is interesting to notice that most of these Mamlikū monuments were built extra muros. There was no longer room within the city walls and the city "burst out" because, paradoxically, "there was an immense development of economic activity during this sad period". "All the trades whose development down the course of the centuries had been assisted by the presence of a princely court, had now to satisfy the demand for comfort and the ostentatious tastes" of military upstarts who thought only of getting what enjoyment they could out of life and of impressing the popular imagination with their display. Dimashk, while remaining the great market for the grain of the Hawrān, became also a great industrial town, specializing in luxury articles and army equipment. This activity was reflected by a new extension of the sāks which was accompanied by "a sharp differentiation between the various trading areas according to their type of customer". A new district, Thābit al-βal`a, developed to the north-west of the town below the citadel. In the 8th/14th century came aced, whose open space remained the centre of military life, groups of craftsmen installed themselves whose clients were essentially the army and who left the shops inside the city walls to other groups of artisans. Wholesale trade in fruit and vegetables also went outside the town; a new Dār al-Bītīlh was set up at al-Ukayba where the amirs and the members of their ġūnd lived.

Towards the middle of the 9th/15th century there appeared the first symptoms of an economic crisis. The state, whose coffers were empty, lived on its wits, but commerce still remained active as is demonstrated by the accounts of such travellers as Ludovico de Varthema (Itinerario, vi-vii) who visited Dimashk in 907/1502. The city profited from the very strong trading activity between western Europe and the Muslim East, but the hostility of the people of Dimashk and that of its governors prevented European merchants from founding any lasting establishments likely to acquire importance. Merchants arrived bringing a above all cloth from Flanders, stocked themselves up with silk brocades, inlaid copper-work and enamelled glassware, and then departed. The effects of the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope did not immediately make themselves felt; it was excessive taxation rather which was beginning to slow down trade on the eve of the coming of the Ottomans.

The Ottoman Period (922-1246/1516-1831). — On 25 Rādjab 922/24 August 1516 the Ottoman troops, thanks to their well-trained infantry and the superior firing power of their artillery, put the Mamlikū cavalry to flight at Mardj Dābīk near Halab. This victory gave the conquest of Syria all the more swift since the majority of the ad-dib`s rallied to the Ottoman cause. There was practically no resistance at Dimashk where the Mamlikū garrison retreated and the Sultan made his entrance into the town on 1 Ramāḍān 922/28 September 1516. The Mamlik detachments protecting Egypt were beaten three months later near Ghazzā. The commander of the Syrian contingents,
Djanbird al-Ghazall, joined forces with Sellm and was allowed to return to the post of governor of Dimashk to which he had been nominated by Sulayman, the last Mamluk Sultan. The arrival of the Ottomans seemed no more to the Damascene population than a local incident and not as a remarkable event which was to open a new era. To them it was merely a change of masters; the Mamlūks of Cairo were succeeded by another group of privileged foreigners, the Janissaries who had come from Turkey. Fairly quickly, however, there was a reaction on the part of the amirs and Djanbird surrounded himself with all the anti-Ottoman elements. On the death of Sellm I in 927/1521 the governor of Dimashk refused to recognize the authority of Sulaymān, proclaimed himself independent and seized the citadel. The rebel quickly became master of Tripoli, Hims and Ḥamā, and marched against Ḥalab which he besieged without success, then returning to Dimashk. Sulaymān sent troops which crossed Syria and in battle at Kāburn, to the north of Dimashk, on 17 Safar 927/27 January 1521, the rebellious governor was killed. The violence and pillaging of the Turkish soldiery then sowed panic in Dimashk and its surroundings. A third of the city was destroyed by the Janissaries.

Under the rule of Sulaymān, the political régime changed and the administration showed some signs of organization. In 932/1525-6 the Ottomans made their first survey of the lands, populations, and revenues of Dimashk (see DAFR 1 KHĀKANI and B. Lewis, The Ottoman Archives as a source for the history of the Arab lands, in JRAS, 1951, 153-4, where the registers for Dimashk are listed). Dimashk was no more than a modest ṣaḥālik in the immense empire over which the shadow of the Ottoman Sultanate extended. Most certainly the city no longer had the outstanding position in the game of political intrigue which it had enjoyed in the century of the Circassians. Pashas, accompanied by a Ḥanafī ḥādi and a director of finance but with no authority over the garrison, succeeded each other at a headlong rate; between 923/1517 and 1103/1679 Dimashk was to have 133 governors. A list of them and an account of these years is to be found in H. Laoust, Les gouverneurs de Damas sous les Mamelouks et les premiers Ottomans, Damascus 1952.

Early in the 12th century the 17th century there was a change of feeling in the empire; the Sultans lost their authority and remained in the Seraglio, and the Ottoman frontiers receded, but they still remained wide enough to shelter Dimashk from internal troubles at that time. The offices of State were farmed out during this period; the holders and especially the governors, wanting to recover the cost of their position as quickly as possible, put pressure on the people; corruption became the rule and lack of discipline habitual. Nevertheless Dimashk was not without a certain prosperity thanks to the two factors of trade and the pilgrimage to Mecca.

As early as 942/1535, France concluded with the Porte a Treaty of Capitulations which opened Turkish ports to its traders and enabled them to do business throughout the eastern Mediterranean. European merchants, three-fifths of whom at the end of the 18th century were French, imported manufactured goods and exported raw materials and spices. Despite the very high custom duties, the bad behaviour of officials and even, to some extent, the insecurity, external trade remained very lucrative and political events never succeeded in stopping the broad movements of commerce. At Dimashk, as in other parts of Syria, the native Christians served as intermediaries between the Europeans and both the Turkish administration and the population which spoke an Arabic that in the course of four centuries had taken in many Turkish loan-words. The intensity of the commercial traffic justified the construction of numerous ḥāms which served as hotels, as well as exchanges and warehouses, for the foreign traders. In the oldest ḥāms, such as the Khan al-Hārīrī, built in 927/1525 by Darwīsh Pasha and still in existence to-day, we find the usual Syrian arrangements: a courtyard, generally square, surrounded by an arcade gallery on to which open the shops and stables, while the floor above is reserved for lodgings. Certainly the Venetian fundus which came into being in Damascus after 1535 would have had the same arrangements. Early in the 19th century this plan was modified; the central space became smaller and was covered with cupolas, the merchandise thus being protected in bad weather. This was a new type of building and specifically Damascene. Still to be seen to-day is the Khan Sulaymān Pasha, built in 1144/1732, whose central court is covered by two great cupolas, and most important of all, the Khan As'Sad Pasha, constructed in 1165/1752, which is still alive and active. This masterpiece of architecture is a vast whole, square in plan, covered by eight small cupolas dominated by a larger one in the middle which is supported by four marble columns.

Trade with Europe was carried on via the ports of the ultrasound of Dimashk, the most important of which was Ṣaydā.

The Ottoman Sultan, having become protector of the Holy Cities, showed a special interest in the pilgrimage to Mecca. This became one of Dimashk's main sources of income. Being the last stop of the darb al-hadīji, it was a good place to meet the pilgrims coming down from the Holy Cities, showed a special interest in the pilgrimage to Mecca. This became one of Dimashk's main sources of income. Being the last stop of the darb al-hadīji in settled country, the city was the annual meeting-place of tens of thousands of pilgrims from the north of the empire. This periodical influx brought about intense commercial activity. The pilgrims seized the opportunity of their stay in order to prepare for crossing the desert. They saw to acquiring mounts, storehouses and bought provisions to last three months. At the given moment, the Pasha of Dimashk, who bore the coveted title of amīr al-hadīji, took the head of the official caravan accompanying the maqamat and made his way to the Holy Cities under the protection of the army. On the way back, Dimashk was the first important urban centre and the pilgrims sold there what they had bought in Arabia, whether coffee or black slaves from Africa.

Once past the Bāb Allāh which marked the extreme southern limits of the town, the caravans passed for three kilometres through the district of the Maydān, where cereal warehouses and Mamlūk mausoleums alternated without a break between them. This traffic to the south helped to develop a new district near the ramparts outside Bāb Djabāya; later, in the 19th century, with the passing of the caravans. These found equipment and supplies in the ṣābs where, side by side with the saddlers and blacksmiths, the curio dealers installed themselves as well. This district owed its name of al-Sināniyya to the large mosque which the Grand Vizier, Sinān Pasha, built in 994/1586 and 999/1591; its minaret covered with green glazed tiles could be seen from a very long way off. Some years earlier, in 981/1574, the governor, Darwīsh
Pasha, had had a large mosque, whose remarkable faience tiles are worth admiring, built in the north of this quarter. This mode of decoration arrived with the Ottomans when the art of Constantinople was suddenly implanted in Dimashk. A new architectural type also appeared in the urban landscape, that of the Turkish mosque, schematically made up of a square hall crowned by a hemispherical cupola on pendentives, with a covered portico in front and one or more minarets with circular shafts crowned by candle-snuffer tops at the corners. The first example of this type in Dimashk was the large mosque built on the site of the Kāsra al-'Abbās and Sulaymānīyya of Kānīn, in 962/1555 according to the plans of the architect, Sinān. This mosque, indeed, formed part of a great ensemble which is still called to-day the Takkīyya Sulaymānīyya. The covered portico of the hall of prayer opens from the walls, over a vast court-yard; on the east and west side there are rows of cells with a columned portico in front of them; on the north stands a group of buildings which used to shelter the scholars. This sanctuary, which since 1957 has housed the collections of the Army Museum, Active centres of religious life were to spring up both around the 'Umariyya Madrasa at al-Ṣālihibiya, and around the mausoleum of Muhīy al-Dīn 'Abū al-Fath Muhammad ibn 'Isā ibn 'Amri, where in 950/1552 the Sultan Sulayman had built an imārāt constructed to make free distributions of food to the poor visiting the tomb of the illustrious šāfi, or again at the Takkīyya Maṭliwīyya built in 993/1585 for the Dancing Dervishes to the west of the mosque of Tankiz. The fact that all these great religious monuments of the Ottoman period were built extra muros shows that the Great Mosque of the Umayyads was no longer a unique centre of assembly for the Muslim community and definitely confirms the spread of the city beyond the old town.

With the progress of artillery the ancient fortifications of Dimashk became outdated, but on the other hand the peace which reigned over the empire diminished the value of the surrounding walls which at this time began to be invaded by dwelling-houses, while the moats which had become a general night-soil dump were filled with refuse. Within the ramparts the streets were paved, cleaned and lit at the expense of those living along them. At the last Mamluks. The picture of this population showed itself in the construction of public fountains (sabil), the madrasas and zāwiyas, in contrast, were deserted by many in favour of the coffee-houses which multiplied and added to the number of meeting-places for the people. The only monument worth notice intra muros apart from the khān is the palace which the governor As-Sā'id Pasha al-'Azm had built to the south-east of the Great Mosque in 1162/1749. The whole body of buildings is a great ensemble which is still called to-day the Tankiziyā. This, which was erected outside the walls to the west of the mosque of the Mamluks, was transformed into a military headquarters which only ceased to exist in 1917, while in this same sector of the city the best patronized shops were grouped together in the Sūk al-Baladīyya and MADjLis) and proposed an independent and centralized government. Europe, and above all Palmerston, was opposed to the ambitions of Muhammad 'Ali; they profited therefore by the discontent provoked by the introduction of conscription to rouse the population against Ibrahim Pasha who was forced to evacuate Dimashk. His attempt at reform was not followed up and the Damascenes fell back under Ottoman domination. A violent outburst of fanaticism was to break the apparent calm of life there. Bloodthirsty quarrels having arisen between the Druzes and the Maronites of the south of Lebanon, public opinion was stirred on the religious side, Ibrahim Pasha founded a college for the Dancing Dervishes serious measures, in the course of which the Amir 'Abd al-Kādīr, exiled from Algeria, was able by his intervention to save some hundreds of human lives. This explosion was severely punished by the Sultan and, at the end of August 1860, provoked the landing of troops sent by Napoleon III.
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Art. DİMASHK

Nahr Jazīd

Nahr Jawrā
LIST OF MONUMENTS SHOWN ON THE PLAN OF DIMASHK

1. Roman arch
2. Agora
3. Castrum
4. Chapel of Ananias
5. Citadel
6. Bab al-Baqid
7. Bab al-Dajjalya
8. Bab Djiyraun
9. Bab Djinn
10. Bab al-Farâdis
11. Bab al-Faradji
12. Bab Kaysan
13. Bab al-Saggir
14. Bab al-Salam
15. Bab SHarâ
16. Bab Tümâ
17. Dâr al-Bittâgh
18. Dâr al-Hâdîth of Nûr al-Din
19. Dâr al-Khayy
20. Djami' Darwishiyya
21. Djami' Highâm
22. Djami' Sibâ'iyya
23. Djami' Sinâniyya
24. Djami' of Tankiz
25. Djami' of Yibughâ
26. Church of St. Mary
27. Great Umayyad mosque
28. 'Imârât of Sellim
29. al-Khadrâ'
30. Khan As'ad Pasha
31. Khan al-Hasir
32. Khan Sulaumân Pasha
33. Khânakâh al-Ţawûsiyya
34. Kaşr al-Âzim
35. Kaşr al-Âlibâk
36. Kaşr al-Hadîdâjî
37. Madrasa al-Âlibiyya
38. Madrasa al-Âmidâniyya
39. Mâdrasa al-Âzizîyya
40. Madrasa al-Kaâdîyya
41. Madrasa al-Nâmiyya
42. Madrasa al-Sâbûniyya
43. Madrasa al-Sâdirîyya
44. Madrasa al-Sâlîhiyya
45. Madrasa al-Zâhirîyya
46. Mâristân of Nûr al-Din
47. Mausoleum of Muhîy al-Din
48. Mausoleum of Shaykh Rasîn
49. Sûk al-Arwâm (site of)
50. Sûk al-Âhâmîyya
51. Sûk Midhât Pasha
52. Takkiiyya Mawlawiyya
53. Takkiiyya Sulaymânîyya
54. Primitive tell
55. Temple of Jupiter
56. Tower of Nûr al-Din
57. Tower of Şâlih Ayyûb
58. Turbat al-Badrî
59. Turbat al-Nâqîniyya
60. Turbat Zayn al-Din
61. University of Damascus

13th century
16th century
19th century
1920
1960
Damascus, was not to appear until 1897. Little by little, however, the Syrian capital was to become one of the centres of Arab nationalism. As in the other towns of Syria, secret revolutionary cells showed themselves very active in the last quarter of the 19th century and periodically exhorted the population to rebel. It was even said that Midhat Pasha, author of the liberal constitution of 1876, protected the movement after he had become governor of Dimashq in 1878. The great reformer had a population of about 150,000 to administer and control. From the very beginning, he showed himself very active in matters concerned with public hygiene and improvement of the traffic system, which since carriages had come on the scene had grown very inadequate in the old town. The governor replaced a number of alleyways in the suks with broader streets. The old town began to empty; there were no longer any houses where European consuls, missionaries, merchants and so on, settled themselves, while the new part of the city was put up at this time on vacant lots to become the kernel of the present-day university. The Christian quarter of Bāb Tūma saw the rise of fine houses where European consuls, missionaries, merchants and so on, settled themselves, while the old town became easier and to the two outer world became easier and to the two

The narrow gauge Hidiaz railway was in-

pilgrimage easier. From this time on, the Sultan was to be on friendly terms with Kaiser Wilhelm II, who had hoped to win the people of Dimashq over to the Turkish cause but was soon forced to give up this idea. It was in Dimashq, in the circle of the family al-Bakrī, that the Amir Faysāl, son of Husayn, the Sharif of Mecca, was won over to the idea of Arab revolt in April 1915; he met with members of the secret societies al-Fatād and al-‘Aḥd, at that time. At the end of May, Faysāl returned from Constanti-
aple and shared in the elaboration of a plan of action against the Turks with the co-operation of the British. They arrived ultimately at the famous “Protocol of Damascus” asking Britain to recognize Arab independence and the abolition of capitulations. In January 1916, Faysāl was in Damascus again and was still there on 6 May when Dji- 
mal Pasha had twenty-one partisans of the Arab cause hanged. This event, the “Day of the Martyrs”, is still commemorated every year. On 10 June, the revolt broke out in the Hījāţ, where the Sharif Husayn proclaimed himself “King of the Arabs”. It was not until 30 September 1917 that Turkish troops evacuated Dimashq. On 1 October Allied forces, including units of the Amīr Faysāl, entered the city. In May 1919 elections took place to appoint a National Syrian Congress and in June this congress decided to reject the conclusions at which the Peace Conference of Paris had arrived concerning the mandates. On 10 December a National Syrian government in Dimashq was formed. On 7 April 1920 the National Congress proclaimed Syria independent and elected Faysāl as king. The Treaty of San-Rremo in April 1920 gave the mandate over Syria to put the agreement which had been con-

The Contemporary Period.—The period of the mandate was marked by expressions of hostility to the mandatory power, which sometimes took the form of strikes, sometimes of more violent outbreaks.

The most serious revolt which broke out in 1925 in the Diābal Durūz, under the leadership of the

spirit of liberalism which had led Kurd ʿAli to bring to the city his review, al-Muškabas, which he had founded in Cairo three years earlier as a daily paper, was deceptive. After 1900 the Ottoman authorities banned it and the only resource for the Arab nationalists was to band themselves together again in secret societies.

The declaration of war in 1914 was to have grave consequences for Dimashq. At the end of that year, Dji- 
mal Pasha was appointed Governor-General of Syria, Lebanon and Palestine, and Commander-in-Chief of the 4th Ottoman army with head-

quarters in Dimashq. This town rapidly became the great General Headquarters of the combined German and Turkish forces and their operational base against the Syrian rebels. Dji- 
mal Pasha soon showed himself a mediocre general but a very energetic administrator. He had hoped to win the people of Dimashq over to the Turkish cause but was soon forced to give up this idea. It was in Dimashq, in the circle of the family al-Bakrī, that the Amir Faysāl, son of Husayn, the Sharif of Mecca, was won over to the idea of Arab revolt in April 1915; he met with members of the secret societies al-Fatād and al-ʿAḥd, at that time. At the end of May, Faysāl returned from Constantinople and shared in the elaboration of a plan of action against the Turks with the co-operation of the British. They arrived ultimately at the famous “Protocol of Damascus” asking Britain to recognize Arab independence and the abolition of capitulations. In January 1916, Faysāl was in Damascus again and was still there on 6 May when Djemal Pasha had twenty-one partisans of the Arab cause hanged. This event, the “Day of the Martyrs”, is still commemorated every year. On 10 June, the revolt broke out in the Hijāţ, where the Sharif Husayn proclaimed himself “King of the Arabs”. It was not until 30 September 1917 that Turkish troops evacuated Dimashq. On 1 October Allied forces, including units of the Amir Faysāl, entered the city. In May 1919 elections took place to appoint a National Syrian Congress and in June this congress decided to reject the conclusions at which the Peace Conference of Paris had arrived concerning the mandates. On 10 December a National Syrian government in Dimashq was formed. On 7 April 1920 the National Congress proclaimed Syria independent and elected Faysāl as king. The Treaty of San-Remo in April 1920 gave the mandate over Syria to put the agreement which had been concluded into force. On 24 July fighting broke out at Maysalūn and on 25 July the French entered Dimashq. King Faysāl was forced to leave the country and power passed into the hands of the High Commissioner. The mandate had begun.

The Contemporary Period.—The period of the mandate was marked by expressions of hostility to the mandatory power, which sometimes took the form of strikes, sometimes of more violent outbreaks.

The most serious revolt which broke out in 1925 in the Diābal Durūz, under the leadership of the

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
Amir Sultan al-Atrash, succeeded in taking Dimashk. At the end of August the rebels, newly arrived in the suburbs of the city, were repulsed. The population did not openly support them until they came back a second time, when on 15 October 1925 serious rioting occurred in the city which caused General Sarrail to bomb it on 18 October. In April 1926 a new bombardment put an end to a rising in the Ghita and the city, but tranquillity was not restored until the following autumn.

From 1926 onwards the town began to develop in towns, the word very quickly. Undeveloped quarters between al-Saljiyya and the old city were rapidly built up and from then on, the suburbs of al-Djir, al-‘Arrau and al-Shuhada\'\' provided homes for a growing number of Europeans and Syrians without any segregation of ethnic groups. The Christians of Bab Tuma left the city walls in greater and greater numbers to set up the new district of Kasra\'. To avoid chaotic development, the French town-planner, Danger, in 1929 created a harmonious and balanced plan for the future town, and its working out was put into the hands of the architect, Michel Écochard, in collaboration with the Syrian services. New roads, often tree-lined, were made and the ancient Nayarab became the residential quarter of Abu Rumm\'a which continued to extend towards the west. New suburbs were developed to the north of the old city between the Boulevard de Baghdad and the Dieal Kaysyûn, and to the north-east towards the road to Halab. In view of the growth of the population and in the interests of public health the drinking water was brought from the beginning of 1932 by special pipelines from the powerful spring of ‘Ayn Filja in the valley of the Barada.

Dimashk suffered very much less in the Second World War than in the first. In June 1941 British and Free French troops entered Syria. On 16 September 1941 General Catroux proclaimed its independence, but there was no constitutional life in Dimashk until August 1943. It was then that Shukri al-Kuwaiti became President of the Republic. On 12 April 1945 the admission of Syria to the United Nations Organization put an end to that mandate, but a new tension was to be felt in Franco-Syrian relations. They reached a culminating point on 29 May 1945, when the town was bombarded by the French army. The British intervened in force to restore order and some months later foreign troops finally evacuated Syria.

From 1949 until 1954 Dimashk was shaken by a series of military coups d'etat. In 1955 Mr. Shukri al-Kuwaitti became President of the Republic again and from 1956 on discussions were broached with a view to a Syro-Egyptian union. On the proclamation of the United Arab Republic in 1958 Dimashk became the capital of the northern region; but after the coup d'etat of the 28th September 1961 it again became the capital of the Syrian Arab Republic.

Ruled by a municipal council, the city in 1955 had a population of 408,800 of whom 90% were Sunni Arabs. Important groups of Kurds, Druzes and peasants of the Ghuta. These not only find many foreign products in its saks but also goods specially manufactured to fit the needs of the country-dweller. There exists also a class of artisans which specializes in luxury goods such as wood inlays, mother of pearl mosaics, silk brocades and engraved or inlaid copper work. Wood turners and glass blowers are also very active.

The protectionist measures of 1926 brought a remarkable upward trend to industry and thus it was that a first cloth factory (1929), a cement works at Dummar (1930) and a cannery (1932) were founded one after the other. Modern spinning mills were installed in 1937, and by 1939 there were already 80 factories representing 1,500 trades. A large glassworks was put up to the south of the city at Kadam in 1945, while to the east many tanneries and dye works ply their centuries-old activities. Since 1954 an important international exhibition and fair has been held at the end of each summer on the banks of the Barada. This has helped to establish Dimashk as a great commercial and industrial centre of the Arab Near East.


AL-DIMASHK — AL-DIMETOKA

DIMASHK — DIMETOKA

Bahá'í writings and other works. He was šaykh and imām at al-Rabwa, described by Ibn Battûta as a pleasant locality near Damascus, now the suburb of al-Sholiyya, and at Ša'īd in 727/1327. Al-Dimashki's best-known work, Nahḥbat al-dahr ji 'ajdā' al-barr wa 'l-bahr is a compilation dealing with geography in the widest sense, and somewhat closely resembling the 'Ajḍā' al-makhliāt of al-Ḳawzmī. Though the author's standpoint is conspicuously uncritical, his book contains a good deal of information not to be found elsewhere. Less well known but also of considerable interest is another work of al-Dimashki, al-Mahdām al-lajšayya wa 'l-tardjamāt al-sūfiyya (see E. G. Browne, Handlist of the Muhammadan MSS preserved in the library of cl. Universidade of Cambridge, 217-218, no. 1012), fifty maḥāmās forming an encyclopaedia of physical, mathematical and theological information, placed in the mouth of one Abu 'l-Ḳāsim al-Tawwāb (i.e., the Penitent), on the authority of Abu 'abd Allāh al-Awāwī (i.e., the Repentant). Al-Dimashki has also left a defence of Islam, Dīwān risālāt al-dживrat Kubrus, in which traces of Sūfī mysticism appear (see E. Fritsch, Islam u. Christentum im Mittelalter, Breslau, 1930, 33-50). Another work of his has been printed:

al-Risāla (variant: al-Siyāsa) fi 'ilm al-firāsá (Cairo 1300 A.H.); but Maḥāsin al-ḥijdāra (Cairo 1318 A.H.) attributed to Shams al-Dīn by Brockelmann (correctly K. al-żirāra ilā maḥāsin al-ḥijdāra, tr. H. Ritter, in Isi., vii, 1917, 1-91) was written by Abu'l-Fadl Di'afar b. 'Alī al-Dimashkī.


DIMETOKA, also called Dimotika, a town in the former Ottoman Rumelia. Dimotika lies in western Thrace, in a side valley of the Maritsa, and at times played a significant role in Ottoman history. The territory has belonged to Greece since the treaty of Neuilly (27 November 1919), again bears its pre-Ottoman name of Didymoteichon, and lies within the administrative district (Nomos) of Egnatia. It has a population of about 10,000, and is the seat of a bishop of the Greek church as well as of an eparch (provincial governor). It is situated near the junction of the Saloniki—Alexandroupolis—Dimotika line with the Orient line.

Dimotika, which was called Didymoteichon (Διδυμότειχος) by the Byzantines, fell first into Ottoman hands in Mūarram 765/November 1361, according to the Florentine chronicler Matteo Villani (cf. F. Babinger, Beiträge zur Frühgeschichte der Türkenherrschaft in Rumelien (14.-15. Jhd.) = Südosteuropäische Arbeiten, xxxiv, Munich 1944, 46). Dimotika had been defended by a castle encircled by a double wall, built for protection on a conical hill, and provided with strong fortifications under the ruler Matthew Cantacuzenus; it was probably the commander Ḥādīd ibn Ḥabū,right b. Dhû al-Qādî who brought it into Ottoman possession. Murād I, before the conquest of Adrianople early in 762/1361 (cf. F. Babinger, in MOG, ii (1926), 311 ff.), set up his court there. The Burgundian traveller and diplomat Bertrand de la Broquiere (see his Voyage d’outre-mer, ed. Ch. Scheler, Paris 1892, 172 ff., 150) has vividly depicted its appearance in 1443; from this it may be seen that Dimotika, as the first residence of the new Ottoman officials—their removal to Adrianople has not followed until about 765/1365—was built and beautified with especial care, although the layout of the fortifications of that time goes back for the most part to Byzantine times. The rich and broad hunting grounds of the surrounding country made Dimotika a favourite resort of early Ottoman rulers, such as the prince and claimant to the Sultanate Mūsâ Čelebi, and Bāyazīd II, who was born there in Dhū 'l-Ka‘da 852/January 1449 to the 15 year-old future Sultan Mehemmed II. The planning of the royal palace and its additions owed its origin to this circumstance. The first design was brought to completion under Murād I (cf. Ḥādīd ibn Ḥabū,right b. Dhû al-Qādî, Rumeli und Bosna, trans. J. von Hammer, Vienna 1812, 65). Bāyazīd II, weary of worldly cares, proposed to spend the rest of his life there, to avoid persecution by his son Selim I, but died in route—probably poisoned—on 10 Rabī‘I 1381/ 26 May 1352, not far from Hafsa (on the place of death cf. Hammer-Purgstall, GOR, ii, 365 ff., 625). The Swedish king Charles XII (1697-1718) fared rather better when, before reaching Stralsund, he stayed in Dimotika from February 1713 to October 1714, and managed to evade pursuit by an adventurous ride.

A graphic description of Dimotika in the year
1. Mausoleum of Şalāh al-Dīn, eastern façade
   By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus

2. Courtyard of the Madrasa al-ʿĀdiliyya, eastern façade
   By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus
3. Wooden cenotaph from a tomb within the mausoleum of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn
   By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus
4. Entrance to the Madrasa al-ʿĀdiliyya
   By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus
5. Courtyard of the Madrasa al-Nūriyya, interior of the eastern façade
   By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus

6. Stalactite ornamentation on the dome of the Madrasa al-Nūriyya
   By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus
7. Madrasa al-Nūriyya, exterior façade

By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus
8. Dome of the Maristan of Nur al-Din, exterior view
By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus

9. Maristan of Nur al-Din, facade and doorway
By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus
10. Courtyard of the Maristan of Nur al-Din, west façade

By courtesy of the General Directorate of Antiquities, Damascus
 DIMETOKA — AL-DIMYATI

roβoβio is given by the Ottoman globe-trotter Ewliya Celebi [q.v.] in the eighth volume of his Siyâsâtname (73 ff.; cf. the abridgement in H. J. Kissling, Beiträge zur Kenntnis Thraciens im 17. Jahrhundert = Abb. K. M., xxxii/3 (1956), 81 ff.). At that time the sole Muslim in the fortress of the city was its commandant (dísâr), for the inner castle (derûn hisâr) consisted of a hundred tumble-down houses occupied by "unbelievers". Dimêyôtâ was the seat of a judge and the administrative centre of a district (nîğiyya). The upper fortress measured, according to R. Bardisi, 2500 paces in circumference, and the outer double walls of stone were defended by "a hundred" towers. There was no moat, no space for one being available. The citadel (iç kal'e) of the upper fort is arranged on two vertical levels; one part is commonly called the "Maiden's tower" (Kiž kal'esi). From Ewliya Celebi's detailed description of the defensive arrangements of Dimêtoya it is specially noticeable that the royal palace, which was at that time no longer much used, lay in the upper fortress, and could be reached through doors accessible only to the sultan. The lower city (varoλ) was divided in Ewliya Celebi's time into twelve wards (mahalle) and consisted of 600 multi-storied tiled houses. In Dimetoka at that time there were twelve places of worship, the most important of these being that with which sultan Bâyazîd I graced the city. Near the mosque of oratory (medîdî) many of whose travelling members mention by name; they owe their origin for the most part to the well-to-do Ottoman dignitaries established there. Sultan Bâyazîd I had a Kurân school erected in Dimetoka, which next to that of Uruđ Pasha is the most important of the four in existence. Of the baths, the so-called "Whisper Bath" (fisilti fiyamûmi), with its "Ear of Dionysus" is also mentioned by Hâdîdjî Khalîfî (op. cit., 66). According to the Sânîname of Edirne, 1309/1891-2, 208, it was still standing and widely famous. There was no basâtîsinâ, although the market (bâzar) was dominated by some 200 potters' stalls, whose wares, especially the red Dimetoka glasses, beakers, dishes and jugs enjoyed a great reputation. The chief produce of Dimetoka and its environs is grapes and jubes.

There were numerous graves of holy men, who found their last resting place in or near Dimetoka; Ewliya Celebi gives a list of them by name, from which it appears that they belonged entirely to the Bektâşi order; from the evidence of Ottoman toponomy the hinterland of Dimetoka towards the west must have been to a very great extent a centre of the dervishes, particularly those of the Bektâşi (cf. H. J. Kissling, op. cit., 83, n. 310). In more modern times Dimetoka, out of the way from the bustle of the world, had practically no part to play under the Ottomans, and gradually declined.

Bibliography: In addition to references in the text, cf. Sânîname-ı Edirne, 18th ed. 1309, 203-9; 28th ed. 1319, 996 ff.; Sâmi Bey Fraserî, Kâmîs al-a'ldm, iii, Constantinople 1308/1891, 2216 ff.; Ami Boué, Recueil d'itineraires dans la Turquie d'Europe, iv, 257-61; the European travellers have hardly touched Dimetoka and its surroundings and have left no descriptions.

DIMYAT (Damietta), a town of Lower Egypt situated on the eastern arm of the Nile, near its mouth. Dimyât, which was an important town before the Muslim conquest, was captured by a force under al-Mikdâd b. al-Aswad, sent by 'Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ. As a Muslim town, it suffered repeated naval raids, at first from the Byzantines and subsequently from the Crusaders. After an attack in Digital Bibliography, in Makrîzl, ed. Wiet, iv/2, 37-80; and 'All Mubârâk, al-Khîsîr ed-djdâldî, xi, 36-57 (largely a reproduction of Makrîzl). For a full bibliography, see Maspero-Wiet, Matämia, 92-3. (P. M. Holz)

AL-DIMYATI, 'abd al-Mu'mîn b. Khâlaf Sharaf al-Dîn al-Tûnî al-Dîmîyatî al-Shâfi'i, traditionalist born in 613/1217 on the island of Tûnâ between Tinnîs and Damietta; at the end of his career he was professor at the Manûrîyya and at the Zâhîriyya in Cairo, where he died in 705/1306. Apart from the works listed by Brockelmann, to be supplemented by the recent study of A. Dietrich, 'Abdalmu'mîn b. Xalâf ad-Dîmîyatînin bir mukhâtûrînt listesi, in Şarkiyat Mecmuası, iii (1959), 125-55) he has left a dictionary of authorities, often cited and used by subsequent historians and biographers, called Mu'jam Shuâyîkh; it only survives at the present time in a single incomplete manuscript (Tûnîs, Ahmadiyya, 911-2, about 1185 entries out of the 1250 contained in the complete work) which was preserved at the author's dictation. In this document are contained the Hadîth, and also other texts collected by al-Dimyâtî in the course of his numerous voyages in Egypt, the two holy cities, in Syria, Diáira and in 'Irâk between 656/1258 and 656/1258; these, together with the numerous reading-certificates which accompany them, will be the subject of a monograph by G. Vajda. Apart from his own works, al-Dimyâtî is one of the most
important figures of the last third of the 7th/13th century in the field of the handing down of traditions. These few remarks cast some light on and perhaps suggest the nature of the commentaries of which the text has been made into Ottoman Turkish in 1257/1841 and 1885-1886 and again in 1901.

After a second pilgrimage to the Holy Cities he journeyed to the Yemen, where he was initiated by his master, Shaykh Ahmad b. Aqili, into the Naṣkhīyah tradition of the Fraternity. On his return to Egypt he established a branch of the Naṣkhīyah in the Delta, specializing in the science of hadith, k)bîth and Shâfî fiqh under the Muṣâwa and the Shâbarmusli, and was able to hear such contemporary masters as al-Âdîẖ, al-Shawbari, al-Kalûbûd and al-Maymûnî. At the conclusion of his studies he went on pilgrimage to Mecca where he studied hadîth under al-Kurâni. On his return to Dimyât he published his Îhât, on which he had apparently been at work while in the Hijâz, and in which he collected the variant readings of Ibn Muhâysin of Mecca, al-Âzdir of Basra, al-Hasan of Basra, and al-Âmash of Kufa, as well as the more commonly studied Ten Readers, prefacing the whole with an excellent study on the science of hadîth. He also made another volume of digests of the famous al-Sira al-Halabîyya, and compiled treatises, al-Dhâhârâr al-mukhîmmîn, on the signs which precede the coming of the Last Day. After a second pilgrimage to the Holy Cities he journeyed to the Yemen, where he was initiated by Shaykh Ahmad b. Aqili into the Naṣkhîyah tradition of the Fraternity. On his return to Egypt he established himself as a marabout in the sea-side village of ʿEzbet al-Burdj. During a third pilgrimage he died at Medina in Muharram 1117/April-May 1705, and was buried in the Baqî'. Besides the Îhât, which has not the sources quoted may be added al-Durûr al-Kâmûnîa, ii, iv, 1, 1852, and Ibn Rauf, Mun- takhab al-Mukhârîr, in the edition of ʿAṣâwîl, 120-2, no. 104; for Dimyât as a transmitter of traditions, see also Ahlwardt, Verzeichniss . . . Berlin, no. 9648 (ix, 193 f.); G. Vajda, Les certificats de lecture . . . Ahmed Ates, in RIMA, iv, 1, 1958, 14.

AL-DIMYATI, AL-BANNA'. AHMAD B. MUHAM- MAD B. ÂBÂD B. MUHAM B. ʿÂBD AL-QÂNÎ LA DMYATI, known as AL-BANNA', though he had some local reputation in Lower Egypt as a pillar of the Naṣakhîyeya order of dervishes, owes his fame to his ʿIbâdî jadila al-baṣâr on the Kur'anic variants of the Fourteen Readers. He was born at Dimyât where he had the usual education of a Muslim youth under local teachers, till he was able to journey to Cairo, where he studied širâdî, hadîth and Shâfî fiqh under the Muṣâwa and the Shâbarmusli, and was able to hear such contemporary masters as al-Âdîẖ, al-Shawbari, al-Kalûbûd and al-Maymûnî. At the conclusion of his studies he went on pilgrimage to Mecca where he studied hadîth under al-Kurâni. On his return to Dimyât he published his Îhât, on which he had apparently been at work while in the Hijâz, and in which he collected the variant readings of Ibn Muhâysin of Mecca, al-Âzdir of Basra, al-Hasan of Basra, and al-Âmash of Kufa, as well as the more commonly studied Ten Readers, prefacing the whole with an excellent study on the science of hadîth. He also made another volume of digests of the famous al-Sira al-Halabîyya, and compiled treatises, al-Dhâhârâr al-mukhîmmîn, on the signs which precede the coming of the Last Day. After a second pilgrimage to the Holy Cities he journeyed to the Yemen, where he was initiated by Shaykh Ahmad b. Aqili into the Naṣkhîyah tradition of the Fraternity. On his return to Egypt he established himself as a marabout in the sea-side village of ʿEzbet al-Burdj. During a third pilgrimage he died at Medina in Muharram 1117/April-May 1705, and was buried in the Baqî'.

There is no doubt about this translation. But the etymological sense of din “debt which falls due on a given date” is to be understood. Henceforth is the corpus of obligatory prescriptions given by God, which one must submit to. This etymology has been exploited by Nöldeke and Volland, who agree with Gaufredroy-Demombynes (Mahomet, 504) in not finding it convincing. In any case, the notion of “religion” in question is by no means identical in Mazdaism and Islam. On the contrary, the two first etymologies, Hebrew and Arabic, seem to interact, and the meanings are nothing like so diverse as has sometimes been stated. Thus the semantic dialectic of Arabic causes daysm “debt which falls due on a given date” to pass to din “custom” (cf. El'), s.v., art. by Macdonald). “Custom, usage”, in its turn, leads to the idea of “direction” (given by God), hadâ; and to judge (the sense of the Hebrew root) is to guide each one in a suitable direction, hence to give direction. In Gaufredroy-Demombynes’ view the “Day of Judgment” (yaasîm al-din) is the day when God gives a direction to each human being”. Elsewhere the Arabic philologists freely derive din from dâna lâ ... “submit to”. Din henceforth is the corpus of obligatory prescriptions given by God, to which one must submit. This din signifies obligation, direction, submission, retribution. Thus the obsequies performed in the 13th/19th century by the Hebrew-Aramaic sense or the ancient Arabic root, there will remain the ideas of debt to be discharged (hence obligation) and of direction imposed or to be followed with a submissive heart. From the standpoint of him who imposes obligation or direction, din must be translated “religion”—the most general and frequent sense.

There is no doubt about this translation. But the concept indicated by din does not exactly coincide with the ordinary concept of “religion”, precisely because of the semantic connexions of the words. Relîgo evolves primarily that which binds man to God; and din the obligations which God imposes on His “reasoning creatures” (akbîd al-ʿuqul, as Djhurjânt says). Now the first of these obligations is to submit to God and surrender one’s self to Him. Since the etymological sense of islâm is “surrender of self (to God)”, the famous Kur’anic verse shows its full meaning: “This day I have perfected your religion (din) for you and completed my favour unto you, and have chosen for you as religion al-Islâm” (V 3; cf. II 126, III 19).

These few remarks cast some light on and perhaps illuminate the field of the handing down of traditions. It is usual to emphasize three distinct senses of din: (1) judgment, retribution; (2) custom, usage; (3) religion. The first refers to the Hebrew-Aramaic root, the second to the Arabic root dâna, dâna (debt, owing), the third to the Pehlevi dvn (revelation, religion). This third etymology has been exploited by Nöldeke and Volland. We would agree with Gaufredroy-Demombynes (Mahomet, 504) in not finding it convincing. In any case, the notion of “religion” in question is by no means identical in Mazdaism and Islam. On the contrary, the two first etymologies, Hebrew and Arabic, seem to interact, and the meanings are nothing like so diverse as has sometimes been stated. Thus the semantic dialectic of Arabic causes daysm “debt which falls due on a given date” to pass to din “custom” (cf. El'), s.v., art. by Macdonald). “Custom, usage”, in its turn, leads to the idea of “direction” (given by God), hadâ; and to judge (the sense of the Hebrew root) is to guide each one in a suitable direction, hence to give direction. In Gaufredroy-Demombynes’ view the “Day of Judgment” (yaasîm al-din) is the day when God gives a direction to each human being”. Elsewhere the Arabic philologists freely derive din from dâna lâ ... “submit to”. Din henceforth is the corpus of obligatory prescriptions given by God, to which one must submit. This din signifies obligation, direction, submission, retribution. Thus the obsequies performed in the 13th/19th century by the Hebrew-Aramaic sense or the ancient Arabic root, there will remain the ideas of debt to be discharged (hence obligation) and of direction imposed or to be followed with a submissive heart. From the standpoint of him who imposes obligation or direction, din must be translated “religion”—the most general and frequent sense.
oversimplify the difficulties encountered in translating the *din* of Kur'anic verses into Western languages. (1) The sense of judgment (and retribution) is quite frequent in the use of the term *din* during the Meccan period: four times taken absolutely and 12 times in the expression *yaum al-din*. (2) The sense of religion is suitable in the other cases. It is true that R. Blachère several times, and appropriately, translates it by “act of worship” (*culte*) (e.g. II, 198; XLI, 11 and 20, etc.). Notice XLI, 11: “Discharge the debt of worship” (*acquites-vous du Culte*), which evokes the primitive Arabic sense of debt, owning. But if we recall that *din* is defined by the obligations and prescriptions laid down by God, it must be admitted that the *culte* is the essential part of *din*. (Moreover Muslim authors often associate ‘*ibāda*, the act of worship proper, and *din*). Finally sundry Kur'anic expression must be indicated which are found again in subsequent elaborations: *al-din al-kayyim* “the immutable religion”: “He it is Who hath sent this Messenger with the guidance on the author’s thought, M. Laoust stresses that Who hath commanded you that ye worship none save Him. This is the immutable religion” (XII, 40); *al-din al-kabīb*, “the religion of Truth”: “He it is Who hath sent this Messenger with the guidance (*huda*) and the religion of Truth” (XLVIII, 28); *al-din ṣawīa*, “religion practised as a *ḥanīf* (*q.v.*)” (XCVIII, 5); *al-din al-khālis*, “the pure religion” (XXXIX, 3). The three texts cited above (V, 5; IX, 36; and XLVIII, 28) emphasize the relationships of meaning between *din* on the one hand and, on the other, *ṣīla* (surrender of self to God), *ḥukm* (judgment), and *huda* (right direction). Other references could be given.

II. Content of the notion of *din*

There are numerous Kur'anic verses which associate the worship of God, or the prayer due to God, and the religion (or *culte*), e.g., XXXIX 14, etc. A well-known hadīth (Buḫdārī, li, 37) unites under “the teaching of religion” (a) the contents of the faith (*imān*), (b) the practice of *ṣīla*, (c) *ḥukm* or interiorization of the faith (“to adore God as though one saw him”). It later became common to define *din* by these three elements.

We now come to a few elaborations of doctrine. The Ḥanāfi-Māturīdī text *Fiḥṭ Abūr Akbar* II defines religion as an appellation including faith, *ṣīla* and all the commandments of the Qur'ān (and its early traditions). The Māturīdī Bākūlī devote a short chapter to the meaning of *din*. He distinguishes several possible meanings: (1) judgment in the sense of retribution (in the expression *yaum al-din*); (2) judgment in the sense of decision (*ḥukm*); (3) doctrine (*madhhab*) and religious community (*milla*), implying faith, obedience, and the practice of a given belief; in this last sense there may be more than one creed (cf. below); (4) *din al-kabīb*, which is *ṣīla* (and Islam): allowing one's self to be led by God and abandoning one's self to Him. In his Ta'rifdt, Dījrānī defines *din* as a divine institution (wādād) which creatures endowed with reason receive from the Apostle. Similar definitions are repeated in the treatises of the Ashʿarī school. Thus in Bāqṣrī’s elementary manual *din* is “the corpus of prescriptions (ḥukmāh) which God has promulgated through the voice of His Apostle”.

Therefore, the Muslims willingly make faith an element in religion; the Aḥṣarī stresses the prescriptions to be observed. As for the Ḥanbal school, their accent is on the “authentic tradition” taken in the widest sense. The Kur’ān and the Sunna—therein lies religion (‘*Akhīda I* of Ibn Ḥanbal); Ibn Taymiyya repeats that it is “the whole of religion”. Hence the assertion that *din* is *tablīq* (Ṭabarīāl-ḥanābīlā, i, 37), endowing *tablīq* with a positive value of faithfulness to the Prophet (contrarily to other schools who see it primarily as pure acceptance, passive and non-reasoning). L. Masségnon writes that, for Ibn Ḥanbal (Passion d'Al-Hallādī, 669), *din* may be understood as “devoting our religious observances to God”, as distinct from *ḥukm* (external practices) and *ṣari‘a* (observance of legal precepts): the whole constitutes faith (*imān*). Thus understood *din* is nourished by the Tradition and supererogatory acts of piety. Besides the Ḥanballās associate *din* with the act of worship (*‘ibāda*) “the whole of religion, and with right guidance (*huda*)”. Now the first act of worship is prayer (*ṣalāt*). Ibn Taymiyya quotes several Traditions where prayer is stated to be “the basis of religion”; “those (then) who cause it to be observed and themselves observe it preserve their religion” (cf. Siyāṣa, tr. Laoust, 19). He is pleased to reproduce the dictum of the “Ancients”, which makes *imān* the complement of *din*: “Religion and faith consist in the act of prayer, and in doing what the Sunna” (Maʿṣūrījī, tr. Laoust, 76). Commenting on the author’s thought, M. Laoust stresses that “religion” is “above all a law” (ibid., 79 n.). Finally, the contemporary writer Rashīd Rida, whose links with Ibn Taymiyya are well known, presents religion as “the act of worship, the care to avoid bad and blameworthy deeds, to respect right and justice in social relationships, and to purify the soul and prepare it for the future life; in a word [it consists of] all the laws whose aim is to bring man near to God” (Kāfīda, 192; tr. Laoust, 156). This concept, though losing nothing of its specifically Muslim character, reminds one of the more usual meaning of *religion*.

III. *Dīn wa-milla*; *dīn al-kabīb*

In order to set forth clearly the elements of the problem the *din* is often distinguished from terms of related meanings or made more specific by a determinative which limits its connotation. Ibn Ḥanbal employed *milla* in the sense of *din* (cf. Masségnon, loc. cit., n. 4), and, as we have seen, Bākūlī noted that *din* could be synonymous with *milla* or, in a more restricted sense, with *madhhab*. Dījrānī (Ta’rifdt, 111) distinguishes a shade of meaning: *dīn* and *milla* agree in respect of their essence, both are the law of God and of the Apostle. Both go back to the idea of Law, divine positive legal prescriptions (*ṣari‘a*). Here we come across the usual Aḥṣarī position again. *Dīn*, says Dījrānī, is the Law as something obeyed; *milla* (a word of Aramaic origin: word, revelation) is the Law gathering men in a community; *madhhab* is the Law to which one strives to return. *Dīn* relates to God, *milla* to the Apostle (*rasāḥ*), *madhhab* to the founder of a school, the *madhhab* who strives to know and interpret the Law. It is to be noted that in the Kur’ān *milla* is used now to designate the “religion of Abraham”, which is already essentially Islam, now to designate the communities of “possessors of the Scripture”.

But Islam alone is *dīn al-kabīb*, the “religion of Truth”. Each time that this expression appears in the Kur’ān it is to affirm that the “religious of Truth” has the authority “over the religion”, that is over all the domain of religion, and so over any other religion (e.g., XLVIII, 27; IX, 33; and parallel text LXI, 9). Opposite to *dīn al-kabīb* is *dīn al-mubaddal* “corrupted religion”, “like that of the polytheists or the Zoroastrians” says Ibn Taymiyya (Maʿṣūrījī, tr. Laoust, 87). Tradition, especially that of the Ḥanballās (e.g., Barbūhāfī, tr. Laoust, La
profession de foi d'Ibn Bafta, 4, n. i), distinguishes hakfr, what comes from God, i.e., the Kur'an; sunna, the common practices and beliefs of the Companions. Thus we have on the one hand din al-hakfr, revealed religion, and on the other al-din al-
'satik “the ancient religion” understood as Islam as practised by the Companions (from whom Barbahârât excludes *Ali). This latter expression is connected with the Hanbalite conception of tabûlîd.

*Din al-hakfr* is to be compared with and distinguished from the other Kur'anic expression din al-
yasâyîm “the immutable religion”: it is Islam referred to the faith of Abraham (VI, 162, here synonymous with din hunafâ) or considered as bound to laws testifying to the order of the universe (IX, 36) and recapitulated in the worship of God alone (XII, 40). Note finally that one of the characteristics of the *din al-hakfr* is to be a “religion of the golden mean”, “far from extremes”. Several Muslim apologists, arguing from *Kûrân* II, 137 where the determinative is applied to the Community (*umma*) and on the other hand from the phrase “no constraint in religion” (II, 256, cf. XXII, 78), like to present Islam as a religion of the “golden mean”. This is a theme which readily re-occurs when a writer wishes to urge a balanced solution on the opponents of his school (maäghâh): thus Ibn ʿAsâkir, in his defence of ʿAbhūrīsm, or Ibn Taymiyya, in his solution of this or that legal problem (e.g., Siyāsâ, tr. Laoust, 31). In the opposite direction a severe warning is addressed to the “People of the Book” (Jews or Christians) who “are extravagant” or “exaggerate” in their religion (*Kûrân* II, 171; V, 77; cf. VII, 31); those who do not practise din al-hâkhî must be combated.

IV. *Din wa-dûnychâ, din wa-dawsâla*  
*De* din, distinct from milaâ et maâqîshâ, is opposed to dawnsâa. The nearest translation would be the relations of the spiritual and the temporal. *Din*: the domain of divine prescriptions concerning acts of worship and everything involved in spiritual life; dawnsâa: “domain of material life”, as M. Laoust translates (dawnsâa appears besides as the opposite correlative to akhâira: “this world” and “hereafter”). *Din* and dawnsâa are undoubted opposites. The Sûfis distinguish three elements: (1) the acts of adhâma, l-dawnsâa. But the most traditional tendency is to subordinate dawnsâa to din, to make “this base world” in some way included in the “domain of religion”. The Hanbal school is insistent on this. It “is an act of religion (diyâna)”, says Ibn Bâta, “to give good advice to the imâms and all the other members of the Community, whether in the domain of religion (din) or that of material life (dawnsâa)” (tr. Laoust, 129-30). Ibn Taymiyya quotes Hasan al-ʿÂsîrî with approval: “Religion is good advice, religion is good advice, religion is good advice”. Religion and state are closely bound to each other: “exercise of a public office is one of the most important duties of religion; we would add that public office is essential to the very existence of religion”. Again: “Thus it is a duty to consider the exercise of power as one of the forms of religion, as one of the acts by which man draws near to God” (Siyâsâ, tr. Laoust, 172-4). “Social order and peace” are indispensable to the exercise of religion. Commenting on Ibn Taymiyya’s political doctrine, M. Laoust writes: “Religion (din) is intimately bound up with the temporal (dawnsâa)”, (Doctrines sociales et politiques d’Ibn Taymiyya, 280).

The contemporary Salafîyya school puts the elements of the problem somewhat differently. By a modernized apologetic, Muhammad ʿAbdûr-Rahîm intends above all to show the conformity of reason (ṣâhîh) and din. Raschîd Ridâ, having set forth what in social life is an integral part of the religious domain (cf. quotation above), enumerates everything which depends on it in a wide sense: respect for life, honour, other people’s property, an attitude based on sound counsel, shunning of sin, iniquity, violence, deceit, abuse of confidence, unjust wastage of other people’s property; in other words the domain of morality. Thus it is a question of an equivalence between “the rights of God and of men”, according to the classic distinction of Muslim jurists. But Raschîd Ridâ adds that there is a third order of facts, which no longer depends on the domain of din: everything to do with “administrative, juridical, political, and financial organization” (*Kûrân* 92/154). Two concepts may be brought up here: (1) the principle of distinction established by Ibn Taymiyya between the prescriptions of the *Kûrân* as distinct from the beliefs (ṣâhîh) and laws concerning the acts of worship (*ibûdât*), which are unouchable, ethics (akhâira) (in certain cases) and social relationships (*mu‘âmalât* more generally) are capable of adaptation to time and place; (2) the prescriptions of the *Kûrân* taken as a whole (domain of din) do not by any means entail in detail for the actual organization of social life; this organization must be, and it is sufficient that it be, subservient to those prescriptions. Thus we see the sketch, according to a traditional line of reflection, of a possible principle of distinction between the “spiritual” and the “temporal” derived not so much from the object of the prescriptions as from their source (“revealed” or not).

The Muslim BREhren vie with one another in repeating that Islam is at one and the same time din and dawsâla (government, domain of politics). The principle of distinction is by no means abolished. Din and dawsâla are not identical. But Islam, which is the link between the two, includes both. According to this view there is a distinction between din, domain of religion, and Islam, which is religion, true enough, but temporal Community also. The Muslim “Alaïcists” (thus to some extent Ibn Taymiyya) tend to identify din with Islam, and to see in the latter a “religion” in the Western sense of the word.

V. *Uṣûl al-dîn*  
Apart from this latter case, where modern Western influence is obvious, din and Islam are distinct. Sometimes Islam, as the practice of the Kûrânic faith, is one of the elements of din (hadîth quoted above, Bûlhârî, ii, 37); and sometimes din is one of the elements of Islam understood as an organized politico-religious Community (e.g. Islam is din and dawsâla). In current language din is employed absolutely in the sense of din al-hakfr and then becomes the religious expression and spiritual radiation of Islam itself. Such is the connotation of the frequent proper names where din is a determinative (e.g., Muḥîî —, Fâkhîr —, Nûr —, Śalîh —, Taqî al-Dîn, etc.).

But if we translate din by “religion” or “spiritual domain” we must not forget that the Muslim concept denotes above all the Laws which God has promulgated to guide man to his final end, the submission to these laws (thus to God), and the practice of them (acts of worship). The expression *uṣûl al-dîn* “sources (or bases) of religion” is to be taken in this sense.

The advanced course in the great mosques is
often shared by three faculties (cf. an old official syllabus of al-Azhar, REI 1931, 241-75: "faculty of Arabic language"), k. al-qaṣṣaḍ [centred on šīb], and k. usūl al-dīn [theology and apologetics]. As a matter of fact, the writers on šīl al-dālīl often used the term usūl al-dīn (or al-dīyāna) to denote an introduction to or a résumé of dogmatics, and so we have the titles of well-known works: Al-ibnāna 'an usūl al-dīyāna (Ash'arī); Maḍālim usūl al-dīn (Fakhr al-Dīn Razī), etc. The Usūl al-dīn of 'Abd al-Karim al-Baghdādī deals with the methods (asbūb) towards knowledge and their degree of certitude. The expression "theology" and apologetics]. As a matter of fact, the heresy is related to earlier [q.v.], his w/awa of the advent of the Prophet. Among its formative oppression, intimidation and pride. To these was added the dislike of animal slaughter and prohibition from the Kurʾān: liberality, "forbearance from bad actions and repulsion of anger with mildness", abstenance, avoidance of "violent material pursuits", piety, devotion, prudence, gentleness, kindness; while the tenth was the şūfīstic "purification of soul by yearning for God". Ritualistically, it was a kind of solar monotheism with an exaggerated preoccupation with light, sun and fire, showing primarily Zoroastrian, and secondarily Hindū and şūfī influences.

The crux of the orthodox Muslim criticism of Akbar's age was focussed on its indirect suggestion of exotting the emperor to a status of prophethood, even of divinity in such manifestations as the mutual greetings of his disciples Allāhu Akbar and Dīn Allāhu. Dīn-i Ilāhī hinting flatteringly at Akbar's name; though these were also familiar formulae of şūfī dhikr. Actually Akbar discouraged enrolment to his sect on the plea: "Why should I claim to guide men before I myself am guided?" The number of its adherents did not exceed nineteen. Akbar seems to have regarded it as a spiritual club confined to those of the élite of his court whose devotion to himself, by his own encouragement, had assumed the form of an esoteric and heterodox personality cult. The Dīn-i Ilāhī did not claim to have a revealed text, and did not develop a priest-craft. The apologetics of Akbar in diplomatic correspondence with 'Abd-Allāh Kān Üzbek [q.v.], stressed that the basis of his religious faith was essentially rationalistic, affirmed Akbar's attestation of faith as a Muslim, and denied any claim on his part to prophethood or divinity. On the other hand Abu I-Fadl quotes Akbar as confessing, at least figuratively, to cessation from Islam.

Though eclectically influenced by other religions, the Dīn-i Ilāhī derives its essential tenets from various streams of orthodox and heterodox şūfism. Its preoccupation with light was an exaggeration of the Suhrawardīyya emphasis on nār; Akbar's personality cult was inspired by Ibn al-Arābī [q.v.] and Dīlī's doctrines of the 'Perfect man'; the use of the Emperor's name in salutation was giving a heterodox significance to familiar şūfī formulae of dhikr; and the ritual of the initiation of a disciple was based on the Čiṣh'īya example.

Some features of the ritual of sun and fire, especially at one stage Akbar's recitation of one thousand Sanskrit names for the sun, suggest Hindu influence; but it is remarkable that very little was borrowed from either orthodox Hindūism or the Bhakti movement. The sect had only one Hindū member, Rāja Birbal, while Akbar's trusted administrators like Bhagwān Dās and Mān Singh were opposed to it.

The trend of recent scholarship is to treat the Dīn-i Ilāhī as a heresy within Islam, rather than a form of apostasy. In Akbar's own age Muslim orthodoxy treated it with some apprehension, and although it died out with him, it set in motion a strong orthodox reaction represented in Nakshbandiya şūfism by Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindi and in theological studies based on hadīth by Shaykh 'Abd al-Hakīm Dīlī (q.v.).

**Bibliography:** Abu 'l-Faḍl 'Allāmī, Dīn-i Ilāhī, i (Eng. tr. by H. Blochmann), Calcutta 1927, 50-8, 64, 110-5, 157-76; ibid, ii (tr. by Jarrett) Calcutta 1891, 30; ibid, iii (tr. by Jarrett), Calcutta 1948, 426-49; idem, Maktūbat, Lucknow 1863, ii, 26; 'Abd al-Kadīr Badāyūnī, Muntakhab

DINĀDĪPUR: a district in East Pakistan; population (1951) 1,354,432. In 1947 the district was partitioned, and its southern part was given to India. The name has been wrongly derived from Dinwādī or Danūdī, identified with king Danūdī Mardana Deva, whose coins are dated in Sākā 1339-40 = A.D. 1417-18. This king's name is also to be found in the town and district of Dināgūṭh, whose original estate was at Bhateriya in this district and who played an important role in the early 9th/15th century Muslim history of Bengal. Dīnādīpur is a non-Aryan term, which with the Sanskrit ending pur makes the full name of the town and district. Such non-Aryan terms are common in the place names of Bengal. The district is famous for the fortified remains of the old city of Devkot, the ancient Koīvārgāh, about 18 miles south-south-west of Dinādīpur, now marking the boundary between India and Pakistan, just on the Indian side of the railway station Hilly. It was at this place that Muḥammad Bāghtīyār Khaljī, the first Muslim conqueror of Bengal, returned from his ill-fated Tibetan expedition and died in 602/1206. There is also to be found the famous dargah of Shaykh al-Masīḥīyyāl Mawlānā 'Aṭā Wāḥibī, who died in the middle of the 8th/14th century. Another important saint, Shāh Ismā'īl Ghūzī, who died a martyr's death in the third quarter of the 9th/15th century in fighting against the non-Muslim rulers of this area, has a memorial dargah at Ghoroğhāf, 18 miles east of Hilly. The third important place is Mahisantogī, spelt in Persian works as Mahisān, which was a centre of Muslim education during the early Muslim rule.


DINĀR (pl. danāmīn), the name of the gold unit of currency in early Islam. The word derives from Greek διωνόμον (Latin, denarius), originally signifying a silver coin but in post-Constantinian times commonly synonymous with solīdus, denarius aureus or νομίσμα χρυσωσ. The Arabs were familiar with the word and with the Roman and Byzantine gold coin before Islam (kūrān, ed. Flügel, iii, 68; and cf. J. Stepková in Numismatische Schriften, iii, 1956, 65). The earliest type of Arab dinār, undated but attributable to approximately the year 72/692-3, and struck almost certainly at Damasus, imitates the solīdus of Heraclius and his two sons but with specifically Christian symbolism deleted and an Arabic religious legend added. A new type, more distinctly Arab, that of the "standing sword-girt Caliph", appears at the Umayyad capital with an issue dated 74/693-4 and is repeated in 76 and 77; but in the latter year ʿAbd al-Malik's coinage reform drastically affects the style of the dinār which henceforth, with very rare exceptions, is purely epigraphic. In North Africa and Spain the early dinār (kūhī) has an independent history: before approximately the year 85/704 the unit and its fractions imitates the Carthaginian solīdus of Heraclius but bears Muslim legends in abbreviated Latin translation; thereafter until the year 97/713-4 the portraits are deleted and dates are sometimes given in indiction years; Hidjra dates appear in 95, bilingual legends in 97/715-6, and just after the turn of the century both Ifrīkiyya (Kayrawān) and al-Andalus (Cordoba) issue dinārs of purely Arab type, differing only in minor detail from the reform dinār of the East. The minting of gold in al-Andalus ceases in 106/724-5 (except for an anomalous unpublished issue of 127/744-5 and is not resumed until 317/929 under ʿAbd al-Rahmān III. The weight standard of the early transitional dinār appears to have been the same as that of the Byzantine solīdus, i.e., approximately 4.55 grams. With ʿAbd al-Malik's reform, however, the weight was reduced to 4.25 grams. The accuracy of this latter figure is attested not only by the weights of well-preserved dinārs but also by the evidence of Egyptian glass dinār and dinār fraction weights dating from the end of the first to the end of the second century A.H. The reduced standard of the post-reform dinār resulted from a decision to redefine the mīṭkāl (i.e., dinār) in convenient terms of 20 Syro-Arabian kīrāṭs of 0.2125 grams in place of such cumbersome terms as 21 7/12 kīrāṭs, or "22 kīrāṭs less a fraction", etc., which had been employed by the Arabs in pre-Islamic times to express the weight of the mīṭkāl. The latter was doubtless based on the Attic drachm, theoretically containing 4.372 grams, but was soon circulated in Arabia, falling somewhat below that weight. While in general the weight standard of the dinār was maintained in most parts of the Islamic world down to the 4th century of the Hidjra, thereafter extreme irregularity occurs both in weight and purity. In any case the dinār usually passed by weight rather than tale, except where payments were made in sealed purses (sura) of coins of guaranteed weight and fineness. The half dinār (mīšf, semiunis) and the third dinār (thūlah, semissis) were struck in North Africa and Spain in the transitional period and in the early years of the 2nd/8th century, while glass weights for these fractions (2.12 and 1.41 grams) continued to be issued until the third quarter of that century. The quarter dinār (rub) was introduced by the Aghlabids in North Africa in the 3rd century and subsequently was issued in large quantities by the Fatimids both in North Africa, and in Sicily where in due course it became the well-known tari d'oro; as well as in Spain under ʿAbd al-Rahmān III and his successors and some of the Mulāḥ al-Tawāḥī. With respect to fineness the standard of the early dinār was exceptionally high. The post-reform Umayyad dinār ranges between 96% and 98% fine.
and this same standard prevails by and large during the 'Abbasid period. Exceptions are the years of civil war between al-Amin and al-Ma'mūn, the period between the end of Tāhtān and the beginning of Ikhshidid rule in Egypt, the Fatimid period in Baghdad. Less debased but still below the early standard is the gold of the Caliph al-Nāṣir and his successors who resumed the striking of dinārs and multiples in their own names in Baghdad during the last years of the Caliphate. In Egypt under the Fātimids the standard exceeds 98% and even approximates 100% under al-Āmid; under Saladin it falls below 90%, but rises again to 98% under his successors, particularly under al-Kāmil. "There existed neither in the West nor in the East dinārs of a standard excelling the standard al-Āmidī al-Kāmilī" (Ibn Bahrā, writing between 615 and 635 A.H.). Reliable statistics for the fineness of the dinār in the period of its decline in the East are lacking (Ghaznavids, Salūdūs, Khwarizmshāhs, etc.), but it is evident from the appearance of preserved specimens and from limited technical data available that in eastern Khurāsān in the 5th and 6th centuries A.H. the alloy is low-grade electrum containing a large percentage of silver. Electrum fractions also appear among the Mulākā al-Tawǎṣṣīf in Spain. Silver and copper "dinārs" of eastern Iran and Transoxiana are known in Mongol and post-Mongol times (see v. Schrötter, op. cit. in bibliography).

For the division of the dinār into various theoretical fractions, see Dānāk, Kīrāt, Ḥabba, s.v. Sīkka.

In outward appearance the dinār of the Caliphates and of most independent dynasties differs very little. The prototype carries the ghāvida and part of Kūrān CXII in the field or area, and the "prophetic mission" (Kūrān IX, 33) and a formula stating the date of striking in words in the circular margins. The 'Abbasīs alter the legends and arrangement slightly. Down to the year 170/813-4 the dinār is anonymous; thereafter the name of the official charged with the administration of the coinage begins to appear; some of the issues of al-Āmid and al-Ma'mūn bear their names, and from the time of al-Mu'taṣim the Caliph's name appears regularly. Until the year 155/871-2 there is no indication of the mint, but beginning with that year at Miṣr (Fustāt) and subsequently at Muḥarrmān (Samarrā), Marw, Ṣurra-man-ra'a (Samarrā) and many other cities, the name of the mint regularly appears in the date formula. Gradually other legends are added, such as the name of the heir-apparent, supplementary religious legends and eventually the names of independent dynasts and princes. The Fātimids, while not entirely abandoning the style of the prototype, introduce Shī`īte legends and a type in which the inscriptions are arranged in concentric circles.

The word dinār differs from the coinage in the 6th century A.H. in the West, in the 7th/1st century in the East and in India, and in the 8th/14th century in Egypt. As a money of account the word was widely used both during and after its circulation as an actual coin.

The influence of the dinār on the economy of western Europe, its rôle in mediaeval international commerce along with the Byzantine solidus or nomisma have been discussed at length, notably by Pirenne, Monneret de Villard, Block, Lombard, Lopez, Bolin, Grierson (synthesis and bibliography conveniently assembled by F.-J. Himly in Rev. Suisse d'Histoire, v. 1955, 31); and it was inevitable that it should on occasion be imitated as other popular media of exchange have at various times been imitated (e.g., the florin, the ducat, etc.). Most important was the Crusader bezant (basanlits saracenatis, sarrazinis, etc., etc., the Arabic dinār șārīf), chiefly imitating Fātimid coins of al-Mustaṣim and al-Āmid. In the western Mediterranean the dinār gave rise to the muncus, a European term used not only to describe the Arab dinār and as an accounting term, but also, with qualifying proper names, to designate various Christian imitations of the 5th/11th century in Spain (cf. P. Grierson in Rev. belge de phil. et d'histoire, xxxii, 1954, 109, and J. Duplessy in Rev. Numismatique, 1956, 101). The original maraiboine (maravedi, etc.) of Alphonso VIII of Castile was an imitation of the Murābit dinār with Christian legends in Arabic character.

Sauvaire (see bibliography) lists numerous adjectives and nouns which occur in written sources qualifying or describing various types of dinārs. To these may be added: Ābdhik (Zagūd), tārī (fortiarii, ?), JAO5 1954, 163; tāṣālī (Fatimid), hasanī (Fatimid), al-ḥakhīrātī (for special occasions, Herzfeld, Geschichte ... Samarra, 195), ṣadād ("counted", ḥāfīma nāvāmāt, papryi), sawā ("correct weight", papryi), ṣarā ("fresh", "uncirculated", papryi), sawāmī (Buwayhid, Ars Islamica 1951, 23), muddākī ("full weight", papryi), mudawwara (Fatimid, with concentric legends ?), musawwara (Fatimid, with legends in parallel lines ?), masbakha or musakha ("settled", i.e., European, BSOAS, 1953, 17, JESHO 1958, 48), muskhirī ("eastern", papryi), musafari (شاه-ی Arman, JAO5 1954, 163), masūlī ("correctly counted out", papryi), musīkī (Zuray'id, Num. Zeitschrift 47, 1914, 172), munākhāt ("clipped", papryi), nisārī (Fatimid), yaswū (Mawuhbid, Ibn Khallīkān).

The word dinār as a denomination applied to coins of various metals including nickel, copper, etc., bearing no relationship to the classical Arab unit, has survived in modern times: e.g., Kādār (Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh and successors, and the Pahlavi dynasty), ʻtrāk (1 dinār, paper money = 1000 fils), Yugoslavia (1 dinār = 100 para).

(See also DIRHAM, MITHKAL, KIRAT, SANADJAT and SIKKA.)

Bibliography: al-Makrizī, K. Shudhūr al-ṣabīh, various eds. including Tychoen (1797), Istanbul (1298 A.H.), L. A. Mayer (1933), A.-M. de St.-Elie (1939); E. v. Bergmann, Die Nominale der Munzreform der Chalifen Abdulmelik, in SBAH, Wien, 1870, 239; H. Sauvaire, Matériaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie musulmanes [JA, 1879-82]; convenient summary of this comprehensive, indispensable work by S. Lane-Poole in NC 1884, 66-67; R. Vasmer in F. v. Schrötter, Wörterbuch der Münz- kunde (Berlin-Leipzig, 1930), s.v. Dinār; J. Walker, A catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and post-reform Umayyad coins (Cat. of the Muhammadan coins in the British Museum, ii, London 1950); A. Grohmann, Einführung und Christo- mathie zur arabischen Papyruskunde (Monografie Archiv Orientforsch., xii/1, Prague 1935); A. Ehrenkreuz, Various articles on the dinār and its standard of fineness in JAO5 1954, 162, 1956, 178, and JESHO 1959; G. C. Miles, Some early Arab dinārs in American Numismatic Society Museum Notes, ili, 1948, 93; idem, The numismatic history of Rayy (N.Y., 1938); idem, Fātimid coins (N.Y., 1951); idem, The coinage of the Umayyads of Spain (N.Y., 1950); the various
dinar — dinawar

In the middle ages was one of the most important towns in Djbil (Media); it is now in ruins. The exact location is 34° 35' Lat. N. and 47° 26' E. Long. (Greenwich). The ruins are situated near the rock of Bisitun; the Gamas-Ab is a tributary of th. Kara Sû which, in its lower reaches, is known as the Karkha. When Ibn Khurradadhbih (ed. de Goeje), vi, 243 ff., and also in Noldeke, ZDMG., xxvi, 559 ff. and his Gesch. der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden (1879), 103, and J. Marquart, Erdnsahr, Berlin 1901, 18-19.

In the Umayyad and Abbasid periods Dinawar was very prosperous. In the 4th/10th century it was, according to Ibn Hawâlî, only one-third less in size than Hamdânân. Mu̇kaddasî praised its well-built bazaars and its rich orchards. The confusion that broke out in the last years of al-Muktâdir's reign (d. 320/932) temporarily ruined the town. When the rebellious general Mardâwîdî of Gilân seized the whole province of Djbil after defeating the troops sent against him by the Caliph, Dinawar also fell into his hands (319/931), and several thousands (the figures vary from 7,000 to 25,000) of the inhabitants perished soon afterwards. Hasânâwî (Hasâniyâ), a Turkish prince living in this region, founded a small independent kingdom of which the capital was Dinawar; he was able to retain possession of it for nearly 50 years (until his death in 369/979). Hamd Allah Mustawîfî (Nûshâ, 106) described Dinawar as a small town, with a temperate climate and abundant water, producing crops of corn and also fruit. Half a century after Mustawîfî's time, Dinawar was completely destroyed by Timûr and has never been rebuilt.

Theodore Strauss, who visited the ruins of Dinawar in 1905, stated that: “The site of Dinawar is indicated only by mounds of earth which have been ransacked several times in the search for coins; numerous finds are still being made especially by peasants tilling the fields” (See his Eine Reise im Westlichen Persien, 1911, 65). Strauss also stated that traces can still be seen in the adjacent Tang-i Dinawar of an ancient road hewn out of the rock which probably connected Dinawar with Bagdad.

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text: BGA (ed. de Goeje), passim, particularly, i, 395-6, v, 259, vi, 119 ff., 226 ff., 243 ff., vii, 271; Balâdhûrî, Futâh, 194, 306-8, 310; Mas'âdî, Murâdî, iii, 263, ix, 24, 25, 31; Yâhîî, ii, 704, 4,
AL-DINAWAR, Abū Ḥanīfa Ahmad b. Dawūd, Arab scholar of the 3rd/9th century. The name of his grandfather, Wanand, indicates that he was of Persian extraction. In spite of the great attention he gave to his work by later authors very little has been handed down about his life except a short notice by Ibn al-Nadim (Fihrist, 78), copied by Yākūt with additional notices about his year of death, which according to various sources fell in 282 or 283/894-5 or before 290/902-3; an appreciation of his work quoted from the K. Tabrīs al-Dīnawarı by Abū Hayyān al-Tawḥīdī and an anecdote about his meeting in Dinawar with the philologist al-Mubarrad (Irshād al-dīna); an extract in ʿAbd al-Kādīr al-Baghḍādī, ʿAlīzād al-adab, 1, 23-27. That he lived in Dinawar is corroborated by what is said by the astronomer ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Sūfī, who in the year 335/946-7 saw the house in Dinawar that served him as an observatory (Ṣuwar al-kāwīkīb, Ḥaydarābād 1373/1954, 8). His philological studies he prosecuted in Trāk, where he is said to have learned both from Baṣrān and Kūfān teachers, especially from the two grammarians al-Sikkīt and his son Ibn al-Sikkīt (see also Suyūṭī, Buğyay al-ʿawāli, Cairo 1326, 132).

Dīnawar belonged to the epoch of Arabic literature which was dominated by the spirit of al-Dīnawarī (q.v.) to whom he may be compared (as did Abū Hayyān al-Tawḥīdī) in consideration of his interests in the "philosophical" studies of the Hellenistic learning (ḥikmat al-falsafa) and the Arabic humanities alike. Unlike Dīnawarī, however, he had a clear disposition for a systematical approach, which was from the very beginning applied by the masters of the philological schools of Trāk to materials treated by them. It may be that this disposition was connected also with his mathematical genius attested by works of his on the field of exact sciences, in which was cultivated the greater part of Iranian origin like himself. From the beginning, Arabic philology, the study of pre-Islamic literature and culture, had been associated with Kūrānic studies; a commentary on the Kūrān to whom he may be compared (as did Abu Hayyan al-Tawhidi) was plagiarized by Ibn Rushd al-Djadhiz (ed. by V. Guirgass, Leiden 1888; Preface, variantes et index par I. J. Krakovskij, Leiden 1912). That this work, in spite of its literary and scholarly qualities, never met with great approval and popularity in the Arab speaking world may be due to accidental circumstances rather than to a deliberate disregard. Its title was known to bibliographers from Ibn al-Nadim on, but the author is never called a historian. History is seen from an Iranian point of view; thus the Prophet is mentioned so to speak in a marginal note of the history of Anūšfarwān; Islam and the Arabs appear on the scene when invading Persia; the Umayyads are treated with only as far as the religious and political movements involving the eastern part of Islam are concerned, etc. This tendency towards promoting Iranian views may be due, not to anti-Arab feelings, but to the sources on which he drew. His chief aim was certainly to write a book of literary and entertaining qualities. For this reason he omitted the isnāds of the akhbār, took the liberty of choosing, among different traditions about one and the same event, the one that suited him and insisted on points of dramatic value; he omitted the fitna of Ibn al-Ash, narratives of Ibn al-Ash, etc., narratives which belong to the finest products of Arab historiography.

Bibliography: in the article. (B. LEWIN)

AL-DINAWAR, Abū Saʿīd (Saʿīn) Naṣr b. Yaʿqūb, is a writer chiefly remembered as author of al-Kādīrī fi l-Tābībān (composed in 397/1008 and dedicated to al-Kādīr Bīlāh 381/1291-92), which is oldest authentic Arabic treatise on onerocriticism and an excellent synthesis of everything that was known on the subject at the time. Its sources were Arabic: Ibn Sīrīn (q.v.) to whom innumerable interpretations are attributed; Greek: Artemidorus of Ephesus, whose Oneirocritica translated into Arabic by Ḥusayn b. Iṣḥāq (died 260/873); cf. Fihrist, 255, MS A 4726 in the Istanbul University Library; later generations it was the standard work in the field and was to a great extent quoted by lexicologists from Ibn Sīdā [q.v.]. Of the two sections into which it was divided the first contained a series of monographs some of which go far beyond the field of "botany" proper, treating with themes that have a more or less indirect connexion with the world of plants; see B. Silberberg, Das Pflanzenbuch des Dīnawarī in ZA xxiv, 1910: 253-95, xxv, 1911: 39-88. Two volumes of the original work have come down to us, the 5th containing the last part of the monograph section and the letters alīf to sāyi of the alphabetical section (ed. by B. Lewin, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1953: 10), and the 3d (M. S. Salisbury, Yale Univ. Libr.; an edition of this together with the monograph part of the 5th vol. is under preparation to appear in Bibliotheca Islamica).

The only work of Dīnawar's that has come down to us in its full extent is his historical work al-Akbār al-taawul (ed. by V. Guirgass, Leiden 1888; Preface, variantes et index par I. J. Krakovskij, Leiden 1912). That this work, in spite of its literary and scholarly qualities, never met with great approval and popularity in the Arab speaking world may be due to accidental circumstances rather than to a deliberate disregard. Its title was known to bibliographers from Ibn al-Nadim on, but the author is never called a historian. History is seen from an Iranian point of view; thus the Prophet is mentioned so to speak in a marginal note of the history of Anūšfarwān; Islam and the Arabs appear on the scene when invading Persia; the Umayyads are treated with only as far as the religious and political movements involving the eastern part of Islam are concerned, etc. This tendency towards promoting Iranian views may be due, not to anti-Arab feelings, but to the sources on which he drew. His chief aim was certainly to write a book of literary and entertaining qualities. For this reason he omitted the isnāds of the akhbār, took the liberty of choosing, among different traditions about one and the same event, the one that suited him and insisted on points of dramatic value; he omitted the fitna of Ibn al-Ash, etc., narratives which belong to the finest products of Arab historiography.

Bibliography: in the article. (B. LEWIN)
interpretations imputed to the Jews and has numerous quotations from the Bible.

**Bibliography:** al-Kādirī fi ḫāibr is still unpublished; 29 MSS. are known. It was translated into Persian (AS 1718) and following Hādīṣī Ḫalifā (ii, 312, no. 3068), translated into Turkish verse by Ṣhibḥ al-Dīn Abū ʿAbdAllah b. Umar (died 854/1450). On this work and Arabic oneirocritical literature, cf. T. Fahd, *Les Rêves en Islam*, in *Sources Orientales*, ii, Paris 1960, 125-58.

**Dindān, the lakah of Abū Dījār fār Aḥmad b. Husayn, a Shīʿite traditionalist of the 3rd/9th century. His father was a reliable authority who related traditions of the Imāms ʿAllī al-Riḍā, Muḥammad al-Diāwād, and ʿAllī al-Hādī; originally from Ḳīf, he lived for a while in Ahvāz, where Dindān was born. Dindān also related traditions on the authority of his father's masters, but was regarded as a ḡālī, extremist, and his reliability as a relator was impugned. He wrote several books, among them Kītāb al-thiqātā jī ʾl-dāwaʾ; none of them appears to have survived. He died and was buried in Kumm.**

These data are found in twelve Shīʿite biographical and bibliographical sources (e. g., Tusys List of Skyṭṭah Books, ed. Sprenger and ʿAbd al-Haq, Calcutta 1853, 26; Ibn Shahrshūb, *Maʿālim al-ʿulamaʾ*, ed. Eghbāl, Tehran 1934, 10; Astarrābādī, *Mnhāk al-makāl*, Tehran 1307, 34). The reference to Dindān's extremist views is amplified in a group of Sunni sources, dealing with the genesis of Ismāʿīlimism. (Fihrist 188; Baghdadī, *Farāh*, 266, tr. A. S. Halkin, *Moslem schisms and sects*, Tel-Aviv 1935, 108; Makrizī, tr. Quatremère, in *J. A.*, 1836, 152, etc.). In these Dindān appears as one of the founders of the sect, in association with ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn [q.v.]. He is said to have played an active part in both the formulation and propagation of Ismāʿīlī doctrines, and in addition to have provided large sums to finance the daʿwa. According to the Fihrist, he was secretary to ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Abī Dulaf (d. 280/893). His name and pedigree are variously distorted in these sources, but remain recognizable. His grandfather's name is given, with various corruptions, as Čahār Lākhtān, *four parts*—obviously a nickname. Abū ʿl-Maʿālī (Bayyān al-adāyān, ed. Eghbāl, 36, tr. Massé in *RHR*, 1926, 57) makes Čahār Lākhtān an associate of Dindān and ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn in founding the Bāṭinī sect, and attributes to him the role of financier.

The much better informed Shīʿite sources make it clear that Dindān lived in the 3rd century. While therefore he may have been a secretary of Ibn Abī Dulaf, he cannot have been associated with ʿAbd Allāh b. Maymūn, who lived and died during the 2nd/8th century. He may well, however, have played some part in the early history of Ismāʿīlimism, though it is noteworthy that neither his name nor any of his works appear to have been preserved by the Ismāʿīlis.


**Dioscorides [see Diwūsūrīdī].**

**Diplomacy** [see Eṣṭ, Muʿāhada, Safīr].

**Diplomatic**

1) Diplomatic has reached the status of a special science in the West, and the results of such research are accessible in good manuals (like Harry Bresslau's *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien*, 2nd ed., 1931). Much less work has been done on Arabic documents; the material is very scattered, and not yet sufficiently collated to permit detailed research. Yet Arabic documents have aroused the interest for them a considerable time: a number of them have been published, and the editing of Arabic papyri of the first centuries of Islam in particular has added materially to our knowledge. It is thus not mere chance that so much of the groundwork for the establishment of a science of Arabic diplomatic should have been done by a papyrologist (Grohmann), and it is to be hoped that the publishing of further papyri will advance work in that direction. It is indeed of very special advantage to possess original documents of so early a date, particularly as there are not so many Arabic documents of the later centuries. Some collections have become known only recently, and it is to be hoped that here too, more material will be discovered. Numbers of important Arabic documents have already come to light in the Geniza collections and among the manuscripts in the St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. Documents of the Mamlūk period are preserved in archives in Italy and Spain.

Arabic manuals for secretaries also form part of the material on which a science of Arabic diplomatic can be based, and these are preserved in great number. In part, they consist of theoretical explanations and advice to scribes, in part of practical examples in the text; these, however, are usually no more than model forms without either names or dates. It is obviously difficult to decide to what extent these texts are authentic, that is to say to what extent they are based on original documents. Such manuals gradually grew and became more complete, until in the time of the Mamlūks they reach encyclopaedic extent in Kālahšandī's *Ṣḥḥ al-ʿashā ʾl ʾismaʿāl al-ʾinshaʿ*. This great work is an essential source book for the study of documents, and therefore its author may be regarded as the most important precursor of scientific Arabic diplomatic. Here too, of course, it is hard to tell to what extent Kālahšandū had himself seen the originals of the numerous texts he gives. It is known that he did have access to the archives, and that many more texts survived than do today. We are not so certain about the older texts: Kālahšandū probably based his work largely on literary sources (some of which he names), but we can hardly expect a critical treatment of these.

The following is an attempt at a survey, based on Bresslau's classification, in order to get nearer to a complete picture.

2) Composition of Documents. The same division which is observed in occidental documents is also to be found in Arabic ones; namely the introductory protocol, the text, and the closing protocol.

A. The introductory protocol is known as īṭrāz and īṭtāz. Īṭrāz is the name of the protocol in the Arabic papyri: to begin with the formulae were bilingual, Greek-Arabic, and later Arabic-Greek; later on, purely Arabic. There is considerable variety in the wording, and extensive material has been published by Grohmann. The purpose seems to
have been to endow the document with a certain authenticity, but as far as the validity of Arabic documents is concerned without impact. From the imperial 4th/10th century it was omitted altogether, and the term *jird* is now used only in the sense of the inscription of names on clothes. Kalkashandi knows it only in this sense, and uses the term *ishtāb* for the introduction of documents, for example *ishtāb al-kutub* and *ishtāb al-mukalla*. He calls the individual parts of this *ishtāb jawālī*; they are *basmāla*, *gharshī* (a direction or address), *salāla* (objective, as for instance *salāla waladuhu* or *salāla al-Muslim al-Nāṣirī* etc. There is also evidence of the use of *tafiya* for sender, developing from the ancient *ja'alanī 'llahu fidda* ah through numerous intermediate forms, as early as *Abbasid* times. The formulae of benediction for the addressee, which were called *du'ud* and were taken very seriously, were even more varied. Developing from inconspicuous beginnings in Umayyad times, there was a whole system of gradation under the *Abbasids*. Scribes appear to have compiled lists of these *adīya* fairly early on, which became more detailed when distinctions in rank became more and more minute in the times of the Fātimids and Mamlūks, when every *laḥab* had its own precise *du'ud*.

The different personal names (*asmaʾ, ḥūnd, lāḥab, nuʿūd*) also underwent considerable development, and details concerning them are naturally of great importance in the interpretation of documents. Kalkashandi devoted his third *mabāla* to them, and the material which he collected is very extensive. Here too, the development is towards ever increasing complexity. Under the Umayyads, *ism* and *kunya* were sufficient, but *laḥab* and *naʿ* became current under the *Abbasids*. There was a veritable inflation of terms in Mamlūk times, when there were also a whole range of new additives and development of the language of appointment. From the *laḥab* and *naʿ* there were numerous intermediate forms, *lakab* became current, and *naʿ* was given a precise meaning. Consequently, the exchange of letters concerning matters of state was called *mukātabāt* by the *Abbasids*, and the chancellery the *diwān al-mukātabāt*. This was also usual in Egypt, under the Fātimids, Ayyūbids, and Mamlūks. There were also *rasāʾil* and *diwān al-∗rasāʾil*. *Murāsasāt* and *tarāsul* were also known, though these appear to have been less common. *Inshā* became the general term for letters, and *diwān al-∗inshāʾ* was already known in *Abbasid* times, then, especially under the Fātimids and Mamlūks, it became the general term for chancellery (cf. 6 below).

C. Letters of Appointment. *Wilāyāt* = offices are dealt with in detail under that heading by Kalkashandi in his 5th *mabāla*. Generally, however, compound words of the type *wilāyāt al-* have been more common, such as *wilāyāt al-∗ahd*, *wilāyāt al-∗bāb*, *wilāyāt al-*Kāhirā and others. There is, for instance, a term like *nasrāt allāhu sidgīl bi-wilāyāt al-∗Kāhirā*. *Tawliya* was the right to appoint, but this, in Mamlūk times, rested with the governors of Syria only, not with those of Egypt. The following terms for the different grades of appointment were, at least in Mamlūk times, more common than these general terms: *bayʿa*, *jahd*, *taklid*, *tafuḍ*, *masrūm*, *tawhīd*, *mangahr*. Each of these has its own history.

(a) *bayʿa* [q.v.] = the homage paid to a Caliph. Under the Fātimids, this reached particular importance, and reports of it were written in the harsh and sent to the provinces, where the governor accepted the oath of allegiance from the subjects.

(b) *jahd* = contract in general, but here the contract between a sultan and his successor, or a sultan, in particular; and later also the contract between a sultan and his successor, or the sultan and rulers of smaller lands. Kalkashandi classifies all these as appointments. He believes that the first two are traceable back to the Prophet, but he describes the latter as developments which took place only under the Ayyūbids after the death of Nūr al-Dīn.

(c) In the actual letters of appointment of officials, there was also one supreme grade, called *jahd*,
which concerned only the highest officials. It has not been usual since the time of the Fatimids.

(d) ta'khli'd was a much used term for high officials such as kadi, although under the Mamluks it was restricted to very special high officials such as the confidential secretary = kadih al-sirr.

(e) tafsqid applied to supreme kadi, appears to have been used in Mamluk times only. It may have been introduced by Shihab al-Din b. Fa'iz Allah (?).

(f) marasim used for military personnel, also appears to appear in Mamluk times only. By this, Shihab al-Din b. Fa'iz Allah means minor documents which are not connected with appointments of these, the more important with basmala, and the less important, such as passes, without), but Kalkashandli distinguishes between major and minor marasim: muhabbarata for the appointment of the commander of a fortress, and military persons of medium rank, muqashbarata for the lower ranks.

The latter are said to be rare (presumably because they were normally given a manghur).

(g) tawsiti: to begin with this seems to have been the ruler's signature, which was appended in the chancellery (whilst altama was a kind of motto written in the ruler's own hand, like a signature, at the bottom of documents). The tawsiti add'l-bi'as may well have developed from this. Later on tawsiti was also used for letters of appointment: to begin with, quite generally (thus Ibn Fa'iz Allah, perhaps even Ayyubid), but later only for the lesser officials, and in Kalkashandli for the fourth and lowest group of the muta'ammin min = turban weavers.

(h) manghur. In the first centuries, this was a pass for peasants in Egypt, apparently designed to curb increasing movement away from the land. In 'Abbassid times, it was the name given to grants of fiefs; under the Fatimids it denoted certain letters of appointment; rather general appointments under the Ayyubids; but under the Mamluks, it became restricted to feudal grants, in different grades according to size and writing. The wording was short and precise, there were no instructions (washiyat), neither was there the sultan's signature, but a kind of tughra can occasionally be found at the head.

D. Contracts. The general terms 'ash, 'as, and mithqal appear as early as the Kur'an, and seem to have been usual at all times. 'Ash [q.v.] seems to have been used particularly for political agreements; 'as [q.v.] for civil contracts, often more clearly defined by an additional genitive, such as 'ash al-nihak, 'ash al-izhamma, 'ash al-suq. Mithqal seems to have been less common. Kalkashandli does not mention it, but Ibn Fa'iz Allah's Ta'rif mentions muwadda and muwaddaba. Kalkashandli uses the terms hudna and mahidanna for an armistice, giving examples from 'Abbassid and Mamluk times. He pays particular attention to the form which the oath takes, and states that such contracts have not been current at more recent times. He knew the terms muwadda, muslama, mukadda, and muradaha as having the same meaning, but these were probably all less usual. Neither did the terms tawshka and mufasakha, for revocation by one or both parties, appear frequently. See further shurut.

E. Documents of a predominantly business nature. These include not only grants of fiefs (see C [q.v.] above) and annual tax settlements, but also the musamahadi and the tarkhansiyat. The former concerned tax-relief, probably only in Mamluk times, and were divided into large ('isam), issued in the name of the sultan, and small (jiqgar) in the name of the governor. Dues thus cancelled were called mukas, jihat musabaka, munkarat, and baswah (ref. balance of tax due). Some were valid for merchants and all their goods, others only for certain sums. The tarkhansiyat were concessions granting aged officials exemption from taxes, and possibly also a fixed salary (ma'alam). In the case of the military, they were called marasim, and in others ta'kwf.

F. Documents of a predominantly legal nature. Such were amin [q.v.], safe-conducts either for whole tracts of land (especially for individuals), or for foreigners in Islamic territory, though later also for Muslims "whose attack is feared, and especially those who have renounced their allegiance", so that, if possible, they might yet be recalled to obedience. The drawing up of such documents gradually came to form the bulk of the work of a diwan. Kalkashandli endeavours to trace both varieties back to the time of the Prophet and gives examples from Umayyad, 'Abbassid, Fatimid, and Mamluk times. Some documents refer to an application of the musa'ammin (e.g., innaka dhakarta raghabatuka), others do not.

Yarilgh = Ferman, extensively used by the Turks, and introduced as far as Mamluk Egypt by consular traffic, but only in its limited meaning of a pass for foreign ambassadors.

Ishlal was the given name to documents reaffirming decisions of former rulers; sometimes, however, they were simply called tawshiki. The Fatimid proclamation of the year 415/1024 (ed. Grohmann, RSO, 32, 641) can be added to the three texts cited by Kalkashandli.

Dafn, the burying of sins, is said to have been known in pre-Islamic Arabia, but appears to have fallen into disuse (perhaps replaced by the amin?) [see mu'mina, dafin al-].

Ta'khild hukmiyya were occasionally written for the kadh; they were appointments either in the form of diplomas or mere musabakat.

Ishfat al-'adda were certificates of good character of witnesses. They are known both in the papryi, and later right into Mamluk times. The altama, date, and habsala at the end were written by the kadh himself, and witnessed by the scribes.

al-tawqifat. The right of decision in petitions in open court, is said to have been the custom even in Sasanid times. In Islam under the Umayyads, and under Harun al-Rashid, the right of tawqif was said to have been transferred to Yahyaa al-Barmak. Egyptian governors exercised this right, too, but it seems to have been forgotten after the Tulinids, and not revived until the Fatimid fostered and developed it. The decision was made immediately, and was noted briefly on the back by the 'owner of the fine pen', then, after instruction (tawqif), by the head of the diwan, it was fully executed by the 'owner of the broad pen'. The right of decision remained with the head of the diwan al-tawqif, even under the Mamluks. The Sultan himself also presided in court, and Kalkashandli reports six different ways of submitting a petition. This tawqif was so popular that the people applied the term tawshiki to the profession of the scribe, and called the scribes themselves muswakbi'in.

'Abd al-nikha. Marriage contracts; legal documents in which the economic details were of special importance (baswah al-urs, mukhbat sadak), though the attestation of equality, the undertaking to pay the remainder of the marriage portion, and the rejection of all claims in case of divorce, etc., were likewise important.
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Fatwâ. Whereas certain qualities were demanded of the mufti, there does not appear to have been any set form for the fatwâ. A customary form did, however, emerge, as can be seen from the many collections, and a certain brevity appears to have been typical.

Wahbiyya, deed of wahbi, also traced back to the Prophet. Lawyers have laid down regulations for the content and form of endowments, and the deciding words wahbiyya, babatu, sabattu, as well as the exhortation that it must be neither sold, nor given away, nor bequeathed, appears in every such deed. Some texts are extant in the original, in literature, and carved in stone. The numerous endowments affected the economic situation adversely, and the state found a solution for this in large scale confiscations, as also—in more modern times—in supervision by Ministries of Awkâl.

Waqiyya, last will and testament, legacy. The content is laid down by law in detail, the form appears to be free, but two witnesses are prescribed.

Wasâyâ diniyya were large and ornate documents for reading from pulpits, in order to inculcate the rules of Islam. They were of particular importance at the time of the Sunnî restoration after the fall of the Fâtimids, but appear also in the Mağribîn.

Yamîn. Oaths played an important part in the ceremonies of homage (bâyâ), and the aymân al-bay'a, introduced by al-Ḥâджîdâdî, were famed for being particularly strong. The Fâtimids systematically extended these oaths, particularly in view of the fact that their subjects were of a different faith. Later, too, the oaths had their significance when they sealed contracts, or were made on attaining office or entering certain professions.

ʿUmra. These were documents for pilgrims to Mecca, who there made the ʿumra; these appear to have been rather rare.

Idjâdati were frequently issued on behalf of scholars and writers, e.g., for futâyâ, tadris, riwâya, often in the form of large sized jârkhât al-ḵâmi.

Mulâṭṭatî were sent by the Fâtimids to the governor of a province when he took up his office, and also when honours were bestowed (fâkhât al-ḵâmî). Mulâtâja was also the term applied to letters accompanying appointments for present holders of office. The orders were laid down for the higher officials, ambassadors, and commanders of fortresses. These were chiefly concerned with income and expenditure.

Tâbrîs recommending books or poems occur occasionally.

4. Transmission and multiplication of documents. Naturally, the Arabs recognized a difference between draft, original, and copy (muscâha, qat, muskha). A capable copyist (mâshikh) might advance to being a munâqîb (qotl 118). Ibn al-Sayrâfî 142 mentions copying as an important occupation, and also mentions a fair-copyist (mubâyîd). Copies are also marked with muskhâ or muskhâlat, and, like originals, could be attested by yâḥâ. The copies were kept, and it may well be that some collected works of the inkhâb literature were compiled from collections of drafts or copies. There are innumerable examples of the transmission of documents, in historical works. M. Hamidullah has collected no fewer than 269 texts attributed to the period before 652 (Documents sur la diplomatie musulmane à l'époque du Prophète et des khâlífes orthodoxes. Suivi de: Corpus des traités et lettres diplomatiques de l'Islam, Paris 1935. Also in Arabic: al-Walâbî al-sijâsîyya fi l-ʿâdh al-nabawî

ua l-ʾkâlidâ al-râqîdâ). This has of course no bearing on the unsettled question of their authenticity.

5. Archives. The preservation of originals and copies in archives was already customary in the Ancient Orient and in Greek Egypt. It may therefore be assumed that the Arabs likewise knew of the practice at an early date, and indeed we find a short précis on the back of some papyri, intended to facilitate storing and reference. But there is no evidence of the existence of a central archive, as there was in Greek times. Barthold in 1920 treated the question of the preservation of documents in the states of the Islamic orient (Arkhîven, Kursk 1, Petrograd 1920; cf. Islamica, iv, 145). Perhaps one might be permitted to regard the documents drawn up between Hârûn al-Rašîd and his sons Amîn and Maḥmûd in 186/802, and sent to Mecca to be hung up in the Kaʿba, as being kept in a kind of archive in that holy place.

There was a proper archive in Fâtimid times, and Ibn al-Sayrâfî (5/118, 142) calls the archivist fâkhân (qotl), and stresses his importance. He praises the Baghdâdî archive al-ḫâlîsâna al-tâmâ as a model. It was the archivist's task to file the originals of incoming documents, and the copies of the outgoing ones according to months, in folders with headings (iḏâbâr yahîb ʿulâykh fībdâla). A certain decline in this practice seems to have set in in Mamlûk times, and there were periods when the dawâdâr of the confidential secretary sufficed as an archivist.

6. Chancelleries. A. Whether the Prophet himself had a chancellery in which his famous writings to the rulers of the world were written is not certain, although we do have a whole list of scribes of the Prophet, among them the first caliphs.

According to one report, ʿUmar is said to have set up the first chancellery and called it dawîn (qotl), a word which might go back to the Persian dâwân, or even the Assyrian dep, and in fact, a certain parallel with Persian administration can be discerned. Yet it would appear to have been a dawîn for matters of finance and the army, rather than an actual chancellery of state.

B. In Umayyad times, the official language—which had hitherto been Persian in the east and Greek in the west—became Arabic. This takhâlî al-dawîn ʾâd l-ʿarâbî was carried through by al-Ḥâджîdâdî in the east, and by ʿAbd al-Malik in the west. It was indeed a disaster when all the dawâns were burnt in the battle near Dayr al-Dâjmâdîm (qotl) in 83/701. Otherwise we know little about Umayyad chancelleries. A special office for the sealing of documents (dawîn al-khâlîm) is said to have been introduced because of an attempted forgery under Muḥâwiyya. Some innovations are said to have been made by Walid b. ʿAbd al-Malik, when papyri appears to have become better and the writing more beautiful; though here, as on other occasions, ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz is said to have reverted to the customs of his forebears. The custom of the caliph's hearing and deciding complaints in open session (al-tâbâb ʾâlî l-ḥâsâs) is said to have come into being under the Umayyads. The scribes then had to record the caliph's decisions in writing.

The most famous of the Umayyad scribes was ʿAbd al-Hamîd b. Yahyâ (qotl), who was active from the time of Sulaymân to the end of the dynasty. He has appeared to have enriched the scribal art in respect of both form and content, and he was probably influenced by the Persians. Not all the writings attributed to him have, however, been authenticated.

C. ʿAbbâsid Chancellery. The ʿAbbâsîds do
not appear to have taken over much of the Umayyad administration. They developed a completely new way, and the state chancellery became known as dhawān al-rasā'il or dhawān al-inshā'. We have only scanty reports (and those particularly from Ibn ʿAbdūs al-Dīshāshīyārī and Maʿrīzī) of its organization and the way it functioned. Some innovations are attributed to the Barnamids. Thus, for example, Khālid b. Barmāk is said to have introduced parchment books (dāšiṭ min al-dīwān) instead of writing scrolls (puḥā muṭarradā), Yabhāy b. Khālid is said to have enlarged the basmāla by the tāsiṣya, and Ḥārūn al-Raḍī is said to have bestowed the right of the tawḥīd al-šaʿr-ashāq on him. The tawḥīd al-šaʿr-ashāq of Dīsṭār b. Yabhāy were copied, collected, and studied as models of erudition. Al-Maḥdī is said to have decreed that scribes should be free every Thursday, and it became a working day again only under al-Muṭṭasim. The following were famous scribes and waṣāʾir of the ʿAbbadīs: Ibn Muḥāḳ (died 338/949), Ibn al-ʿĀmīd (died 360/970), and Ḥābīb al-Sābī (died 384/994), and many innovations are traced back to them. One used to quote: Futḥāl al-rasāʾil bi-ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd wa-ḥṣīṣmat bi-Ḥān al-ʿĀmīd. We hear little of the working of the state chancellery in later ʿAbbāsid times, but it will still have served as an example to the chancelleries in Egypt and other countries.

D. Chancelleries in Egypt. Papyri are the main source for the earliest days, and Grohmann has attempted to describe the administration of the provinces from these in From the world of Arabic papyri, 114 ff. Of course, Egypt had no state chancellery at that time, although it did have one for the provinces which dealt with the exchange of letters with the capital. A seal of the conqueror of Egypt, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ (died ca. 436/653), has survived as an examination. Cliques and intrigues in the dhawān are described by Ibn al-Sayraṭī, in the chancellery of state in the time of the Ayyūbids, but there are a few details in the Rasāʾil of Kāf al-Fāḍil, and in Ibn Māmūṭī, al-Nābulusī, and Ibn Shīḥ. Al-Kāfī al-Fāḍil describes his admission to the dhawān al-inshā' by a stringent examination. Cliques and intrigues in the dhawān are also mentioned. Ibn Shīḥ describes conditions in the province of Syria, and pays special attention to the form of the documents. There is a detailed description of the Tarqgama of the sender; ḍuḏā, Ṽuḏāt, and 'uṣūn are treated in detail, and so is collaboration with other dhawāns.

Our most extensive sources date from Mamlūk times, namely from Shīhāb al-Dīn b. Ṭaṣkıī (d. 749/1349), in his Taʿrīf bi l-mustalakah al-gharīf, and others. His work can thus be regarded as a precursor of an Arabic diplomatic. Amongst the heads of the Dhawān al-inshā', the families of Banū ʿAbd al-Ẓāhir and Banū Fadl al-Malīk became famous and continued to improve their position. The title kāṭib al-sīrīr emerged under ʿAlāʾun, and under Nāṣir Muḥammad b. ʿAlāʾun, the head acquired the right of the tawḥīd al-šaʿr-ashāq, and precedence over the wazir. The number of employees rose with the increasing importance of the office. The higher employees bore the title of kāṭib al-dārādīr, and the others kāṭib al-darādīr. Although their numbers increased, their status in the public eye diminished. The head also succeeded in bringing official mail and the whole of the news service gradually under his control. The spheres of work were the same as under the Fātimids, but they were enlarged and differentiated. Foreign correspondence in particular had grown very much, through contact with almost the whole of the world which was then known. Foreign languages and
interpreters were of importance. The exchange of letters with governors became increasingly complicated as the number of grades, titles and addresses increased. It was, however, at this stage that the number of these became enormous, demanding further written work, and one now distinguishes 5 different grades of officials (cf. C 3 above). The *taωbi'tt al'αlā l-bi'siās* continued, as did a whole group of occasional documents such as contracts, passes, oaths, amnesties etc.

E. Compared with Egypt our knowledge of chancelleries in the other Arab countries, such as the Maghrib and al-Andalus, is somewhat more meagre. In these, the term *sahr* was commonly applied to all documents. Ibn al-Khaṭīb (died 767/1364) became famous with his *Rayhānat al-khuttāb*, which is frequently quoted by Kalkashandi. Cf. below, ii.

7. Probative force of documents. Islamic law accepts only proof brought by witnesses, and rejects written testimony in principle. Nevertheless, in the actual practice of law, documents have achieved great importance. Incidentally, contracts seem to have appeared in writing in Arabia even in pre-Islamic times. The seal (*khdtam*), which is of very long standing in the Orient, was an important means of authentication in Arabic documents. This seal was not replaced, as it was in the West, by the use of a signature, for the document was not valid unless a seal appeared on it, even if it was signed. The Prophet is said to have had a silver seal with the picture of a bull, which is of great importance for the interpretation of documents. A special branch is the emergence of rhymed prose

8. Development of Documents. Petitions and preliminaries also occur amongst Arabic documents. Petitions (*bi'siās*) naturally preceded decisions (*taωbi'tt*), and were the instigation of their formulation. The actual text of the *taωbi'tt* was generally short and to the point, so that mention of the petition was hardly possible. The *fatiMah*, too, was preceded by an investigation, and the state of affairs was described more or less explicitly in a set formula which omitted names. Contracts were often preceded by lengthy negotiations, but there is no mention of these preliminaries in the actual text of the contract.

9. Procedure and authentication, stages of authentication. Of the nine stages of authentication known in Arabic documents, only a few can so far be traced in Arabic ones. Ibn al-Šayrāli (108 f.) mentions revision and correction as *mukabala* and *is.wā*. During the consultation with the ruler, the head of the *diwān* merely indicated the main points of the reply, whilst the reply itself was drawn up by the relevant secretary. Then he compared the reply with the excerpt, corrected omissions and errors if need be (there is also mention of a special corrector = *mu.tașsīf*), and only then did he submit the completed reply to the ruler to be signed. The latter then added his signature (‘alāma), but the address (‘umusān) had to be written by the head of the *diwān* himself, in order to give visible proof that he was aware of the contents and accepted responsibility for it. In order to be put into effect, the document required the *ta.yīn* for the charge of carrying out the decision, which was authorized by the reverse of the *is.wā*; this charge had to be assigned in writing by the head of the *diwān*. According to the rank of the secretary who was ordered to carry this out, it had different phrasing and placing, e.g., *yuκtab bi-dhλλbuka* or *li-yuκtab bi-dhλλbuka* (cf. Kalkashandi, vi, 210). Great attention was obviously paid to the elegance of the fair copy, and the Fātimids had a special fair-copyist (*mu.bayyyid*) who was responsible for all types of documents (cf. Ibn al-Šayrafī, 133 f.). Nothing is said concerning the reading of this fair copy to the ruler, or about its handing over to the addressee.

10. Intercessors and witnesses. The religious intercession (*ṣawāfa*) of the Prophet is well known in Islam. There are also intercessions of a secular nature, such as on the occasion of the handing in of a petition to the ruler, or on standing surety for a debtor. Kalkashandi, ix, 124 gives early and late textual examples, and, in xiii, 328, an *a.mūn* in which the intercessor is referred to as follows: *inna M.b. al-Muṣayyib bi'l-sahr fī 'inda al'mūn wu-dhikara rāqibatūkum fī 'l-khidma*.

11. Model documents for use by scribes. In the West, set forms were always used, from the days of ancient Rome to the end of the Middle Ages. As early as the first century, there are some Arabic papyri which prove that letters and documents were written in a certain set form, and one may therefore assume the presence of models, although none is extant. Later Arabic formularies, the so-called *ins.wā* works, are an independent genre of literature. Of these, three types can be distinguished: 1) collections of models similar to the formularies of the West, 2) treatises on stylistics and rules concerning the drawing up of the documents, similar to the Western *arles* or *summaria dissectionis*, 3) a mixture of both, that is to say, formularies with theoretical commentary, or theological treatises with examples from practice, similar to the ones found in the West from the 12th century onwards. The most important of the many (over 50) Arabic *ins.wā* works are probably the following: al-Šūlī (d. 335/946), *Adab al-khuttāb* (type 2); Abū Ilshāk al-Šabī (d. 384/994), *Rasīd* (type 2); Ibn al-Šayrafī (d. 542/1147), *Kādūn diwān rasīd* (type 2); al-Kāfī al-Šafī (d. 596/1199), *Rasīd* (type 1); Shihāb al-Dīn b. Faḍl Allah (d. 749/1349), *al-Tawfīr bi-l-mu'tašalā al-šarīf* (type 3); al-Kalkashandi (d. 821/1418), *Ṣuḥb al-a'zāq fi šīnd.āt al-λns.wā* (type 3). As examples of preliminary documents, one might perhaps mention those known as *iš.tāb*, which confirmed decisions of earlier rulers. These naturally refer to the older documents, but there is no evidence of a complete list as in the West.

12. Copies. There are many examples of official facsimiles or copies in the West, but I know of no Arabic ones. But there were grounds for them, too, such as the loss of an original, or the accession of a new ruler. There are Arabic examples of illegal imitations or forgeries. As early as Sulī (143), there is mention of forgery from *mīl al'all* to *mīs'all al'all*, which is given as the reason for introducing the *diwān al-khdtam* of the Umayyads. Kalkashandi (xii, 104) writes on Tamlīn al-Dārī's first investiture with land, and Shihāb al-Dīn b. Faḍl Allah (Masālīk, i, 173) claims to have seen the original. This can hardly have been anything other than a forgery. Hamidullah seems to accept the documents attributed to the Prophet as genuine, but some internal evidence would argue against the authenticity of some of them. Concerning forged papyri cf. Grohmann, *Chrestomathie* 35.

13. The language of the documents. Whilst much thorough work has been done on the development of Latin in the Middle Ages, only the main outline of the development of modern literary Arabic from Classical and Middle Arabic is known (cf. *Ārabiyya*). This development is of great importance for the interpretation or documents. A special branch is the emergence of rhymed prose
14. Dating. Just as in the West, dating (taṣārik) brought about several problems. Even the normal ḥaḏira dating offered many possibilities, such as dating according to nights and days, feast-days, parts of the month etc.; but Kalkashandi (vi, 234 ff.) treats no less than 19 older eras and one younger era, that of Yezdegird. Most of them were of little importance. Only the Christian and the Coptic occurred frequently. A special problem was the adjustment between the lunar and the solar year (sana hilāliyya and khurādīyya) for the purposes of taxes. As far back as ʿAbbāsid times, special documents, ḥaḏa wa-ḥaḏa al-sana, were written when the need arose. [see taṣārik].

15. Writing materials. Extensive work has been done on writing materials by papyrologists, the most recent being by Grohmann, (Christomatia 63 ff.). Apart from the usual materials (papyrus up to the 11th century, parchment, paper), there were the rarer materials, such as cloth (especially for marriage contracts), wood, stone, wax, bones and potsherds. Size (ḥāṭ, in Šūlī mudār) also differed greatly, and so did the kinds and the prices. Kalkashandi gives several recipes for the ink (ḥibr, midād). [See AGMENT, Kāḥid, Kirtās, Rīk, Warāk].

16. Script in documents. Although much groundwork has been done by Mortiz, Tisserand, Chetkio, and others there is as yet no full scholarly history of Arabic script (cf. AGMENT). Grohmann investigated the script of the papyri (Christomatia 88-103). As far as later documents are concerned, observation of the peculiarities of different types of script, the use of diacritic marks and differential signs, must suffice in order to decide the age of undated pieces approximately. Certain formulae, numbers, notes on records etc. often appear in a shortened cursive hand which one might almost call shorthand. Grohmann (Christomatia 83) discusses the writing materials, and Kalkashandi (ii, 430) lists no less than 17 terms, the precise meaning of which can hardly be determined in the absence of drawings. Codes and hidden allusions may always have played a part, as in Šūlī (186) (targāma), and Kalkashandi (ix, 239, tašmiyya, later bal al-rumūs). They even occur in a papyrus (Grohmann, Christomatia 103 f.).

17. Sealing. Šūlī (139) and Kalkashandi (iii, 273) were already interested in seals (ḥāṭām). In Europe too the shape and use of Arabic seals has roused a certain amount of interest since Hammer. According to Grohmann (Christomatia 129 f.), one should distinguish between the use of a seal to replace the signature as a means of authentication, the attaching of a seal by way of recognition and ratification, and sealing on the part of witnesses. [See AGMENT].


ii. — Maghrib

In the Maghrib the external characteristics of documents (format, colour of paper, kinds of script, etc.) as well as the choice of protocols and formulae appear always to have been simpler than in the East.

To be mentioned, however, is the introduction by the Moroccan Almohad dynasty (al-Muwaḥḥidūn) of a sign manual of authentication called al-šālāmā. This consisted of the precatory formula wa-l-hamdu li-llāhi wakallāhu wa-llāhī al-ʿamīn, elegant in large, thick letters, with a ligature of the ḥāʾ and the dāl in the final word, and followed by a “terminal sigla” (see below). This mark of authentication was written afterwards at the top of the document, in a broad space left free for this purpose by the scribe, below the basmala and the taṣliyya, of which it was a complement.

Of a “unitarian” nature, this formula was possibly used by the mahdi Ibn Tūmart himself in some of his epistles. His successor ʿAbd al-Muʾmin certainly used it in his famous Risālat al-Fuṣūl (see E. Lévi-Provençal, Documents inédits d’histoire almohade, Arabic text, 13). But it is Ya ḡūb al-Mansūr (580-95/1184-90) whom the Kīrṣās (ed. Fās 1305, 154) considers to have been the first to use this formula as an al-šālāmā and to write it with his own hand. Indeed, it was not until under this ruler that the formula appeared, as a dynastic device, on the Almohad dinars (see Lavoix, Cat. mon. mus.. Espagne et Afrique, 303-308) replacing the earlier formula al-ḥamdu li-llāhī rabbī l-ʾalāmin.

The Almohad Ḥafṣid rulers of Ifrikiya expanded the formula by adding wa-l-ḥakūmah, l-ʾilāhī. Later, the Naṣrids of Granada chose wa-la ʾalāhī illa ʾilāh “and there is no conqueror but God”, very likely in memory of the name of their eponymous ancestor Naṣr (“divine aid which grants victory”). Moreover their first ruler chose the laḥbāb: al-Ghālib bi’llāh.

These two dynastic devices, Ḥafṣid and Naṣrid, appeared as well on their coins and some monuments. Left at first to the ruler himself, the responsibility for inscribing the al-šālāmā was later entrusted to a very
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high confidential official, a kind of head chancellor or keeper of the seal called šāhīb al-ṣālama. It was most often a scholar of great distinction; thus it was that Ibn al-Abbār [q.v.] and Ibn Khalūdūn [q.v.] filled this office at Tunis. According to the importance of the document to be authenticated, it could have an al-ṣālama kubrā or an al-ṣālama suğrā, whose inscription was entrusted to two chancellors of different rank.

In Morocco the use of the Almohad hamdala as al-ṣālama continued to the end of the Saʿdīan dynasty. But it is believed that it became a kind of tracery of arabesques, difficult to decipher, and possibly in imitation of the Turkish tağrā [q.v.]. This very artistic al-ṣālama of the Saʿdīans, for them a sort of coat of arms, is found on their guns, some of their coins, and in the ornament of their palaces. In the last years of the Saʿdīan dynasty as well as the manual al-ṣālama, use was made of a stamp in ink engraved on an oval seal.

The succeeding Moroccan dynasty, that of the ʿAlawīs, abandoned entirely the Almohad al-ṣālama, both manual and stamped. The sole mark of authentication became the ink stamp of a round seal (fība’s), large or small according to the importance of the document, placed below the blank space between the hamdala and the taṣliya.

Yet another particularity of Maghribi diplomatic must be noted. To mark the end of the text in a document, a terminal sigla was placed immediately after the date, consisting of an initial ḥadi with a tail curving towards the right, which it is tempting to read, not without reason, as an abbreviation of the verb intahād (“it is concluded”). In any case it cannot be an abbreviation of the postscript (taʿṣifī) šahh hadīkha or šahīh dīkhā (this is authentic) which appears at the end of diplomas conferring privileges and favours, often written by the ruler in his own hand.

We might add that some Moroccan documents, of the Waṭṭāṣids and Saʿdīans, are dated in “Greek numerals” which also appear on some of their coins, and that the Saʿdīan sultan Ahmad al-Mansūr made “Greek numerals” which also appear on some of their coins, and for the official language and thus provided for its introduction into the chancellery. A similar development took place under the Sāliḥids (see B. Spuler, i, 6; Cusa, I Diplomi greci ed arabi di Sicilia, Palermo 1868; ʿAbd Allâh Gannûn, Rasûlī Saʿdīyâ—Cartas de historia de los Saadies, Tetuan 1373/1954; M. Nehâl, Les systèmes chiffrés, collection of 128 official documents of the Moroccan ʿAlawīid dynasty, in facsimile, Paris 1915. The collection of Sources Inédites de l’histoire du Maroc contains in transcription, as well as plates, numerous Moroccan diplomatic documents.

(P. S. COLIN)

iii. — PERSIA.

The origins of Persian diplomatic are to be found in the period of the foundation of Turkish states in Persian territory. While in the chancelleries of the ʿAbd Allâh and Mawīyâ Sulaymān b. Muḥammad, acquired a solid power of attorney, bayʿa sharīʿa-nâma (deed of sale), waṣīya-nâma (testament), waʿfīb-nâma (act for the establishment of a pious foundation). These documents (ṣādir-lī-sharīʿya) belong primarily to the sphere of competence of the authorities for religious law. In contrast to these, documents containing orders were the exclusive prerogative of the organs of state, executed by the ruler or his
deputies and recorded in the chancellery. In principle an "official document" (farmān) can be found for every expression of the ruler’s will. In practice they may be divided according to contents into the following groups: deeds of appointment, of investiture (iḫṭāʾ, in the Mongol and post-Mongol period: soyyārḫā; musallāmī, tax-exemption; tiyyāl, officeholder’s tit; wasfīa, grants to religious from foundations or state funds; the awarding of a robe of honour, ḥatīrā, etc.), treaties, passports, judicial decisions of the ruler, and orders of a general nature to governors and officials. In the Safavid period the terminology appears to have been still largely undeveloped. In addition to farmān, the most general term, manšūr (manaššīr) refers to documents of the greatest diversity, while others are tablīd, taftūd, tashlīm, miḥāl (amḫīla), and manaššīr-i tablīd or taftūd (see Rieu, Cal. Pers. Ms in the Brit. Mus., London 1879, i, 389; Ethé, Cal. Pers. Ms in the Ind. Off. Library, i, 2131; Muntaghić al-Dīn Badīʿ Alībeg al-Dwuyalī, Sālabat al-kātaba, passim). The expression niqānīn appears in the Timūrid period (see Roemer, Staatsbriefen der Timuridenzeit, Wiesbaden 1952, passim) and is used until the 17th century (see Chardin, Voyages du Chevalier Chardin en Perse, ed. Langlès, Paris 1817, ii, 97). Synonymous with niqānīn is maḥūb, occasionally used in the Timūrid period (Niğām al-Dīn Shāhī, Zaftar-nāma, ed. F. Tauer, ii, 264, index). Decrees were further called ḥukm (Ḥafiẓ-i Abrū/Tauer, Cinque opuscules, 83, index), taḵkī (originally only the signature of the ruler and later his seal as well, see below) or miḥālī (Shāhī/Tauer, ii, 299). The Mongol designation yrīlīq, alone or in the combination ḥukm-ī yrīlīq, remained in use until the end of the 15th century (Shāhī/Tauer, ii, 274). A distinction according to diverse introductory formulae (see below), though not according to contents, appears in the 16th/17th-16th centuries: parvānda and ḥukm with solemn formulae are treated with simpler documents designated by rakām (see H. Busse, Untersuchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiewesen an Hand turkmenischer und safawidischer Urkunden (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologisehen Instituts Kairo, Islamische Reihe, i, 1952), in which acts of submission and authority are not explicitly called miḥāli (miḥālī-i diwān al-ṣadāra: Padapazyan no. 17, 970/1562). In the Kāḏjār period the designations depend upon the issuing authority: only the decrees of the Shah are called farmān; acts of governors of royal origin are called rakām (arkām); those of other governors ḥukm (see Greenfield, Die Verfassung des persischen Staates, Berlin 1904, 135). In less official language, however, almost all of the expressions listed above occur (see S. Beck, Persische Konversationsgrammatik, Heidelberg 1914, ii, 211 ff.).

Distinct from deeds and orders in the strict sense are the letters concerned with domestic and foreign affairs (maḥūb, kāḥbaṭ or risāla). Like the former they are provided with an official attestation and have a fixed external and internal form, but lack a legal content, as for example in the letters confirming friendly relations (ihatūsayyīd). There is a type of letter or document addressed to the provincial governors of the ḫūṣūl (dīyāyīd), condolence (thaʿṣiqat-nāmā), etc. Into the 9th/15th century foreign correspondence, based on a Mongol pattern, preserved in part the form of a decree, from which, however, it tended to depart under the Ṣafawīs in the 11th/17th century. Owing to their legal contents “border-books” (nimūr-nāmā, examples in Evoğlu Haydar, İnşāh, see Rieu, i, 390) approach the form of decrees. The same may be said of letters-patent for envoys. Letters from the royal hand (dastḵᵛāšt-i ḫumāyīn or muḥbrāt), the highest in rank, assume a middle position between documents and other writings, their contents ranging from the personal execution of an act by the ruler to confidential communications.

The internal structure of documents and writings has in the course of nine hundred years of Persian chancellery history scarcely changed—that is, until modern times. The documents begin with an invocation to God (mawṣūla) frequently combined with a devotional ejaculation (compare the phrase in maḥbūl l’iḫṭāʾ). These formulae, together with the formula of promulgation, the arenga and the narratio, constitute the protocol, which is followed by the most important part of the document, the dispositio. In the arenga the execution of the document in general terms, mostly of a religious character, is established, partly by the abundant use of Kurānic citations, and reused as a spiritual analogy. Here, in contrast to other parts of the document which are bound by more rigid formulae, the writer is free to display his literary talent. Evidence of this art is to be found, however, in pronounced form more frequently in ṣināḥ works than in original documents. The narratio on the other hand contains the essential transaction, for the most part a report of the proposition (ʿardā-dāḏa) of the petitioner, while in documents of confirmation the proposed act, or, depending upon the affair in question, several acts are included completely or in their most important parts (insertio). In the narratio appear for the first time the name and title of the addressee, who is always referred to in the third person, and afterwards only by maḥšūr, maḥsūrī, maḥšūrī ʾlāyhi and maḵmūl ʾlāyhi. The full titles can, in artistic combinations with ṣanāʿ wa ṣanāʿat, be extended for several lines. The formulae of promulgation (such as farsandān wa usurā ... bi-dāndān ki) are placed before the arenga or narratio, but can be omitted. The arenga closes frequently with the phrase ammā baʿdāʾ.

The nucleus of the document is the dispostio, or decision of the ruler: in appointments and investitures the office and the date of the nomination or object of the investiture are given in more detail (circumscriptio), while in other acts the decision or command is set forth. The dispositio is expressed in either active (that is, the ruler refers to himself in the first person plural: muḵkār barjamān wa arsāni ḏaḏṣīm) or passive form, (muḵkār rafīʿīda ʾšūd ki). Vestiges of an original first person singular were preserved in isolated phrases into the 17th-18th centuries: ʾšūd bībām, ḏuḏḏ-i baṣūrgudram (accompanied by blessings). The transition from the narratio to the dispositio is accomplished by means of set formulae: frequently bīnāʾlān ʾalāyhi, bīnāʾ bar in, ḥāḏāḏa, or mi-bāyād ki. To the dispositio in cases of appointments and investitures, prescriptions (adhortatio) for the addressee or officials and persons concerned might be added, usually introduced by sabīl wa ṣarīḥ. In contrast to the formulae of promulgation, where the highest dignitaries are named first, they appear here at the end. To the accoutants (al-bukāʿīyān) are often directed to register the document (dār dafīr rasmāl ṣamāl namāyend). Finally a prohibition might follow, forbidding the annual request for a renewal, with the directive “may this apply in all similar cases”. Except for the insocratia all of these parts which precede and succeed the dispositio may be omitted, in which case the document consists only of the dispositio. Most frequently, however, the order
is narratio—dispositio—conclusion (date etc.). In this case the entire text is included between ... to his coronation (8 March 1736; the nominal ruler was the Safawid cAbbas III, 1732-6) contained the phrase farmdn-i 

names of the months appear with their customary n.s. xiv, 222) or ed. Jahn, The day of fi. tahrir

dispositio. In the sitio).

In the ioth/i6th centuries, to the right below the text and later disappearing altogether. Similarly, until the end of the 9th/10th century the place of issue was named after the date: ba-madām, ba-madina or ba-dār al-saltana. With some exceptions this later disappears. In Turcoman documents, beneath the date and place name, is an apprēciatio: rabbi šītām bi'l-khāyrib wālī�bālī (see Busse, Untersuchungen, no. 2). In the 10th/16th century this phrase was moved to the right-hand margin and shortened to ḥūtima bi'l-khāyir or ḥūtimā, later disappearing altogether. Similarly, until the end of the 9th/10th and beginning of the 10th/16th centuries, to the right below the text and perpendicular to it, was a reference to the secretary and other officials who might have participated in the preparation of the text: parawndn-yi aqrāf-fa ʿlīd, ba-risalā (name), ba-awnlī (name). From the beginning of the 11th/17th century this remark can be found in altered form on the reverse side of the document (see below).

The external form of the documents has been more subject to change than the internal form. The periods of modification are roughly the following: Pre-Mongol—Mongol—Timurid and Turcoman—Safawid to the beginning of the 14th/20th century. The tughrā—[q.v.]—was employed by the Baldānūs and the rulers of Khāzīm (in ʿAtabat al-kalaba a wawir-ī tughrā mentioned, no. 16; for Khāzīm see al-Nasawi, Strat al-sūtān Djalāl al-Dīn Māngıbārdā, ed. Hāfīz Ahmad Ḣamdī, Cairo 1953, 324). While here they consisted evidently only of the name and titles of the ruler, in the Mongol period was added, in addition to bābdār (after 1219, see Spuler, Mongolen, 197 and 271), after the name the phrase ṣūrā manšū ("an order from us"). In Timūr's documents the phrase reads in Turkish translation: Timur gūrkān sōṣūmū (see Fekete, Arbeiten der germanischen Orien- 
talistik auf dem Gebiet der türkischen und persischen Paläographie und die Frage der Formel sōṣūmū, in AO Hung. vii (1957), i, 14). In this form the tughrā was preserved on particular documents throughout the Turcoman period into the 11th/17th century, and it was employed by the khāns of Būgārā as well as by the Golden Horde in southern Russia (see Fekete, op. cit., 14). In Aḵ Ḵoynūlu documents the tughrā is combined with the ʿaḏmar ḥaša which appears on their coinage (see Hinz, Irans Aufstieg zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert, Berlin and Leipzig 1936, 106 and the illustration opposite 104). An innovation for the world of Islam was the Uyghur practice introduced by the Mongols of indenting the first lines of the text, as well as emphasizing (owing indirectly to Far Eastern influence) the term and the word yardīg by beginning a new line (see Busse, Die Entwicklung der Staatsurkunde in Zentralasiien und Persien von den Mongolen bis zu den Safawiden, in Akten des XXIV. Internationalen Orientalisten-
kongresses München, Wiesbaden (1959), 372-4). With insignificant changes this usage can be observed as late as the 13th/18th century in documents with a tughrā, from which it was also extended to other documents. During the rule of the Saʿfawī Ismāʿīl I (1501-24) the tughrā disappeared from certain documents, though the first two lines of the text continued to be indented. The seal, earlier at the bottom of the document, came generally to be placed at the top (where it is still, in the form of a crest). There was a new development under the second Saʿfawī ʿAbbās I (1524-76), in that the tughrā, written by the head of the chancellery (munšī al-mamlīk), was written in red ink in two forms as an introductory phrase (while the indenting of the first two lines was dropped): farmān-i humāyūn ʿṣūd and farmān-i humāyūn šarāf-i nāṣirī yiḏl. At the beginning of the 11th/ 
17th century was added the phrase (written in black ink by the sāḥīb-i-nawīs, equivalent to the μαχίσης 
Niwas or wasir-i lāp): ḥuṅm-i ḡiāhān-muʾādī ḍūd. In documents of the divān begi the same formula appears in red ink (see Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, ed. and tr. V. Minorsky, London 1943, fol. 21b, 24b, 40a). A further differentiation had already begun to develop (the first example in Papazyan no. 3, 866/ 1462), in that the tughrā in documents emanating from members of the royal family had instead of sōṣūmū the term sōṣūm ("my order"), to be found up to the end of the 10th/16th century (see Puturidze no. 17, 1992). There appeared further in the 10th/ 16th century in the documents of governors the formula amr-i ʿṣūd ḍūd (also in combination with the tughrā containing sōṣūm: Puturidze no. 76, 1051/1643), and in the 11th/17th century mukarrar as kt. Under Ismāʿīl II (1576-77) the phrase amr-i diwān-i aqrāf-fa ʿlīd was used in certain decrees (Papazyan no. 19, 984/1577). Documents of the authorities in the central government bore in the post-Safawid period. The formula farmān-i 
humāyūn ʿṣūd continued to appear in the acts of the Afšarīs, though combined with baʿdawān Allāh ʿawdāl (later aʿūdhu biʾllāh ʿawdāl), while the strokes of the letters were curved into an artistic shape similar to a row of treble clefs. In Kāḏarīr documents is the phrase ḥuṅm-i diwān-i aqrāf-fa ʿlīd (with al-mulāk iliʾlāh ʿawdāl), while in the acts of Muḥṣafar al-Dīn Shāh (1856-1907) farmān-i humāyūn ʿṣūd reappear (see Beck, Am-mamlīk ii, 349-3 and note) and in red or gold ink was preserved. The phrase ḥuṅmī- 
ḏiwaṅ-muʾādī ḍūd (without additions) appears even in the late Afšarī and in some Zand documents, retaining the same simple form of the Safawīd period. The acts of Nādīr Shāh prior to his coronation (8 March 1736; the nominal ruler was the Saʿfawī ʿAbbās III, 1732-6) contained the phrase farmān-i
Al'Ali Mardán Khán, also unofficially Shah, employed the introductory phrase ḥukm-i wāllā ḍud (without additions) in the 9th/i5th century though with an interlinear introductory phrase ḥukm-i wḏld shud, which with this phrase were executed completely in black. The use of coloured inks was dropped also in the documents emanating from provincial authorities. In writing, a large margin was left at the top and on the right, in which only words to be stressed were written. The lines rise, especially in the early period, slightly to the left; occasionally, in order to prevent later insertions, the last word of the line was extended to reach the left-hand edge of the paper. Until the end of the 9th/15th century the beginning of the disputation (muhammad) or signet rings, were occasionally used in the place of which there were tendencies under Ismâ‘īl I, the long overdue designation muhr. Shâh Ismâ‘îl included in his edicts the phrase huwa Allâh al-‘ādîl (Papazyan no. 19, 984/1577), though it was an exception; in principle the seal was enough. Not until the Kâdîr period did the seal require a countersign (tughra) by the Shah (see Greenfield, op. cit., 197; Beck, op. cit., facsimile: sakha below the first line). The ruler’s seal was originally at the bottom of the document. The Mongol square seal was also used on paste-joints, in order to preclude the possibility of later insertions, though in the 9th/15th century the seal appeared only at the bottom (see Kurat, op. cit., 29). At the beginning of the Safavid period, in acts of the ruler and those of the central government, the seal was put in the place of the tughra at the top of the document. In the decrees of governors with the tughra: ḥukm-i ‘āli ḍud, the seal remained at the end, while those governors who were princes placed their seals to the right of the tughra (similar to the paper of the Ottoman viziers). Correspondence (makhâbbâ‘) was sealed by the seal of the Carmelites in Persia and the Papal mission of the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries, 2 vols., London 1939, plate opposite 95 in vol. i). In the Mongol chancellery seals for the various affairs of state were stamped in different colours, such as blue, red (or gold), green, and black (see Spuler, Mongolen, 293). For the square seal still to some extent used by the Timūrids, gold ink was employed; later all seals were stamped in black. In addition to square seals (Ghâzân Khán had introduced different kinds of seals for the different branches of government; see Rashâd al-Dîn, ed. Jahn, 292) the Timūrids also had round seals, often stamped at the top of the document (see J. Deny, Un soyurgal du Timouride Shah Rûkah en écriture ouïgûre, in JA 245 (1957), 253-56). The use of different seals for different kinds of documents, of which there were tendencies under Ismâ‘îl I, reached full development in the later 9th/15th century: "great" seals (mehr-i sharaf-i nafâḏâgh and mühr-i humâyûn) were used in documents with the introductory formulae farmān-i humâyûn sharaf-i nafâḏâgh yâfî and farmān-i humâyûn ḍuḏ, while "small" seals (mehr-i anqaleh-i āfāb āfāb), or signet rings, were used for documents with ḥukm-i dihâqān mu‘ādh ḍuḏ. The inscription in the large seals partly contained the names of the twelve imāms, that in the
small seals contained only the ruler's name, frequently combined with the title banda-yi shah-i wilayat (servant of the king of holiness, that is, 'Ali). Chardin gives evidence also of a square seal (Plate XXXI, and shir wa khurshid) and small (oval) seals are still to be found in the Kâdîr period (plates in Rabino di Borgomale, Coins, medals and seals of the Shahs of Iran, 1500-1547, place of publication not given, 1945, plate 3). The seals of the ruler were later for the most part rectangular with an upper extension in the shape of a roof. The lion and sun (shir wa khârgâh) appears in the seal as early as 1159/1746 (Chubua, no. 47). Large (rectangular with extension) and small (oval) seals are still to be found in the Kâdîr period (plates in Rabino, op. cit., 4). The governors' seals were in the Safawid period mostly rectangular or oval (some isolated examples are round) with inscriptions containing the name of the office-holder and a religious device. These were also employed during the Safawid period a special round "diwân-seal" (muhr-i musawwada-yi diwân-i a'ld). Originally in the custody of the keeper of the seal (muhr-i dâr), the seals passed in the early Safawid period into the safe-keeping of harem officials (see Roemer, Der Niedergang Iran's nach dem Tode Isma'il des Safawidenkönigs, Würzburg 1939, 44), in whose protection they remained in the later Safawid period. The actual sealing was executed by officials with the title dawât-dâr (see DAWÂR), while the keepers of the seal placed only a small stamp on the reverse side (see Tadhkirit al-Mulîh, ed. Minorsky, fol. 414 ff.).

Before delivery to the addressees the documents were sent through different departments of the financial administration (dawât khâna-yi humâyûn a'ld), where high officials supplied flourishes and seals, and other officials confirmed the entry of the documents in various registers (dawât, dâ'âsîr) by means of seals and annotations (muhr wa khatt) (other than for example in the Ottoman administration, where these remarks were placed on the draft, that is, as mere bookkeeping comments; see Fekte, Die Siyaqat-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung, Budapest 1955, 67, 68 note 2). While flourishes evidence also a square seal (Plate in XXI, and decrees for example, between the last lines (see Grohmnn in RSO, xxxi (1957), 641-54), in Persia they appear early on the reverse side from and written in a direction perpendicular to that of the text. This procedure was already to be found in Ilkhan documents (see Cleaves in HJAS, xiv (1951), 493-526). In this respect Ghâzân Khân also introduced obligatory prescriptions (see Rashid al-Din, ed. Iahn, 291-6). A series of seals and impressions are also to be found on Timurid (see Deny, op. cit.), Turcoman and early Safawid documents (see Busse, Untersuchungen, 77 ff.). A definitive system was introduced at the beginning of the 11th/17th century and remained substantially in effect until the end of the Kâdîr period. The flourishes consist of a religious device (for example, lauakhâlu 'alâ'âhik), while the registration comments contain a reference to the nature of the business, the fiscal year, the registration comments (dawât-i daftar-i daftar-i gaan-i a'ld shud ("it has been entered in the outgoing register of the high diwan"), or simply sahâ ("correct"). In the later Safawid period flourishes and seals were applied to all documents by the grand vizier (t'immâd al-dawla), by the sadr and officials who belonged to the arkhân-i dawlat, such as the kure'il bashk andULLar abâst, on documents which fell within their jurisdiction, while registration comments and seals were applied by the musawwâf al-mamâlih (or—hâssâa), laqshar-niûs, shah-dâ'âshik, darâ-âh-khâna-yi a'ld, darâ-âh-khâna-yi dawât-khâna-yi a'ld, and others. The documents were brought first to the musawwâf, then circulated in the various departments, returning finally to the musawwâf. The registration comments of the imperial officials (sârkhân-i mamâlih) differed from those of the officials for the royal domain (sârkhân-i hâssâa-yi sharfa) in composition: for example ba-nâfar rasîd (imperial), nasrâ'î (green ink, royal domain). In contrast to those documents which were registered in the dawât-khâna (arkân-i dawât), are those which were not registered (arkân-i bayâdî) because they did not concern the financial administration or because they were to be kept secret (see Tadhkirit al-Mulîh, fol. 42b; and Busse, Untersuchungen, 79).

The documentary commission was given orally by the ruler or a high official directly, or in writing by way of the "relator", to the chancellery. The actual process was then, even in the Mongol period, entered on the document (see Hinz, Die Resâld-yi Falakiyyd des 'Abdolldh ibn Mohammad ibn Kiyd al-Mazandarani, Wiesbaden 1952, fol. 444 ff.). In Turcoman documents into the 10th/16th century the annotation was placed on the lower right-hand front (see above), but from the beginning of the 11th/17th century it is to be found on the reverse side: in an oral commission from the ruler ba'tl-muhâjdâ al-'alîya al-âlîya, otherwise huwa bâsâb al-amr al-a'ld. In the latter case beneath this formula the relator was named: as kârâr-i niwâsî . . . when the relator was the grand vizier; otherwise ba-ridâl. The phrase bâsâb al-amr al-a'ld was omitted when the grand vizier or another official had given the commission (see Busse, Untersuchungen, 69 ff.). In post-Safawid documents such annotations appear to have been omitted. After all of the formalities had been seen to the documents were rolled together with the writing inside and pressed flat. Letters to foreign rulers were often sent in richly ornamented covers of brocade, protected against unauthorized view by a special seal.

In the early period documents and correspondence were prepared in the imperial chancellery (dâr al-inshâ', diwân al-rasâ'i) under the authority of the muntîh al-mamâlih. From the 11th/17th century on, documents with the introductory formula (tughra) bukm-i gâshân-mulâs shud (in black ink) were executed in the chancellery of the wâsh'a-niûs, who was also responsible for letters addressed to foreign princes. There was also a subdivision in the jurisdiction for the empire and for the royal domain: documents relating to imperial affairs (with the introductory formulae farmân-i humâyûn sharfa-i nasîfâd yâft and farmân-i humâyûn shud) were prepared by the muntîh al-mamâlih, those for the royal domain by the wâsh'a-niûs. In addition to these two authorities separate departments of the dawât-khâna were also authorized to execute documents, in the Safawid period for example, the laqshar-niûs, and the secretaries of the abâst, tubâ'î bashk, tufangtî bashk, and others. These documents contained no introductory formulae (tughra). The provincial authorities had their own chancellories. Solemn documents were independent pieces of writing; on less important occasions, though the other formalities were preserved (seal, tughra), the resolution was placed in the upper margin of the petition (t'arâm-dâkh). Supplementary
Remarks and additions by subordinate officials were until the 9th/10th century written between the lines, later in the right hand margin (with the phrase mukarrar and kiss and seal). In solemne edicts the ruler could make additions in his own hand (khatḵīya baḵšiḵt-i muḏbārā). In addition to the Persian section there were, as was mentioned before, in the chancellery departments for foreign languages as early as the Ghaznavids. Especially comprehensive in this respect, corresponding to the many nationalities involved, was the Ilghānūd chancellery (see H. Busse, Die persische Geheimkanzlei im Mittelalter, in West-östliche Abhandlungen, Wiesbaden 1954, 345). The Timūrids corresponded with the Ottomans partly in Arabic and partly in Eastern Turkish (Rieu, i, 389; Kurat, op. cit., 195 ff.), the Šafawīd in Ottoman Turkish (see Fekete, Iran Šahārīnī iki türke məktəb, in TM, v (1935), 269-74). During the Ḷāḏārī period French became the principal foreign language of the chancellery, a position which it has preserved.

Original deeds and deeds of confirmation may be distinguished according to the occasion of their issue. Confirmations were necessary upon the death of the incumbents of hereditary offices and fiefs, and general upon a change of government. The prohibition at the conclusion of many documents "a renewal (lagiḏīd) shall not be requested annulment (muḍur tawāṣer) was very likely of a precautionary nature. In practice an annual renewal does not seem to have been customary. For practical reasons possessors of documents might have issued verified copies of these which carried the same degree of authority as the originals. Edicts which concerned larger groups of people or the population of an entire community were frequently posted in the form of inscriptions in public buildings and places (see Barthold/Hinz, Die persische Inschrift an der Mauer der Manucehr-Moschee zu Amīn, in ZDMG, ci (1951), 241-69; and Hinz, Steuerinschriften aus dem mittalterlichen Vorderen Orient, in Belleth., xii (1949), 745-69).

The oldest original documents preserved belong to the Ilghān period (largely Mongol letters to European princes). Some Persian documents of the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries are related to Persia (and bordering territories), and in European archives and museums. Only Šafawīd and later documents have been found in greater quantity. Especially rich in this respect are Georgian (M. Čušua, Persidskije firmānt i uštā Muzeya Grusti, i, Tbilisi 1949; and V. S. Puturidze, Gurisu-persidskie istoricheskie dokumenti, Tbilisi 1955) and Armenian sources (A. D. Papazyan, Persidskie dokumenti matenadarana, 2 vols., Erivan 1956-60). A small collection of Šafawīd documents (of which two are Turcoman) is located in the British Museum (Rieu, Suppl. 252-60, the greater part having been published by Busse, Untersuchungen). Isolated documents and letters are to be found in the Vatican (A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, Appendix B) and in Italian archives (see F. Gabrieli, Relazioni tra lo scia’ Abbās i Granduchi di Toscana Ferdinando I e Cosimo II, in Rend. Lincei, 1949), in Poland (H. S. Szpszal, Wyobrazenia swietych mużalmanskich, Wilna 1934, 26-48), in Sweden (see K. V. Zettersten, Türkische, tatarische and persische Urkunden im Schwedischen Reichsarchiv, Uppsala 1945), in Austria (Vienna), and in Germany (Dresden, see Fekete, Iran Šahārīnīn . . .). In Persia there are large and small collections in private archives in Teheran (Huṣayn Šahābī, Muḥammad Farḥād Muṭʿamīd, Khan Malik and Tabriz (Muḥammad and Ḫursayn Āḏā Nāḥḵūdwaṇ), other collections in the Archaeological Museum in Teheran, in the Chihil-Sūṭn pavilion in Isfahān, in the Armenian church in New Šuflā, and in the Sanctuary Library (kiṭāb-khāna-yi āstānā) in Maḡāhād. In Germany there is a small collection of documents, assembled in 1938-9 by Wilhelm Eilers (Würzburg) in Persia (original documents and copies of inscriptions), in the possession of Hans R. Roemer (Mainz). In two articles the latter has brought together the material known up to 1957: Vorschläge für die Sammlung von Urkunden der islamischen Geschichte Persiens, in ZDMG, civ (1954), 392-70; and Über Urkunden zur Geschichte Aegyptens und Persiens in islamischer Zeit, in ZDMG, civ (1957), 519-38.

the pattern brought by Asiatic Turks who in turn followed diplomatic models that were developed by the states of Central Asia, thus presenting a blend of Uyghur and Chinese traditions. On the other hand its organization was largely based on European practice, especially that established by the Byzantine Empire. The Tatar documents (those of the Golden Horde and of the Crimean Tatars) mainly followed Central Asian models and showed influence of Uyghur and indirectly of Chinese diplomatic usage. This fact is evidenced by Persian documents dating from the 16th to 17th century which use the titles of the type of the sūmūsūsū (see L. Fekete, "Arte de la grusinisch-Amerikanisch auf dem Gebiete der türkischen und persischen Palaeographie und die Frage der Formel "sūmūsūsū", in AOHung., vii, 1, 1937). The documents of Ottoman Turkey from the 15th century represent a set of more or less consistent patterns (see F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, in STAK Wien 1921 and TOEM, xxviii, P. Wittek, in WZKM, 1937). The documents, their general names being ērūbāk or ṣētwāk, were issued by the chancellor's office of the Sublime Porte; solemn public documents proclaimed by sultans or announced by viziers were issued by the office of the so-called beylik or beylik belami, a special department of the central office of the Porte, formally known as ḍawān-i khamūdān belami. The secretary, the scribe and the official in charge of the whole department (byelik) attached those of their signatures to the documents, before they were sent to the reis efendi for his stamp (the resit). More important deeds were checked by the nishdndj or to be had to bear his tughra, in the office of takwil documents such as letters of appointments, proclamations and letters-patent were renewed or ratified. The documents called tekhkeree were issued by the office of the ḍawān-i khamūdān belami, and those of the fisc were made out by the clerks of the defterdar. Officials of lower rank in the capital as well as in the provinces had their own secretariats and were endowed with the authority to issue their own documents (see J. Hammer, Staatsverfassung und Staatsverwaltung des osman. Reichs, Wien, 1815; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanlı devleti teskildi, 1945, and also Beylik above).

The body of a Turkish document shows a great similarity to a European document. It is quite probable that its form and shape were imitated from the Byzantine model. The Turkish document can be divided into two parts; the first (the opening and concluding formula) bears the character of protocol while the middle part contains the essential text. There are particular formularies which are also found in any Turkish document: ērūkān: (1) āvātsī, being an invocation composed of the formula containing the name of governor (the Bey's name). This would range from the simplest huwa to the longest titles (numerous examples are quoted by Fr. Kraelitz, Osmanische Urkunden in türkischer Sprache, in STAK Wien 1921). A little space that follows the initial formula sometimes to the right hand side (in the documents issued by the Sultan only) is succeeded by (2) tughra, the device or the sign of the Sultan, named also nisān-i humāyūn, tevkī, or 'ālamī, and of different design for each sultan. This device contains the name of the Sultan and all his titles and other distinctions with the formula muṣafir daʾūmā. All this is encased in an ornamental design, always with the same motifs and shape. The tughra was drawn and painted with particular care by a clerk specially assigned to this work, the tughra-keş. It was made in colours. The origin of tughra is not certain (see I. H. Uzuńçarşılı, in Belleten v, 1941; P. Wittek, in Byzantion xvii, 1946 and xx, 1956; F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, in MOG i; F. Babinger, Sarre-Festschrift 1925; P. Miyatev, Tugrite na osmanskite sultani ot XV-XVII w. in Godischiq na povod ttorne narodna biblioteka i muzei 1537—1739, Sofia 1940; E. Kühnel, Die osmanische Tugra, Wiesbaden 1955; and TUGRA). The documents issued by higher officials bore instead of the tughra another sign, the penče. It was usually placed not at the beginning but on the left hand or right hand margin or at the foot of the scroll. It was made in colours. It was called incorrectly tughra (see F. Kraelitz-Greifenhorst, Studien zur osmanischen Urkundenlehre, i; Die Handfeste (Pensê) der osmanischen Wesire, in MOG, ii). (3) The ṣennâm, that is, the title of the person in whose name the document was made, was, especially in sultanic documents, of considerable length and worded in solemn form beginning with the traditional benki... (see Orgn Zariit, Tugralarda el muṣafir daʾūmā duası ve Sahnı umursı, Türk Tarih, arkeol. ve etnogr. dergisı, Istanbul 1949). (4) The inscription or the title of the person to whom the document was addressed (elkib), especially in documents of great importance, was also very long, and was introduced with the formula sen ki or hâli. Beside the name and titles of the addressee it contained (as regards Christian rulers) certain long-established formularies, e.g., "the paragon of the highest princes of Jesus", "the second of the illustrious dignitaries of the people of Messiah", etc. The addressee's name was followed by (5) dušī, e.g., by a brief clause expressing the good wishes of the sender, an equivalent to a certain extent of a salutation in European documents. If the person addressed was a Muslim the clause contained also a blessing, an invocation to Allah for protection over his person, etc. If the letter was addressed to a Christian, this formula would contain
an allusively worded hope for his future conversion to Islam, e.g., *Muqimiat 'awdkh bila-bi'ây, see J. Östrup, Orientalische Heilighkeitsformeln, Copenhagen 1927, 55-6* (German tr., Orbis Theol. Orient., Leipzig 1929). The *dûlî* concludes the introductory part of the protocol. The transition to the contents proper of the document is achieved through a special expression, e.g., “when this writing comes to your hand, let be known that”, then follows (b) *nâkî-i *iblîk or *taqîr, that is the main body of the letter or document which tells of the reasons for writing it, of favours bestowed or letters which have preceded it, sometimes introduced by means of the areng, i.e., excuses and apologies that would occasionally contain a quotation from the Kûrân, or a proverb, etc. In documents dispatched to foreign rulers no distinction is made between the narrative part and the succeeding one, which is (7) a dispositio with the opening words *bism Kom or *emr. This bears the main decision or resolution, either being strengthened by the use of the word te'kid and the formula, such as for instance *gâyôle *bilestî together with *la.net, a threat of punishment in case of disobedience to orders (in relation to superior authorities). Then follows (8) an attesting formula, corresponding to the European: *corboratoras as bîs takûkh bilûb, *i'timad *kîlastî. The dating or (9) *taqîr is marked by means of an Arabic formula, e.g., *tâhir**â** fi. Then comes (10) *gûrra, the last one, *sulûd, the middle of the month, *munasafl, to indicate particular months abbreviations are used. This rule is followed in documents written in the *siyqâkat* script. From the abbreviated forms the names of the quarters of the year are made (the first is *mûshir, the second *revedî, the third *reveden and the fourth *lebâlah) see J. H. Mordtmann, in *Isr, ix; F. Krae litz-Greifenhorst, in *Isr, viii; J. Mayr, *Armenische Handschriften, in *Hand worried.* H. Sabanovi, *Irâzi evâl ii, evasisi evâhî ve datamima turkîs spomênikâ, in *Prilozi za Orientalnu *filologiju, i, 1950. (10) The place of promulgation or announcement comes after the date and here the usual formula is *be-mêkâm-i . . . Then the name of the town is given (sometimes accompanied with an appropriate epithet), which frequently is descriptively defined. If the writing was made out on a journey or in camp, the phrase *be *yûrî is used. Last comes (11) the seal *mûshir, *kahlem, serving to attest the document. It is impressed in China ink on the moistened paper. The seal is of various sizes and shapes, round, oval, square, polygonal etc. It contains the name of the writer, religious formulae and ornamental elements (see 1. H. Uzuncarshî, in *Belleten*, iv, 1940; also *mûshir). On the front page of the writing or on its back there are attached various attesting formulae for ensuring its validity, e.g., *sh (= *sakht) inserted by the officials of the chancellorry to attest to the authenticity and correctness of the document. There frequently occur abbreviated forms of certain terms, e.g., *m in the meaning of *mer-kâm (= mentioned), *la instead of *Allîh, etc.

As a matter of course documents of the Turkish chancery were written in the vernacular (in Turkish), but there are also other documents in Greek, Old Slavonic (Cyrillic characters), Hungarian, with the genuine *tughra or *pînê attached to them. Sometimes a translation in Italian, Polish etc. accompanied the Turkish text, or its transcription in Latin, Greek or Armenian characters. The documents of the Kazan Khâns and those of the Golden Horde that were dispatched to the sultans in the 15th century were written in the Uygur language and bore the specific characteristics of Central Asian diplomatic documents.

Turkish diplomatic practice led to the development of a specific formula for writing more formal and solemn documents. The left hand side of each line was rounded upward and resembled a sabre with a curved point. For the sake of more intricate ornamen- tation the last letter in each line was inscribed in oval shape (usually *nân, *rî or *îlî). The script used was the *dîwânî, also known as *te'nêî* in its various forms (see under *mattî). Not infrequently the in- vocation would be written in *tâhîlu* while the rest of the text would be written in the *dîwânî characters. Documents signed by inferior officials were written in *neskhi and *dâwânî (see Mahmut Yazar, Eski yazlar okuma anahtars, Istanbul, 1942). Fiscal documents were written in the *siyqâkat* characters which are very difficult to read (see L. Fekete, *Die Siyqâkat-Schrift in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung, i-li, Budapest 1955; N. Popov, Paleografski osobnosti na cislitelnite imena v pismoto *siyqâkat*, Sofia, 1955).

Official papers are usually written with a rather broad margin (kendr) on the right hand side. It is covered with notes and remarks (der kendr), suggesting the main points to be worked into the body of the answer.

The usual ink used for writing was black China ink; in some words the black letters were covered with gold dust (altln rig or rîh).

Waxpaper, frequently imported from Italy, with watermarks was used (see F. Babinger, in *OM*, xi, 1931). The sheets were of elongated rectangular shape about 50 cm. long and 20 cm. wide; the letters of sultans, solemn acts of alliance were at times several metres long.

Generally the document was folded in pleats breadthwise so that when unfolded itould unfold the introductory text and the forms of courtesy etc. would be the first to be read. Longer documents were rolled up like scrolls. Each document was kept in a satin bag, *kise, tied up and having a slip of paper sticking out that contained the address or *bula.b.

Copies (sürel) were made and sewn together into files (mangulâd). They would contain the bare text only, with no remarks, notes, *tughra, or stamp. The legal formula which was usually placed on the right side close to the first lines of the text stated (usually in Arabic) the conformity of the copy with the original and was called *imdâd or *te'nêîâî *îdâdî (see F. Krae litz-Greifenhorst, *Legalisierungsmethoden in Abschriften osmanischer kaiserlicher Erlasse und Handschriften, in *MOG*, ii, 1926). In order to indicate that this was a copy only and not an original, additional phrases were used as *yasâlîhâ, gendirilidîh, irad ulunâ. Also registers of documents were kept with entries which contained transcripts or summaries, the so-called *defer or *siyâfil.

The development of the style and phraseology of the Turkish diplomatic document continued till about the 17th century, when the forms crystallized and acquired their uniform character. In the 19th century the lettering looked exactly like print.
style and wording of Turkish documents had their effect upon the somewhat different tradition and usage of the Crimean Tatars, as they also left their mark upon Persian diplomatic practice. A certain number of letters sent out by the Chancellor's office of the Persian pādēghās in the 17th and 18th centuries were written in Turkish (see L. Fekete, in Türkçâyet Mecmuası, v, 1936).

The copies of the documents and incoming correspondence were kept in special offices from which Turkish archives later developed (see Băsvekall Aşşvi and F. Bajraktareviç, Glavni arhiv u Sarajevu; i s p i s t i t i u n e ga u Pribosu za orijentalnu filologiju i istoriju Jugosl. naroda, vi-vii, Sarajev 1958).

Numerous Turkish documents are extant in the countries once forming part of the Turkish Empire—

in Egypt (see J. Deny, Sommaire des Archives turques du Caire, Cairo 1930, Tûnisia (see (R. Mantrac, in Les Cahiers de Tunisie, 1957, 34 ff.); Budapest 1926, with an introduction by A. Zajâczkowski and Jan Reychman: Historia diplomatiei turco-osmanskiej. An English version of this book, under the title: A manual of Turkish Diplomats, revised and considerably enlarged, is in the press.

In 1938 a Rumanian scholar M. Guboglu published a new book: Paleografia, și diplomaică turco-osmană, Bucharest 1959, which, beside the facsimiles contains 203 Turkish documents from Rumanian archives.

In the book the author gives new and useful information on the subject of Turkish diplomatica turco-osmanica, diplomatica turco-osmanica, and
diplomats.

DIPLOMATIC — DlR

completely defeated and the Mihtar Aman al-Mulk of Citral acquired great influence in Dir. Muhammad Sharif Khan had to take refuge in Swat [q.v.] with whom he maintained concord, but he was constantly at war. He made several unsuccessful attempts to regain from Amān al-Mulk his territory, which in 1890 was conquered by the adventurer, Umra Khan, chief of Dīandol. Five years later in 1313/1895, Muhammad Shārif Khan succeeded with the moral and material backing of the British forces, in regaining Dir and even capturing Shir Aftāl, proceeder to the throne of Citral.

In 1897 the title of Nawāb was conferred on Muhammad Sharif Khan who had, the same year, annexed a part of the upper Swat territory, the old enemy of his House. This title was, in all probability, conferred on him in recognition of his services to the British in dissuading the Dir tribes from participating in the jihād which Mūllā Sa‘d Allah Khān of Bunēr, nicknamed Sartor (crazy) Fakir, had launched against the alien government. A close ally of the British Government, in receipt of an annual allowance amounting to 26,000 rupees, Muhammad Sharif Khan died in 1904 and was succeeded by his son Awrangzīb Khān (Bādghāsh Khān). He soon fell out with his younger brother, Mīyān Gul Dīn, who in alliance with the disaffected sections of the population of Dir, marched against his elder brother and captured, in Dīnumādī 1323/June 1905, two of the Dīr fortresses. Peace was, however, restored through the efforts of the British Chief Commissioner of the North-West Frontier Province. It proved short-lived and fighting broke out between the two brothers again in 1911-12. This period of internecine war came to a close with the death of Mīyān Gul in Dīandol in 1924.

In 1917, while World War I was still in progress, Bādghāsh Khān helped ‘Abd al-Matīn Khān, a son of Umra Khān, to regain the principality of Dīandol but soon afterwards occupied it himself. This act was characterized as usurpation and betraya of the worst kind. The Sultan of Turkey, in an appeal issued in Muharram 1336/October 1917 to the warlike tribes of Yaghanistan, exhorted the Nawāb of Dir to give up creating discord among the tribesmen but his principality had been almost constantly at war. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Muhammad Shah Djahān Khān, the deposed ruler. In 1930 when the entire north-west frontier of India was ablaze he placed his resources at the disposal of the British Government for quelling the Red Shirt disturbances in Peshawar and the surrounding area. The same year existing boundaries between Dir and Swat were confirmed, and Malakand Agency.

Bibliography: C. U. Aitchison, Treaties, Engagements and Sanads ... Delhi 1933, xi, 417-46; Ghulām Rasūl Mīhr, Sarguṣaṣī Muddā ḫīdīn, Dehli 1924, 34. 35. 385, 368, 459, 530; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, 360-1; W. W. Hunter, The Indian Muslims, Calcutta 1945, 29; Memoranda on the Indian Slates, Delhi 1940, 210-15; also see the article swāt. (A. S. Bazmī Ansāri)

DIR [see somali].

DIRĀR B. AL-KHATTĀR B. MIRDĀS AL-FIHRI, a poet of Mecca. Chief of the clan of Muḥābī b. Fihr in the Fīdjar [q.v.], he fought against the Muslims at Uḥud and at the battle of the Trench, and wrote invectives against the Prophet. He was however converted after the capture of Mecca, but it is not known if he perished in the battle of Yamānā (12/633) or whether he survived and went to settle in Syria.

Bibliography: Sīra, ed. Sākā, etc., Cairo 1375/1955, i, 414-5, 450, ii, 145-6, 254-5; Tabāri, index; Muḥ. b. Ḥabīb, Muḥabbār, 170, 176, 434; Buḥtūrī, Ḥamāsā, index; Ibn Sallām, Tabākit, ed. Shākir, 209-12; Aghdānī, iv, 5 = ed. Beirut, iv, 144-5; Ibn Ḥadjar, Isāba, no. 4173; Ibn ʿAṣākir, vii; Nallino, Litt., 74. (Ed.)

DIRE DAWA, important road, rail, and air communication centre and chief commercial town in British Ethiopia, 33 m. North-West of Harar [q.v.] and thus within the cultural orbit of this major Muslim city in the Ethiopian Empire. The name is most probably derived from the Somali dir-dabo 'limit of the Dir' (the Dir being the confederation of Somali tribes which inhabit the vast arid region between Dire Dawa and Djibouti), but it is possible that the Amharicized form is meant to reflect a popular etymology from the Amharic dire dawa 'hill of uncultivated land'. Dire Dawa owes its comparatively recent origin and importance to the Addis Ababa-Djibouti railway which climbs from the desolate Dankali plain to this first great centre of sedentary population at the edge of the escarpment at an altitude of just below 4000 feet. The total population (estimated between 30,000 and 50,000) includes Ethiopians proper as well as Gallas, Somalis, Labores, Chechis, and Oromo of the Abyssinian and Arabian tribes. The ill-starred Emperor, Lidj lyasu, built a mosque at Dire Dawa during the First World War, while during the Second the town became the headquarters of the British Reserves Administration after the reconquest of Ethiopia in 1941. The Islamic culture of the Muslim population of Dire Dawa and its hinterland varies considerably and includes remnants of pagan practices. The Shāfiʿī is the most generally accepted madhhab in this area.


(DIR LULLENDORF)

DIRGHĀM ('Lion'), Fāṭīmīd amir and waṭrī; his full name Abu l-ʿAbdāl al-Dīrghām b. Amīr b. Sawwār, he received the agnomens of Fāris al-Muslimīn, Shams al-Khiliāfā, and, when he was
vizier of the last Fāṭimid al-Aṭid, the title of al-Malik al-Mansūr, the victorious king, according to a protocol issued by Rūdwan [q.v.]. He was Arab in origin and was perhaps descended from the former kings of Htra, to judge from the dynastic names of al-Lakhmî and al-Mundhîrî that he bore.

The first mention of him is made in 548/1153. He was among the detachment charged with relieving the garrison of ʿAskalān led by the future vizier al-ʿAbbās together with Usāma b. Munkîd b. Qatādah [q.v.]. It was during the advance of this company that the murder of the vizier al-Ṣalâr [q.v.] was planned, and it was carried out by Naṣr, the son of al-ʿAbbâs; the latter, advised of this, returned to Cairo with his company and seized the vizierate (Muharram 548/April 1153). Al-ʿAbbâs was overthrown by Tallārī b. Ruzzîk in 549/1154. The latter, whose trust Dirghām seems to have received (Abu ʿl-Mahasin, v, 338, 10), the most important office after the vizierate. But Dirghām, in spite of his good relations with Ruzzîk whom he had just formed. He rose in the hierarchy and became nāʾīb al-bāb, that is to say lieutenant of the sāhib al-bāb or grand chamberlain. He distinguished himself as commander of the army sent by Tallārī against the Franks, which gained a victory at Tell al-ʿAḍīl in Palestine on the 15 ʿṢafar 553/19 March 1158. The following year, together with Ruzzîk, son of the vizier, he triumphed over the rebel Bahrām in Upper Egypt near Athīb (Derenbourg, Osmara du Yémén, i, 1-3, ii, 127). During the vizierate of Ruzzîk, Tallārī's successor, Dirghām, was sent with an army to stop the expedition of the king Amalric I who, in September 1162, invaded Egypt in order to claim the tribute already promised by Tallārī. Dirghām (Dargent de Guillaume de Tyr, in RHC, Occ. l/2, 890-1), was defeated and fell back on Bilbays and put to flight at the end of April 1164. His three brothers were likewise killed soon after him. But Dirghām, after trying in vain to muster some supporters and accompanied by no more than 500 cavaliers, presented himself at the palace of the Caliph, who refused to admit him and advised him to have a care to his own life. The desertions continued until he retained only thirty cavaliers. He took the title of Fāris al-Muslinna which Dirghām had formerly borne. According to al-Makrizî, during his vizierate Dirghām was dominated by his brothers Humām and Hus ām. Fortune did not smile on Dirghām for very long, and difficulties soon arose. Aware of Shāwar's preparations for revenge, he attempted to start negotiations with Nur al-Dīn by promising him his allegiance and an advantageous alliance against the Franks. Nur al-Dīn gave an evasive reply. And perhaps it was at the instigation of Nur al-Dīn that Dirghām's messenger was seized by the Franks of Karak on his return from Damascus. thwarted in this and disturbed by the attitude of the amirs of the corps of the Barṣiyā, who had given him powerful support in winning the vizierate but some of whom envied him and were negotiating with Shāwar, Dirghām trapped them in an ambush and massacred seventy of them, not counting their followers. Historians do not fail to point out that these executions removed men of ability and weakened Egypt dangerously.

Amarīl however had not given up his scheme to conquer Egypt, and at the end of 1163 or at the beginning of 1164 his advance-guard invaded Egyptian territory. Dirghām, after failing to bring over Nur al-Dīn to his cause, decided to negotiate with Amalric and offered him, on condition that he withdrew from Egypt and treated the demands of hostages, and the payment of an annual tribute to be levied until a date fixed by the king. But Shāwar had finally gained the support of Nur al-Dīn, who in Djihamād I 559/April 1164 sent into Egypt with Shāwar an army commanded by Shirkhū which included Salādīn his nephew. It crossed unhindered the territory controlled by the Franks who withdrew from Egypt. Thus, by the end of 1164, the power of Egypt was reduced to the Amalric's smaller part. Dirghām, that had been deserted by most of his troops; the corps of Rayḥānī who had sustained some losses promised their aid to Shāwar. Dirghām, after trying in vain to muster some supporters and accompanied by no more than 500 cavaliers, presented himself at the palace of the Caliph, who refused to admit him and advised him to have a care to his own life. The desertions continued until he retained only thirty cavaliers. He took to flight followed by the curses of the people while Shāwar's troops entered Cairo. Overtaken between Cairo and Fustāt, Dirghām was dragged from his horse and killed near the mausoleum of al-Sayyida Nasīma in Ramadan 559/July-August 1164, or, according to certain traditions, at the end of Djihamād II/24 May 1164 or in Radjab/May-June 1164. His three brothers were likewise killed soon afterwards. His corpse remained without burial for two or three days and his head was carried on a pikestaff. He was buried near Birkat al-Fil and a cupola was raised over his tomb. His vizierate had lasted only nine months.

ʿUmāra al-Yamanī and al-Makrizī praised Dirghām whom they consider among the greatest amirs and bravest cavaliers. He combined with his physical
qualities (skill at polo, archery, wielding the spear, and feats of prowess at tilting in the ring) a gift for penmanship, for poetry (he composed some fine
manuscripts), and for poetic criticism. Umāra has spoken highly of his generosity, but has also noted that he was quick to turn against his friends, and it must not be forgotten that he betrayed successively Ruzzik and Šhwar.


**DIRHAM**

1. The name of a weight, derived from Greek ὀργή, traditionally the dirham kēyār or ḍahr waʿid, from 50 to 60 average-sized, unshelled ḍahr or ḍabba, and was theoretically divided into 6 ḍanāb, the latter being calculated variously between 8 and 10 ḍahr. So numerous and contradictory are the values of the dirham and its relationship to other Arab metrological units in different parts of the Islamic world and at different times that they cannot be summarized here, and the reader is referred to such works as Sauvaire’s *Islamische Masse u. Gewichte* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Ergänzungsbänd 1, Heft 1, Leiden 1955, 2 ff.), where also 19th and 20th century legal definitions in different countries are to be found. Although most Muslim states have officially adopted the metric system, the dirham and other traditional weights continue irregularly in use in various trades. In present-day Egypt, the dirham is defined as weighing 3.12 grams; two actual goldsmith's brass dirham weights of the year 1953 are found to weigh 3.1322 and 3.1335 grams respectively.

2. The silver unit of the Arab monetary system from the rise of Islam down to the Mongol period. The earliest Arab dirhams (baghl) were imitations of the late Sasanian drachm of Yazdigird III, Hormuz I V and (chiefly) Khusraw II. The Sasanian iconography was retained, but a Kufic religious inscription was added to the margin; on a few issues the name of the Caliph (Muḥāwia and ʿAbd al-Malik) and on most issues the name of the provincial governor and the abbreviated mint name and date according to the Hijra, Yazdigird or post-Yazdigird era (all in Fāheli characters), were engraved. About the year 72/691-2 (American Numismatic Society *Museum Notes* vii, 1957, 191) and for a few years thereafter variations of the conventional type, including the use of more Kūfic legends and innovations in iconography more suitable to Islam, were experimented with. In the year 79/698-9 ʿAbd al-Malik’s monetary reform drastically altered the style of the dirham, which thenceforth, with few exceptions, was, like the dinār, purely epigraphic. The post-reform dirham was at first anonymous, but in the course of the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.H. the names of governors, heirs-apparent, Caliphs, etc. were added. The name of the mint and the date, in words, was always present. In Umayyad times the chief dirham mints were located in former Sasanian administrative centres, but silver was struck also in Damascus, North Africa and Spain. Wāṣīt, founded in 847/703-4, appears to have been the most prolific of Umayyad dirham mints, and it is possible that the administration of the silver coinage was centred in this city and that the dirham dies were engraved there. Little change in the style and general appearance of the dirham occurred, but variations of the type were found in the various dynasties down to the end of the 4th/10th century, except that the legends on the Fātimid dirham were usually arranged in concentric circles. There followed a period of silver famine in the East when the output of silver coinage was relatively insignificant (cf. R. P. Blake in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 1937, 291, where the study of this phenomenon is broached but not investigated) and in the Ghurid dynasties to the end of the 11th century, dirhams and multiples thereof, differing in design from the *classical* type, were again issued in immense quantities. For the late Fātimid dirham waʿāb, the Ayyūbid dirham Nāṣirī and Kāmilī, and Mamluk dirhams, see P. Balog in BIE, xxxiii, 1950-1, and H. H. Schröter, s.v. dirham. In the West, however, dirhams declines in weight and, with the increasing dependence of the Umayyad dynasty of Spain, is restored in somewhat altered form under the Marābitūs, and undergoes a complete change in style and weight with the Muwāḥhidīn, when the square dirham (marābbī), also imitated by the Christians in France (the *milares*), is introduced (corpus and bibliography in H. W. Hazard, *The numismatic history of late medieval North Africa*, N.Y. 1952).

With regard to the weight of the classical Arab dirham, statistics (unpublished) show that the highest frequency group of the Sasanian drachm of Khusraw II falls between 4.11 and 4.15 grams. The Arab-Sasanian dirham was definitely lighter, approximately 3.98 grams. After the reform of 79 A.H., an entirely new standard is adopted with the result that thenceforth until the middle of the 3rd/9th century, when weights begin to be very erratic, the peak weight of the dirham consistently lies between approximately 3.98 grams. After the reform of 79 A.H., the traditional theoretical figure based on the classical Arab formula which pronounced the weight of the dirham to be 7/10 that of the dinār (dinar), loss of weight, is 2.97 grams, which conforms exactly with the classical Arab formula which pronounced the weight of the dinar to be 7/10 that of the dirham. Hence the loss of weight, is 2.97 grams, which conforms exactly with the classical Arab formula which pronounced the weight of the dinar to be 7/10 that of the dirham. Hence the
that there were in Egypt dirhams of 13 kharrubās, weighing still less.

The rate of exchange between dinār and dirham fluctuated widely at different times and in different parts of the phenomenon. For instance, the rate of exchange was 1 dinār for 10 (or 12) dirhams to the dinār in the time of Muḥammad, but subsequently there is plentiful evidence to show that the dirham at times sank as low as 15, 20, 30 and even 50 (see the numerous textual citations by Sauvage, Lane-Poole in NC 1884, Grohmann in Einführung, etc.). P. Grierson (op. cit. under Dīrām) has attempted to explain the economic bases of the mint and market gold-silver ratios, with particular reference to Byzantine-Arab relationships.

Both typologically and economically the dirham exerted a strong influence on Byzantium and the West. The Byzantine miliareon, introduced in the second quarter of the 8th century after a generation during which virtually no silver coinage was issued in Constantinople, was clearly inspired by the dinār, and many Dīrāmias of the 8th and 9th centuries were actually struck on Arab silver plates. The desire to believe also that the style of the Carolingian denier or denar may have been influenced by the dirham. The great importance of Arab silver in commerce between the lands of the Eastern Caliphate on the one hand and Russia, eastern Europe, Scandinavia and the Baltic regions on the other, is abundantly documented by the immense numbers of dirhams and fragments of dirhams found in these areas in hoards dating from four clearly defined periods between 780 and 1100 A.D. (comprehensive summary and full bibliography in U. S. L. Welin in Kulturstorisk Leksikon for nordisk middelalder, i, Copenhagen 1956, s.v. Arabisk mynt). Dirhams also have been found in lesser numbers in England and France (cf. J. Duplessy in Rev. Numismatique 1956, 101).

Beginning in the 5th/11th century, dirhams of base silver (billion) and copper were struck by various dynasties (late Buwayhid, Karakhanid, Khāwarīm, etc.). The large, thick copper dirhams of the Artūkids (in the coin catalogues "Urtukids"), Zangids and Ayyūbids, with figured types resembling those of Hellenistic, Roman provincial, Byzantine and other coinages, and occasionally exhibiting original Islamic iconography, constitute a unique series of coins, of which the reasons for their introduction are unaccountably unexplained and deserving of further study (best illustrations in the British Museum and Istanbul catalogues and in S. Lane Poole, Coins of the Urtuk Turkmuns, London 1875; cf. also J. Karabacek, in Num. Zeitshchr., 1869, 265).

Bibliography: In addition to the bibliography under Dīrām and the works cited in the body of the present article, see R. Vasmer in F. v. Schrotter, Wörterbuch der Münzen (Berlin 1930), s.v. Dirhem (with valuable bibliography); J. Walker, A Catalogue of the Arab-Sassanian Coins (A Cat. of the Muhammadan Coins in the British Museum, i, London 1941); U. S. L. Welin, in Kulturstorisk Leksikon for nordisk middelalder, iii (Copenhagen, 1959), s.v. Dirhem; G. C. Miles, Byzantine miliarens and Arab dirhem: some notes on their relationship in American Numismatist Society Museum Notes ix (1960), 186-187; idem, The Iconography of Umayyad Coinage in Ars Orientalis iii (1959), recent bibliography; idem, "Trésor de dirhems du IXe siècle", in Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran, xxxvii, 1960, 67-145 (detailed study of a large hoard of dirhams found at Susa). (G. C. Miles)
is reported to have been in the region of al-Katīf, but its exact location is not known. Some genealogists state that the Marada, the kinsfolk of Māni, belong to Banū Ḥanīfa, while others advocate a descent from Banū Ḥizam. It appears to be the prevailing view among members of Āl Saʿūd.

After Māni various branches of his descendants took turns in ruling al-Dirʿīyya. Ghasība seems to have been the original centre and strong point; no record has been found of when it was supplanted by al-Turayf, which topographically enjoys an even greater degree of impregnability. In 1133/1721 Saʿūd ibn al-ʿĀimmah al-Hammar became the lord of al-Ḥasā, plundered houses in al-Zuhayra, Malwī, and al-Surayba, all settlements still existing along the left bank.

In 1139/1726-7 Muḥammad b. Saʿūd al-Mukrīn, a direct descendant of Māni, became the independent ruler of al-Dirʿīyya, including Ghasība. At that time the primacy among the towns of central Naǧd was held by al-ʿUyayna, farther up the valley, under the domination of Āl Muṣammār of Tamīm. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad, the most powerful representative of this house, died the same year Muḥammad b. Saʿūd came to power in al-Dirʿīyya. Muḥammad b. Saʿūd won a good reputation as a secular lord. In 1157/1744 Shaykh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb chose al-Dirʿīyya as his new home when requested to leave al-ʿUyayna, his native town, by ʿUṯmān b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Saʿūd. The Shaykh and Muḥammad b. Saʿūd made a compact to work together in establishing the true version of Islam throughout the land of the Arabs.

The spiritual force of Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and the military skill of Muḥammad b. Saʿūd and his son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and grandson Saʿūd brought virtually the whole of the Arabian Peninsula under the authority of al-Dirʿīyya by the early 13th/19th century. Ibn Bishr records his own eye-witness description of the capital in the time of Saʿūd. Much of the land now given over to palms was then occupied by buildings. Particularly vivid are Ibn Bishr's vignettes of the market in the valley bottom, the sunrise religious assembly in the same spot attended by Saʿūd and his resplendent corps of mamlāḳs, Saʿūd's bearing of petitions and dispensing of largesse to his subjects and guests, and the diligent Islamic instruction given by the sons of the Shaykh. Saʿūd was said to own 1,400 Arab horses, of which 600 were taken on campaigns by Bedouins or his mamlāḳs. He had 60 cannon, half of which were of large size. For Naǧd, al-Dirʿīyya had become a very cosmopolitan and expensive centre: visitors from Oman, the Yemen, Syria, and Egypt thronged its bazaar; shops rented for as high as 45 riyals a month, and houses sold for 7,000 riyals. So much building went on that there was a great scarcity of wood.

The first and only European to see al-Dirʿīyya while it flourished was J. L. Reinard, an Arabic-speaking Dutchman (or Englishman?) sent there in 1799 by Samuel Manesty, the East India Company's Resident in al-ʾBaṣra, to negotiate with the Imām ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Reinard, who spent a week in the oasis, remarks on the simplicity of the ruler's establishment and the sullen hospitality of the inhabitants.

When Ibrāhīm Pāḥa of Egypt advanced into Naǧd with the intention of breaking the power of Āl Saʿūd, ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿūd, who had succeeded to the rule in 1229/1814, fortified himself in al-Dirʿīyya instead of using the superior mobility of his forces to harass the enemy's over-extended lines of communication. Ibrāhīm, establishing himself athwart the wadi at al-Ilib, began a siege which lasted about six months. The attack consisted of a ponderous advance step by step down the wadi, accompanied by a piecemeal reduction of the defenders' numerous towers and barricades of the defenders scattered about the heights on either flank. Ibrāhīm moved his headquarters from al-Ilib down the wadi to Kārī Ḵūsāy (now known in memory of his army as Ḵūrāy al-Rūm), a tributary descending from the north. Sweeping around the oasis, the invader's horse fell on the town of ʿIrīḵa farther down the wadi. Progress was hampered by the presence of the Musḥārya depot, but ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿūd failed to exploit this opportunity. Once a new supply of ammunition had been built up, Ibrāhīm resumed pressure on the main front and fought his way into the palm grove of Musḥārya south of the tributary al-Bulayda, thus gaining access to the promontory of al-ʿUyayna, from the heights to the west. A resolute offensive smashed at all points brought about the surrender of the capital in Dhū al-ʿĪdā 323/September 1818. After staying in al-Dirʿīyya a short time, Ibrāhīm returned to Egypt. On his orders the place was systemically torn down in 1234/1819. According to Captain Sadleir, a British officer who saw it almost immediately afterwards, "the walls of the fortification have been completely razed by the Pacha, and the date plantations and gardens destroyed. I did not see one man during my search through these ruins. The gardens of Dīrah produced apricots, figs, grapes, pomegranates; and the dates were of a very fine description; citrons were also mentioned, and many other fruit trees, but I could only discern the mutilated remains of those I have mentioned. Some few tamarisk trees are still to be seen."

An attempt was soon made to restore al-Dirʿīyya as the capital. As many members of Āl Saʿūd had been killed during the siege or carried off to Cairo, Muḥammad b. Muḥāri b. Muṣammār of the old princely house of Muṣammār of al-ʿUyayna, a nephew on the distaff side of the great Saʿūd, established himself in al-Dirʿīyya before the end of 1234/Oct. 1819 with the aim of rebuilding the oasis and making himself the head of the reform movement in Naǧd. A few months later, in 1235/1820, Muṣammār ap-peared in al-Dirʿīyya, and Ibn Muṣammār swore allegiance to him as scion of Āl Saʿūd. Having once tasted power, Ibn Muṣammār dreamed of regaining it and rebelling against Muḥārī b. Saʿūd. Another member of Āl Saʿūd, Turki b. ʿAbd Allāh, a cousin of the great Saʿūd, now returned to the scene after having escaped Ibrāhīm Pāḥa's dragnet. Turki sided with his relative Musḥārī b. Saʿūd, but the Egyptian forces got hold of Musḥārī and he died in captivity in 1236/1821. In revenge Turki put Ibn Muṣammār to death. After taking al-Dirʿīyya, Turki also occupied al-Riyād, but the Egyptian troops quickly drove him out. In 1236/1821 Ḥusayn Bey, the new Egyptian commander, ordered all the people who had settled in al-Dirʿīyya with Ibn Muṣammār to go to Tharmada, the new Egyptian headquarters. After their departure al-Dirʿīyya was destroyed for the second time, trees being cut down and the orchard set to whatever was inflammable. In Tharmada about 250 men from al-Dirʿīyya were paraded on orders from Ḥusayn Bey and slaughtered in cold blood. The obliteration of al-Dirʿīyya was complete. When Turki in 1240/1824 gained strength enough to challenge the Egyptian forces, he attacked them in al-Riyād, which he chose
as the new capital for his realm in preference to the twice desolated home of his forefathers.

In 1281/1865 Colonel Pelly, the British Resident in the Persian Gulf, passed through al-Dir'iyya on the way to al-Riyadh; the place seemed to him "utterly deserted". The modern oasis, now encroaching on the territory of its forerunner even in the hallowed precincts of al-Ṭurayf, was described by Philby after his visit in 1356/1917.


**DIRLIK,** a Turkish word meaning living or livelihood. In the Ottoman Empire it was used to denote an income provided by the state, directly or indirectly, for the support of persons in its service. The term is used principally of the military fiefs (see TIMAR), but also applies to pay (see ULUFA), service. The term is used principally of the military fiefs, but also applies to pay (see ULUFA), service. The term is used principally of the military fiefs, but also applies to pay (see ULUFA), service. The term is used principally of the military fiefs (see TIMAR). From 916/1509 the Mughals, returned to Diu. He invited Nuno da Cunha to come north, and having failed to tempt him ashore, visited his galilee. On his way back to the shore he was killed in a scuffle with the Portuguese, 3 Ramadan 943/13 February 1537.

The Portuguese thereupon seized the palace, treasury and arsenals in Diu, and in 943/1537 proclaimed Muhammad Zaman Mīrāz sultan, in return for his confirmation of their position in Diu. He was defeated outside Diu, however, and in 945/1538 Khāḍja Ṣafar laid siege to the island. The siege was intensified after the arrival of Khādīm Sulaymān Paḡa [q.v.], governor of Egypt, with a powerful fleet, but after three months, distrust between Ottomans and Gudjarātis and reports of Nuno da Cunha's approach led to the break-up of the siege and a final concession of peace, 6 Shāhwal 945/25 February 1539.

On 20 Rabī' II 953/20 April 1546 Khāḍja Ṣafar opened a second siege of Diu which lasted seven months and cost the lives of the Khāḍja and his son before the viceroy João de Castro routed the Muslim forces and lifted the siege on 19 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 953/11 November 1546.

For many years the Portuguese from Diu fort controlled all seaborne traffic from Gudjarāt through a system of cartasises or passes. Though in 1079/1668 and 1086/1676 Diu was overrun and sacked by Arabs the Portuguese were able to use Mughal decline to extend their control over the whole island and its mainland suburb. They retained them until December 1661.


**DIVAN** [see DIWAN].

**DIVINATION** [see KIHANA, also DJAFR, FA'L, IKHTILADJ, RAML, TA, TA'HIR].

**DIVORCE** [see TALĀS].

**DIW** (originally *dew*, Avestan *daeva*, Sanskrit *deva*), in Zoroastrianism, the name of the spirits of evil and darkness, creators of Ahriman, the personification of sins; their number is legion; among them are to be distinguished a group of seven principal demons, including Ahriman, opposed to the seven Amhas-pand (Av. *amšašpanda*), the "Immortal Holy Ones"). "The collective name of the daeva designates . . . exclusively the inimical gods in the first place, then generally other supernatural beings, who, being by nature evil, are opposed to the good and true faith . . . . These daeva, these dev have become increasingly assimilated to the ogres and other demoniac beings whose origins are to be found in ancestral beliefs" (A. Christensen). In the Iranian epic Kayūmarth, the first of the civilizing kings of Iran, and then his son and his grandson, fought the Black Diw and his hordes; Tahmurāth, his great-grandson, deprived them of power, and they taught writing (Firdawsi, *Shāh-nāma*, 4. tr. J. Moli, i, 39-32); Djamšīd, son of Tahmurāth (ibid., 35), controlled the diw (as Solomon did the djinn in the Muslim legend [see SULAYMĀN B. DĀWŪD]); these, on his orders, constructed palaces and other buildings, then took him to heaven on a day later called nawrūz; under the following dynasty, that of the
Kayanids in the course of the war against the king of Mazandaran—a country frequented by the diws (ibid., 421 ff.)—the hero Rustam, champion of the king Kayanid, killed the Arzang whose several times opposed monstrous form (Livre diws (ibid., 421 ff.), the hero Rustam, champion of the king Kayanid, killed the Arzang whose several times opposed monstrous form (Livre diws (ibid., 421 ff.).

It is impossible to mention here all the diws who appear in Persian literary or popular sources: most frequently the term diw is juxtaposed to the Arabic epithets 'iršār, shayṭān, ūlagh; for example, the diws with Cows' Feet (diw-ī-gāy-pāy: Saʿd al-Dīn Warawīni, Marsūbān-namā, ed. Muḥammad Kazwini, 79 ff.; M. Nizāmūd-dīn, Introduction to the Jawdshīyār, 16). The diw remains, e.g., in H. Māsī, Comtes en persan populaire, nos. 27 and 29; or it may be associated with both di˚s and part (e.g., Rāʿa Ḥakīm and A. A. Kohzd, Légendes et coutumes afghanes, 17 and note). According to the Shīʿas, men, diws, and di˚s will receive reward or punishment at the day of resurrection (Tābrīz al-sawmm, ed. Iqbal, 210). Ḥamd Allāh Mūstawfī Kazwīnī mentions a Diw River (district of Djiruft, Kirman), so called because of its rapid current (Nishāt al-kabūl, tr. Le Strange, 217, 139).


**DIWĀN,** a collection of poetry or prose [see *Arabiyā, Persian literature; Turkish literature; Urdu literature* and *shīʿa*], a register, or an office. Sources differ about linguistic roots. Some ascribe to it a Persian origin from dev, 'mad' or 'divel', to describe secre¬
taries. Others consider it Arabic from *daewāna,* to collect or to register, thus meaning a collection of records or sheets. (See Kalkashandi, *Sābūk, i, 90; L. d., xvii, 23–4; Sāhī, *Adab al-Kabūl,* 187; Māwardī, *al-Kāmil al-sulhīniyya,* 175; *Diāshiyār, Wusara* (16–17), cf. *Badālūr, Futūh,* *449*). However, in administration, the term first meant register for troops (cf. Sāhī, *op. cit.,* 190; Kindī, *Wulāīt,* 86; *Badālūr, Futūh,* 454) when it was first used for office. It seems that the idea is foreign, but the term itself was in use earlier.

---

**The Caliphate**

Umar instituted the first diwān (usually called *al-Dīwān*) in Islam (*Diāshiyār, op. cit.,* 16). The sources ascribe this action to the need to organize the pay, register the fighting forces, and set the treasury in order. (Cf. *Diāshiyār,* 16–17; *Badālūr, Futūh,* 449–51; Makrizī, *Khitāt,* i, 148; *Yākūbī, *Taʾrîkh,* ii, 130; Abū Yūsuf, *Kharaḍā, 25,* Sūlī, *Adab,* 190–1; Abū Sālim, *al-Tādhb,* 154–5). Though some reports put this in 15 A.H., more reliable authorities prefer 20 A.H. (See Tābarī, iv, 162; *Yākūbī, i, 170; Makrizī, *Khitāt,* i, 148–9; *Badālūr, Futūh,* 450; Abū Yūsuf, 24).

This first diwān was the *diwān al-dīgn.* The register covered the people of Medina, the forces that participated in the conquests and those who emigrated to join garrisons in the provinces, together with their families. Some *mawdīli* were included in the register, but this practice was not continued. With the names, pay and rations were indicated (Abū ʿ Ubayd, *al-ʿAmādi,* nos. 562, 569, 568; Tābarī, iv, 163). A description of these genealogists carried out the registration, by tribes, and pay depended on past services to Islam and relationship to the prophet. Registration by tribes continued till the end of the Umayyad period. (Abū Yūsuf, 24, 26–7; Tābarī, iv, 162–3; *Yākūbī, Taʾrīkh,* ii, 132; Abū ʿ Ubayd, *Al-ʿAmādi* nos. 560, 520, 577; *Badālūr, Futūh* 450 ff.; 457–9. Makrizī, *Khitāt,* i, 149–50). Similar diwāns (of *dīgn*) were set up in provincial capitals like Baurā, Kūfa and Futūṣ (cf. *Diāshiyār,* 21, 23; *Thaʿlabī, Latīf,* 59). Besides, Byzantine and Sādānī diwāns of Kharaḍā continued to function in the provinces as before (*Diāshiyār,* 38; cf. 3).

The Umayyad Period. — The *diwān al-kharaḍā* of Damascus became the central *dīgn* and was now called 'al-dīgn' to indicate its importance. It looked after the assessment and levying of land taxes. Under Muʿāwiyah it was the central *dīgn* (usually called *dīgn al-khātām* or 'office of the seal', where a copy of each letter or document was kept and where the original was checked, sealed and dispatched. It was set up as a check to prevent forgery (*Diāshiyār,* 25; *Thaʿlabī, Latīf,* 16; Nabiya Abbōt, *Kurrah qābīry,* 14; See also Grohmann, *CPR,* iii, Bd. I/1, 17 ff.). The Caliph would read all correspondence and make his comments, and then the secretary (*kātib*) would draw up the letters or documents required (*Diāshiyār,* 24, 34; Kalkashandi, i, 92). Muʿāwiyah established the *diwan al-khaitam* or 'office of the seal', where a copy of each letter or document was made and kept while the original was checked, sealed and dispatched. It was set up as a check to prevent forgery (*Diāshiyār,* 25; *Thaʿlabī, Latīf,* 16; Nabiya Abbōt, *Kurrah qābīry,* 14; See also Grohmann, *CPR,* iii, Bd. I/1, 17 ff.). The Caliph would read all correspondence and make his comments, and then the secretary (*kātib*) would draw up the letters or documents required (*Diāshiyār,* 24, 34; Kalkashandi, i, 92). Muʿāwiyah established the *diwan al-khaitam* or 'office of the seal', where a copy of each letter or document was made and kept while the original was checked, sealed and dispatched. It was set up as a check to prevent forgery (*Diāshiyār,* 25; *Thaʿlabī, Latīf,* 16; Nabiya Abbōt, *Kurrah qābīry,* 14; See also Grohmann, *CPR,* iii, Bd. I/1, 17 ff.). The Caliph would read all correspondence and make his comments, and then the secretary (*kātib*) would draw up the letters or documents required (*Diāshiyār,* 24, 34; Kalkashandi, i, 92).

Muʿāwiyah also established the *diwan al-kharid* (post office), which was later reorganized by *Abd al-Malik* (d. 86705) (see further BARID). The *diwan al-dīgn* carried out, at intervals, censuses of the Arabs by tribes to keep its registers up to date. The *diwan of Egypt* made three censuses during the 1st/7th century, the third by ʿAbd al-Sharīf in 95 A.H. (Kindī, *Wulāīt,* 86; Makrizī, *Khitāt,* i, 151).

The *diwan al-naṣīḥāt* (expenditure), which is very probably a continuation of a Byzantine office, kept account of all expenditure (cf. *Diāshiyār,* 3).
It seems to be closely linked to the treasury (Bayt al-Mal [q.v.], Djahshiyari, 49). The diwan al-sadaqa was founded to assess the zakat and 'ughr [q.v.]. A diwan al-mustaghfalt was established, apparently to administer government lands in cities, and buildings, especially sīsī' rented to the people. The diwan al-irdās was responsible for making banners, flags, official costumes and some furniture. The name of its secretary was inscribed on the cloth (cf. Dhahshiyari, 60; Sābib, Rashīdī, i, 141).

Each province had a diwan of khardājī to which all revenue came (li-judūdī 'l-amwāl), a diwan of diwān and a diwan of rasā'īl (Dhahshiyari, 21, 23, 24, 27, 36, 44-5, 60, 61, 63-4). The chief secretary of a diwan received three hundred dirhams a month under Ḥaddādī (Dhahshiyari, 61).

'Abd al-Malik initiated the policy of Arabization in the diwāns, ḥiraṣ and currency. Hitherto, the diwāns of khardājī used local languages: Persian in Irak and Persia, Greek in Syria, and Coptic and Greek in Egypt, and followed previous practices of book-keeping and recording. Even local seals and dates were frequently used. Arabic forms and formulas were introduced and previous calendars adjusted to the Muslim lunar year. (See PERF Nos 556, 559, 566, 586, 587, 572, 589, 601; CPR III Bd. I, Teil I 97, Teil II c-ii). Arabic was occasionally used (the first available papyrus dates from 22 A.H. PERFS no. 558) before the diwan became the official language. However, local languages were occasionally used far into the 2nd/8th century (cf. Grohmenn, Étude de papyrologie, i, 77-9; P. Lond IV, 417; Nabiā Abbott, op. cit., 13-14). The arabization of the diwāns was effected in the Empire by stages. In 78/697 Ḥādīḏḏārī arabized the diwāns of ʿIrāk (Dhahshiyari, 39; Baladhuri, Futḥ, 300-1; Sāhib, Abad, 192); then in 81/799 ʿAbd al-Malik arabized the diwāns of Syria (Baladhuri, Futḥ, 193; Dhahshiyari, 40; Sāhib, Abad, 192-3). The diwāns of Egypt followed in 82/798 (Kindli, Wudūʿ, 80; Ibn ʿAbd al-Hakam, Futḥ, 122; Makhrīṭī, Ṣūrī, i, 150). Finally, the diwāns of Khurāṣān were arabized under Ḥīqām in 124/742 (Dhahshiyari, 63-4). Phīlmīs, who were the bulk of secretaries in these diwāns were no longer used, but some continued to be employed. The mawdūlī were always employed (cf. Dhahshiyari, 61, 67, 38-40, 51; Tritton, The Caliphīs and their non-Muslim subjects, Ch. ii; Kindli, Wudūʿ, 80; Baladhuri, Futḥ, 193; von Kremer, The Orient, 196-7).

The ʿAbbasīd period. — The ʿAbbasīds extended and elaborated the Umayyad system of diwāns, and provided a central bureaucratic direction through the office of ṭawāṣir (q.v.).

Under ʿAbd al-Maʿmūn a diwan for confiscated Marwānī lands was established (Dhahshiyari, 90). It probably developed into the diwan al-diyāʿī, which looked after confiscated palaces and lands to the west of the Caliph (Ibn Tayfur; Taʿrīf Baghdādī, vi).

During the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik, in 162/779, we hear of diwāns of zīrāmīn (control), one for each of the existing diwāns. In 169/784 a central diwan, zīrāmīn al-akṣīmān, was established to control all zīrāmīn. These diwāns checked the accounts of the diwāns, supervised their work and acted as intermediaries between single diwāns and the ṭawāṣir or other diwāns (Dhahshiyari, 146, 166, 168; Tabārī, x, 11; Baladhuri, Futḥ, 464). The diwan al-maṣrūqīn was created to look into complaints of the people against government agents. Judges sat in this diwan (Fakhrī, 131).

The diwan al-khardājī seems to have been established by the Caliph (Dhahshiyari, 195; Ibn ʿArabī, MaṣĪṭī al-wulām, 42, 50). Letters of the diwan al-khardājī were checked in the diwan al-badīʿ, and delays here led Rashīd to recommend his wazīr to send the letters directly (Dhahshiyari, 178).

Under Mutawakkil we hear of a diwan al-mawāḥil wa l-ṭawāṣir, which may be another version of the diwan al-khardājī. It was concerned with slaves and clients of the Palace whose number was very large (Yaʿkūbī, Buldūm, 252). The diwan al-khardājī, also called diwan al-sīrī (confidential affairs) (Dhahshiyari, 177), was of special importance because of the close relation its head kept with the Caliph (cf. Tabārī, x, 51-2).

In the provinces there were local diwāns of khardājī, diwāns and rasāʿīl which were smaller copies of the central diwāns (cf. Dhahshiyari, 141, 142, 177, 220-1).

A distinguished khitīb was sometimes appointed over more than one diwan (ibid., 266; cf. 179). Until the time of Maṣūm the salaries of khitīb ranged between 300 dirhams and ten dirhams a month (Dhahshiyari, 23, 126, 131-2. Dhābīţī states that the highest in pay after Maṣūm was that of khitīb al-khardājī (cf. Three essays, ed. Finkel, 49). (See further khitīb).

Diwāns reached full development during the 3rd/9th-10th centuries. The diwan al-khardājī usually kept copies of records of local diwāns. But by the middle of the 3rd/9th century each province had a special diwan of khardājī in the capital. Muṭtaḍī combined these diwāns in the capital and organized them into one diwan called diwan al-dār (or diwan al-dār al-kharīb). Under his successor Muqtaḍī, it was reorganized in three diwāns: diwan al-maqṣūrī for Eastern provinces, diwan al-maqṣūrī for Western provinces and diwan al-sāṣīd for ʿIrāk. ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā considered the diwan al-sāṣīd the most important diwan (Miskaway, Ṭadājīrbī al-wulām, i, 150). However, under Muṣṭaḍīr a central office (diwan al-dār still remained. The three diwāns remained under the ṭawāṣir, or one secretary next to him, but they were still considered sections of the diwan al-dār (Ṣāhib, Wusārā, 123-4, 131-2, 262; Yaḥṣūʿ, Iṣrāḥīd, i, 177; Ṣāhib, 42; Miskawayh, i, 152-3; Bowen, ʿAṣr b. Ṣāḥib, 31-2). It seems that the dār or palace refers to the dār al-usṣārah or ministerial residence (cf. Sāhib, Wusārā, 131). The secretary of the diwan al-dār was authorized to communicate directly with the ʿummul (Ṣāhib, Wusārā, 177). After the Buyyāhid occupation (334/945) we hear only of diwan al-sāṣīd because of the dismemberment of the caliphate (cf. Sāhib, Taʿrīfā, 467-8).
The diwāns of Khārdādī kept a record of the areas of lands, the rates of taxation in money or in kind, and the measures used. (Māwardi, op. cit., 182-3; Khašārizmī, Mādīth, 37). They received the revenue of Khārdādī, dījāt and zakāt (al-Hasan b. ʿAbd Allāh, ʿAḥār al-ṣulāl (Bulāk 1295/72). Māwārdī’s reference to diwān al-ʿawārī could only mean a section of this diwān. Māwārdī, 182).

When the diwān al-dār was formed, the relevant diwān was combined in one (Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 97; 84; idem, Taʾrīḫ, 468). The zīdmūn was “guardian of the rights of Bayt al-Māl and the people” (Māwārdī, 189). It kept another copy of the documents concerning lands in the diwān al-ḥarādī and checked assessments, orders for payments and receipts (Māwārdī, 190-1). An ikṭāʾ was granted by Muʿtaḍīd, and passed by the Wazīr and the secretary of the diwān al-dār, was not passed by the secretary of diwān al-zāmīm until he checked the ikṭāʾ in his records (Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 683).

The diwān al-naṣṭāḥī dealt with all diwāns. It examined accounts of their expenses and drew its reports (al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh, op. cit., 71). By the end of the 3rd/9th century it dealt mainly with the needs of Dar al-Khišāla (Mes (Arabic), 152; cf. Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 11 ff.). It kept records of recurring and current debts (Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 16), and had sub-sections dealing with various heads of expenditure (cf. Mes (Arabic) 1, 125-6). There was a zīmām of naṣṭāḥī, and in 355/967 its secretary held the zīmām of treasury stores (khāṣāzīn) as well (Ṣāḥīb, ʿAbd Allāh al-Rādī wa l-ʿUmmāṭī, 61; Mīskawayh, i, 152).

The diwān of Bayt al-Māl, also called al-diwān al-sāmī, kept classified records of the sources of money and goods, coming to the Treasury, and maintained stores (khāṣāzīn) for the different categories of revenue, and a small diwān for each, such as diwān al-khišāna (for cloth and money), diwān al-ahlād (for cereals), and diwān khāṣānát al-sīlah (for arms) (al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh, op. cit., 72; cf. Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 16). This diwān checked all items of income, and all expenditure had to be passed by it. The secretary took charge on day three of orders and payment was required by the wazīr (Mes (Arabic), 1, 126-7). Usually, the diwān drew up monthly and yearly balance sheets. (In 315/927 ʿAll b. Ḥāfīz requested weekly sheets. Mīskawayh, i, 651-2; Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 303, 306).

The diwān al-dhīnakhaḍa branched off from the Bayt al-Māl. (q.v.). See further Dāftar, Dāḥabaḍa). The diwān al-diyyāʾ administered domains of the treasury (Hamadān, Taḫmīla, 18; Mīskawayh, i, 21; cf. Ṣāḥīb, Rādī, i, 139). Yet we hear at times of more than one diwān for diyyāʾ. In 325 A.H. there was a diwān al-dīnyaʾ al-khišāna wa l-mustāḥdaṭa (i.e., Caliphal and newly acquired domains) and diwān al-dīnyaʾ al-Furdisyā (i.e., Domains on the Euphrates) (Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 123-4; Mīskawayh, i, 152).

In 304/916 Ibn al-Furat established a diwān al-mārdīf (lit. aids; brījes, etc., which were paid by governors, obviously from riches accumulated by dubious means). The mārdīf accounted then to 100,000 dinars per year from Syria and 200,000 dinars from Egypt. ʿAll b. Ḥāfīz forbade the mārdīf because they corrupted administration (Mīskawayh, i, 44, 108, 241-2; Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 31-2, 81).

While every diwān dealing with finance had a zīmām, all diwān al-zāmīm were occasionally put in one hand. In 295/907 the wazīr c. the one-day Caliph Ibn al-Muṭṭaḍ put all the wazīrs (diwāns proper) under ʿAll b. Ḥāfīz and the diwāns of zīmām under Ibn ʿAbdūn (Mīskawayh, i, 60). In 319/931 the zīmāms were put under one secretary and the wazīrs under another, mentioned. The diwān of al-ṣalāḥī was repeated in 325/936-7 and in 327/938-9 (Ṣāḥīb, ʿAbd Allāh al-Rādī wa l-Muṭṭaḍī, 87, 147).

The diwān al-diyyāʾ kept a register of the forces classified according to their ranks, and their pay or ṭhāʾāʾ. It consisted of two sections, one dealing with pay (ṭhāʾāʾ [q.v.]) and expenses, and the other with recruiting and classification (lāṣīfāʾ) (ʿAllāb, Three Essays, 48). The wazīr called the major diwān al-māḥarīb, and majdīṣī al-Muḍāḥāba, Mes (Arabic), 1, 165. See also Māwārdī, 179-80). This diwān had a zīmām, called diwān zīmām al-diyyāʾ, and, as already mentioned, it supervised its accounts and expenditure (Mīskawayh, i, 152).

The diwān al-ṣaḍāṭīl was directly under the wazīr or under a secretary. Letters and documents were drafted by the first secretary on the instructions of the wazīr (or Caliph) and when approved by him the final copy was made. Sometimes, a special calligrapher (muḥarrīr) made the last copy. At intervals of three years, letters and documents were sent to the great store (al-khišāna al-usmāʾ) to be finally classified and indexed (Kalkashandī, i, 96; Ibn al-Ṣaʿraffī, Ḫāsim diwān al-ṣaḍāṭīl, 94, 100-3, 108 ff., 116, 118, 144-5; ʿAllāb, Three Essays, 49; Ṣībī, ʿAbd Allāh Wuzarrā, 21, 123; ʿAbd Allāh al-Rādī wa l-Muṭṭaḍī, 109 where diwān al-khāḥāṣī is used). The diwān al-ṣaḍāṭīl, probably a section of the diwān al-ṣaḍāṭīl in origin, opened letters and documents, and had sub-sections, put indications of their contents on the back, presented them to the wazīr and kept a record of them. (Mes (Arabic), 1, 130-1; Ibn al-Ṣaʿraffī, op. cit., 108; Tawḥīdī, al-ʿImārī wa l-ʿuṣūrī, i, 98). In 295/907 one secretary looked after the diwān of ḥārāt and ʿṣādāṭīl (Mīskawayh, i, 152; Ṣāḥīb, Rādī, 111).

Mention is made of a diwān al-karam which looked after the affairs of the female section of the palace (Mīskawayh, i, 152).

There was a diwān to administer confiscated property, called diwān al-muṣīdārīn (Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 306, 311). Two copies of confiscations were made, one for the diwān, and the other for the wazīr (Mīskawayh, i, 155). A diwān was created to administer confiscated estates, diwān al-dīnyaʾ al-muḥābba (Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 21, 30; cf. Mīskawayh, i, 84; cf. Hamadānī, Taḫmīla, 83 where a diwān al-muḥābba is mentioned, as administering the property of Muʿīnis.

It is clear that sections of a diwān were sometimes called diwāns, while some diwāns were short-lived and were set up for temporary needs. Besides, more than one diwān were sometimes put under one secretary (cf. Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 27, 123-4).

In the reign of Muʿtaḍīd, the two days rest was resumed, Tuesday for relaxation and Friday for prayers (Ṣāḥīb, Wuzarrā, 233).

Salaries of the heads of diwāns varied. At the beginning of the 4th/10th century, the secretary of the diwān al-sawādī received 500 dinars per month and the secretary of the diwān al-ṣaṭā ṭīl 10 dinars. In 314, ʿAll b. Ḥāfīz reduced salaries by one third, so the secretary of the diwān al-sawādī got 333½ dinars,
The secretaries of the diwan al-fadd and diwan al-khatam 200 dinars each. The secretaries of the diwan al-dār 500 dinars, and the secretary of the diwan of simām, together with his kuttub, 2700 dinars (Ṣāḥib, Wuzūrā, 31; 84, 177, 178, 314; cf. ibid. 20-1; Miskawayh, i, 68). Measures of economy led ʿAli b. ʿIsā to reduce the year to 8-10 months of pay, and this became a common practice (Ṣāḥib, Wuzūrā, 314; Miskawayh, i, 152.

In the Buwayhid period (334-447/945-1053), we still find the official of the saʿādah with a secretary and an assistant secretary (khalīfah), and of a diwan al-dīyaʾ (or al-dīyaʾ al-khāṣṣa) (Ṣāḥib, Taʾrīkh, year 390 A.H., 401-2, year 392 A.H., 467-8; Miskawayh, ii, 120-1; Ābū Shudāʾ, Ḍhāti Taʾdārīg al-umām, 147). The central diwan for finance was now called al-Dīwān; it was under the wasīr or a secretary next to him in importance (cf. Miskawayh, ii, year 338 A.H., 242, 263, 266; Ābū Shudāʾ, 143). In 389/999, this diwan went under a masūḥ, and its secretary was the head of this diwan was the khaṣṣīn or nāṣir, and at times, the mint (dār al-dār) was put in his charge (Abū Shudāʾ, 250-1). Al-Tawhīdī, however, mentions a special diwan for the mint called diwan al-nāḍr wa l-iṣyār wa dār al-dār (lmīa, i, 98).

The diwan al-ġund was divided into two dinwāns, one for the Daylamites and the other for the Turks (the two main elements of the army) and called diwan al-dījāyshayn (Ṣāḥib, Taʾrīkh, 467-8). There was however one head or paymaster, called al-ʿarīf (Abū Shudāʾ, 258).

The Fāṭimid s.— Fāṭimids diwāns are basically related to the ʿAbbāsiids. The diwan al-rasādī is here diwan al-iṣḥāq; its head is šāhī diwan al-iṣḥāq or kāhī dast-al-iṣḥāq. The detailed account inshād* of this diwan given by Ibn al-Ṣayrāfī shows that it was also called the ʿAbbāsi diwan with a secretary (See Ibn al-Ṣayrāfī, Kāmīn diwan al-rasālid, ed. A. Bahjat, Cairo 1905; Makrīzī, Kitāb, ii, 244, 306; iii, 140; Kālkhāshdī, iii, 490; i, 103; x, 310; Ibn al-Kalānīsī, Ḍhāyi taʾrīk Dimāshq, 80; Ṣhayyāl, al-Waḥābi al-Fāṭimiyya, 365).

The diwan al-ġund was called diwan al-dījāysh, or diwan al-dījāysh wa l-raʾūdīb (office of troops and salaries). It consisted of two sections: the diwan al-dījāysh, under a wasīr, dealing with the recruitment, equipment and inspection of the troops, and the diwan al-raʾūdīb dealing with pay. However, other references show that the two diwāns were often separate, the first under šāhī diwan al-dījāysh and the latter concerned with salaries of the military and civilians (See Makrīzī, Kī Bahjat, 242; Kālkhāshdī, iii, 492-3, 495; cf. Ibn al-Ṣayrāfī, Ihkāāh, 25, 47; Makrīzī, Ihkāāh, year 542; Ṣhayyāl, Waḥābi, 304). Such soldiers who attached great importance to the fleet, had a diwan al-ṣamāʿīr to look after the construction of ships and their forces (Kālkhāshdī, i, 496).

Accounts of the diwāns of finance are involved. The diwan al-maǧālīs seems to have been the central bureau. It had different sections, one of which dealt with fiefs (ibīd-al). It was probably similar to the ʿAbbāsid ʿal-Dīwān. It made the estimate of the budget (istīmām) when required, after getting estimates from all diwāns (Makrīzī, Kī Bahjat, ii, 236 ff.; i, 150-2; cf. ii, 245; Ṣhayyāl, Waḥābi, 325). The diwan al-nasār had general control over the diwāns of finance (amṣāl) and over their officials. It seems to correspond to the central diwan of kharāḍī, of the ʿAbbāsids (cf. Ṣhayyāl, Waḥābi, 304, i, Ibn al-Ṣayrāfī, Iḥkāāh; ii, 247; Kālkhāshdī, iii, 493). The diwan al-taḥsīb was linked to diwan al-nasār, but its function was to check the accounts of other diwāns of finance. It is parallel to the ʿAbbāsid central simām (Makrīzī, ii, 242; Kālkhāshdī, iii, 493, i, 407; Ibn Muyassar, Ḍhāhi, 43).

The diwan al-khāṣṣ looked after the financial affairs of the palace (Makrīzī, Ḍhī tāʾsī, 200). The office of waṣīr was the diwan al-ḥābīs (Kālkhāshdī, iii, 494-5). The diwan al-maṣrūṭī al-bāḥriyya was instituted to administer escheated and heirless property (Ibn Muyassar, 56; Kālkhāshdī, iii, 496). The Makrīzī says the “central office of the palace” was headed or wasīr. There was a diwan al-taḥsīb, with two secretaries, to deal with them (Makrīzī, Ḍhī tāʾsī, 307; Kālkhāshdī, 491).

Salaries of secretaries varied. The secretary for inshād* got 150 dinars monthly, that of nasār 70, of ʿabād al-mīl 100, of taḥsīb 50, and of the secretaries of dijāysh, tawālī ṣalāḥīs and ʿabād 40 dinars each. Lesser secretaries got 5-10 dinars (Kālkhāshdī, iii, 526; Makrīzī, Kī Bahjat, ii, 243). Non-Muslims were widely employed in the diwāns, and this led to occasional reactions against them (cf. Ibn al-Kalānīsī, 59; Ibn al-Ibhr, Taʾrīkh, 370; Ibn al-Ṣayrāfī, al-Iḍhārā, 34, 35, 48, 53. Cf. Tritton, op. cit., ch. ii).

The 11th-13th centuries.— Since the Buwayhid period, the diwan al-rasālī had been called diwan al-iṣḥāq, and its secretary kāhī al-iṣḥāq (Abū Shudāʾ, 153-4; Ibn al-Djawiš, Munṣāsam, ix, 55; x, 125; Ibn al-Ṣuqūf, Waḥābi, 16; Ibn al-Sāʾī, Diʿāmī, ii, 222). The central bureau was al-Dīwān (cf. Ibn al-Djawiš, ix, 91, 27, 28, 29, 83). It was headed by the wasīr, and at times by a secretary called šāhī al-dīwān (Ibn al-Djawiš, ix, 56, 165, 125). Later it was called al-dīwān al-ʿadīs (cf. al-Fuwātī, 47, 63, 88; Ibn al-Sāʾī, Diʿāmī, iii, 285).

Finances were primarily the concern of diwan al-simām, which in effect carried the work of diwan al-kharāḍī; fief farmers and governors sent revenue to it (Ibn al-Sāʾī, ix, 16). It had two sections: the main diwan headed by a kāhī (kāhī al-simām) (cf. Ibn al-Djawiš, ix, 150, 223, x, 27, 124) later called ʿadīr, and the other section headed by a muḥriṣ who supervised the work of the diwan and the revenue (Ibn al-Sāʾī, ix, 96-9, 128; Ibn al-Ṣuqūf, 16, 62, 63). Each province (or district) had such a diwan headed by a nāṣir or a muḥriṣ (Ibn al-Djawiš, 63, 104).

Al-maḥkām al-maʿmūr replaced, in time, al-maḥkām (treasury) used for Bayṭ al-Māl, and its head šāhī al-maḥkām was replaced by nāṣir or ʿadīr. This diwan supervised the mint also (cf. Ibn al-Djawiš, x, 24-5, 52, 125; ix, 125, 155, 216). His standing was very high (cf. Ibn al-Djawiš, ix, 205). In 949/1059 the ʿadīr of this diwan was given authority over all diwāns (Ibn al-Sāʾī, ix, 250). It had many sections each headed by a nāṣir (for example kūhān al-galālī, Ibn al-Fuwātī, 7, 37; cf. Ibn al-Djawiš, ix, 83; x, 52; Ibn al-Sāʾī, ix, 103, 127. He describes the ceremony of appointment, 141). Here, again, there was a muḥriṣ to supervise
the work of the mahkûm. Obviously, ishrdf replaces
the old zîmdm (Ibn al-Fuwati, 103; Ibn al-Sâ`î, ix, 20, 229).

The diwân al-dimârî (i.e., poll-tax) looked after assessing and levying the poll-tax. (See DIWÂN, DÂYÂ.) A new bureau, diwân al-tarîkât al-haṣâriyya, appeared to administer heirless property (Ibn al-Sâ`î, 107; Ibn al-Djawzi, x, 68). The diwân al-`ašâr, headed by a nāṣîr, looked after buildings, such as shops, owned by the state (Ibn al-Fuwati, 63; cf. Ibn al-Djawzi, x, 243). Building and repairs, however, were the concern of another bureau called diwân al-abnîya (but b. b. Sahl). It had engineers and architects among its staff (Ibn al-Sâ`î, ix, 93, 184). In 635/1237-8 it participated in repairing the walls of Baghâd (Ibn al-Fuwati, i, 111). The diwân al-bisâha was usually under the Kâfî al-kâdî, or under a deputy (Ibn al-Salî, ix, 16; Ibn al-Fuwati, 64).

Non-Muslims worked with Muslims in financial offices to the end of the Caliphate. Occasionally restrictions against them were enforced, but only temporarily. In 533/1140, Jews and Christians were expelled from the diwân and al-Maḥkûm only to be returned after one month (Ibn al-Djawzi, x, 78). The repetition of such orders (like that of al-Nâṣîr li-Dîn Allâh in 601 A.H.) shows that they were not enforced and non-Muslims continued to be employed (Ibn al-Sâ`î, ix, 162).


ii. Egypt.

Three periods may be distinguished in the development of the Egyptian diwân, though, since continuity in administrative institutions tends to be stronger than changes of governments, there are in reality no clear deavages: (1) the time when Egypt was a province of the great Muslim Empire (18/649-
358/969); (2) the Fātimid caliphate (358/969-567/ 1171); (3) the Ayyubid and Mamlûk period (567/ 1171-923/1517).

The sources for the first section are scattered remarks in the earlier and later historians and manuals for kuttâb as well as the growing number of Arabic papryri. For the second and third periods the manuals and encyclopaedic works for kuttâb provide ample materials which increase by the end of the mediaeval period; and the historians supplement the actual facts rather than the more theoretical explanations of the former. Among the latter al-Mâkûzî (d. 845/1442) al-Khâtâfî is of outstanding importance, as he gives a nearly continuous history of the Egyptian administration from the Muslim conquest until his own time (ed. Bûlâk, i, 82 ff., 397 ff., ii, 215 ff.), besides many important additions in the scattered “Vitaes” and the descriptions of buildings etc.

(1) The Muslims carried on the administrative practice in Egypt that the Byzantines had established with the help of the local population, even allowing them the use of the Coptic language.

Since the term diwân was not in use in Egypt during the Byzantines, we may deduce that it was brought by the new masters. Severus b. al-Mukaffa (living about 1000 A.D.; see IBN AL-MUQAFFA, ABU`L-BÂSHR) reports that the second Abbott Allâh b. Sahî (854-95/66, [4]) “established the diwân at Mi`râb (al-Fustat) to which all the taxes of Egypt were paid” (History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, ed. C. S. F. Seybold; ed. B. T. Evett (Pair. Orient. vi), 5, quoted by N. Abbott, The Kurra papyri, 13, and D. C. Dennett, Conversion and poll tax, 74). Unfortunately the Muslim sources do not offer any confirmation either for the establishment of a central revenue office, or the use of the word diwân for it at such an early time. Al-Mâkûzî relates (Khâtâfî, i, 94, 2-10) that the governor Maslama b. Mu`âṣîr al-Anâsîr (47/667-682; al-Kindî, ed. Rh. Guest 38-40; Makrîzî, Khâtîfî, i, 301, 18-27) appointed an official to go round among the immigrant Arabs each morning to inquire about changes in their family status, or the arrival of guests, and to report it to the diwân. The governor would then advise the ahl al-diwan (the officials of the diwân) to pay the increased pensions. This narration indicates the existence of an organized office called diwân, as well as its concern with registration and the payment of pensions to the immigrant Arabs. The same use of the term diwân also appears in a note by al-Kindî (ed. Guest 71; Makrîzî, Khâtîfî, i, 94, 10-3): the first diwân was established in Egypt by `Abî b. `Asî, the second by `Abî al-Azîz b. Marwân, the third by Kurra b. Sharîk [q.v.], the fourth by Bîshr b. Safwân. After the establishment of the fourth diwân nothing worth mentioning happened except the admission of the Kays into the diwân during the caliphate of `Abîd b. Marwân (105/724-725/743). Al-Kindî (ed. Guest 76) refers to that event in the year 109/727: 3000 families of the Kays were transferred to Egypt to pay the new tax, together with their diwans. These notes show that the term diwân was used from an early time to denote (a) the pension lists of the Muslim-Arab tribes, (b) that these lists accompanied the tribe wherever it moved, (c) that consequently the term diwân (pension list) of the Kays was transferred to Egypt and there added to the other already existing diwans.

During the second half of the 11th/17th century the use of the term diwân to denote central government offices must have become more general. We read (al-Kindî, 58-9; al-Makrîzî, al-Khâtâfî, i, 98, 11-15) that the change-over from Coptic to Arabic in the Egyptian diwans took place in 872/705 (cf. ed. Wiet, ii, 58). This can only mean that in the above-mentioned year the term diwân was already the name of the central government office at al-Fustat. The first independent director of finances (fâmil al-kharadî) was Usâmâ b. Zayd al-Tânîkî who was appointed in 667/127 by the caliph Sulaymân b. `Abîd b. Malik on the death of the governor Kurra b. Sharîk. That Usâmâ worked with the help of a diwan is shown by the report of al-Makrîzî (Khâtîfî, i, 77, 37-8, 3) that `Umar b. `Abî al-Azîz (997/177-1015/720) abolished the poll-tax for Muslims and notified the diwan (al-kharadî) about it. In
105/725 the governor al-Hurr b. Yusuf sent officials of the diwan against Coptic peasants in order to enforce the payment of higher taxes. Two years later the well-known 'amil al-kharadji Ibn Habhab (C. H. Becker, Beiträge, ii, 107-10) set up lists of taxpayers which were carefully put together and provided with detailed information for the diwan al-kharadji (al-Makrizi, Khiṭāt, i, 74, 24 & 99, 10).Ashḥāb al-ahra (officers of the government granary) are already mentioned in a papyrus dated Shawwal 90/August-September 709; it seems likely that they were officials of the diwan al-ahra listed later by al-Nābulusī (C. H. Becker, Patrologia Orientalis, Schott-Reinhardt, 70, 37 & 49; see below). — The diwan al-barid (diwan of the post) is alleged by diwan al-rawdtīb, the central pay office for all receivers of salaries from the wazir down to the muḥn. It can be called the predecessor of the diwan al-majlis which was the predecessor of the diwan al-inṣāq wa l-mukdātāt. The following list of diwāns culled from the above-mentioned sources can not claim to be complete one. It should be kept in mind that the different offices styled diwan do not rank on the same level, as diwan denotes sometimes even provincial branches of central offices. (i) Diwan al-inṣāq, its predecessor was the chancellery of state (daftar al-majlis) in which the whole of the administration was concentrated. A number of clerks sat there in their own rooms with or without assistants (muʿātim). The chief of this diwan was responsible for the grant of fiefs (inšāʿ; C. H. Becker, Islamstudien, i, 226; W. Björkman, Index; C. H. Becker, Evolution de l'État, in Annales ESC, 1953). The chief of the diwan al-majlis dealt with such topics as alms, gifts, clothing and administration of the private purse of the sultan. Our sources do not state whether that diwan existed already before the Fatimid or when it was split up into different independent diwāns took place. But it seems probable that the diwan al-majlis was the predecessor of the diwan al-amwil, and that the diwan al-inṣāq existed side by side with it. These offices were subdivided into three departments: (a) Sāḥib al-dawla, head of which was the diwan al-majlis, with high-rank officials, and his deputy existed in the main places of the provinces (head). — The diwan al-amwil, with his deputy existed in the main places of the provinces (head). — The diwan al-sāḥib al-dawla, head of which was the diwan al-majlis, with high-rank officials, and his deputy existed in the main places of the provinces (head). — The diwan al-sāḥib al-dawla, head of which was the diwan al-majlis, with high-rank officials, and his deputy existed in the main places of the provinces (head). — The diwan al-sāḥib al-dawla, head of which was the diwan al-majlis, with high-rank officials, and his deputy existed in the main places of the provinces (head). — The diwan al-sāḥib al-dawla, head of which was the diwan al-majlis, with high-rank officials, and his deputy existed in the main places of the provinces (head).
to the cavalry trooper (cf. A. Mez, Renaissance 74-6); (c) diwān al-`ītad (diwān of fiels and pensions) for civilians, as the military personnel belonged to the diwān al-kārkhāndī (al-Kākhashandi, iii, 492-3; al-Makrizī, Khīṭāt i, 401-2). (iii) Diwān al-amūāl (diwān of finance, the treasury) was divided into fourteen departments, also called diwān, which are enumerated by al-Kākhashandi (iii, 493-6) and much more briefly by al-Makrizī (Khīṭāt i, 400-1). Ibn Mammātūt offers a list of seventeen employees of the class of civil servants (ṣamā‘ al-muṣtakhād mīn hamal al-`ītum) which apparently belonged to the staff of the diwān al-amūāl; but it is not always clear to which of the 14 departments these 17 groups correspond (ed. A. S. Aṭiyya 297-306). (a) Nasār al-dawwārīn, or diwān al-nasār (control-office of the diwān). The head of it is ex officio the chief of the diwān al-amūāl, i.e., the chancellor of the exchequer. Ibn Mammātūt distinguishes between the nasār of the diwān (the controller, auditor) who checked and countersigned the accounts and the muṣawālū (superintendent) who was responsible for all business (C. H. Becker, Islamstudien i, 170, 173; (b) diwān al-tahkīk (diwān of official enquiry (cf. Dozy s.v.) was founded by al-Aḍāl b. Bādir al-Dāmiyālī [q.v.] in 501/1107-8. When a Jew and a Christian were employed as its heads; later on it was not filled for most of the time (Ibn al-Ṣayrāfī/Maṣṣūs 82 note 1); (c) diwān al-maqālīs (see above xxx) only administered royal gifts, alms etc.; (d) diwān khāṣṣ‘ al-kiswā, diwān of the houses of clothing; about the numerous storehouses see the long lists in al-Kākhashandi, iii, 475 ff. and al-Makrizī, Khīṭāt i, 408 ff.; (e) Diwān al-tahdīd (diwān of the embroidered garment-factories and storehouses). The diwān maintained several branches at places where the factories were situated, e.g., Alexandria, Damietta, Tannūs (Ibn Mammātūt 330-1; A. Grohmann, Stud. z. hist. Geogr. u. Verw., 44); (f) diwān al-ahbāds (diwān of endowments). Since its foundation by the caliph al-Mu`izz in 363/974 the diwān dealt with the administration of pious foundations (mawāfī [q.v.]); its officials were Muslims only and the chief of it is called sahib diwān al-ahbāds (the controller, superintendent). The certificate was often signed by fifteen clerks of the class of civil servants. It is not clear what the relation had been between this diwān and the office of the same name in the diwān of the holy war, or the navy. Its seat was in the dockyards at Cairo, and it served as administrative centre for the military personnel of the caliph (Ibn LANAN 329-). (g) Ibn Ayūbīd period. The political and religious break which the end of the Fātīmid caliphate meant for Egypt was counterbalanced by the administrative continuity clearly demonstrated by the leading personality: the last sāhib diwān al-`ītad al-Kādī al-Fāḍī Muhīy al-Dīn [q.v.,], was kept on by Salādīn in the same office and later on created wāzīr. Hence al-Kādī al-Fāḍī and his numerous successors often formed a link between the periods. As already mentioned Ibn Mammātūt’s Kauwānīn al-dawwārīn can serve as a contemporary source for the first half of the Ayūbīd period; for the second half two other contemporary authors have come down: Ibn Shīth al-Kurashi and ‘Uthmān al-Nābulūsī. Like Ibn Mammātūt, Ibn Shīth al-Kurashi was a pupil of al-Kādī al-Fāḍī whose high esteem he gained by his skill in poetry and prose. He went to Damascus where he became the head of the diwān al-`ītad and the friend of Mu`azzam b. al-`Aḍīl (d. 624/1227). Mal`ūm al-kiṭāb, a guide to the correct form of letter-writing for clerks of the diwān al-`ītad, offers but one chapter dealing with our theme (pp. 23-32). The diwān al-`ītad is in the eyes of Ibn Shīth the most important government office, hence its head (sāhib al-dīwān) should be of a moral standard that corresponds to his exalted rank and the high esteem he enjoys among his colleagues. His next subordinate to whom he forwards the answering of letters and deeds was called muṣawālū kiṭāb al-`ītad, (superintendent of the secretariat of the chancellery). Other offices enumerated by Ibn Shīth: diwān al-`ītad, diwān al-`ītad al-ma‘ūsī, whose chief (kāhid al-`ītum) holds a lower rank than the sāhib diwān al-`ītad, and needs an account-book (dajarīd) with the names and fiels of all the military personnel to be in a position to pay out their salaries, even if no head of the diwān al-`ītad should have been appointed. The diwān al-`ītad apparently was an independent office, whose head was of lower rank than that of the diwān al-`ītad and both worked together with and under the control of the military personnel (al-wāṣīr). It is not clear what the relation had been between this diwān and the office of the same name in the diwān al-`ītad. It seems possible that this diwān al-`ītad had been a kind of predecessor to the diwān al-khās (the diwān of the private fund of the caliph; al-Kākhashandi, iii, 495 and 457); (h) diwān al-Sa`īd (diwān of Upper Egypt); (i) diwān Asīl al-arīd (diwān of Lower Egypt); (j) diwān al-`ītum al-thughūr (diwān of the frontier districts). The marches of Alexandria, Damietta, Tannūs and ‘Aydhab formed an administrative unity for the purpose of levying import-taxes from the merchants at the ports (al-khums and maṭīfūr [see maws]; Ibn Mammātūt 325-7); (k) diwān al-`ulmār wa l-mawwūrīt al-`ītum (diwān of the poll tax and estate duty of dhimmīs; F. Lokkegaard, Islamic Taxation 51 & 140-1; C. H. Becker, Islamstudien i, 172; Ibn Mammātūt 306, 317-8 and 454; C. H. Becker, Le régime des impots, iii, 24; (l) diwān al-khārājīn wa l-`ilālī (diwān of the lawful and illegal taxes). F. Lokkegaard, 185-6; C. H. Becker, Islamstudien i, 177-9). Ibn Mammātūt enumerates several offices connected with this diwān: al-`ītum (the tax collector), al-`ītum (the notary) who countersigned the invoices, al-māzik (the surveyor), etc.; (m) diwān al-harār or al-`ītum al-thughūr (diwān of the houses or the stables); (n) diwān al-`⅋hār or al-`amārī (diwān of the holy war, or the navy). Its seat was in the dockyards at Cairo, and it served as administrative centre for the military personnel of the caliph (Ibn LANAN 329-).
DIWĀN

therefore, asks for the knowledge of foreign languages among the officials of that diwān such as Turkish, Persian, Greek and 'Frankish' al-farangiyya (Latin); šaḥdāl-aštāfā'; i, 165-7; Björkman, Staatskanzlei, 44 and note 21; (b) appointments (wilāyāt), including the oath of allegiance (hayyāf), and the document of investiture for the sultan's successor ('aḥd) as well as the governors of the provinces (kullād) and other officials (lašfīd, tašfī); al-Kaškhāndi, i, 253; Björkman, Staatskanzlei 48, 52; (c) the royal decisions upon complaints of the common folk (tašfīdāt ʾalā l-ḥāja, see above, al-Kaškhāndi, vi, 202 ff.). Björkman, Staatskanzlei 52-3. (ii) Diwān al-diaysh, or diwān al-diaysh al-mansūra administered the grant of fiefs of army personnel (al-Kaškhāndi, i, 102), hence sometimes called diwān al-ḥaṣā; al-Kaškhāndi, iii, 457; Björkman, Staatskanzlei 51, note 2). Its chief, nāṣir al-diaysh (controller of the army-diwān), often a Kādi, was assisted by the inspector of the diwān al-diaysh (ṣāḥib diwān al-diaysh) and numerous other officials (wazīr, kādī, nāẓir, shuḥûd, kuttāb, etc.) whose head was called nāẓir bayt al-mdl which according to Makrizi no longer existed at his time (Khitat. Egypt and Syria, 97: "controller dawdddr [qq.v., ddr., etc. Ibn Khaldun considers the diwān al-mufrad (diwān established the function of the special bureau) for the control of stipends, clothing of the army-diwān), Sultan diwāns: asfydb al-suyuf) the military class (arbdb) of Alexandria (see above) and of the royal Mamluks etc., and all that at the expense of officials: nāṣir al-māl (controller of the exchequer), ṣāḥib al-dawārin (superintendent of the diwāns), nāṣir al-khāṣṣ (controller of the private funds of the sultan; W. Popper, Egypt and Syria, 97; controller of private funds) and kādī al-ṣawārī (secretary of state) of the royal Mamluks etc., and to the sultan, or presented foreign ambassadors to it as typical sign of "senility" of an epoch and a time" (Ibn Khaldun, ii, 15 & 20; tr. Rosenthal, ii, 51, note 2). Its chief, the kātib al-sirr, was concerned with (a) correspondence (muḥāfās) with foreign powers as well as with the provincial authorities. Al-Kaškhāndi,
224, 36-7), nazar al-mawdrith al-tashriyya (control-office of heirless property; Popper; Syria and Egypt*, 99, 17), nazar al-muradiyya bi'l-tashriyya (control-office of heirless property; Popper; Syria and Egypt*). The historians provide ample examples for the working of that complicated machinery, the disastrous effect of its inefficiency aggrandized by the incessant changes of the leading personnel as well as of the rulers and the cruel arbitrary system of punishments (muṣādara) that accompanied every change.


(H. L. GOTTSCALK)

iii. Muslim West.

A. So far as Muslim Spain is concerned, we do not know how much of the civil and military administration of the Visigoths, which unquestionably was influenced by the Byzantine system, was found and adopted by the first conquerors at the beginning of the 2nd/8th century. In the 14th/19th century, in the Umayyad period, three basic divisions of public administration have been in operation, corresponding with the three essential needs of a State, each directed by a special minister (wizar or sāhib).

These were:

1. The Chancellery and Secretariat, diwan al-rasā'īl (= al-tariq) wa'l-khdāba, which dealt with official correspondence, both incoming and outgoing, and also with the drafting of various diplomas and commissions (sāḥibat, sāhib).

2. The Ministry of Finance, diwan al-khdāriyya wa'l-khdāriyya, diwan al-ashghal, diwan al-al-fayd (for the payment of salaries; Popper; Syria and Egypt*), etc. The historians provide examples of the work of that complicated machinery, the disastrous effect of its inefficiency aggrandized by the incessant changes of the leading personnel as well as of the rulers and the cruel arbitrary system of punishments (muṣādara) that accompanied every change.

3. The Ministry of the Army, diwan al-diyāq, diwan al-djand, diwan al-rasā'īl, diwan al-thughār, which had three different functions; keeping up to date the financial records of the regular army; keeping accounts and giving the army their pay (arżād); and active service gratuities (ṣayyidūd); distributing gifts of estates to senior officers (bāzād). But it had no share in the command of troops or direction of campaigns.

After the Umayyads, a similar tripartite organization, though naturally on a much reduced scale, was found at the "satrap's" court (mulūk al-fawād), and later at the Nasrids'.

With regard to North Africa before the Almohad period (6th/12th century), we know practically nothing about the diwāns. In 554/1159 the Almohad 'Abd al-Muʾīn, after imposing his authority over North Africa from Wādat Nūl to Barka, had a survey made of his empire, with the aim of compiling a register for the assessment of land taxes (hārādগ), payable in kind and money; from this we can deduce that a special fiscal diwan was either set up or developed.

Another Almohad, Yaḥyā b. Al-Manṣūr (580-95/1184-94) introduced the practice of 'ulāma, the formula of authorization written in large letters at the head of despatches and commissions, the text of which was: wa'l-khdārū li-lāhī wa'dah. At first this was inscribed by the sovereign himself; later the insertion of 'ulāma was entrusted to the High Chancellor. The practice was maintained by the Ḥafṣids and Marinids, and was observed until the end of the Sa'dids. The Nasrids alone did not adopt it.

In other respects the Almohad diwāns correspond with those of the Umayyads in Spain. But the High Chancellery tended to become the diwan al-tawād. This organization was maintained in Ḥafṣid, and in Morocco by the Marinids. However, several diwāns were often put together and held simultaneously by a single statesman belonging to one or other of the great ministerial families.

From the 10th/16th century there is very little information about the operation, or indeed the existence, of diwāns in North Africa. In Morocco we only know of the diwan al-diyāq which included all regular troops, at first Arab and later negro ('Abīd or Ḥarāfīm). As these troops (more particularly the 'Abīd) had often made and deposed Ḥalīwī sultans, their diwan sometimes appeared to be a kind of royal Council.
After the disastrous Tetuan war (1860), sultan Muhammad III b. cAbd al-Rahman tried to establish a modernized diwan al-diwyā, but his attempt proved abortive.


B. From the Almohad period (6th/12th century), in those ports open to trade with Christian Europe (from the Maḥdīyya in Ifrīkiyya to Ceuta, and also in Almeria), the existence has been established of special offices which were subordinate to the diwan al-aṣchāl, and whose function was to collect tithes (aʿghar) and other incidental taxes (maṣālīm) which were imposed on European importers. This sort of office in general called simply al-diwān; but more detailed titles are also encountered: diwan al-bawāy and in particular dār al-īṣāra, which exercised supervision over the levy of customs-dues. The local official in charge was called mushrī.

To facilitate the operation of customs, and in addition to ensure the safety of Christian merchants and their merchandise, one or more entrepôts (one for each nation) were situated very close to the diwan; these were ʿandūb or kaysāriyya, the eastern equivalents of which were ḥāmid and (dār al)-yashūdā. As an exception, offices of this sort also operated in capital cities situated inland, as for example at Tlemcen and Fez. In the latter town, the "office for the tax" levied on cloth imported from Europe which Leo Africanus (beginning of 10th/16th century) recorded as being in the kaysāriyya there must correspond with the small commercial quarter, still known today as Ed-Diwānī, immediately north of the present kaysāriyya.

The word diwan, taken in this narrow sense (which must have been the one best known to European merchants), is evidently the origin of the Italian dogana and the Spanish aduana, and also of the French douane, but the loss of the -a- and the addition of the final -a in the two first borrowings cause difficulty. In Granada (end of 9th/15th century), P. de Alcala still gave, as the Arabic translation of the Spanish aduana, the word diwān. However that may be, the present-day term in Morocco is diwān, perhaps influenced by the Spanish form. In the other Maghribi languages as in eastern languages, that is to say in the Arabic-speaking countries which were annexed to the former Ottoman empire, the words for "Customs" are borrowed from the Turkish giṃrūkh which goes back to the Latin commercium through demotic Greek.

Bibliography: Ibn Djubayr, Rība, ed. de Goeje, for Alexandria (39-40) and ʿAkkā (302); De Montlhr, Relations et commerce de l'Afrique septentrionale, 1886, 166, 335; Hespéris, xii (1931), 162 (for Ceuta). C. From the middle of the 10th/16th century diwāns made their appearance in the Turkish principalities of Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli. At that time the word denoted a clique of senior officers who were appointed to assist and, more particularly, to supervise the leading Turkish official of the locality. It was no doubt on the precedent of these cliques that, at the beginning of the 11th/17th century, the Moors living in the kasaba of Rabat set up their Diwān or Council (contemporary European texts refer to them as diwan, douan, duana), the members of which exercised supervision over the Government.

In its present use in dialect, the word diwan is sometimes applied to the "councils" which the Saints, and also diwnān, are reputed to hold from time to time. It is partly for this reason that the word is sometimes used in the sense of "plot, cabal".

Bibliography: See the articles ALGERIA, LIBYA, TUNISIA; de Castries, Les trois républiques du Bou-Rregag, in Sources indiées de l'histoire du Maroc (Holland, 1st series, V, i-xvii), in which the author is mistaken with regard to "douane".

In the East, special systems of writing were used in government offices, notably the diwānī for chancery and diplomatic usage, and the siyāb or siyāba, including a system of numerical abbreviations, for fiscal and financial records. In the Muslim West the accountants in the financial offices made use of a system of 27 figures called rusūm (or ṣurūf) al-simām "abbreviations or characters of the great book", the Byzantine origin of which is established. See also khatt.

Bibliography: G. S. Colin, De l'origine grecque des "chiffres de Fes", in JA, 1933, 193. (G. S. Colin)

iv. Irān

The term diwanī was variously used to mean the central government in general, in which sense it was also more specifically known as the diwanī-ī aštā, the office or place in which government business was transacted and the "civil" administration as opposed to the "military" administration, though the dividing line between them is sometimes difficult to establish. By the mid-19th century the term diwanī in the sense of the central government had been largely replaced by dawla or dāʿara-ī dawla. Secondly the term diwanī was used to mean a government department in general, in which sense it was eventually replaced by wizāra, dāʿara, and idāra. These diwāns varied according to the exigencies of the time. The adjective diwanī is similarly used. Thus, muḥimmāt-ī diwānī meant the affairs of the central administration; takālīf-ī diwānī were taxes or dues (of a non-canonical character) which were levied on goods entering the country; takālīf-ī land diwānī meant state land in contradistinction to crown land or private estates.

Barthold's statement that "throughout the whole system of the eastern Muslim political organization there runs like a red thread the division of all organs of administration into two main categories, the dargāh (palace) and diwanī (chancery)" (Turkestan, 227) is, perhaps, an over-simplification; there was, almost inevitably, because of the intensely personal nature of power, a tendency for the dividing line between the competence of the various officials to be a shifting one. The general tendency in the early phases of Ilkhanī, Safawid, and Kāḏār rule, for obvious reasons, was for the central administration to be relatively simple and for the differentiation between the various organs of government to increase with the passage of time. This is noticeable especially in the Safawid and Kāḏār periods.

The diwanī-ī aštā covered the whole field of administration; but it was concerned primarily with three aspects; the issue of diplomas and decrees; financial administration; and the administration of justice (apart from cases of personal status which came under the ṣurūf courts). The first two fell
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within the purview of the wazir; the last, so far as it was delegated, was delegated, not to the wazir, who lacked the power to execute decisions, but rather to his officials as well as conducting state business in the diwan-i a'ādā also held from time to time a diwan-i mārādīm. Under the Timurids and Ṣafawids the chief judicial official was the diwanīn,begī, who was usually a member of the military classes. The tradition of personal administration, including the administration of justice, by the ruler continued into KāḏĀr times (Malcolm, History, London 1939, ii, 308), and the royal residence in which state business of all kinds was transacted by the ruler (and by the governors in the provinces) in general, and the audience hall in particular, was known as the diwanīkhāna.
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hadźadźi of the divān (‘Atabat al-kataba, 61). There are also cases recorded of Seldjuk women having divāns (cf. ‘Atabat al-kataba, 61; Қūndandarəm, Dašt-i a-wusur, 490). With the Mongol invasion of Persia there was to some extent a break with tradition; much of the earlier administrative structure nevertheless remained, or was revived after the adoption of Islam by the Ilkhāns; and the officials of the bureaucracy and the religious institution with their various divāns were again found alongside the officials of the “military” government. The foremost minister of state continued to be known as the wazir, or, sometimes, in his position as the representative of the ruler as the nāšib (Spuler, Mongolen, 282). There was, however, a tendency to remove financial affairs from the direct supervision of the wazir and to entrust these to an official known as the sāhib divān, who tended at times to overshadow the wazir. It seems not unlikely that the Ilkhāns intended in this way to lessen the likelihood of the divān, were religious institution with their various divāns being used, or was revived after the adoption of Islam by the earlier administrative structure nevertheless remained to some extent a break with tradition; much of the division for the chief official of the administration which broadly coincided with the dichotomy between Turk and Tadjik (i.e., Persian) was clearly marked.

Under Husayn Baykara the diwan-i a’ld (under the divān-i a’ld) was under the wazir, the supreme organ of government was divided into the diwan-i buzurg-i amārāt (under the divān-i a’ld, which deal with military affairs, and the diwan-i māl (under a wazir), which was concerned with “civil” affairs (Roemers, Staatsschreiben der Timuriden, 347). The highest official of the administration, similarly designated. There appears to have been something in the nature of a state council, to which certain members of the diwan-i a’ld belonged; this council seems to have been outside the traditional pattern of the central administration. Alessandri states that Tāhmāsp held a daily council attended by twelve sultans (i.e., provincial governors and therefore members of the military classes) and those of his sons who were at court (A narrative of Italian travels in Persia, Halkdyrt, 220-1). The functions of this council appear to have been purely advisory. The Tadhkirat al-Muluk states that the khūllar-ḍāšt, sāhib-ḍāšt, tujangēšt-ḍāšt, wazir-i a’ṣam, divān-begi, and wāṣṭ-i a’ṣam “had from early times belonged to the council of amirs of the umārā-yi djiṅši and at the end of the reign of Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn the nāšir, mustawfi-i al-māmālik, and the amir-ṣāḥib-ḍāšt were also, on some occasions, included in the council. If the council met on the subject of sending an army commander (sipahṣālr) to some outlying part of the empire, the presence of the sipahṣālr at the djiṅši was a necessary condition” (ff. 7b-8a). Minorisky considers the institution to be of Mongol or Tumurid origin. Chardin maintains that there was no council of state similar to the European institution; Sanson, on the other hand, states that all decisions were taken in the King’s Council (Tadhkirat al-Muluk, 113-4). Under the Kāḏār the djiṅši does not appear to have been a regular part of the central government administration, but to have been a tribal council dealing with affairs concerning the Kāḏār tribe, which presumably normally sat under the ilḵānī. Malcolm mentions a case of treason by a “high noble” of the Kāḏār tribe being tried about 1608 by a djiṅši (History, li. 327n.). The highest official of the diwan-i a’ld under Ismā’il and Tāhmāsp was the wazir, who was the alter ego of the shāh as the wazir, in his heyday, had been of the sultan; his competence extended virtually over the whole field of the administration. The use of the term wazir for the chief official of the diwan-i a’ld appears to have died out in the middle of the 16th century and to have been replaced by the term wazir-i a’ṣam, who held the title of ‘Ismā’il-al-dawla. After 920/1514 his office tends to be referred to as the nāṣarāt-i diwan-i a’ld, nāṣarāt-i diwan, or diwan-i wisiara (R. M. Savory, The principal offices of the Safavid state, in BSOAS, xxii/1, 1960, 91-105 and xxv/1, 1961, 65-84). In due course an elaborate system of administrative procedure was evolved. As head of the diwan-i a’ld the wazir confirmed official appointments; documents concerning these matters and the pay of officials went through an office called the dafarkhāna-i kumāyān-i a’ld under a special wazir. Documents concerning the pay of the “standing army” (bārēšt, ghuḏām, tujangēšt, and members of the toppbhāna) went through the relative department (sarkhā), which was under a wazir and mustawfi and staffed by secretaries belonging to the diwan (Tadhkirat al-Muluk, f. 58 ff.). Letters of appointment and salary grants for “civil” and military officials as well as being sealed by the
wazir-i a'zam were also sealed by the lashkar-niwis of the diwan-i a'zam, who was also wazir of the depart-ment (sarkdr) of the diwan-i acld, who was also wazir of the... of his control over the diwan-i khdssa are not entirely clear. The budget of the buyutdt was apparently submitted to the wazir-i a'zam (Taghkirat al-Muluk, f. 16a). Under the mustawfi al-mamdlik there were various officials in charge of different tax offices (daftar-i mawfyufdt) of the state (Tadhkirat al-Muluk, ff. 7iaff.). This last was, in the relevant matters according to whether they were situated in mandlik or khdssa areas. These included a sarkdr-i mawfyufdt (Taghkirat al-Muluk, f. 71a) and a daftar-i mawfyufdt (f. 75a). A special department, the sarkdr-i jayd dthdr, at Mashhad administered the wakfs of the shrine of the Imam Ridan (‘Alam-drd, 258b, 654). General supervision of wakfs was carried out by the diwan-i saddr-dthdr under the sardr-i a'zam (H. Busse, Unter-suchungen zum islamischen Kanzleiwesen, Cairo 1959, 204). Some of the provincial sardrs also had wakfs or sarkdr-i jayd dthdr (Iskandar Munshi, ‘Alam-drd, 765). As the royal court its procedure from the time of Fath ‘All onwards was elaborate. The administration of the royal household, which comprised a number of offices which were collectively known as the buyutdt, was, however, more clearly separated from the diwan-i a'zam than had previously been the case. So far as the diwan-i a'zam in the central government was concerned, its organization was less elaborate than in Safavid times; and there was no longer a distinction between the mandlik and khdssa departments. Aka Muhammad Khan apparently attended to the details of the administration largely in person; the rule of Fath ‘All was also personal, but during his reign the administration was expanded. The chief official of the diwan-i a'zam was the sardr-i a'zam; his power varied with the relative energy, indolence, and competence of the shah. Under Aka Muhammad Khan the sardr-i a'zam, Haidjji Ibrdrhm, is said to have presided over all the departments of state (Malcolm, ii, 308-9). The two most important departments were under the mustawfi al-mamdlik and the laghrar-niwis respectively; the latter was concerned with the pay and levy of the military forces, which was closely bound up with the tax administration. Under Fath ‘All the office of mushkip al-mamdlik again became important. The internal administration of these various departments appears to have been of a relatively rudimentary nature under the early Kadjars. Morier, writing in 1809, states that the offices of the ministers and secretaries of state were situated in the shah's palace where they assembled every day to be ready whenever the shah might summon them (A journey through Persia, London 1812, 216); but in fact the ministers often had to set up their departments wherever they happened to be. Aka Muhammad Khan and Fath ‘All both spent much of their time on military expeditions and in camp (as also did their successors); and they were normally accompanied on these occasions by their ministers. In such circumstances government departments had to function without any elaborate administrative apparatus. Malcolm states that “the accounts of the receipts and disbursements throughout the ecclesiastical, civil, revenue and military branches of the government, are kept with much regularity and precision” (History, ii, 370). In fact, these records were largely treated as the personal property of the officials who made them; and so far as they concerned the revenue assessment, by the middle of the century they often bore little relation to conditions as they were. The diwan of the mustawfi al-mamdlik was organized on a geographical basis; the tax assessment and records of a given area were placed in charge of a mustawfi, who was known as the mustawfi of that district. Separate departments dealt with crown lands (khdlisa) and waqfs and other special aspects such as arrears (babdy). The provincial administration was delegated to the governor, who often attended to the details of this in person. In the case of a powerful provincial governor, especially if he were a Kadjar prince,
the provincial court tended to be a replica (on a smaller scale) of the diwan-i 'ald. The most important provincial official was the wazir, who was normally appointed by the diwan-i 'ald. His main responsibility was to ensure that the governor remitted the provincial tax quota to the central government.

**Bibliography:** see authorities quoted in the text. (Ann K. S. Lambton)

v. India

The term *diwan*, meaning a government department, appears to have been first introduced into India during the rule of the Ghaznavids with the seat of their administration at Lahore. Artyark, the Commander of India appointed by Sultan Mahmud, had all the wealth which he had accumulated during his vicereignty in India confiscated on his dismissal and recall to Ghazna. A great part of this fortune must have come from land-revenue for whose collection and disbursement there must have existed a separate department. Narshakhi (cf. *Tarikh-i Bukhara*, ed. Schefer, 24) mentions the existence of no less than ten *diwan* under the Ghaznavids, including the *diwan-i wizira* or revenue department (cf. also Abu 'l-Fadl Bayhaqi, *Tarikh-i Bayhaqi*, ed. Said Nafozi, Teheran 1319/1940, 53, 180, 792). Bayhaqi was himself on the staff of the *diwan-i risala* (*diwan-i inquld*?) during the rule of Mas'ud b. Mahmud. Moreland's contention [see Bibi] that the word *diwan* was first used by Indian historians to denote a department or a ministry in the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries is, therefore, erroneous. The term was in use much earlier.

During the Sultanate period its use was mainly confined to the minister for revenue, who was ordinarily the wazir himself, and his department, the revenue ministry. A new department, on its creation, was also known as the *diwan*, such as the *diwan-i risala* or the *diwan-i masailim*. During the same period the word was also used for the military department, which too was under the control of the wazir, although under the Ghaznavids, this department was known separately as the *diwan-i ard*.

This system of government seems to have been fully developed during the Sultanate period as we find quite a number of departments in existence. These included: (i) *diwan-i risala*, which dealt mainly with the expenditure only. Firuz Shâh Tughluk had also set up a separate *diwan*, under a *muqaddar*, for the royal *kâyhanas* (factories), whose accounts were, however, audited by the *diwan-i wizira*. There occurred a slight change in the designation of the *wazir* during the Mughal period, who came to be known as the *diwan-i kull* and his colleagues in the same department as mere *diwan*, with such other appellations as denoted their functions and duties such as the *diwan-i tan* or the *diwan-i khalîla*.

Another significant change under the Mughals was that the office of the revenue department of revenue and finance came exclusively to be known as the *diwan*. During the reign of Akbar the word *wazir* in this sense was seldom used, having been replaced by the term *diwan*, which had come to denote a person rather than an institution or a government department. However, in the reign of his son, *Diwângir*, the old practice was revived and the term *wazir* again came into vogue. It was during the reign of Shâhjahân that the *wazir* came to be known as the *diwan-i kull* and his other colleagues in the department as *diwan*, with the addition of such epithets as showed their designations. For some time the two words *wazir* and *diwan* remained almost synonymous, and even in private business, a person who managed a high officer's or a wealthy person's financial affairs came to be known as a *diwan*. Dayânât Khân was the *diwan* of Mumtâz Mahal in the first year of Shâhjahân's reign (*Ma’dârî al-umârâ?*, Eng. tr. by A. H. Beveridge, i. 484). Even to this day male members of some families, both Hindu and Muslim, proudly carry the hereditary honorific of *Diwan*, once borne by some illustrious ancestor.

The revenue ministry, under the *diwan*, was consequently known as *diwân*, a term which was destined to survive in the *diwân* (civil) and *faujiyâr* (criminal) courts of the British days, which still form a part of the legal structure of Pakistan.

During the Mughal period the *diwan* performed multifarious duties. He was not only responsible for the disposal of revenue papers, but also drafted urgent royal letters and *farmâns*. He also granted interviews to the agents of the princes, provincial governors and high nobles. The mounting of the guard, under the command of the *wazir*, was performed in the imperial palace at night was also a part of his duty. He had to submit revenue collection and expenditure returns to the emperor who was in this way kept informed of the finances of the State. As an administrative functionary, he allocated duties to all high dignitaries on first appointment, received regular reports from them, and also had powers to grant leave. He was also in charge of all official records which were deposited in his office (for a detailed list of these records, see Jadunath Sarkar, *Mughal administration*, Calcutta 1952, 29-32).

His colleagues, the *diwan-i khalîla* and the *diwan-i tan*, had separate duties to perform. The former, *inter alia*, examined the accounts prepared by the revenue department, checked up the *farmâns* (record of total standard assessment) of the *Mâdîsa* (Crown lands), prepared the estimates of expenditure (*badar-i darâdr*) on the troops and the emperor's personal staff and retinue. The *diwan-i tan* was responsible, *inter alia*, for the submission of all matters to the emperor, which dealt with the *fadârs* or cash disbursements including the drafting of *farmâns*, memoranda, *paradâns* etc. for the grant of *madad* to scholars, the 'ulamâ, *khalîla* etc.

The office of the provincial *diwan* was next in
importance to that of the sipahs-dldr only. The provincial diwdn having been appointed directly by the emperor on the recommendation of the central diwdn, was no longer given a subordinate to the governor. He obtained his orders from the central diwan and was only responsible to him; the idea was to keep the fiscus independent of gubernatorial control and thus minimize dangers of misappropriation, defalcation and embezzlement of public money as well as of the insurrection of the sipahs-dldr. The Mirzâ-i Ahmadî (Baroda 1926, i, 165-70) quotes fardâm from Akbar giving in a comprehensive form the duties of a provincial diwan, who according to this fardâm, should be a “trustworthy and experienced person who has already served some high noble in the same capacity”. His duties entailed heavy responsibilities as he was supposed to scrutinize the accounts of the revenue collectors (tamis) and report corrupt ones for dismissal. He sometimes also acted as the provincial auditor.

As time passed, the powers of the diwan increased greatly. Not only could he make grants up to 99,000 dams but could also sign the deeds for the grant of jādîgs and a’imma lands, which technically were defective and void without the Imperial seal or the signature of the central diwan. In spite of this the diwan did not enjoy a rank equal to that of the sipahs-dldr as head of the revenue department, enjoyed a higher status, prestige and honour in the public eye than the ‘chancellor of the exchequer’.

The provincial diwan was assisted in his duties by a pîqshâr or personal assistant, who was appointed by an imperial sanad under the seal of the central diwan, a dârâgha or office superintendent, a muqâfî and a taqâshîr-i dalâlr-khâna (record-keeper), all holding a mansabd. Among the lower staff the muqâfî (process-server) occupied an influential position in the public eye and was generally held in great respect.

In 11th-12th/17th-18th centuries the term diwan came to be used only for the revenue administration in contrast to the nizamat or fawdîgârî, terms which denoted the general administration, concerned primarily with the maintenance of law and order. Even to this day civil courts in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent are known as diwan courts, as distinguished from the criminal or fawdîgârî courts.

In this sense the word owes its origin to the appointment of the East India Company as the diwan of the Province of Bengal. The management of the Company found it desirable to establish their own court of justice which they named the Diwâni A’dâlât, i.e., court of the diwan.

In some of the former princely States in India, now merged with the Indian Union, the chief minister was known as the Diwan. The word also formed part of two of the titles Diwan Sahib and Diwan Bahadur, conferred by the British Indian Government; their use was, however, restricted to South Indian celebrities.

The use of the word in expressions like the Diwan-i A’dâm (Hall of Public Audience) and the Diwan-i kâhîs (Hall of Special Audience) in the Mughal forts at Lahore, Agra, Dilli, and elsewhere, is a faint echo of its original meaning. In the houses and mansions of the great or well-to-do people, in days gone by, there was a separate apartment known as the Diwan-khâna, equivalent to the modern drawing-room, but reserved exclusively for the use of the male members of the family or their guests and visitors.

Bibliography: In addition to the authorities quoted in the text: S. M. Jaffar, Mediaeval India . . . (The Ghaznavids), Peshawar 1940, 242-54; idem, Some cultural aspects of the Muslim rule in India, Peshawar 1942, 51, 130; Jadunath Sarkar, Mughal administration (Calcutta 1952, 25-40, 53-4); Ishtiaq Husain Qureshi, The administration of the sultanate of Delhi, Lahore 1944, index; Ibn Hasan, The central structure of the Mughul empire, London 1936 (Ürdû trans. entitled Daeslat-i Muqâbîyya ki Hay’at-i Marhazî, Lahore 1958), index; P. Saran, The provincial government of the Mughals, Allahâbâd 1941, 189-97; R. F. Tripathi, Some aspects of Muslim administration, Allahâbâd 1936; W. H. Moreland, The agrarian system of Modern India, Allahâbâd n.d., xiv-xv, 78, 109, 133 ff., 148, 197, 271; Rieu, iii, 926a, (gives a list of wakîls, diwâns, etc., from the reign of Akbar to that of Muhammad Shâh).

(A. S. Bazmee Ansari)
anecdote, the withdrawal of the Sultan is confirmed by the Kānūn of Mehemed II, which states clearly that the Sultan sits behind a screen (dawādḵ bāzḵi) and that the Grand Vizier or beylerbey, he sat above the defterdārs; if that of sandjak-beyi, below the defterdārs, and the nishandjī, at which the Sultan was present behind a grille (kānūnndmē 15, 23). In former times, it had been the practice of the Sultan to dine with the viziers, but Mehemed had abolished this (ibid. 27).

In the course of the 10th/16th century the membership of the dīwān was somewhat extended. A document of 942/1536, quoted by Feridūn (Munše'īlāt al-Selāfīn, i, 595) authorizes the Beylerbey of Rumeli to attend the dīwān but excludes the Beylerbey of Anatolia. Later, in recognition of the growing importance of naval affairs, the Kapūdarān, who then was the ordinary custom so to do, in two of the four Divan days, viz., upon Sunday, and upon Tuesday) to attend the Sultan an account briefly unto His Majesty of all such businesses as he hath dispatched" (ed. Greaves 1747, 616). Besides the regular dīvān meetings, certain special dīwāns were held. These were 1) the wūšlı̇ dīwān or gālebe dīwān, held quarterly for the distribution of pay and supplies to the Janissaries and other 'slaves of the gate' (see Kāpū), and also for the reception of foreign ambassadors; 2) the ayaḵ dīwān—a extraordinary or emergency meeting presided over by the Sultan or army-commander. It was so-called because all present remained standing. (On these two, see I. H. Uzunçarşı, Osmanlı devleti təşkiləndən kapakulu oceklər, i, Ankara 1943, index, and idem, Osmanlı devletinin saray təşkilədə, Ankara 1945, 225-9).

C o n s t i t u t i o n and procedure. The Kānūn of Mehemed II, which purports to set forth the practice of the Sultan's father and grandfather, lays down the constitution of the dīwān-i humāyun in some detail. The dīwān met every day; those attending were, in order of precedence, the Grand Vizier, the other viziers, the kādī'askers, the defterdārs, and the nishandjī. If the nishandjī had the rank of vizier or beylerbey, he sat above the defterdārs; if that of sandjak-beyi, below the defterdārs. When they came, they were received with obeisance by the Chief Pursuivant (Ca'wāḵ-bāzḵ) and by the Intendant of the Doorkeepers (Kāpīḏīlar Kāhyasl). Four times a week a meeting was held in the audience chamber (ark odasl), attended by the viziers, kādī'askers, and defterdārs, at which the Sultan was present behind a grille (kānūnndmē 15, 23). In former times, it had been the practice of the Sultan to dine with the viziers, but Mehemed had abolished this (ibid. 27).

During the 10th/16th century, the dīwān met regularly four times a week, on Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday. Its proceedings began at daybreak, and dealt with the whole range of government business. The morning was normally devoted to public sessions, and especially the hearing of petitions and complaints, which were adjudicated by the relevant member of the dīwān, or by the Grand Vizier himself. About noon, the mass of petitioners and their assistants, clerks, and messengers.

During the 10th/16th century, the dīwān met regularly four times a week, on Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday. Its proceedings began at daybreak, and dealt with the whole range of government business. The morning was normally devoted to public sessions, and especially the hearing of petitions and complaints, which were adjudicated by the relevant member of the dīwān, or by the Grand Vizier himself. About noon, the mass of petitioners and their assistants, clerks, and messengers.

During the 10th/16th century, the dīwān met regularly four times a week, on Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday. Its proceedings began at daybreak, and dealt with the whole range of government business. The morning was normally devoted to public sessions, and especially the hearing of petitions and complaints, which were adjudicated by the relevant member of the dīwān, or by the Grand Vizier himself. About noon, the mass of petitioners and their assistants, clerks, and messengers.
addition was the office of the Amedd [q.v.], who headed the personal staff of the palace. Their subordinate were called kâdd [q.v.]. Decline of the Diwan-i humayün. The growing importance of the Grand Vizierate as against the palace led to the practice of the ikindi diwanî, a meeting held in the Grand Vizier’s residence after the afternoon prayer (ikindi), to deal with unfinished business left over from the diwan-i humayûn. This body came to meet five times a week, and gradually took over a large part of the real work of the diwan-i humayûn. The transfer of the effective control and conduct of affairs from the palace to the Grand Vizierate was formalized in 1054/1644, when Sultan Mehmed IV presented the Grand Vizier Derwish Mehmed Pasha with a building that served both as residence and as office (see bâb-i âli and pasha kâpusu). To this new institution most of the administrative departments formerly under the diwan-i humayûn were, in time, transferred. By the 18th century the diwan-i humayûn had dwindled into insignificance. A new form of diwan appeared under the reforming sultans Selim III and Mahmûd II, who established special councils to plan and apply the reforming edicts (see tanzîmat). These in time evolved into a system of cabinet government. Bibliography: an early statement, from an Ottoman official source, on the constitution, in yâzîde-i hümâyûn (total population, 508,000 according to the ‘preliminary figures’ of the 1957 census with the dependent kâdd [q.v.]). It is the headquarters of a liwa? (total population, 508,000 according to the ‘preliminary figures’ of the 1957 census with the dependent liwa? of Samawa, 132° N.), midway between Hilla and Samawa. With a population of some 12,000, most of all Shi‘i Arabs, it is the headquarters of a liwa? or under the ‘Irâk government (notably in 1336/39, 1919/20) has frequently embarrassed the government by faction and disobedience calling for punitive expeditions; the influence of the Naqdi ‘ulamâ? is strong. The town, built mainly on the left bank and with only small date-gardens, is now extending to the right and has been greatly modernized in recent years with improved streets, bazaars and public buildings. A new steel bridge has replaced the ancient and a landing-ground serve the town and district. It is an important military station. Diwaniyya under its present name dates only from about 1271/1564, when it was formed as a settlement of the Khâzâ‘î bûyüs for the accommodation of the office and reception room (diwan) of their tax-gatherers. The Turkish government adopted it soon afterwards as headquarters of a bâdâ, and merchants, officials, and a military and police garrison augmented the existing matting dwellings and mud-huts, and inaugurated the modern town. In site, however, and as an important middle-Euphrates tribal, administrative and intermittently military station, it seems to have continuity from the Hiska of earlier (post-medieval) centuries. It and its district were disorganized and largely deserted by the tribesmen and cultivators when the Euphrates increasingly abandoned its eastern (Hilla) channel from 1298/1880 onwards in favour of the Hindiyiya channel; but conditions were restored by the erection of the Hindiyiya barrage in 1330/1912.

Bibliography: S. H. Longrigg, Four centuries of modern ‘Iraq, Oxford 1925, and ‘Iraq 1900 to
DIWIRIGI or DİFRİĞ(199,739),(374,757), now a small town in modern Turkey, situated on the confines of Armenia and Cappadocia on one of the routes leading from Syria and Upper Mesopotamia to the Anatolian plateau. Through it runs a torrent which flows into the Çaltı Irmak, a tributary of the Kara Su (northern Euphrates). This chief town of a haddā in the province of Sivas, situated among market gardens and orchards which make it a pleasant resort—archaeological remains testify to its former prosperity in the Middle Ages—is now no more than a very scattered village, part of which is deserted (in about 1930 it had less than 4000 inhabitants). It stands at the bottom of a fertile valley, the old quarters of the town clustered together on the right bank, along with the ruins of the citadel.

The ancient Byzantine Tephrikē, which must not be confused, as is sometimes done, with the Nikopolis of Pompom Arba of the early centuries knew by the name of al-Abrik or al-Àbrūk, "capital of the Paulicians" (G. Le Strange, Al-Àbrīk, Tephrike, in JRAS, 1896, 733-47, and Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. Tephrike), known to have been long occupied by Manichaean sectarians who were persecuted by the emperors of Constantinople and aided by the caliphs of Baghdad. But the most important period in its history followed the annexation of the country to Islam, shortly after the battle of Manazgird in 464/1071 and the partial conquest of Armenia and Asia Minor by the Saljūqids under Alp Arslān. The upper Kara Su region, with Erzindjan and the mummified bodies of "martyrs of the time of 'Umar b. al-Khattāb", which the shaykh 'Ali al-Harawi, whose account has been reproduced by Yākūt, has the opportunity to visit at al-Ubrūk, doubtless the present locality of Ubruk which appears on maps between Konya and Ak Saray.
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DIYA, a specified amount of money or goods due in cases of homicide or other injuries to physical health unjustly committed upon the person of another. It is attacked upon several occasions, by the Mongols among others, still continued to depend upon minor local dynasties, is consequently somewhat obscure. For a time reunited with the Ottoman possessions by Bāyezid I in 801/1397, it was recaptured by the Mamlūks who have left many epigraphic traces of their occupation and, along with the other Taurus frontier-zones which for a time protected their empire from the Divriği territory they created the third of the great Armenian districts forming the mountain marches of the province of Aleppo, connected with Malatya and Cairo by a post road. Finally, in the reign of Selim I in 922/1516, Divriği was to become Ottoman for several centuries.

The dismantled castle which dominates the town was probably founded in ancient times, but the present fabric apparently dates entirely from the Middle Ages (inscriptions of 634/1236-7, 640/1242-3 and 650/1252). The mosque of amir Shāhānshāh, also known as the Djāmī-i, built in 526/1130-1, is still well-known, but the most remarkable building in the town, and indeed one of the most curious Turkish monuments in the whole of Anatolia is, beyond question, the architectural group comprising the great mosque and the adjoining hospital, built in 626/1228 for Ahmad Shāh, grandson of the previous sovereign, and his wife Tūrān Malik by the skill of a native craftsman of Aḥāḍī. The rich decoration of the three doorways is no less effective than that of the vaults which have been used to cover these buildings. One must search far in the East to find parallels to these features. Various mausolea of the same period, aedicules built on an octagonal base, crowned with a pyramid of stone and containing a domed burial chamber, are also noteworthy, in particular the tomb of Shāhānshāh, known by the name of Sitte Malik Türbesi, and a shrine of amir Kamar al-Dīn, both of which were built in 592/1192-6. On the other hand, it is profitable to seek to identify in present-day Divriği the site of the strange place of pilgrimage, generated both by Muslims and by Christians and housing in a grotto the mummified bodies of "martyrs of the time of 'Umar b. al-Khattāb", which the source Al-Harawi, whose account has been reproduced by Yākūt, has the opportunity to visit at al-Ubrūk, doubtless the present locality of Ubruk which appears on maps between Konya and Ak Saray.

The historical origin of the institution lies in pre-Islamic customary practice, where it was closely bound up with the social organization of Arabia. This rested upon a tribal basis, with the absence of any political authority, even within the individual tribe, and a system of private justice tempered to some extent by the practice of voluntary submission to arbitration. In matters of homicide particularly the principle of the exercise of personal vengeance (thāʾr [q.v.]) reigned supreme, apart from the possibility of voluntary renunciation of the right against the payment of diya. The amount of this was, in principle, fixed—at least in the area in which Islam was born—at one hundred head of camels, although
there are certain traditions which speak of ten camels only. A strong solidarity, as much active as passive, united the members of the tribe in the application of the system: the tribe as a whole was obliged to share in the payment of the diya, just as vengeance itself could be exercised upon members of the tribe other than the culprit himself. In the opposite case, and where the nearest blood-relative of the victim was himself unable to exact vengeance, any other qualified fellow-tribesman could take his place.

Islam did not interfere with the basic system; various Kur'anic texts even expressly confirmed it. They indicated, however, certain modifications, among which the most important was the rule which made compensation obligatory in the case of accidental homicide.

On the other hand the integration of the ancient custom in the Kur’anic revelation perforce had the effect of fixing this custom in a definite form in the law and thus constituting, in principle, a barrier to any further development.

It was, however, soon to find itself out of tune with the new Islamic society such as was to develop rapidly into a community unified in principle and, in particular, organized as a State.

Working under the influence of such opposing demands the jurists constructed a theory of the diya land of the law of private justice (see kisâgâh) in which divergent trends are readily apparent. This theory is, in general, the same in both the Sunni and the Shi’î doctrine, apart from certain differences on secondary points, some of which will be noted below.

The operation of the institution is confined to the field of homicide and a certain number of injuries to the body which will be defined below and which are restricted by enumeration to such effect that outside their bounds the developed common law of civil liability and the precise calculation of damage asserts its sway. Diyas are sometimes optional and sometimes obligatory.

They are optional in the case of offences committed deliberately (’amd). In the case of homicide the condition of intention is interpreted restrictively: not only is it necessary that the murder should have been committed with a weapon intrinsically likely to kill. In the absence of this last condition there is quasi-deliberate (shibh ’amd) homicide where the diya is no longer optional. The Maliki madhhab does not recognize this separate category: whatever the means employed might be, as soon as the intention to kill is established the diya remains optional.

There are, however, a certain number of cases where an ’amd offence does not entail a right of vengeance and for which the diya is no longer optional, such as infanticide, murder which is not the direct and immediate result of the assault, etc. (see kisâgâh).

The diyas are obligatory in all cases other than those of deliberate offences which entail a right of vengeance.

Controversy exists among the different schools on the question as to whether the choice of the optional diya in place of kisâs depends solely upon the wishes of the victim or his heirs, or whether the agreement of the offender is necessary for the choice to be effective.

In the absence of a contrary agreement between the parties there is a fixed tariff for the amount of the diya. In principle it consists of camels of different ages and sex. The diya in cases of homicide is one hundred camels, split into five categories equal in number: twenty four-year-old, twenty three-year-old, twenty two-year-old and twenty one-year old female camels and twenty one-year-old male camels. Subject, however, in the matter of this division, to divergent juristic opinions, if the homicide is deliberate or quasi-deliberate, the value of the diya is increased (diya muhâllala) comprising now only female camels of the first four categories described. The diya for accidental homicide is also due in full in all cases of total loss of an organ or of a physiological or intellectual function. In cases of partial loss the amount of the diya is in proportion to the part lost: a half of the total diya for the loss of an arm, a leg, an eye or an eyelid; a quarter for the loss of eyelashes; a tenth for the loss of a finger or toe; a twentieth for a tooth, etc.

The remaining physical injuries for which a diya or arâh is prescribed and for which, again, the amount is determined by reference to the diya of homicide are the following: the gîdâ’â, a wound penetrating the brain: 1/3rd of the diya; the munâabîla, a fracture with displacement of a bone: 3/20ths; the kâshîma, a fracture of a bone: 1/10th; the mûdîha, a wound laying bare the bone: 1/10th. All other injuries lie outside the system of the diya and are dealt with on the basis of what is called hukumat ’adl, i.e., an assessment: the actual harm suffered. This remains, however, under the influence of the diya system inasmuch as compensation is determined by a comparison with an injury for which a fixed diya is established and it cannot, in any case, exceed the amount of the diya.

The previously cited amounts of diya or arâh are due in full only where the victim is a Muslim, of the male sex and of freeborn status. The diya of a woman is half that of a man. According to the Malikis, however, who are here followed by al-Shâfi‘i, this reduction to half is only applicable where the diya exceeds a third of the full diya; but if, for example, the offence is one for which it would have been due at the rate of a quarter of the full diya, this same amount will be due to the woman.

The diya of the dhimmî or the mus’ta‘min (a non-Muslim foreigner temporarily admitted to Muslim territory—in the case of the foreigner who is not musta‘min nothing is due) is at the rate of one third or one half in the opinion of the majority, though the Hanafis admit an equal rate. In every case the diya is due only where the offence is committed in Muslim territory. As for the slave, he is outside the system when he is the victim (see below for his position when he is the offender). Since he is assimilated to property, if he is killed or is the victim of some injury to his physical well-being, his master will be entitled to an amount of compensation equivalent to the loss he himself suffers from this fact. Such compensation may even exceed the amount of the relevant diya, except, according to a minority opinion, in the case of murder, where the compensation may not exceed this amount.

Although, according to the original principle, the diya consists of camels, it was very soon recognized that it could equally well be paid in gold coinage (1000 dinars) or silver coinage (10,000 or 12,000 dirhams according to different versions which, without doubt, depend upon the variations in gold and silver currency rates). According to certain opinions the diya may consist of cattle (200), sheep (1000) or clothing (200 garments). Opinions differ, however, on the point as to whether the choice of
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the mode of payment depends upon the agreement of the parties or belongs to the guilty party or to the judge; or whether the diya in camels is the fundamental obligation and it is only in circumstances where the provision of payment in this form is impossible that recourse may be had to the other forms.

As to the matter of deferred payment of the full diya, the majority opinion (Shafi', MalikI and Hanbali) draws a distinction according as to whether the offence was committed; while in other cases it may be paid over a period of three years in instalments of one third. According to the Hanafs the diya may, in all cases, be paid within the three year period.

Where the diya is equal to one third of the full diya, payment may be exacted, in all cases and according to all opinions, in the course of the first year. Where the diya exceeds one third of the full diya the same controversy exists as in the matter of the full diya; the second third may also be exacted within the first year in the case of a deliberate offence according to the majority opinion, while according to the Hanafs it may be paid in the course of the second year.

The legal nature of the diya is complex and is marked by diverse and contradictory characteristics which are the result of its origin and subsequent development. It appears at one and the same time as a manifestation of the law of private vengeance, as a measure to safeguard the public order and as a means of compensation for loss suffered.

The creditor of the diya is the victim; in the case of homicide it will be the victim's heirs according to the order of succession; it is not precisely the circumstances of the victim of the loss which will be the determining factor.

The debtor of the diya was, at the outset, the tribal group—referred to, in these circumstances, as the 'dhiil (q.v.)—to which the culprit belonged; and this is the explanation for the comparatively high amount of the diya. The principle of this collective responsibility was firmly maintained in theory; but in fact it was progressively impaired, eventually disappearing altogether; it is avoided in the case of deliberate offences, as we have seen. The responsibility of the 'dhiil, having previously been the primary one, became subordinate to that of the culprit himself; it was now regarded as no more than the act of a beneficiary towards a debtor without means; and then, in recognition of the fact that the tribal organization had disappeared in developed Islamic society, the place of the 'dhiil was taken by the State itself, whose responsibility, in turn, eventually disappeared. In cases where there is a number of culprits the diya is divided among them per capita.

If the perpetrator of the offence is a slave, again a distinction is drawn according as to whether the offence is deliberate or accidental. In the former case there is ground for hizād just as in the case of a freeman, unless, according to one opinion, the victim or his heirs should choose to surrender the slave. In the view of the majority, however, the choice of the successful prosecutor lies solely between hizād and outright pardon.

A secondary practice connected with that of diya and hizād is that of baskama (q.v.). When the corpse of a murdered person is found in a locality—tribe, village or district—and the identity of the culprit is not discovered, fifty persons from the local population are asked to take an oath that they have no knowledge of the identity of the perpetrator of the offence. In default of such oaths, the obligation to pay the diya will fall upon the local population. This practice also, as was observed by an author of the 6th/12th century, eventually disappeared.

The survival of the diya.

The system of the diya survives in the present contemporary period in two principal forms according to circumstances.

Among the Bedouin tribes, with their innate hostility towards a State organization, the system of private vengeance tempered by the practice of the diya still survives upon a basis of customs which are analogous to ancient Arabian customs in several particulars—though they differ from tribe to tribe—and which often contradict the precepts of the Kur'ān and the rules of Islamic law. The efforts of the governments concerned have not been able to achieve more than the imposition upon these groups of certain regulations of a procedural character and of limited scope.

Thus, among the Arab tribes of Egypt, Jordan and Syria there is a fairly general custom which renders the diya obligatory in all cases save those of deliberate homicide. The composition of the diya varies from tribe to tribe—40 male camels only, 40 male camels and a virgin girl, a sum of money (in Egypt, for example, £E 400, or 300 or 150 etc.).

The diya of a woman is usually greater than that of a man; among certain tribes it even reaches four times or eight times the amount of a man's diya. As regards proof of the offence, the system of ordeal, by fire and water particularly, is often practised. Among certain tribes a procedure of baskama is in evidence.

The survival of the system in communities more fully developed and politically organized is essentially attributable to the religious character which it had acquired. A typical example in this regard is provided by the Ottoman Empire. The principle of compensation, despite the modernization of the law towards the middle of the 19th century, and notwithstanding the fact that the principle of the rule of compensation (properly so-called) for loss suffered had been enunciated and the system of public law had been duly organized, the right of the interested parties to demand the application of hizād and, finally, the diya, was retained, notably under the terms of the penal code of 1863. The amount of the diya was officially fixed at £T 224.

All this has now, in actual fact, disappeared from positive legislative enactments; but traces, hard to erase, of the former state of things still persist. In certain countries such as Syria the courts, in spite of the spirit and the letter of legislation, such as a civil code and a penal code wholly modern in inspiration and in force since 1949, still continue to pronounce liability for diyas, the amount of which, in cases of homicide, is always fixed as a lump sum of money, and is greater or less according as to whether it is a case of deliberate or accidental homicide.

DIYA — DIYAR BAKR

DIYAR BAKR, properly "abode of (the tribe of) Irak". Its name, of unknown origin and meaning, is as ancient, appearing in antiquity as ZIYAR or DIYAR or DILAS; its upper waters are known as the Sirwan or (originally and more correctly) Shirewan, as known to Yakut, and this name is in common use for most of its length. It forms a left-bank tributary of the Dijla (Tigris), navigable only by small craft, and with a discharge formidable in the flood season (March-May), slight in the later summer and autumn.

The river rises in western Persia, where the many hill-streams (often dry in the summer and autumn) which unite to form its principal tributaries drain (1) the area north of Kirmanshah, (2) the area both ways of the Persian frontier follows substantially the old alignment by way of Ba’kuba, Shahrabán, Kizil Rubát, Khánikln, and Kasr-i Shírin. The first three of these sources have made their contributions before the middle of the river flows first through Mesopotamia. Having stayed for some time in the middle and lower course, where it flows first through undulating, then through flat country, diminishing its speed of flow, and lending itself to important towards the north. It was at the time of the conquests of Khánikln, Mandáli, Kháli, and Ba’kuba —are due entirely to the presence of these canals, and to water-lift irrigation by the Middle East. The intensive cultivation and famous ruins of the Diyálá Íwad—not itself named from the Dijla river (the Djabal Hamrin a series of major canals and to water-lift irrigation by the Tigris at or near the present mouth, 10 miles below Baghdad. Techni-

cally, the relation between the Diyálá (with its capacity for sudden and formidable flooding) and the Nahrawán canal-system, remains obscure; nomenclature varies in the Arab geographers, who do not distinguish between canals and mere flood-channels, and at times even identify the Dijla with the Nahrawán or Támría. The mediaeval cities dependent on the Dijla and its connected canals included Nahrawán, Bándísrí, Ba’kúbá, Daskara and Djalálí. The area astride its lower course was closely admi-

cistered and sustained hundreds of villages and a dense population; traces of Sásáníán and older sites indicate that this had always been a favoured region. The main road from Bágdád to, and through, the province of al-Dijláb—the Khurásán highway—ran through it, and largely followed the course of the river; this is still the case; the motor-road running from Bágdád to and across the Persian frontier follows substantially the old alignment by way of Ba’kúbá, Shahrabán, Kizil Rubát, Khánikln, and Kasr-i Shírin. The metre-gauge railway to Khánikln, constructed in and after 1337/1918, follows a similar line; railway bridges exist at Ba’kúbá and at Karághán, where the Kírkük-Irbil line branches off.

Bibliography: For the Arab geographers, see bibliography under Díyá; equally for the relevant works of Streck, Le Strange, Wilcockes, and Longrigg.

DIYÁR BAKR, properly "abode of (the tribe of) Bakr", the designation of the northern province of the Djazira. It covers the region on the right bank of the region where it changes from its west-east course to flow in a south-easterly direction. It is, therefore, the upper basin of the Tigris, from the region of Sírt and Tell Fáñán to the north-west of Ámid and Bișan al-Hammi (Cermúk) to the west of Ámid. Yakút points out that Diyár Bakr does not extend beyond the plain.

Diyár Bakr is so called because it became, during the 1st/7th century, the habitat of an important portion of the Rabí’í tribe of Bakr b. Wa’il [q.v.]. The latter had already moved forward, following the tribal wars of the pre-Islamic period, into Mesopotamia. Having stayed for some time in the region of al-Kufa, the Bakr tribes spread out towards the north. It was at the time of the conquests under the caliphate of Uthmán, while Mu’áwiyá was governor of Syria and the Djazira, that some Mdárí and Rabí’í tribes were settled in the occupied lands of this region on the orders of the government. Mu’áwiyá installed these Mdáris in what came to be called the Diyár Mu’dar and the Rabí’í in what came to be called the Diyár Rabí’í. Al-Baládíchur, who gives us this information, does not mention the Bakr tribes expressly, who were included in the Rabí’í group, but it is probable that it was in the same manner and at the same time.
that they established themselves in the Diyar Bakr. This appellation does not however mean that this territory was inhabited by Bakris alone; on the other hand, there were Bakris elsewhere.

The Diyar Bakr and the Diyar Rabl, since the two groups of which it was composed, are sometimes spoken of jointly under the single name of Diyar Rabî (Yûkît, ii, 637).

The principal towns of the Diyar Bakr are Āmid, the capital, Mayyafarîkî, Ḥisn Kayfâ, and Arzan, which strictly speaking is part of Armenia. The territory of the Diyar Bakr has, from the administrative point of view, generally followed the destiny of the Djazîra. It has, however, sometimes formed, in juxtaposition with neighbouring Armenia, a distinct and quasi-independent government. Esâ b. al-Shaykh al-Shaybânî, from 256/870 to 269/883, and his descendants ruled over the Diyar Bakr until the reconquest of Āmid by the caliph Muḥtaḍâd in 286/899. The same situation occurred in Ḥamdânî times when Diyar Bakr and Armenia were in the hands of the Amir of Aleppo, Sayf al-Dawla, at the same time as northern Syria, over which the decline of the latter in 356/967 Diyar Bakr returned to the Ḥamdânî Abû Taghlib of al-Mawṣî. With the rest of the Djazîra, it fell under the domination of the Buwayḥid Āḍud al-Dawla in 357/978, but after the death of the latter in 372/983 it passed into the hands of a Kurdish chief, Bâdîth (the Kurds were also inhabitants of this part of the Djazîra), then to those of his nephew Abû Ḥâlid b. Marwân, who disputed the Diyar Bakr lands with scions of the Ḥamdânî family, but remained in control, and was the founder of the Marwânî dynasty.

From Diyar Bakr comes the name of the Bakrî frontier posts (al-thughr al-bakhrîyya) enumerated in M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Ḥamdânîs, i, 254-61, and cf. 846 ff., which are situated in the north and north-west of the province.

i. The formation of the Saljûq empire faced the Marwânîs with a new problem. From the beginning they rejoiced in their increasing power, causing the khâlsâ to be read in the name of the Sultans as well as of the Caliphs. The Saljûqs were in no hurry to suppress a principality which was functioning as a buffer state between themselves and Byzantium. The Marwânîs, however, were unable to prevent some Turcoman infiltrations, some of which were accompanied by plunder. The dislocation of the empire of the likhans proceeded. In the face of this invasion, Artukids and Ayyûbîds had no differences, and both Mayyafarîkî and Mardîn succumbed after severe sieges (657/1259 and 659/1261), but the Mongols allowed two small dynasties, an Artukid one at Mardîn and an Ayyûbîd one at Ḥisn Kayfâ, to remain, under their suzerainty; these recovered some degree of autonomy as the dislocation of the empire of the likhans proceeded. The region, however, became the prey of nomadic pastoral tribes, especially Kurds in the north and Turcomans in the south, whose attacks against the rural Christian communities of Tûr ʿAbdîn contributed to the Islamization of this region which had hitherto not proceeded very far. On the eve and the morrow of Timûr's devastations (especially at Mardîn), Diyar Bakr was the stake in the struggles with which the two great confederations of the Ak-Koyunlu and the Kara-Koyunlu occupied themselves; the former, masters of Āmid, made themselves masters of the whole of Diyar Bakr having taken Mardîn from the Kara-Koyunlu, and then Ḥisn Kayfâ from the Ayyûbîds. Diyar Bakr was, however, occupied for a time by the troops of ʿShâh Ismâʿîl, founder of the Safawî dynasty in Persia (913/1507), and fell, for three centuries, into Ottoman hands in 922/1516.

It must be borne in mind that, in the terminology of the Saljûqids of Rûm, Diyar Bakr referred to the western confines of the province, which were all that they possessed in those areas in that of the Mongols it often refers to all the Djazîra, including the Diyar Muḍar and the Diyar Rabî.

ii. Diyar Bakr, in its Turkish form Diyarbakr, is the name by which the Turks called the capital of the province, Āmid, which they also called Kara ("black") Āmid, on account of the black colour of its ramparts and its houses, built of basalt (or millstone); this is noted by the Arab geographers, and is perhaps alluded to in a verse of al-Muṭanabbi (ed. Bârkhûlî, i, 182; cf. Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, ii/2, 316). A proverb relates that all there is black, dogs, walls, and hearts.

Only the Āmid of Arab times is described here. This was built on the left bank of the Tigris on a plateau which runs down abruptly to the river, which runs beside the enceinte on three sides, the fourth being protected by a moat and an outer wall. Āmid was taken without a fight in 960/1550 at the time of the first appearance of the Ottoman Turks under ʿOzâyîd b. Zâhîn. It was besieged by al-Muṭâḍâd who put paid to the attempt at independence of the small Shaybânî dynasty (see above), and the walls of the town were dismantled; at the time of al-Muṣṭadîr, however, in 297/910, they were restored. An inscription commemorating this restoration is still legible on the Mardîn gate. Āmid fell into the hands of the Buway-
bids in about 368/978. It was also the target of several attacks by the Byzantines, such as in 347 and 348/958 and 959 by the Domesticos John emperor, in 972, 973 and 974 A.D. In the course of the success of the Byzantines, and Ibn Hawkal seems to have foreseen that it would fall into Greek hands.

Amid was renowned for its woolen and fine linen products, said to be “Greek” and “in the Sicilian style” (al-Mukaddasi, 145).

Bibliography: i. (to the 10th century): Le Strange, 109 ff., where reference to the geographers will be found; M. van Berchem, Arabische Inschriften aus Armenien und Diyarbekir, in Lehmann-Haupt, Materialien zur ältesten Geschichte Armeniens und Mesopotamiens, Abb. G. W. Gött., ix/3, 22; indem, Inschriften Max Oppenheim, i, Arab. Inschr., 71, 91-2; M. van Berchem and J. Strzygowski, Amida; J. Strzygowski, Kara-Amid, in Orientalisches Archiv, i/5; Sarre and Herzfeld, Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigrisgebiet, ii, 263; G. Beli, Amurath to Amurath, 122 ff.; J. Laurent, L’Arménie entre Byzance et l’Islam, index; Amedros, The Marwanids, in JRAS, 1903; M. Canard, Hist. de la dynastie des Hâmadnides, i, 77 ff., 572 ff., 795, 799, 838 ff. et passim; Margo-liouth, The ellipse of the Abbasid caliphate, index. On Amida in Roman times, see Chapot, La frontière de l’Euphrat, 523 ff.

Of the Ottoman rulers, the sources of the history and general geography of the periods covered, for which see AK-KOYUNLU, ARTUKIDS, AYYÜBSDS, the only references specifically to Diyar Bakr are Ibn al-Khatib, Khusraw, Iskender and Behrân, Nasûh, Murtezû, Melek Ahmed, Dâltaban ‘Ali and Ismâ’îl Pashas built one mosque each in the city, while Hasan Pasha had an inn (khan) built. Another khan is ascribed to Melek Ahmed Pasha. Bathes were built by Melek, Iskender and Behrân Pashas and a dâr al-hurma by Kâpûlu-žâde ‘Abdulhalîc Pasha. Sarl (yellow or fair) ‘Abd al-Rahmân Pasha founded a library. In 1815 Suleymân Pasha repaired the walls.

Amid, known now as Diyarbakr, also became an important cultural centre in Ottoman times. In the 19th/20th century it bred the poet İbrahim Gulpınar, who also founded a tariqa (religious order), and the historian Khâzî Huseyn. It was during that century that the famous historian Müsûd al-Dîn Lârî was mufti of Amid. Many poets are known as Âmîdî in the 19th/20th century, including Labîb, Hamîl, Wâlî and Ahmed Murâhidî, as also the physician Ahmed Râdi, the mathematician Ismâ’îl and the theologian Küçûk Ahmed-žâde Abû Bakr. Later local notables included the poets Refî, Râgib and Tâlib in the 19th century, as also the historian, belles-lettres and poet Sa’d Pasha, while in modern times there are the latter’s sons Suleymân Nasîf and Behrân ‘Ali Bey, ‘Ali Emîl Efendi, the founder of the Millet library, and the political thinker Ziya (Diyâ) Gökalp. The ‘Abd al-Dîjaal-žâde family which gave many distinguished Pashas to the service of the Ottoman Empire is also of Diyarbakr origin. Descendants of tribal chiefs in the Kara-Koyunlu and Ak-Koyunlu States, of 19th/20th century governors and of regional notables can still be found in the city.

In the second half of the 19th century the Diyarbakr region, like other Ottoman provinces, was the
scene of opposition and sometimes of revolts of local amirs, tribal chiefs and other notables who did not wish to accept the reforms carried out in the Ottoman Empire. This led to armed uprisings and ouster of the authorities, as a result of which local chiefs, such as Bedir Khan Pasha, were forced to submit, or were punished, sometimes by exile. Leaders of nomadic or settled tribes, however, succeeded in maintaining their influence, even although their official titles had been abolished, only instead of gathering round amirs or tribal chiefs, these notables gave allegiance to the shaykhs of the dervish orders (tariqa). Led by shaykh Sa‘id, the latter rebelled in 1924 against the reforms which the new Republican government of Turkey sought to carry out. The revolt started in Khani and spread before long to most of the Diyarbakr region. The rebels were, however, beaten back before the walls of Diyarbakr, after which the Government, which had proclaimed a partial mobilization, rapidly quelled the rebellion. In 1928 an Inspectorate-General was formed in the region of Diyarbakr and of A’kkâhl with the object of promoting reforms. While it was in existence a small rebellion was quelled at Şâsun.

The city of Diyarbakr is always named Āmid in all writings up to the end of the 19th/20th century. It then began to acquire its present name, which was the name of the province of which it had become the centre, the name of Āmid being gradually forgotten. Under the Republic the form Diyarbakr was officially adopted, in place of the earlier Diyarbekir.

Bibliography: Among Ottoman geographers and travellers, Kâtîb Celebi (Diyahannûmû) gives some information, Ewliyâ Celebi very much more (Ṣiyâhatnâmê, iv, 24 ff.). There are useful data on the social and cultural conditions in the region of Diyarbakr in the Mênâkî of İbrahim Gûlşênî. Interesting information on local customs is given in the chapter on Diyarbakr written by Bâkî Faydî (in the author’s private library). At the end of the 19th century Diyâbekirî Sa‘îd Paşa gives the mediaeval Islamic history of the city in his Mîrî‘î al-‘îbâr: he does not, however, add very much to the data of Ibn al-Āthîr and Munegdîmîm-Bâshî. Detailed information on local scholars and writers is given in ‘Alli Emrî Efendî, Tâhtâ-Îlî, which was published in 1924. The second volume of this work has not, however, been printed. There is further information in the same writer’s Diyâbekirî Vîlîyêtî, Istanbul 1918, in his Mîrî‘î al-fa‘ûlîyyd and in the magazine Āmid which he published. For more recent Turkish work on the history of the city and province see Basrî Konyar, Diyâbekirî tarihi, kitâbeleri, yildaş, Ankara 1936; İbrahim Tokay, Diyâbekir, Istanbul 1937; Osman Eff, Diyarbakır, Diyarbakır 1937; Kâzîm Baykal and Suleyman Savci, Diyâbekir şehrî, Diyarbakır n.d.; Kâzîm Baykal and Suleyman Savci, Diyâbekir şehrî, Diyarbakır n.d., and Diyarbakır şehrî, Diyarbakır 1942. Much useful information will also be found in the Sülênîmê of Diyarbakr.

Data on the city and region can also be found in European travellers from the 16th century onwards. Scholars have also described the region and the archaeology, geography and history of the city. For local monuments and inscriptions see van Berchem and Strzygowski, Amida (Heidelberg 1910) (reviewed by Khâlîl Edhem in TOEM 1st year, no. 6, 1329, 365-77). Further information on inscriptions is given by J. Sauvaget and Basrî Konyar. See also the extensive bibliography in A. Gabriel, Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale (Paris 1940). (Mîkrimih H. Yımançlı)

Monuments. One of the most remarkable characteristics of the present-day town of Diyarbakr is without doubt the archaeological wealth of this city of black stone, with its old quarters still surrounded by walls which give the site its characteristic shape, which, throughout the middle ages, gave a strategic value to this locality which is otherwise lacking in natural protection. The well preserved enceinte naturally attracted the attention of 19th century European travellers, as well as admiration from all visitors to the stronghold since the Arab conquest (for example, the account of Nâsîr-i Khursaw). But not until the serious archaeological investigation made on the spot by A. Gabriel, re-opening the joint study to which M. van Berchem and J. Strzygowski had formerly bent themselves on the basis solely of photographic material, was it possible to recognize in it one of the most eloquent witnesses of military art in the mediaeval Near East. The site shows a rampart of regular trace, somewhat modified by certain configurations in the terrain (the original town was in fact situated on the edge of a plateau bounded by escarpments on the side of the Tigris), displaying on a perimeter of more than 5 km. a curtain flanked by towers and contreforts, before which were a fausse-braie and a ditch, now filled in, interrupted by several monumental gates and by breaches of recent date. The layout of the curtain (8 to 12 m. high, 3 to 5 m. broad, built of masonry rubble between two matching facings), with its chemin de ronde protected by a crenelated parapet and its arched gallery running at certain places under the chemin de ronde,—the disposition of the square, polygonal or circular flanking towers, of varying dimensions, with powerful basalt piers equipped with lower casemates and with upper rooms or platforms arranged for defence,—the roman elements still in place between the circular salients of the gates now called the Kharput, Ura and Mardin gates, all combine with epigraphic evidence to show the antiquity of an enceinte which indeed underwent successive alterations after the Arab conquest but "which remains the most important and the most complete example of Byzantine fortification of the 4th century" (A. Gabriel). No less significant, however, is the nature of the works which were carried out in the 13th century under the Mu‘tadid period, indicated particularly by the restoration of the principal gates (dismantled by al-Mu‘tadid, then rebuilt by al-Muqtadir, as inscriptions of 297/709 testify)—on the other, under the Marwânids, Sa’dîjids and Artûkîds who undertook at different times partial repairs to the curtain and towers on the western front (indicated both by inscriptions and by underpinning of coursework), or more important works of reconstruction attested by those enormous circular bastions of the Artûkîd period, Ulu Badan and Yedi Kardash, which are over 25 m. in diameter and encompass previous works within their complex systems of casemates and galleries—and, finally, under the Ottomans, who were content to keep the enceinte of the town in repair but directed their main efforts to the citadel, of which the south-east corner, extended it, and substituted their own works for the ruins of the former palace of the Artûkîds.

In the interior of the enceinte the great mosque, Ulu Dîjamî, is noteworthy, whose abundant inscriptions, scattered in the greatest disorder on a heterogeneous composition in which re-utilized older material dominates, have provoked a clash of opinions concerning its origin and history. In fact
the most probable conclusions, with regard to both
the actual state of the building and the vicissitudes
(fire in particular) which, according to textual in-
formation, it must have undergone, tend to show it
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following the death of al-Kamil, granted it to the Khwarizmians, recent fugitives from Asia Minor (635/1238). The later defeat of these latter and the fall of the Ayyubid dynasty in Egypt caused the region to pass into the hands of the Aleppo Ayyubid al-Nasir Yusuf, from whose time dates the administrative description of 'Izz al-Din b. Shaddad; but in 658/1260 it was conquered by the Mongols, who were already in control of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia.

Henceforward the function of the Dyir Murd changed. Reconquered by the Mamluks, who repelled the Ayyubids in Egypt and Syria. They established a frontier with the Mongols of Persia, and later with the Turcoman dynasties who succeeded them at the end of the 8th/14th century. Successive invasions ruined the land, especially in the south, and Harran declined irretrievably, although Edessa was the capital of the province. As in the neighbouring regions of the north, east and west, the Turcoman element, here especially of the tribe of the Djabal Sindjar; and that on both banks of the Tigris between Tell Fafan and Takrit, was more important than in the Umayyad period as in the 5th/nth century. The eclipse of the Abbasid caliphate, as much in the Umayyad period as in the 5th/nth and 6th/i2th centuries.

Bibliography: The sources of the history and geography of this period are to be found especially, for almost all the Djazira, in 'Izz al-Din b. Shaddad, A'tid, iii, analysed by Cl. Cahen in REJ, 1934. (Cl. Cahen)

DIYAR RABI'A, a name formed in the same way as Diyar Bakr [q.v.], is the most eastern and the largest province of the Djazira. It includes three regions: that of the Khabur and its tributary the Hirmas (Diaghchagh) and their sources, i.e., the slopes of the Tur 'Abdin; that which is contained between the Hamadan, the Tigris, the former Beih 'Arabayyeh with the Dijalal Sinjar, and that on both sides of the banks of the Tigris between Tell Fafan and Takrit, which marks the boundary with 'Irak. The lower reaches of the two Zabs are also included in this last region. The principal towns are the capital Mosul (al-Mawsil) on the left bank of the Tigris, Balad, Djazirat Ibn 'Umar, al-Sinn, and in the west Bark'ud, Sinjar, Nasibin, Mardin, and Ra'a al-'Ayin. The strategy of the Dyir Rabi'a is not so menaceous as that of al-Mawsil. It was marked by numerous Khalidji revolts, which also affected other regions of the Djazira, as much in the Umayyad period as in the 'Abbasiad. In the first period they were further complicated by the rivalries between the Caliphal governors of the Djazira and Syria. An account of the troubles which afflicted the Dyir Rabi'a in the Abbasid period is given in Sulaiman Saigh, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdaniades, i, 97 ff., and passim, Vaglieri, Le vicende del Harizismo in epoca abbaside, in RSO, xxiv, (1949), 31 ff.; M. Canard, Hist. de la dynastie des Hamdaniades, i, 291 ff.

The Dyir Rabi'a is the region from which sprang the Taghlibi family of the Hamdaniades, who took part in these Khalidji revolts and founded thereafter the quasi-independent amirate of al-Mawsil, which during the reign of Nasir al-Dawla consisted principally of the Dyir Rabi'a. After the conquest of the Hamdani amirate of al-Mawsil by the Buwayhids, the attempt on the part of the last Hamdani, Ibrahim and later with the Turcoman dynasties who succeeded them at the end of the 8th/14th century. Successive invasions ruined the land, especially in the south, and Harran declined irretrievably, although Edessa was the capital of the province. As in the neighbouring regions of the north, east and west, the Turcoman element, here especially of the tribe of the Djabal Sindjar; and that on both banks of the Tigris between Tell Fafan and Takrit, which marks the boundary with 'Irak. The lower reaches of the two Zabs are also included in this last region. The principal towns are the capital Mosul (al-Mawsil) on the left bank of the Tigris, Balad, Djazirat Ibn 'Umar, al-Sinn, and in the west Bark'ud, Sinjar, Nasibin, Mardin, and Ra'a al-'Ayin. The strategy of the Dyir Rabi'a is not so menaceous as that of al-Mawsil. It was marked by numerous Khalidji revolts, which also affected other regions of the Djazira, as much in the Umayyad period as in the 'Abbasiad. In the first period they were further complicated by the rivalries between the Caliphal governors of the Djazira and Syria. An account of the troubles which afflicted the Dyir Rabi'a in the Abbasid period is given in Sulaiman Saigh, Histoire de la dynastie des Hamdaniades, ii.—In the middle of the 5th/11th century the Dyir Rabi'a sustained the repercussions of the Turkish advance. From 433-5/1041-3 it was ravaged by the first band of Turcomans, who were finally massacred. When in 447/1055 the Saljuk sultan Tughril Beg was enthroned at Bagdad by the 'Abbasid caliph, the 'Uqaylidis, fearing for their Shi'a faith and for their pastures, resisted his summons, and it was in their territories that the coalition of Arab adversaries of the sultan was organized, grouped under the former Buwayhid general al-Basasiri [q.v.], who was now adhering to the Fatimid caliph of Cairo (449-51/1053-9). The 'Uqaylid Kuraysh however decided in due time to rally to Tughril Beg, who for his part in this frontier region preferred to content himself with his vassal status. The 'Uqaylid principality thus remained until 479/1086, the son of Kuraysh, Muslim, recently suspected of intrigues with Egypt, having met his death in a battle in Syria, and Malikshah, the third Saljuk sultan, having thereupon annexed his dominions without a struggle. After the death of the last Saljuk emperor, to reconstitute this amirate for their advantage at the time of the Buwayhid Bahi'a al-Dawla (579-403/1089-1012) was opposed on the one hand by the Marwānid of Diyar Bakr [q.v.], and on the other by the 'Uqaylid amir Muhammed b. al-Musayyab, who had originally helped the two princes and had received three places in the Diyar Rabi'a in return. The latter became ruler of al-Mawsil, and was nominally subject to the Buwayhid of Bagdad. He was the founder of the 'Uqaylid dynasty of al-Mawsil, to which the Saljūks put an end. (CL. CAHEN)
was not integrated into the new Turkey. The odd disposition of frontiers divides it between Syria.

Some further articles are DJAZIRA, DJAZIRAT IBN QUMAR, AL-MAWŞİ, NASBIN, SINDJAR, and ZANDGIS.

**Bibliography:** The sources are those of the general history of the period; the only special work is *Histoire des Atabeks de Mossoul* of Ibn al-Ashir (ed. and Fr. trans. in *Revue des Hist. des Croisades, Hist. Arabes*, ii/2), which, however, is particularly devoted to the exploits of Nūr al-Dīn, who reigned at Aleppo and not al-Mawsī. The *ATabēk* of *Izz al-Dīn b. Muhammed al-Dīyar Rabil* (see Cl. Cahen, in *REI*, 1934), but does not give the developments promised about al-Mawsī.

(OUTLINES)

AL-DIYĀRBAKṘ, ḤUSAYN B. MUḤAMMAD B. AL-ḤASAN, 10th/11th century author of a once popular history of Muhammad, entitled *Ṭabakāt al-ḥamāsī fi abwāb nafs nafs* and preserved in numerous MSS and printed twice (Cairo 1285, 1302).

The work is furnished in addition to a brief sketch of subsequent Muslim history. The brief enumeration of Ottoman rulers at the end stops in some MSS with Sūleymān Kānnūjī but usually ends with Murād III (982/1574).

The author is also credited with a detailed description of the sanctuary in Mecca. There is much confusion concerning his identity. According to Ḥājjī Khalīfa (ed. Flugel), iii, 277, the *Ṭabakāt* was finished in 940/1534, and its author lived in Mecca, and died in the 950s/1550s. His date of death is now given as 990/1582 on the basis of an identification with Judge Kāram al-Dīn Ḥusayn al-Mālikī of Mecca, who was appointed judge of Medina in 982/1574-5 (al-‘Ayarḍūf, *al-Nūr al-sā‘īr*, 380-3; Ibn al-‘Imād, *Shahārīdī*, vii, 419 f.), but proof for this identification is not available. The unpublished works of al-Nawrāwī may decide the question. However, the identification is unlikely if only in view of Istanbul ms. of the *Ṭabakāt*, such as Topkapısaray, Ahmed III 3044, which was written at the latest around 960/1553 and which states that the work was completed in 935/1529-30 (and which represents an earlier recension breaking off, originally, with the caliphate of Ẓulfic al-Mustaṣir in Egypt); or Damud Ibrahim 898, dated Wednesday, 28 Safar 941(Tuesday) 8 September 1534 (dated stating that the work was completed on Sunday, 8 Shabān 940/23 February 1534 (see Ḥājjī Khalīfa, loc cit.).

**Bibliography:** Brockelmann, ii, 500, s ii, 514, III, 1293; *Qāmūs al-mudīlli*, iii, 118 f. A further ms. of the *Risāla fi dhār al-Ka‘ba* in Istanbul, Bagdatîl Vehbi 1142, 100-16a.

(F. ROSENTHAL)

**DIYUSKURİDİS,** is the most correct transcription of the Greek ΔΙΟΥΣΚΟΡΙΔΩΣ; other forms, such as Điysuskūridiš, allow a certain Syriac influence to be admitted. In Islam the name always refers to Pedanius Dioscorides (1st century) wrote a resume in Syriac entitled *Ṭabakāt al-ḥamāsī fi abwāb nafs nafs* and preserved in Mecca. Later the polygraph Abu ‘l-Faraj—Bar Hebraeus (7th/13th century) wrote a résumé in Syriac entitled *Kathāba ḏe Dhiqorhâdus*. In the whole, the work of Dioscorides was known above all in the fragmentary form preserved by Ibn al-Wāfīd, Māṣawayh and others. Latin versions which for the most part were made in Toledo allowed mediaeval Europe to become acquainted, through the medium of two translations, with only part of his work; and the complete text of Dioscorides only became known in the West at the Renaissance. But fragments of the Arabic Dioscorides were also translated in the East, as is proved by the Armenian pharmacology of Amir Dawlat (2nd half of the 15th century).

Any study of the materia medica of Dioscorides is incomplete if his iconography is omitted. Dioscorides himself used botanical drawings by Cratavas (1st century).
century B.C.), whose sketches are preserved in Greek and Arabic manuscripts. In their illustrations these manuscripts contain an additional element which may help to determine their origins. As for the iconography, in addition to the ancient source already mentioned, it sometimes reveals Byzantine traces, and at other times Iranian influence; by the nature of things the different Muslims' schools of painting are reflected, as for example the Baghdad school or the later Persian schools. Particularly interesting as a Muslim botanist and one of the most original was Ibn al-Surl (d. 639/1241), who when botanizing in Syria took with him an artist who made drawings of plants for him at different stages of growth; it is astonishing that Ibn al-Baytār does not quote this author who was his contemporary. In the iconography of the Arabic Dioscorides we have a proof that Diyskuridēs became the point of fusion of all the earlier traditions, enriched by the Muslims' observations of nature.


**DIZFOL**

The capital of the district (ṣubḥān) of the same name in the 51th wādī (Khūzistān) of Persia, is situated in 32° 23' N. Lat. and 48° 24' E. Long. (Greenwich), on the left bank of the Aḥ-ʾi Dīz or Dīz-fūl-rūd. This river, which rises in the Ab-i Diz or Dizful-rud. This river, which rises in the Neapolitan Apennines, flows into the Kārūn (g.v.) at Band-i Khr (Askar Mukram, g.v.). The town, which stands 200 metres above sea level, is built on a conglomerate formation; many of the inhabitants have made cellars (sardābā) under their houses in this formation, into which they retire during the heat of the day in summer. Dīzful (Persian *Dīz-fūl* = 'castle bridge') takes its name from the fortress which was built to protect the well-known bridge over the river there. The piers of this bridge, like those of the even more famous bridge at Shūhtar (g.v.), are undoubtedly Sasanid; their construction may have been supervised by Roman engineers in the time of Shāpūr I (see D. L. Graadt van Roggen, *Notice sur les Anciens Travaux Hydrauliques en Susiane*, in J. de Morgan’s Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse, Paris 1905, vol. v, 87). The arches and superstructure are of later origin and have frequently been repaired. According to Mustawfī (740/1339-40), this bridge had 42 arches, while ʿAll of Yazd (828/1424-5) stated that it had 28 large and 27 small arches, making 55 in all (these authors doubtless regarded as arches the supplementary vents over the piers which were made in order to ease the pressure on the structure when the river was greatly in flood).

The name Dīzful did not come into use until the 6th/12th century; previously it had been known as Khurāsānī or Khurāsānīk (this name is now borne by the small town on the Trans-Iranian railway 11 km. to the north of Dīzful). The older Arab geographers gave the town various names, such as Kāsr al-Rūnāgh, ʿAnārār al-Rūm (‘the Roman Bridge’), ʿAnārār al-Rūd (‘the River Bridge’) and ʿAnārār al-Zāb (Zāb repeatedly occurs as a river name; it is one of the Semitic roots ʿālām ‘to flow’).

Procopius, in his *Batarepa* (Book I, v, 28 and 29) has given an interesting account of a ‘castle of oblivion’ (γοῦ τός Αμάρτης φροῦριον) somewhere in Persia where persons of high degree were incarcerated; no one, under pain of death, was allowed to speak of it. Neither Procopius nor the Arab and Persian writers who also mentioned this castle gave its precise location, but, according to Armenian sources, it was at Andamishn, which H. HübSchmann, in his *Armenische Grammatik* (Leipzig 1897, 19), has identified with Andamishn, that is, Dīzful. Dīzful, like Shūhtar, was for long overshadowed by the neighbouring city of Gundšt- Šāpur. Later, when Gundšt-Šāpur fell into ruin, Dīzful became more prosperous, but it and the surrounding district suffered when the wonderful hydraulic system of the Sāsānids fell into disrepair. Although Dīzful escaped destruction by the Mongols, it afterwards submitted to the rule of the Il-Khāns. In 1393 it offered no resistance to Timūr. It is said that, shortly after its surrender to Timūr, Khshād ʿAll, the grandson of Shvēkš Nafti (q.v.) of Ardabīl, visited Dīzful and converted its inhabitants to Shiʿism by temporarily stopping the flow of the Aḥ-ʾi Dīz by a display of his supernatural powers. Nādir Shāh (q.v.) visited Dīzful on several occasions; in order to protect it against the Lurs, he built a fortress called Dīzšt-Šāh some miles to the north-east.

Muhammad ʿAll Mīrzā, one of the sons of Fatḥ ʿAll Shāh (q.v.), had the famous bridge repaired in the early years of the 19th century, but exceptionally heavy floods in 1832 swept away the parts that had been carefully restored. It was at this time that the cultivation of indigo was introduced on a large scale in the neighbourhood. Much indigo was produced until the importation of foreign dyes made the industry uneconomic. Dīzful was also noted for its reed pens, which were for long considered the best in the east and were exported far and wide. The raw material for this industry was supplied by the inexhaustible reed-beds in the so-called Bāštā, the marshes of the lower reaches of the Tigris and Euphrates.

Owing to very severe outbreaks of plague and cholera at Shūhtar in 1831 and the following year, Dīzful for a short while supplanted it as the capital of Khūzistān. About the middle of the 19th century, Loftus estimated the population of Dīzful at between 15,000 and 18,000, all of whom were Muslim except some 30 Mandaean families. Wols, in 1883, gave the total as 20,000, while Herzfeld in 1907 estimated it at only 15,000, including Persians, Kurds, Lurs and Arabs. At the present time (1962), the population is approximately 50,000. Many of the inhabitants, like those at Shūhtar, are Sayyids or descendants of the Prophet. In the town are some 35 mosques and a large number of tombs of saints; in the suburb of Rūbān is the shrine of Sultan Ḥusayn which closely resembles that of the Prophet Daniel at Susa (Shāhī).
Quite recently the bridge over the Ab-i Diz has been extensively repaired; in the process, a number of the old arches have been replaced by three modern spans. Dizful and the surrounding area will undoubtedly benefit greatly when the big dam across the Ab-i Diz which is now (1959) under construction in a gorge 12 miles to the north-east of the town has been completed, as it will not only provide sufficient water to irrigate a large area, but it will also supply electricity on a large scale to northern and central Khuzistan.


**DIA'ALIYYUN:** (1) A group of tribes in the Republic of the Sudan. The principal tribes of this group, mainly sedentary in their way of life, inhabit the banks of the main Nile from the Dongola [q.v.] region southwards to the Fifth (Sabaluka) Cataract. Other tribes and clans in Kurdufan (Kordofan) and elsewhere attach themselves to this group. The link among the tribes of the Dja'aliyyun is traditionally expressed in genealogical form: their eponymous founder (rather than ancestor) is said to have been a certain Ibrāhīm known as Dja'īl (i.e., "he made it", because he made himself a following from those whom he relieved in a famine). More realistically, the common element of the Dja'aliyyun group may be seen in a Nubian strain in their ancestry. The Danākila, or northern tribes of the group still speak a Nubian tongue. They are separated from the southern Dja'aliyyun by the Şaḩkiyya. Although no memory of Nubian speech survives in the southern sector of the group, the name of Berber [q.v.] may well indicate an ancient linguistic enclave or frontier (cf. the Barībrā [q.v.] further north). Migration from the Nile valley, a recurrent historical phenomenon, probably accounts for the numerous claims to Dja'all descent made in other parts of the Sudan, e.g., by the Hamājud of the Sinnar region, and by a group of tribes lying west of the Nile whose names are derivatives of the root DI-M-<br>

Dja'alla in Sudanese usage. The claims of the dynasties of Dār Fūr and Waddāy to 'Abbāsīd descent should be understood in this sense.

(2) The name of Dja'aliyyun in a more restricted sense is commonly and currently applied to a specific tribe, the most southerly member of the riverain group, which has its territory (dār) between the Atbara-Nile confluence and the Sabaluka Cataract. It is probably the "kingdom of Al Ga'il" mentioned by the Jewish traveller, David Reubeni, who passed through its territory in 1523. During the Fundj period, the Dja'aliyyun were dependent upon their southern neighbours, the 'Abbālāh, whose hereditary chief, the Wād 'Adjiḥ, was paramount over the Arab tribes under the sultan of Sinnār. From the late 10th/16th century until the Turco-Egyptian conquest, the tribe was ruled by chiefs (muḥāk, sing. makh) of the Sa'dāb clan. Their capital was at Ṣanḍī (Ṣendi) on the right bank of the Nile. At the time of Bruce's visit (1772) the effective ruler was an 'Abbālābīyya princess, the widow of the late makh. Under the last makh, Nimr Muhammad, the Dja'ail tribal kingdom was far more important than that of the 'Abbālāh, whose power was much decayed. At the time of Burchardt's visit (1814) Şanḍī was the principal trading-centre of the eastern geographical Sudan, as it was the meeting-place of routes from the interior of Egypt and the Red Sea. During the Turco-Egyptian invasion, Mākū Nīmī submitted to the ser'askebr Ismā'īl Kāmil Paşa (23 DJumādā II 1236/28 March 1821). When Ismā'īl returned from Sinnār in the following year, he was entertained at Şanḍī by Nimr. A quarrel over the slave-trust, a matter then causing great tension in the newly annexed territories, led to Ismā'īl's assassination, which in turn touched off a revolt of the Dja'aliyyun and the tribes to their south. The rising was bloodily suppressed by the ǧerdir Mehmed Khişrev Bey, the ser'askebr in Kurdufan. Şanḍī was devastated, and the sister-town of al-Matamma, on the left bank of the Nile, became the principal urban centre of the tribe. In general, however, the Dja'aliyyun, sharpwitted folk with great trading ability, profited under Turco-Egyptian rule. Dja'aliyyun of the dispersion were numerous in Kurdufan and Dār Fūr, especially in the Arab-negroid southern fringe, where conditions were particularly favourable to petty traders (dja'allāb). The involvement of the dja'allāb in slave-trading led to severe measures being taken against them by the governor-general C. G. Gordon Paşa in 1879. It is therefore not surprising that many of the Mahdi's supporters were Dja'aliyyun of the dispersion. The Dja'aliyyun and other riverain tribes were prominent in the early years of the Mahdist state, but the Khalīfā 'Abd Allāh [q.v.] transferred political power increasingly to the Bakğḳa [q.v.]. When Kitchener began his great advance towards Omdurman, the Dja'all chief of al-Matamma, 'Abd Allāh Sa'd, refused to obey the Khalīfā's order to evacuate the town (which was to form the base for the Mahdist forces), and sent for help to the south. This could not be given; al-Matamma was retaken by Mahdist troops, and 'Abd Allāh Sa'd was killed (30 Muḥarrām 1315/7 July 1897). Under the settled rule of the Condominium, the Dja'aliyyun gained from the increasing opportunities for trade and education, and are ubiquitous throughout the territories of the present Republic of the Sudan.

**Bibliography:** H. A. MacMichael, *A history of the Arabs in the Sudan*, Cambridge 1922, i, 197-

(L. LOCKHART)

**DJABÄ** [see benêk].

**DJABA** (variants: Ibn Rusta: N. dhiba; Ya’qûbî: N. du nayd a, Kasbîya; al-Idrîsî: Dhiba; ibid, MS. Cairo: Hâba; again, ‘Abâ, Dhiba, ‘Ana, etc. occurring in the same list as kings separately in Ibn Khurradadhbih and al-Idrîsî are perhaps a dittoGRAPHY of Dîbâh) represents the name of the former hill-state of Chamba (old name Šâmpâ). The ancient capital of the state was Brahmapura (or Vayrâfapafana). Hîuen Tsang describes the kingdom as 667 miles in circuit, and it must have included the whole of the hilly country between the Alaknanda and Karnâlî rivers (Law, Historical geography). Later, the city of Chamba became the capital of the state. During the early decades of the 9th century A.D. it was merged into Himâchal Pradesh to be centrally administered by the Union Government of India.

Djâba is generally used by the Arab writers as the title of the rulers of Chamba, who were probably Sûryavamshi Râdjâpûtas. According to Ibn Rusta, the king enjoyed an honourable position (among the kings of India) and belonged to the Salti (race). The term Salti according, which undoubtedly applies to the ruling dynasty of Chamba, seems to have been wrongly used for the country in Hudâd al-Šâlam (for the salâkî hound, see KALB). There is a difference of opinion among scholars with regard to the date of the foundation of the Chamba dynasty. The earliest Arabic source to mention Djabû is Ibn Khurradadhbih, and the first draft of his work was prepared in 231/846, although the original report of the source was drawn up much earlier. It is therefore very likely that the city of Chamba existed during the early decades of the 9th century A.D.

Ibn Rusta and Marwazi state that the rulers of Chamba, on account of their pride (gharâb) took wives only from among themselves but the Balâkyr kings (the Râshîfrûkas, married their ladies. Then, they were always at war with al-Djura (the Gûrdjara-Prathâras) who also possessed the Râshîfrûkas and al-Tâhâ (Takka-daša east of Sialkô). It may be deduced from the above information that the Râshîfrûkas and the rulers of Chamba may have been allies, not only because they had a common enemy in the Gûrdjara-Prathâras, but also because they were related to each other, in the internecine wars for political supremacy in India at this period. The Red Sandalwood, which according to Ibn Rusta was exported from Chamba, is the product of Pterocarpus santalinus, native of South India, Ceylon and the Philippine Islands; climatic conditions could not have favoured its growth in Chamba. Al-Bîrûnî says that the red sandalwood is *wûrît hažâ‘n* (= Skt. rahtâ-candana) and was exported from DJAWA.

The kingdom of Dîbâb al-Hindi, the Island of Dîbâ (Ibn Khurradadhbih), the Indian Dîbâ (Hudâd al-Šâlam) and Dîbâ Island (Kazwinî, ‘Ajdâbî) are all the same place as Zîbâdî of other Arab writers and represent Java [q.v.].


**DJABAL** Mountain, see under the name of the Mountain.

**DJABAL-ARAKAT** [see YAPÔîT].

**DJABAL-AL-HARITH** [see AGHRIDAH and BUDUL].

**DJABAL-TâRÎK, GIBRALTAR,** the promontory of calcareous rock, a British possession, south-west of the Spanish province of Cádiz, almost at the southern extremity of Spain (length 4.6 km., breadth reaching 1.2 km.; area, 4.9 sq. km.; highest point 425 m.); the town extends the length of the western slope, which is fairly gradual, and numbers 28,000 inhabitants (British, Spanish, Jews and Morocans) including the garrison; it is as it were the key to the Mediterranean, and is fortified and studded with batteries on a gigantic scale. In the bay to the west, called the Bay of Gibraltar or of Algeciras, there was in antiquity the European column of Hercules, also called Calpe or Abyla Mons, facing the African column called Columna Abyla or Amenâ (the modern Sopers), Gibralmar, from the north-east, the whole strait between Europe and Africa, the Atlantic Ocean and the Mediterranean Sea; in antiquity this strait was called Γκαρδάπεδος Πολις, Fretum Gaditanum (from Gadis, Cadiz) or Herculeum; the Arabs call it (Khalidi) al-Zubûh, “(canal of) the alley” [see BAK AL-MAQÂHIR]. Gibraltar received also the name of Diqbal al-Fâk or Djâbal Târîk from the name of Târîk b. Ziyad, who landed there in 92/711. During the entire Arab period the port, the town and the citadel (“The Moorish Castle”) on the north-west of the rock played a continual part as a sure base for vessels, while Algeciras, facing it across the bay, developed still further and became the pros perous principal town of the entire southern extremity of Andalusia. The Almohad caliph ʿAbd al-Muʾmin, on his return from the Ifrikiya campaign (954-5; 1159-60) sent from Constantine orders to his son and successor Yûsuf, then governor of Seville, to construct a new town at Gibraltar which, with regard to the attacks aimed at Cordova, Granada and Seville, would serve as a base and as an assembly point for the large scale campaign he intended to undertake against the Christian kingdoms of the Peninsula. Yûsuf, from Seville, and his brother...
In the 4th/10th century, with the renewal of the power of the Byzantines, the town was occupied by them on two occasions (Nicephorus Phocas in 537; 685, and John Tzimiskes in 964); it once again became part of the dāwand of Hīmṣ. In 473/1080, ḫālīf Abū Muhammad ʿĀbd Allāh b. Maḥṣūr, known by the name of Ibn Sulayha, drove the Byzantines out, and the town fell into the hands of the Muslims who kept an important Jacobite bishopric there. After the third attempt of the Franks, the ḫālīf surrendered the town to the ʿabd al-Malik b. Marwān b. uṭūba of Damascus (726/1326); a short time later the Damascene garrison was driven out and replaced by the Banū ʿAmmār of Tripoli.

In 502/1108-9 Djabala was captured by the Crusaders, its commerce was given to the Genoese and it became the seat of a Roman bishopric.

In 584/July 1188 Șālāb al-Dīn was called in by the inhabitants and captured the town, which became part of the empire of al-Ẓahir. Between 1192 and 1285 Djabala was the object of rivalry between the Templars and the Hospitallers. In 1285 Sultan Kālāwūn took possession of it and joined it to the nīyābā of Hamāh; throughout the Mamlūk occupation the town’s prosperity benefited from the important pilgrimage to the tomb of the Sūfī Ǧibrīl b. ʿAḍām [q.v.] (d. 1617/778).

In 1516 it remained for four centuries under Ottoman rule. Nowadays Djabala, surrounded by gardens, is no more than a small town where it is still possible to admire numerous traces of the past. Bibliography: Yākūṭ, Muṣāḏam, ii, 105-6; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 460; Dussaud, Topographie Historique de la Syrie, 136, 432; Grousset, Croisades, i, 128, 210, 444; ii, 824-6; Cf. Cahen, Syrie du Nord, 233, 428-9, 634; Lib. topogr. syr., i, 129; Encyclopédie de l'Empire ottoman, 211-2; Arch. Orient., i, 197-8.

(J. F. SEYBOLD- [A. HUICI MIRANDA])

DJI B AL TĀRIK — DJABALA

Ugmn, from Granada, hastened to collect the necessary material and workmen for the foundation of a new and beautiful city with a cathedral mosque, palace for the Caliph and his children, and vast dwellings for the high officials of the empire, and for the troops, all, including gardens and orchards, supplied by water derived from mountain springs. The architect in charge of the works was al-Hadīdī; in the “Moorish Castle” remains of the fortifications erected at that time by the Almohads have been preserved up to the present day. ʿĀbd al-Muʿāmin arrived in Gibraltar in Dhu ʿl-Kaḍā 555 (November 1160); he received the homage of the whole of al-Andalus with great pomp and, having organized a reception in which the poets took part, inspected and accelerated the work on the new city which he named Madinat al-fāṭh “city of victory”, he returned to Morocco in Muḥarram 556 (January 1161, after a stay of two months. In 709/1309 Gibraltar was taken by Alonso Pérez de Guzmán, the Bueno, on behalf of Ferdinand IV of Castile, but in 733/1333 it fell into the hands of the Marinids of Morocco, from whom the Naṣrī Yūsūf III Abu ʿl-Haḍidīḍ of Granada took it, but only in 831/1420, until the time when, on 24 Dhu ʿl-Kaḍā 866/20 August 1462, the town was finally conquered by the duke Guzmán de Mediná Sidónia on behalf of Henry IV of Castile. From 1462 to 1502 it became, together with all the mountainous region of the Campo de Gibraltar, on the north-west (in substance the entire Sierras de los Gazules), a hereditary fief of the Guzmán of Medina Sidónia, after which it reverted to the crown. In 947/1540 Gibraltar was pillaged by the Algerian corsair Khayr al-Dīn, but in 953/1552 it was powerfully fortified by Charles Quint; in 1561/1610 the admiral Don Juan de Mendoza embarked at Gibraltar the Moors who had been driven out in order to return them to Africa. In the war of the Spanish succession Gibraltar fell in 1704 into British hands, and subsequently had to sustain several difficult sieges, particularly in 1779-83 under General Elliott, against Spain and France.


(D. F. SEYBOLD- [A. HUICI MIRANDA])
relying, as suggested by a remark of the poet Labid, too much on one another, were utterly defeated. The prince Laššī fell, while Hāǧībīb, one of his brothers, was taken prisoner and afterwards ransomed for a huge sum. This defeat shattered the last remnants of Kinda's power in Central Arabia; one of the tribe's leaders also fell in battle. The statements regarding the date of this battle are, as usual, contradictory and uncertain. According to some it took place 17 or 19 years before the birth of the Prophet, while others say it was fought in the year of his birth. Causin de Perceval places it a few years later, and this must be the correct date, if the king of al-Hīra who sent reinforcements was, as is said, al-Nu'mān b. al-Mundhir; his reign did not begin until about 580 A.D.

In 1347/1929 another memorable battle took place at Djabala between branches of 'Uṭayba. Following the crushing defeat of the rebellious Ḥādaṣūn at al-Sabāla by King 'Abd al-'Azīz al Saʿūd, the Barkā branch of 'Uṭayba fled, under Sūltān b. Bīgād al Humayad, the paramount Shaykh of 'Uṭayba and one of three leaders of the rebels. He and his men were eventually caught and beaten again at Djabala by 'Umar Ibn Rubyān in command of loyal elements of al-Rawḳa of 'Uṭayba. Sūltān himself managed to escape once more, but he was later taken prisoner. Like Tamīm on Yawm Djabala, the fugitive members of 'Uṭayba may have been attempting to reach one of the wadis of Djabala, either the michaḥ of 'Athīyya in the southeastern wādi or the 'idd of Muwajjih in the northeastern wādi, the reputed site of the pre-Islamic battle.


[D. SOURDEL]

The fortress owes its modern name to the Kushayri Djabar b. Šābīk who captured it in the time of the Saljūḳids, but was forced to give it up to Sulaymān Shāh. The latter handed it over to the last Ṣukyūlid of Halab, Sālim b. Mālik, who had been expelled from his former possessions (479/1086-7), and Kašīf Djabar remained in the hands of Sālim's descendants for almost a century, apart from a brief occupation by the Franks (497/1002). Zankī, the powerful atabeg of al-Mawṣil, was assassinated there in 527/1131 while besieging it, and in 564/1168-9 the Ṣukyūlid Shīḥāb al-Dīn Mūṣā al-Mardūk surrendered it, in exchange for other districts, to Nūr al-Dīn who put up various buildings there; of these a minaret still survives. The importance of the Jewish colony at the time was noted by Benjāmin of Tudela. Subsequently Djabar passed into the hands of the Ayyūbids, and then the Mamluks. Under the latter dynasty it was at first abandoned but the fortress, which had fallen into ruin in the time of Abu 'l-Fida', was restored at the end of al-Nāṣir Muhammad's reign by governor Tankiz in 736/1335-6. Traces of the fortress still attract attention, standing above a steep chalky cliff and dominating the wide Euphrates valley, but no serious archaeological investigations have ever been conducted there. According to ʿAshīkhpaštázade (chapter 2) and other Ottoman historians, Sulaymān Shāh, the ancestor of the Ottoman Sultans, was drowned nearby; he was buried by the castle of Djabar and commemorated by a tomb known as Mēzar-i Türk or Türk Mezari. The tomb was reconstructed by order of 'Abd al-Hamīd II and retained as Turkish property by article ix of the Treaty of Ankara of 1921. This story is perhaps due to a confusion between Sulaymān Shāh, the putative grandfather of ʿOṯmān I, and the Saljūḳid prince Sulaymān b. Kūṭumūsh [q.v.]. The tomb itself is in all probability not connected with either of them.


[D. SOURDEL]
DJABART, the name of the Muslims of Ethiopia. Originally the name of a region (Djabara or Djabarti) in the territories of Zayla' and Ifat (cf. al-Makrizi, al-Ilmdm, Cairo 1895, 6 fl.), later applied to all the Muslim principalities of southern Ethiopia and, ultimately, to all Muslims living in Ethiopia. The term Djabart is sometimes also used by the Christian population of Ethiopia with reference to the Muslims of the Arabian peninsula and thus becomes identical with the term Muslim in general. In modern usage Djabart is almost always employed, in a narrow sense, to describe the Muslim nuclei in the Christian plateau provinces of Eritrea, Tigre, Amhara, Shoa, etc. The common form Diabarti is scarcely a nisba but rather shows the ending by which Tigriina and Harari dissolve final consonant clusters. According to Abyssinian tradition the word is derived from Ethiopic agbirt (pl. of gaba) "servants (of God)"—cf. the similar development in the case of ciibd. In Amharic a Muslim is called islam or могадаре ("trader").

The Djabarti live in families and small groups scattered throughout the Christian Abyssinian highlands. Ethnically and linguistically they are indistinguishable from their Christian neighbours. Their knowledge of Arabic is generally limited to the minimum necessary for an understanding of the Kur'an. Some of them claim descent from the first Muslims other than Djabarti in the narrow application of the term, they maintain a number of mosques and Kur'an schools. In maghribi they belonged to the Malikiyya and Shafi madhhab an schools. In the 15th century Djabarti concentrated on the 12th/18th century, for the fact which discouraged Djabarti from pursuing his narrative taking first place and the narrative only second. This fact acquires a considerably added significance if we consider the extremely large proportion of material, hardly surpassed in either quality or quantity, that he collected solely for biographies, and attempt to interpret it in terms of the period of Ottoman rule in Egypt (918-1226/1512-1821 approximately) is conspicuous for the dearth of its historical sources written by contemporary inhabitants of the country. A very limited revival of historiography in Egypt, which took place towards the close of the 17th/18th century, did not change substantially this state of affairs. According to al-Djabarti's own testimony, the history of the period was completely ignored and despised by his contemporaries. He himself would not have dealt with it had he not been ousted from public life. His knowledge of Muslim and Egyptian history up to 1100/1688 (the year with which his chronicle opens) seems to have been very limited; yet in spite of these handicaps, and in spite of the fact that he had only a local knowledge of a province belonging to a much wider empire, he succeeded in writing one of the most important chronicles of the Arab countries during the Muslim period.

Al-Djabarti's main historical work is his chronicle, entitled Â¿îdîb al-thdni 'ashar fi 'l-tardjim wa 'l-akhbdr, which covers the years 1100/1688 to 1236/1821. He gives us two versions about its compilation: from the first version, which is somewhat unclear, it would appear that he started to take notes for his book regularly from 1100/1688. According to the second account, the Damascene historian al-Muradl, author of the biographical dictionary of famous people of the 12th/18th century (Silik al-durar fi 'l-yan al-barn al-thdni 'ashar) was the "main cause" of the compilation of the chronicle in its existing form. Al-Muradl asked and obtained the co-operation of Muhammad al-Murtagd the author of Tádd al-arâs, who lived in Egypt, in the compilation of that work. Al-Murtagd was helped in this task by his pupil al-Djabarti. When al-Murtagd died in Sha'ban 1205/April 1791 al-Muradl asked al-Djabarti to take his dead master's place. Al-Muradl died, however, in Safar 1206/November of the same year, a fact which discouraged al-Djabarti from pursuing his collection of material. Somewhat later, however, an "internal urge" (hâlidh min nasîf) prompted the author to resume his work and add the chronicle of events "in the present order".

From the above it is made clear that as long as al-Djabarti worked for al-Murtagd and al-Muradl he collected material solely for biographies, and that only quite a long time after 1206/1791, when he decided to continue his work independently, did he start collecting historical data. This explains the extremely large proportion of biographies in his book; it explains also why al-Djabarti concentrated on the 12th/18th century, for al-Murâdî's biographical dictionary is devoted to persons of the same century. In any case, it is no mere accident that al-Djabarti's chronicle is called al-Tardjim wa 'l-akhbdr, biographies taking first place and the narrative only second. This fact acquires a considerably added significance if we...
recall that out of all the chronicles of Ottoman Egypt al-Djabarti's was the only one to include biographies in historical work. In the Mamlik sultanate whose written records developed an extensive biographical literature, unparalleled perhaps in any other Muslim country or region. This kind of historical writing died out completely in Egypt under the Ottomans until it was revived by al-Djabarti alone, as a result of Syrian influence. Whether he was also influenced by the Mamlik biographical works is a matter which, in the state of our knowledge at present, cannot be ascertained.

Al-Djabarti wrote the first three volumes of his chronicle in their final form during the year 1220 and the beginning of 1221/1805-6; the fourth and last volume was compiled, seemingly, during the period which it covers, i.e., the years 1221-36/1806-21. There is no doubt that he intended to continue the chronicle after the fourth volume, as may be inferred from his remark at the end of that volume. Whether he did continue it or not cannot be established with certainty.

Because of al-Djabarti's vehement attacks on Muhammad Ali and his regime, the publication of the 'Aḍḍālīb was long forbidden in Egypt. A. von Kremer gives revealing evidence of the Egyptian government's attempt to suppress the book (Aegypten, ii, 326). Only towards the end of the 1870s was the ban on the book lifted. The first time any part of it was published without government interference was in 1878, when the press of the Alexandria newspaper Misr printed the section dealing with the French occupation; it was edited by Adīb Isḥāk, who called it Taʾrikh al-Faransawiyya fī Misr. In 1297/1879-80, soon after the Khedive Tawfik's accession to the throne, the whole chronicle was published for the first time at the Bālāk printing press — this is the standard edition. In 1302/1885-6, the chronicle was published again in al-Maḥāsa al-Azhariyya in the margins of Ibn al-ʿAṯīr's K. al-Kāmil. In 1322/1904-5, it was published as an independent book in al-Maḥāsa al-Aṣḥābiyya, Cairo.

A French translation of the 'Aḍḍālīb, called Merveilles biographiques et historiques, ou Chronique du Cheikh Abd-El-Rahman El-Djabarti, was published in Cairo at the Imprimerie Nationale during the years 1886-90; it developed an extremely ripe and bad translation and is very dangerous to use.

The chronicle is of immense importance for the whole period which it covers. As for the early part of that period, it is difficult to establish, in the present state of our knowledge, to what extent al-Djabarti relied on earlier sources which he has not cited; also, he might have erred about certain facts, some of which are important. Yet the general picture which he depicts of that early part reflects the history of the Egypt of that time in the clearest and truest way. For the later part of that period, and especially for the French occupation and the early reign of Muhammad Ali, he is undoubtedly the best extant source (for an enumeration and evaluation of the subjects with which the chronicle deals see D. Ayalon, The historian al-Jabarti and his background, in BSOS, xxii/4, 1960, 235-9).

A second chronicle written by al-Djabarti, called Muḥkir al-tadkīb bi-dhakhāb dawlat al-Farans, covers the few years of the French occupation of Egypt. Its compilation was finished at the end of Shāb 1218/1216/1801 of December 1801 or beginning of January 1802. In it al-Djabarti attempted to curry favour with the Ottomans by extolling them on the one hand and by denigrating the French on the other. It was published recently (in 1958) by Muḥammad ʿAṭīya under the title Yaḥyāyyiyya al-Djabarti (two small volumes, nos 59 and 60 in the series Ṭabārān al-lāh, Dar al-Maʿārif, Cairo). It was twice translated into Turkish, by the historian ʿĀṣim, and by the physician Bahdjat Mūṣā (q.v.). The latter's version, under the name Taʾrikh-i Misr, was published in Istanbul in 1282 A.H.

Al-Djabarti also made an abridgment of Dāwūd al-ʾAntaklī's medical treatise Tadbirat al-Albāb, according to Lane he also refined the language of the Thousand Nights and One Night, and "added many facetiae of his own and of other literati". This copy seems to have been lost.

Although al-Djabarti's knowledge of Muslim history was very limited, and although he did not have any personal contact with any important Muslim historian, he was very well situated to acquire first-hand information on events which took place in Egypt and especially in Cairo. His family, and particularly his father, Ḥasan, had strong and numerous connexion both among the ruling class (Mamlik sultanate and Ottomans) and among the religious notables. His father had the greatest share in moulding his character and shaping his outlook. He seems to have inherited from him the combination of Muslim piety and learning with the practical knowledge and understanding of a man of the world. Other persons who greatly influenced al-Djabarti were the above-mentioned Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, Ḥasan al-ʿAṭīr [q.v.] and Ismāʿīl al-Khāshab.

Bibliography: (1) Autographs. For an example of the 'Aḍḍālīb in the Irāk Museum library see RIMA, i, 1955, 45; for an autograph of the Musīr in the Cambridge University library see E. G. Browne, Handlist, 1900, nos. 1058. Qq. 214. (2) Works and references in Arabic: All Mubārak, al-ɑliʃī al-Tawfikiyiya al-djidiyya, passim; Djurji Zaydān, Taʾrikh ald-lugha al-ʿArabiyya, Cairo 1914, iv, 283-4; P. L.Cheikho, al-Addār al-ʿArabiyya fī ʿl-barn al-tāṣī ʿnish, Beirut 1924, 21; Sarkis, i, col. 676; Khallī Shaybū, ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Djabarti, Cairo 1948 (no. 70 in the series Ṭabārān); ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Djabarti, Misr fī ʿl-barn al-ghāmīn ʿnish, 3 vols, Cairo 1955-6; Muḥammad Ani, Taʾrikh Djabarti, bayna Muḥkir al-tadkīb wa-ʾAḍḍālīb al-dāhar, madjdalat kuliyyat al-ādāb, Cairo 1956, xviii, 59-70; Diānmāl al-Din al-Shaybānī, al-Taʾrikh wa-l-muʾarrighān fī Misr fī ʿl-barn al-tāṣī ʿnish, Cairo 1955, 10 ff. (3) Works and references in European languages: D. B. Macdonald, art. Djabarti in EI; Brockelmann, ii, 364, 480; S II, 730; Supplement to the catalogue of the Arabic misc. of the British Museum, London 1894, no. 571; G. Wiet, Index de Djabarti (Arabic title: Fihīs ‛Aḍḍālīb al-dāhar), Cairo 1954; Fr. Babinger, Geschichtschreiber, 340; Seetzen, Reisen, Berlin 1854, iii, 128-9; E. W. Lane, Description of Egypt, Brit. Mus. MS., Add. 34080, vol. i, fol. 215; idem, Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians, (first publ. 1836), Everyman's Library ed. 222; idem, The Thousand and One Nights, London 1965, i, 61, n. 28; 66, n. to ch. 1; 201, n. 85; Giambattista Brocci, Giornale delle osservazioni fatte nel viaggio in Egitto, nella Siria e nella Nubia, Bassano 1843-4, i, 157; A. Cardin, Journal d'Abdurrahman Gabarti pendant l'occupation Française en Egypte, Paris 1938; Histoire scientifique et militaire de l'Ex- pédition Française en Egypte, Paris 1830-4, i, 10

**Djabarot** (see A‘lama).

**Al-Djabbar** [see Nudum].

**Djabbul**, a town in Central Babylonia, on the east bank of the Tigris, a few hours’ journey above Kūt al-A‘Amara, and five parasanges (about twenty miles) south-east of Nu’māniya (the modern Tell Nu’mān). It is described as a flourishing place by the older Arab geographers; but, by Yakut’s time (beginning of the 7th/13th century) it had considerably declined. In course of time—we have no details of its decay—it fell utterly into ruins. This town must date from a very remote period; for the name of the Gamūlū, one of the most important Aramaic nomadic tribes, frequently mentioned in the first thousand years B.C., must have survived in Diabbul; they have left traces of their influence in modern topography in several other places. The ruins of Diabbul, which were known by the name Diambul, Diambal, or Dzibul as late as the first half of the 19th century according to the travellers Rich, Chesney and Jones, have now utterly disappeared owing to earthquakes. On the site where Chesney in 1833 had seen the ruins of a large town, no trace of them was to be seen in 1848 when Jones passed it; the Tigris had in the interval entirely engulfed the remains of the town.


(R. M. STRECK)

**Al-Djabbar**, the ancient Gabbula, a place east-south-east of Ḥalab, watered by the Nahr al-Dhabab. The salt-mines there lent Diabbar a certain economic importance in the middle ages as well as still, to which it probably also owed its position as an administrative centre in the political division of the Mamlūk kingdom.


(R. HARTMANN)

**Djābir b. Aflah, Abū Muḥammad**, the astronomer Geber of the middle ages; he was often confused with the alchemist Geber, whose full name was Abū `Abd Allāh Diābir b. Ḥayyān al-Ṣaffī. He belonged to Seville; in the period in which he flourished cannot certainly be determined, but from the fact that his son was personally acquainted with Maimo-

nides (d. 1204), it may be concluded that he died towards the middle of the 12th century. He wrote an astronomical work which still survives under two different titles; in the Escorial Ms. it is called *Kitāb al-Hay'a* (the Book of Astronomy), in the Berlin copy it is entitled *Iṣāh al-Muṣaffī* (correction of the Almages). In it he sharply criticizes certain views held by Ptolemy; particularly rightly when he asserts that the lower planets, Mercury and Venus, have no visible parallaxes, although he himself gives the sun a parallax of about 3'. He also says that these planets are nearer the earth than the sun. The book is otherwise noteworthy for prefiguring the astronomical part with a special chapter on trigonometry (see also *Abū l-Wafa*).

In his spherical trigonometry, he takes the “rule of the four magnitudes” as the foundation for the derivation of his formulae, and gives for the first time the fifth main formula for the right-angled triangle (cos A = cos a. sin B). In plane trigonometry he solves his problems with the aid of the whole chord instead of using the trigonometrical functions sine and cosine. The work was translated into Latin by Gerhard of Cremona and this translation was published by Petrus Apianus in Nuremberg in 1534.


(H. SUTER)

**Diābir b. Ḥayyān** b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kūṭī al-Saffī, one of the principal representatives of earlier Arabic alchemy. The genealogy quoted above is taken from the Fihrist, where on p. 324 the oldest biography of Diābir is preserved. His kunya given there is not Abū Mūsā, as usual, but Abū ʿAbd Allāh, although Ibn al-Nadīm himself states that al-Rāzī (c. 325/935) used to quote: “Our master Abū Mūsā Diābir b. Ḥayyān says...”. The biography shows not only complete uncertainty regarding facts, but also legendary elements; on the other hand, the tradition that his father was “a certain Azdī called Ḥayyān, a druggist of Kūfah...” is not without some worth for prefacing the astronomical part with a special chapter on trigonometry (see also *Abū l-Wafa*).

In his spherical trigonometry, he takes the “rule of the four magnitudes” as the foundation for the derivation of his formulae, and gives for the first time the fifth main formula for the right-angled triangle (cos A = cos a. sin B). In plane trigonometry he solves his problems with the aid of the whole chord instead of using the trigonometrical functions sine and cosine. The work was translated into Latin by Gerhard of Cremona and this translation was published by Petrus Apianus in Nuremberg in 1534.


(H. SUTER)

**Diābir b. Ḥayyān** b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kūṭī al-Saffī, one of the principal representatives of earlier Arabic alchemy. The genealogy quoted above is taken from the Fihrist, where on p. 324 the oldest biography of Diābir is preserved. His kunya given there is not Abū Mūsā, as usual, but Abū ʿAbd Allāh, although Ibn al-Nadīm himself states that al-Rāzī (c. 325/935) used to quote: “Our master Abū Mūsā Diābir b. Ḥayyān says...”. The biography shows not only complete uncertainty regarding facts, but also legendary elements; on the other hand, the tradition that his father was “a certain Azdī called Ḥayyān, a druggist of Kūfah...” is not without some worth for prefacing the astronomical part with a special chapter on trigonometry (see also *Abū l-Wafa*).

In his spherical trigonometry, he takes the “rule of the four magnitudes” as the foundation for the derivation of his formulae, and gives for the first time the fifth main formula for the right-angled triangle (cos A = cos a. sin B). In plane trigonometry he solves his problems with the aid of the whole chord instead of using the trigonometrical functions sine and cosine. The work was translated into Latin by Gerhard of Cremona and this translation was published by Petrus Apianus in Nuremberg in 1534.


(H. SUTER)
But the time of the writings is not that suggested by the names of the persons occurring therein. The earliest evidence of their existence is found partly in the works of the alchemist Ibn Wahshiyya (c. 350/962) and of the forger Ibn Wahshiyya (c. 350/962), and partly in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadim [q.v.].

The corpus was divided into several collections of which the most important are: the CXII books, incoherent essays on the practice of alchemy with many references to ancient alchemy (Zosimus, Democritus, Hermes, Agathodemon, etc.); the LXX books, a systematic exposition of the alchemical teachings of Djabir; the CXLI books, the Kutub al-mawdizin ("Books of the balances"), an exposition of the theoretical and more philosophical foundations of alchemy and of all occult sciences; the D books, consisting of isolated treatises investigating more fully certain problems of the Kutub al-mawdizin. These four collections also mark successive stages in the development of the Djabirian doctrine and in the compilation of the corpus. To this have been added other smaller collections dealing with alchemy in its relation to the commentaries on the works of Aristotle and Plato, then treatises on philosophy, astronomy and astrology, mathematics and music, medicine and magic, and finally religious works.

This vast body of literature, which comprises all the sciences of the ancients which passed to Islam, cannot be the work of a single author nor can it date back to the second half of the 2nd/9th century. All the facts combine to show that the corpus was compiled at the end of the 3rd/9th century and beginning of the 4th/10th century.

The writings of Djabir in the first place present us with a problem in religious history. Just as the ancient alchemists who have been preserved are oriented towards Greek gnosio, so Djabir introduces into his system of sciences Muslim gnosio. This gnosio is not the primitive gnosio which developed in Shí'í circles of the 1st/7th and 2nd/8th centuries as described to us by Muslim writers on heresy; it is rather the gnostic syncretism which was in vogue among the Shí'í extremists (ghūdūl) at the end of the 3rd/9th century, which, combining with revolutionary political tendencies, threatened the very existence of Islam. Djabir proclaimed the imminent advent of a new imām who has succeeded one another from the 3rd/9th century, which, by the way, come from the same source.

From the point of view of his religious terminology, Djabir is closely connected with Karmatianism (the Karmatians who came to the front after 260/873) are even quoted in Djabir). The imām is called nātīk in contrast to sāmīl; the degrees of initiation are called ṣābīk tālī, ṭāhīk, etc.; the doctrine of the adversaries (addād) of the imām is also developed. The history of the world is divided according to the successive revelations into seven stages, of which the revelation of the Djabirian imām is the last. Similarly the Muslim imāms who have succeeded one another from the 3rd/9th century, which, by the way, come from the same source.

The scientific terminology used by Djabir is without exception that introduced by Hunayn b. Ishāk, which shows once more that the corpus could not have been composed before the end of the 3rd/9th century.

The fundamental principle in the science of Djabir is that of mīzān (balance). This term combines the most diverse speculations and shows very well Djabir's scientific syncretism. Mīzān means: (a) specific gravity (references to Archimedes); (b) the στάχυς of the ancient alchemists, meaning the measure in a mixture of substances; (c) a speculation on the letters of the Arabic alphabet, which are connected with the four elementary qualities (hot, cold, wet, dry). This notion is not applied to all things comprised in the sub-lunar world, but also to metaphysical beings, like intelligence, the soul of the world, matter, space, and time. It was from neo-Pythagoreanism on the one hand and the Shí'í speculations of the ḍīfār [q.v.] on the other that Djabir borrowed this system; (d) mīzān is also the metaphysical principle per excellence, a
symbol of the scientific monism of Djabir. In this sense it is opposed to the dualist principle of the religious teaching.

The writings of Djabir seem to be closely connected with the pagan scholarship of the Harranían milieu. Djabir expressly refers to the Şáhiya when reproducing their discussions of certain metaphysical problems. The direct sources of his scientific system are the writings of Ps.-Apollonius of Tyana (Bašiň [q.v.]), Kitāb sirr al-khălība and others, apocryphal works which, according to a note by Muhammad b. Zakariyya al-Râzî, were composed in the time of the Ma'mûn and are found to be the best source for a knowledge of "Harranian" literature.

Djabir says that his knowledge was handed down to him by his master Dja-far al-Sâdîk. It is to this "mine of wisdom" that all his knowledge goes back, he himself being only a compiler. In the religious hierarchy he ranks immediately after the īmām. He further quotes as his master a certain Harbi the Himyarî, a monk (ruhîb) and a man named Ufîn al-Himâr. Among the contemporaries of Dja-far are mentioned the Barmakids Khâlid, Yahya and Dja-far, to whom Djabir dedicated several of his treatises, and the members of the Šhi'i family of Yağıt. All these statements belong to the realm of legend and are in contradiction to the internal evidence of the writings. Besides, a pupil of Dja-far named Djabir b. Hayyân is nowhere mentioned in Šhi'i literature and seems to be a pure invention. It is easily understood why the author of these works attributed them to a pupil of Dja-far, who was often regarded in Šhi'i literature as the representative of Greek learning and particularly of occult sciences. Moreover, Dja-far was the father of the seventh imām Ismâ'il, whose advent is announced in these writings.

The Flārist of Ibn al-ナdām says that there were in his time Šhi'i who doubted the authenticity of these writings. The philosopher and scientist Abû Sulaymān al-Mantiḳī (d. ca. 370/980-1) has left in his Ta'īkât a note according to which he was personally acquainted with the author of the writings attributed to Djabir. He calls him al-Hasan b. al-Nâkad al-Mawṣûli. We have no reason to doubt the authenticity of this statement even if it is certain that the writings of Djabir are not the work of a single author and even if the corpus underwent a fairly long evolution before attaining its present form. The terminus ante quem would be about 330/942.

The writings of Djabir considerably influenced the development of later Arab alchemy. All later writers quote them, and there were numerous commentaries. Several books of the corpus were translated into Latin. The famous writings attributed to Geber rex Arabum, however, represent only a late recension by a Latin author of the 13th century A.D.
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DJABIR B. ZAYD — AL-DJABR WA 'L-MUKABALA

AL-DJABIYA, the principal residence of the amirs of Għassan, and for that reason known as "Djābiya of kings," situated in Diwān (q.v.), about 80 km. south of Damascus, not far from the site of the modern Nawa. It extended over several hills, hence perhaps the poetic form of plural Djawabi, with an allusion to the etymological sense of "reservoir," the symbol of generosity (cf. Aghānī, xviii, 72). It was the perfect type of ancient bedouin birḥājdīna, a huge encampment where nomads settled down, a jumble of tents and buildings; there is even a record of a Christian monastery there. At the present time the site is marked by a vigorous spring and pastures still visited by the bedouins of the Syrian desert. Even after it had disappeared, its memory was perpetuated by the name of the south-west gate in the Damascus wall, Bāb al-Djābiya.

The Arab conquest still further increased its importance. From an early date a large camp was established there, the principal one in the whole of Syria, and for a long time also the headquarters of the gīnda of Damascus. The name al-Djābiya is associated with the battle of the Yarmūk; it was there that a skirmish with the Byzantines took place and that the booty was collected together after the victory. This situation explains why, in 17638, the caliph ūmar went there to decide upon conditions in the new conquests, accompanied by the principal ʿakhba of the Ḥijāz with the exception of ʿAll. A meeting of the generals and principal officers was then held there and has remained famous, with the name yaum al-Djābiya, while ʿUmar's speech, frequently quoted in birḥājdīna, was edited with English translation by F. Rosen, Diwān, v, 3-4; Bakīr, Muqāiam, ed. Wüstenfeld, 227; Ibn al-Fākhi, 105; Ibn Khurrazadibīh, 77; Masʿūdī, Murādī, v, 198; al-Tanbiḥ, 308; Tabārī, YaqĪbī, indices; Baladhūrī, Futūh, index; Ibn Saʿd, iv, 124; v, 28, 29; Hassān b. Thābit, Dinwān, ed. Hirschfeld, v, 7; xiii, i, 22, 3; ʿAghānī, Tables. Lance AMMEN-J. SOURDEL-THOMINE)

DJABIR B. ZAYD — AL-DJABR WA 'L-MUKABALA

AL-DJABR WA 'L-MUKABALA, originally two methods of transforming equations, later the name given to the theory of equations (algebra). The oldest Arabic work on algebra, composed ca. 850 A.D. by Muḥb. b. Mūsā al-Khwārizmī (q.v.), consistently uses these methods for reducing certain problems to canonical forms; al-Khwārizmī's work was edited with English translation by F. Rosen, London 1831. A revision of Rosen's text is badly needed, cf. S. Gandz, The Misraḥat ha Middot, in Quellen u. Stud. z. Gesch. d. Math., Abt. A: Quellen, 2, 1935, 61 ff.; the translation is arbitrary and often wrong, not the least because Rosen tries to force the variable terminology into a preconceived rigid pattern. This edition has been the source of countless errors and mistakes in the older literature. It was J. Ruska who gave the first critical analysis of the Arabic original. For its history, see J. Ruska, Zur ältesten arabischen Algebra und Rechenkunst, in SB Heidelberg AWiss, phil-hist. Kl., 1917; in particular his explanation of al-Djābr wa 'l-M. (5-14) has not been refuted by any later authority. In the first problem, 25 Arab. text, 1 capital (māl) is equal ('uldā'a) to 40 "something" (dāqiyya) without (ilā) 4 capitals. al-Khwārizmī's instruction reads: "Fill it (the 40 "something" without 4 capi-
Dr. A0-DI3ABR WA 'L MUKABALA

(tals) up (udjburhu) with (bi) four capitals, and add them to the (i) capital*. Thus al-gjabr means eliminating quantities prefixed by ijl (later called heads of the operation of ijl-multiplication), by adding these quantities, in accordance with the usual meaning "restoring", especially "filling up the lacking sum of money" (examples in Dozy, Suppl. s.v.). In the fifth problem, 28 Arab. text, 50 dar&him and 1 m&l are equal to 29 dar&him and to "something": "Balance confronting (kabhil) with (bi) it (the 29 dar&him), and this means that you cast off twenty

Irrational quantities here are admitted as solutions.

... but only those which could be reduced to quadratic equations.  

Liber algebrae et almucabola, (1145 A.D.) composed a second translation of the first part, titled De jebra et almucabala, ed. G. Libri, Historie der sciencia mathematicae, i, Paris 1838, 253-297. In 1520 A.D. Leonard of Pisa, in the Liber abaci, ed. B. Boncompagni, vol. i, Rome 1857, 406, uses the expression compositum algbræ et elmulchabala. According to Suter, in E1', s.v. AL-DI3ABR WA 'L-MUKABALA, Canacci of Florence (14th cent.) was the first Western writer who used the term algebra, which he erroneously believed to derive from the name of Geber (11&br), the alchemist?) leaving aside almucabala; Gosselin (1577) is said to have been the last known who used almucabala. From the terms shay* and m&l derived ars rei et census, Ital. arte (or regola) della cosa, Germ. Regel Cass.

The Islamic world, Abi Kamil Shudja* (q.v.) (between 850 and 956 A.D.), who exercised a considerable influence also on the development of Western mathematics, employed the word shay* in the theory, which he turned into a powerful instrument for geometrical research, building upon the foundations laid by al-Kh&rizmi. He solved systems of equations involving up to five unknown quantities, represented by different kinds of coins. He discussed problems of a higher degree, but only those which could be reduced to quadratic equations. Irrational quantities here are admitted as solutions.
His work contains first steps leading to a theory of algebraical identities. He also dealt with problems of indeterminate analysis (integral solutions), which indicate close connection with analogous problems studied in India.

The algebraists learnt new methods from the translations of Greek mathematical works. The theory of irrational quantities was carefully discussed by Abū'Abd Allāh al-Hasan al-Muḥ. b. Ḥamīlī (?), known as Ibn al-Baghdādī, in his Risāla fi 'l-muqābala wa 'l-mutabīna, ed. in al-Rāsīl al-mutafjarra fi 'l-nayā'a, Dāhra al-Maṣā'īrī, Ḥaydārābād, 1366/1947. He is cited by al-Bīrūnī in his Risāla fi istiḥkārādī al-a'lātūr wa 'l-da'ā'tūrā, in the collection just cited, 224.


W. HARTNER

Djābr ibn al-Kasm was a high official of the Fatimid Caliphs al-Mu‘izz and al-Āzīz. On one occasion he was al-Āzīz’s viceroy over Egypt; in 373/984 he replaced Ibn Kīlls as vizier for a few weeks, without great success.


Djābr ibn al-Kasm, or Djābr, Hebrew Gabriel[C, was “Man of God”, is mentioned for the first time in the Old Testament, Dan. viii, 15 ff.; ix, 21 as flying to Daniel in the shape of a Man, sent by God in order to explain the vision of Daniel about the future. In post-biblical Judaism Gabriel plays an outstanding role among the archangels representing nations and individuals and natural phenomena. He belongs to the archangels and is governor of Paradise and of the seraphs and the cherubs (Enoch, xx, 7). He is one of “the angels of the face”, standing at the
left side of the Lord, and he dominates all forces (ibid., xi, 1-9, cf. Rev. v, 6). Michael has preference as the angel of Israel, but Gabriel is often the Messenger of God to man (2 Chron. xxxii, 21) the Targum has Michael and Gabriel, and "the man clothed with linen" (Ezek, ix, 3; x, 2) is in Yoma lixxvi identified with Gabriel. The same is even the case with the man who met Joseph in the field, Gen. xxxvii, 15, 23; according to Targum Jonathan. All angels are said to have wings (tabard), made of fire, water or air, they do not eat nor drink nor marry, and they do not die (see Weber, 166 ff.; Moore, 405; cf. Matth., xxiii, 30; Luke xx, 35 f.). Their names, also that of Gabriel, are used in the magic papyri (see Blau, 134).

These views were on the whole taken over into Islam, and here Djibril became conspicuous as the bearer of the revelations to the Prophet. In the Kur'an Djibril is only named thrice, viz. ii, 97, 98 (here also Mika'il); LXXVI, 4; and ii, 97 it is expressly said "he brought it (the Kur'an) down to thy heart". On the other hand the correspondence between God and man is also said to take place by the spirit (al-rūh) descending and ascending between heaven and earth and bringing messages on whom God will (XVI, 2, cf. LXXIV, 4; XVII, 4). The rôle of the spirit was not understandable to the people: "They ask you about the spirit, say: the spirit is (in XXVI, 95) the trustworthiness of my commandment of my Lord, but you have only got little understanding" (XXVI, 85). In some passages the spirit seems to have the character of a spiritual force, since God fortiies the faithful "by spirit from him" (LXXXIII, 22), and Jesus was fortiied by God through the Holy Spirit (II, 87, 253; V, 110). But other passages say explicitly that God sent the spirit to the Prophet with the revelation (XL, 15; LXXIV, 52); the Kur'an is brought down by "the trustworthy spirit" (XXVI, 193). Thus the spirit and Djibril are identified, just as we find in the New Test. that the seven angels standing before God (Rev., viii, 2, 6) also are named the seven spirits (πνεῦματα, Rev., i, 4; iii, 1; iv, 5; v, 6), and Jesus is named a spirit from God: sūra IV, 171.

In the taafsir (Tabari, Zamakhshari, Baydawi) there is a story about Djibril being the messenger who brings the revelation to Muhammad, and the two visions of "the Mighty in power, the Vigorous one" (Sūra LIII, 1 ff.) are interpreted in the way that it was Djibril whom the prophet saw, first "in the loftiest horizon", and later "by the sidra-tree at the furthest end". In the commentaries on sūra II, 97 the question of Djibril's activity is made the salient point that both of the strife with the Jews. These asked Muhammad (another tradition 'Umar) who was the angel that brought him revelations, and when he said it was Djibril, and that he was the helper (wafl) of every prophet (cf. Ibn Sa'd i, 1, 116, 9), the Jews said that then they could not acknowledge him, because Michael was their wafl and Gabriel their enemy (who betrayed their secrets). The Prophet answered said that both of them were God's servants and so they could not be enemies, and then Sūra II, 97 f. was revealed. 'Abd Allâh b. Sallâm was said to have given up his Jewish faith for Islam because Muhammad, after having demonstrated a knowledge that only a prophet could have, said that he had it from Djibril (Buḫkârî 60 (ambiyâ), bâb 1; 65 (taafsir al-Kur'ān), bâb 6).

In the Sîra Djibril is the constant counsellor and helper of the Prophet. When he had brought Muhammad the first revelation (sūra XVII, 5-10) on mount Hûrâ' Wârâqa b. Nawfil assured Khadhîja that he was the same "great nâmâr" who formerly came to Moses, and Khadhîja understood from the discretion of the angel towards her that he was no ghaşyân (Tabari i, 1150-3; Ibn Hishâm, ed. Wüstenfeld, 153 f.). Thus Djibril became the guarantee of the coherence of Islam and the two older religions. The opening and purifying of the belly and the breast of Muhammad was executed by Djibril and Mika'il (Tab. i, 1157; v. Wensinck, 160). Djibril came to the Prophet on the mountains of Makkâ, produced a spring and taught him wudu* and trahîd (Tab. i, 1157; Ibn Hishâm, 158), and he guided the Prophet on his ascension (Tab. i, 1157-9; Ibn Hishâm, 263 ff.; v. Wensinck, 25). When Muhammad once was passive Djibril threatened him with God's punishment if he did not follow His commandments (Tab. i, 1171), and when the Prophet's acknowledgement of the three goddesses al-Lât, al-'Uzza and Manât was made public, Djibril reproached him for reciting a message that he had not received from the angel (Tab. i, 1192 f.). He warned the Prophet against the plot of the Meccans before the hidâra (Tab. i, 1231 ff.; Ibn Hishâm, 325 ff.), at Badr he appeared with thousands of angels (Ibn Hishâm, 449 f.; Ibn Sa'd ii, 1, 9, 18), and he ordered Muhammad to attack Banû Kaynûkâ and later Banû Kurayza (Tab. i, 1300, 1486, cf. sūra VII, 59; LXXII, 5 ff.; Ibn Hishâm, 684); according to the commentaries he was the Messenger of God to every prophet. From Adam to Christ the angel carrying a divine revelation, the others see an ordinary man (al-Tâ'îyya al- khwârî v. 279-84).

In his Kīsâs al-ambiyyâ (Leiden 1922) al-Kisâî carries out the idea that Djibril was the messenger of God to every prophet. From Adam to Christ Djibril is acting as the helper and guide of all leading persons in the Bible as well as of the Kur'ânic prophet Sâlih. Most tales are referred to the converted Jews Ka'b al-AhÎbâr and Wâbâ b. al-Munabbîh. A similar account is to be found in Thâliab: Kīsâs al-ambiyyâ (al-'Arâ'îs), Cairo, 1325.

Also "pseudo prophets" pretended to be inspired by Djibril (v. Tabari iii, 1394), and this is a popular motif in jocular tales, e. g. Mas'ûdî, Murâjudî, vii, Paris 1873, 52 ff.


(D. Pedersen)

DJABRAN KHALIL DJABRAN, Lebanese writer, artist and poet, born on 6 January (al-Samir, iii/2, 52, Young 7, 142) or 6 December (Nuʿayma, 13) 1883, at Bsharri. The details which have been related about his childhood are often romanticized or imaginary (Nuʿayma, 14-96; Young, 7, 161 and passim). Biographers are agreed upon 1895 as the date of his departure to the U.S.A. with his mother Kāmila Rāhma (d. 28 June 1903), his two sisters Maryāna and Sulṭāna (d. 4 April 1902) and his maternal half-brother Burtis (d. 12 March 1903). The family settled in Chinatown, a poor district in Boston (Nuʿayma, 29-30) where Djābrān attended the elementary school (al-Samir, ibid.). On 3 August 1898 he returned to Beirut (Karam, thesis, 33). His knowledge of Arabic at that time was rudimentary. The three years he spent at the College de la Sagesse (Beirut) partly filled the gap. In 1902 he left the Lebanon, travelled to Paris, paid a brief visit to New York and was in Boston in January 1903, a year of misfortunes which only Maryāna escaped (al-Samir, ibid.; Nuʿayma i, 50 and 60; Young 7, 185). In 1904 he held an exhibition of his drawings, but without success (Young, ibid.; Khayrállah, 17-18), and corresponded with the Arabic journal al-Muḥādīr which was then edited in New York by A. al-Ǧhurayyib. His quasi-philanthropic relation with Mary Haskell dates from this period.

As regards his stay in Paris (14 July 1908-22 October 1910), it has been finally disproved that he attended the École des Beaux-Arts regularly or that he was a pupil of Rodin (Huwayyik, 208-9). After the Arab Political Conference in Paris, he returned to Boston and formed a society, al-Ḥalaṭa al-Dhahābīyya (unpublished sources; Masʿūd, 240); then settled in New York (autumn 1912), sharing with N. ʿArīḍa the work of editing al-Funūn (1913), an Arabic periodical which was replaced by al-Sāʿīb (1913). He then set out to make a way for himself in American letters, starting in the periodical al-Maṣḥūra (al-Machriq, English version ii, 37-43), then published three times in Arabic before reaching its final, definitive form (al-Maḥrīq, xxxvi; Young, 53-58, 185).

Nicetsche, Blake, the Bible, Rodin, Western romanticism, together with recollections of Eastern mysticism are the influences most profoundly affecting his works, both literary and artistic. We should moreover note the intimate connexion between his poetic prose and his symbolic drawings, the poet being nourished by the artist, whilst the latter derives from the poet the dynamism of his imagery.

The translations of his English works by Antonius Baṣghir are unfailingly prolix or laconic. For this reason conservatives do not recognize him as the author of any masterpiece in Arabic. Nor is he regarded as an important figure either by historians of Anglo-American literature or by art historians. But it remains none the less true that he is a principal representative of the new Arabic literature, the reflection of a nation in torment, and a source of inspiration for contemporary Arabic poetry.


is a romanticism reflecting a mal de siècle similar to that in Europe in the 19th century. There is the same range of themes: revolt in social, religious and literary forms, lyrical outpourings, nature, love, death, mingled with recollections and his native land, an anxiety about the hereafter where metaphysical melancholy ends in mystical serenity and the diversity of the cosmos gives way to universal unity (Iṣan al-Dīlah al-Īmām). In fact, neither his stories ʿArīḍīs al-murūḏā (1906), al-Arwaḥ al-mutammārīda (1908) nor his novel al-Ǧumāniha al-mulukhiyya (1911) entirely meet the formal requirements of the novel. They are merely a setting for a revolt or for a purely lyrical manifestation. Uprooted by emigration, and fostered by Western civilization, he escaped the traditionalists' strict discipline and was repelled by their dazzling linguistic feats and archaic artifices. Accordingly he took his inspiration from the Arabic version of the Bible. In his writings all difficulties of form dissolved into a kind of internal music, overflowing with quasi-mythological images and visions. The vocabulary he uses is severely limited, and the commonest words seem to be new and enriched with a multiplicity of potentialities. This new and somewhat free poetical prose did not fail however to provoke much criticism from traditional quarters.

His works in English are an extension of his Arabic writings. In them can be found the moral fable, the aphorisms, the biblical style, the purely oriental imagery. The character of Jesus, the subject of his first works, received its fullest realization in Jesus, Son of Man; The Earth Gods is the perfect expression of the mystical outlook, and The Prophet, his masterpiece, is the focal point in which elements scattered throughout his earlier writings are concentrated and centralized. In it, thought is detached from logic and transformed into feeling and atmosphere. And the symbol of al-AGMENTA is the manifestation of the superman on his way towards the divine, to find full realization in the person of Jesus. We must reject the unfounded assertion that this work was drafted three times in Arabic before reaching its final, English version (al-Maḥrīq, xxxvii; Young, 53-58, 185).

...
Djabrân Khâllî Djabrân — Djadhîma b. Āmîr

Gibrân, Thesis, Sorbonne, 1958; idem, in Cenacle Libanais, March 1956; J. Lecerc, in Stud. Isl. i and ii, 1953-54; H. Mas’ûd, Djabrân hâvy* *wa-mu’âyy*, Sa’d Paolo 1952; M. Nu’ayma, Djabrân Khâllî Djabrân, better than the last. This man from Lebanon, New York 1954. (A. G. Kâram)

Djabrî Dajallâ (see sa’d allâh Djabrî).

Djabrîds (see supplement).

Djabriyya, or Mudîbîra, the name given by opponents to those whom they alleged to hold the doctrine of diabr, "compulsion", viz. that man does not really act but only God. It was also used by later historians to designate a group of sects. The Mu’tazila applied it, usually in the form Mudîbîra, to Traditions, Ash’arite theologians and others who denied their doctrine of kadr or "free will" (al-khayyat, later heresiographers to describe a group of sects.

Shark al-Fikh al-Akbar or kadr and others who denied their doctrine of the Mu’tazila applied it, usually in the form diabr, "acquisition", was a commonplace of the Ash’arite theologians, to Traditionists, Ash’arites, till, according to Urban (London 1948), 96 f., 67, 69, 135 f.; Ibn Kutayba, K. ta’wil mukhtalat al-hadîth, 96; Ibn al-Murtadâ, Djabrân al-mu’âyy (ed. Arnold), 45, 71 — of Fâkhr al-Dîn al-Râzî; al-Malati, 144; Ash’arite theologians, al-Malati, 430; al-Malati, 144; Brockelmann, S. S. I, 215 f.). The Mârîrîd author of Shahr al-Fikh al-Akbar (Haydarâbad 1321 A.H.) says (p. 12) that the Ash’arîyya hold the doctrine of diabr, though elsewhere he seems to use Mûdibîra of the Djajhiyya (i.e., etc.). The Ash’arîyya considered their doctrine of kadr, "acquisition", was a mean between diabr and kadr, and identified diabr with the doctrine of the Djajhiyya. Al-Shahrastani classifies the latter as "pure diabrîyya", and al-Nâdirîj and Djarr as "moderate Djajhiyya". (K. al-milal, London, 59 f.). With the increasing complexity of later discussions of human actions the conceptions of diabr and even of kadr were largely neglected.


Djad’b d. Dirham (see ibn dirham).

Djad’a (‘Amîr), a South Arabian tribe. In early Islamic times Djad’a had lands in the southernmost part of the Yemen highlands, the Sarw Himyar and Dja’dâ were very prominent, and the Sarw Himyar represent their southernmost point, doubtless mingled here with local South Arabian peoples.

Hamdân gives copious topographical details of the Djad’a territory in the upper Abyan basin, enumerating their wâdis, districts, castles, villages and wells; some of these names are still in use. The districts (kuwwar) are attributed to the clans of Djad’a, of whom he mentions al-Uq’ûd, A’hâd, Mu‘âjdîr, al-Ubrûd and al-Sâkâsîka. The language of the Sarw Himyar and Djad’a is described as incorrect and inferior to that of the regions nearer the coast of Labûdî, Abyan and Da’thîna: their Arabic has South Arabian elements (lakhîrin) in it and they drawl and elide their words (yajurrûn fir kalâmîmik wa-yakbîsûn). They use the South Arabian definite article an- and drop the prosthetic af, saying sima’ for isma’.

The present-day territory of the ‘Amîr tribe, a sub-section of the Sarw Himyar, is broadly that of the classical Djad’a, comprising the plateau 100 miles N. of Abyan with its centre at al-Dâ’ilî (Dhaîla), capital of the Amirate of ‘Amîr [q.v.]. There are also Dja’dî tribesmen in the western Darâmatw at the Wâdî ‘Amrd region 100 miles N.-W. of Mukallâ and 70 miles E. of Shabwâ, who practise agriculture by irrigation. The name of their ancient centre there, Hisn Ka’dhî, indicates northern connexions, and these Dja’dî trace their origin to the Banû Hîlîl and a migration from further north.


Dja’d’a b. Kâb (see ‘Amîr b. sa’â’â’).
Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen, 175 ff., attributes the following facts to the Djadhima b. 'Adi b. Du'il b. Bahir b. 'Abd Manât, etc. (Table N), without apparent justification. There was an ancient grudge between the tribe of the Djadhima and that of the Kûraysh, although there was kindred between them: before Islam, the Kûnâna had attacked a caravan coming from the Yemen and had killed an uncle and a brother of Khâlid b. al-Walid, and the father of 'Abd al-Rahmân b. 'Awf; the latter had taken his revenge by slaying the chief of the aggressors, Khâlid b. Hishâm; the situation had been, however, eased when the Djadhima, while denying their complicity, had paid the blood-wit.

It seems probable that the Djadhima had already accepted Islam before the conquest of Mecca by the Prophet; nevertheless the latter after the victory sent among them an expedition of 350 men commanded by Khâlid b. al-Walid, to assure himself of their neutrality if not their support (8/629). The troops comprised, besides some Muhâjirun and Anṣâr, contingents of the Banû Sulaym b. Manşûr and of the Banû Mûldîlî b. Murra, who themselves entertained some grudge towards the Kûnâna, and moreover towards the Djadhima on account of the defeat which had been inflicted on them on the yawm of al-Burza. Although sent for a pacific purpose, Khâlid took advantage of the occasion to revenge himself, which he did in a way which aroused lively indignation at Mecca. The Prophet, to calm the agitation, rebuked Khâlid publicly. Khâlid excused himself to 'Abd al-Rahmân, who had reproached him for having killed Muslims, saying that he was unaware of their status as Believers. Khâlid thought it better to absent himself for some time, and on his return took again part in the occasion to revenge himself. The dispute with the Djadhima was adjusted by 'Ali, who paid the blood-wit for the 30 killed, and conscientiously compensated for the value of the booty.

Bibliography: Tabârî, i, 1649-53: Wâkidî (Wellhausen), 351-4; Ibn Hîshâm, 833-8 (Gül- laune, 561 n. 1 of his translation of Ibn Ištâhâ, observes that the order of events is better established than in Tabârî); 4âdînî, vii, 26-30; Ibn Al-Hâdjâr, ii, 265, no. 2072; Yakût, 817; Cauzins du Perceval, Essais, iii, 242-4; Caetani, Annali, A. H. 8, 107-12; W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, Oxford 1956, 70, 84, 257.

(L. Veccia Vaglieri)

DIJADID (Arabic 'new', 'modern'; Turkish pronunciation dêjjîdî), followers of the usûl-i dêjjîdî (the 'new methods', among the Muslims of Russia). The movement arose in about 1850 among the Kazan qâsî Tatars, who provided it with its first leaders; from there it spread to other Turkish peoples in Russia. The Djdïdïs were against 'religious and cultural retrogression'; they pressed, above all, for modern teaching methods in the schools, for the cultural unification of all Turkish peoples living under Russian domination, but also for their participation in the cultural and social development of the Russia of that time. Consequently, it seemed necessary to the Djdïdïs that the south-west part of the Russian Turcs, especially the Crimean Tatar Isâmîl Gaspîralli (Russ. Gasprinskîy; 1853-1914), who published, from 1885, his journal Terjûmân 'The Interpreter', in such a way that it remained virtually free from police prosecution, in spite of the influence of pan-Islamic and pan-Turkish ideas were quite evident. Gaspîralli himself put forward the idea of the creation of a language which would be understandable to all the Turks in Russia, the basis of which was, in fact, Ottoman (cf. Gustav Burbie, Die Sprache Isâmîl Bey Gaspîrallys, diss. Hamburg 1950).

The Kadîms set up their own traditional ideas in opposition to the Djdïdïs. Since this party, composed mainly of Manadhîm and modernists, provided its support for the status quo—a support which was in no way a danger to Russia—and represented a cultural self-sufficiency which was in no way aligned to that of 'modernist' Turkey, it repeatedly received the support of the Russian state.

After the revolution of 1905 the efforts of the Djdïdïs were able to expand more freely, and now reached more strongly into Central Asia. From this direction came efforts, in the years 1917-22, to establish independent Islamic states on the territory of the former Târsît Empire (for details see the articles on the Turkish peoples of the USSR). Although the Djdïdïs had, since 1905, worked closely with the representatives of the Russian leftist parties, from whom they hoped for some recognition of their efforts, the Soviet Government turned sharply, from the very beginning, against the Djdïdïs and the corresponding movement in Central Asia, the Basmaëîs [q.v.], whom they regarded as 'foreign Imperialist agents'. Nevertheless, the Djdïdïs remained faithful to their ideas as long as any distinctive intellectual movements survived among the Russian Turks, until about 1930. The ideologies of the older Russo-Turkish emigres remain, even today, influenced by the ideas of the Djdïdïs, whereas the younger generation have come further and further from any thoughts of returning to their homeland.


(B. Spuler)

AL-DIJADIDA, Arabic and the present-day official name of the ancient Mazagon (former Arabic name: al-Buraydja "the little fortress"), a maritime town situated on the Atlantic Ocean c km. south-west of the present Moroccan town of Rabî; its population was 40,318 in 1954, of whom 1704 were French, 120 foreigners, and 3,328 Jews.

Some authors have considered that Mazagon arose on the site of Ptolomy's Ρουσπαλία την Πλην, Pliny's Portus Rutibus. The texts do not, indeed, say that there had ever been a town there, but merely an anchorage frequented by ships, and this
seems to have been the case throughout the middle ages. The name of Mazagan seems to have appeared for the first time in al-Bakri (5th/12th century). This geographer, enumerating the Atlantic Coast ports of Morocco, mentions one Mərəd (de Slane's reading) which must certainly be restored as Mazighan, the form attested by al-Idrīsī (6th/12th century). The same place-name recurs in a ms. collection of edifying anecdotes concerning the great saint of Azammūr, Mawlay Aḥdūṣu'yab, who also lived in the 6th/12th century; here Mazighan appears as a fishermen's hamlet situated between the town of Azammūr and the ribāṭ of Tit [g.1.]; the propinquity of these two relatively important centres impeded its development. The anchorage is marked on a whole series of planispheres and portolani of the 14th and 15th centuries (publ. Ch. de la Roncière, La découverte de l'Afrique au Moyen Âge, 1925), which give the forms Mezagān (1339 and 1373), Measγhan (1367), and Mazagam, forms intermediate between Mızāğhan and the Mażągāo of the Portuguese. These latter had, since the end of the 9th/i5th century, come to load corn from the Dukkāla in the port of Mazagan for the provisioning of their capital. In 1502 a squadron commanded by a Portuguese gentleman, Jorge de Mello, caught by a storm in the straits of Gibraltar, is said to have been driven as far as Mazagan and to have landed there. The Portuguese accommodated themselves in an abandoned tower for protection against possible attack by the inhabitants. Shortly thereafter Jorge de Mello returned to Portugal and obtained royal permission to found a fortress at Mazagan. Although the account of these facts is only recorded by 18th century authors, it must be based on the actual events, for letters-patent of the king Dom Manuel, dated 21 May 1505, grant to Jorge de Mello the captaincy of the castle which he was authorized to build at his own expense at Mazagan. However, he did not avail himself of this privilege, because when, on 27 August 1513, the Portuguese army who were on their way to the conquest of Azammūr under the command of the Duke of Braganza disembarked at Mazagan there was no town and no fortress except for the old ruined tower (al-Buraydja). The difficulties of access to the port of Azammūr induced the Portuguese to establish a more accessible base at Mazagan.

During the summer of 1514 there was built, under the direction of the architects Diego and Francisco de Arruda, a square castle flanked with four angle towers. One of these bastions was formed out of the old tower al-Buraydja, whose name, for the present inhabitants, continues to refer to the Portuguese town. Most of the original castle still stands; most worthy of notice is a magnificent room the vaulting of which is supported by twenty-five columns and pillars, probably a huge granary built to receive the quit-rent, paid in grain, of the tribes subject to Portuguese protection rather than an armoury; this was later (1541) used as a reservoir. Since more than ten years previously the predication of Portuguese strongholds on the coast, in the face of the religious and xenophobe movement roused by the accession and the conquests of the Sađī sultans, was so bad that the king of Portugal thought of abandoning many of his fortresses. The capture of that of Santa Cruz in Cape Ghir [see AGADIR-IGHIR] by the Sharīf (12 March 1541) was a warning. John III resigned himself to evacuating Safi and Azammūr and concentrating in Mazagan, a more favourable and more easily defendable position, for all that he wished to leave some Portuguese forces in the south of Morocco.

It was at this time that the walls of Mazagan received their present layout.

In preserving Mazagan the Portuguese wished to retain a base on the coast to guarantee the protection of the Indies route. They hoped also that the fortress might serve them as a springboard for the conquest of Morocco when conditions became favourable, but this was never to be realized. In fact, for over two hundred years while it remained in Portuguese possession Mazagan only furnished them with a pretext for obtaining papal bulls of Crusade, which furnished appropriate revenue to the treasury. But the tribes kept the town so tightly blockaded that the inhabitants were unable to venture outside the walls without military protection. The Muslims of the neighbourhood had founded, a mile or so from the town, two large villages, Faħṣ al-Zammūriyyin and Faħṣ Awlād Dhuwayyib, the ruins of which still remain, where they ensconced themselves in order to maintain the blockade.

Badly provisioned by sea, often victims to famine and epidemics, the garrison and the population managed to live in fair security within the protection of their powerful walls, against which the tribesmen could do nothing, although on several occasions the stronghold sustained vigorous attack. In April 1562 Muhammad, son of the Sađī sultan 'Abd Allāh al-Ghālib bi 'Ilāh, laid siege to Mazagan, but the besiegers became discouraged after two attacks and were repulsed. During the disorders which accompanied the decline of the Sađī dynasty the governors of Mazagan seem to have succeeded in opening the blockade and in re-establishing relations with the tribes. The muḥāfīz Sīdī Muhammad al-'Ayyāshī, to remedy this offence, made an attack on the Portuguese in 1639 and inflicted some losses on them. Mawlāy Ismā'īl, occupied with the siege of Ceuta, never seriously attempted to make himself master of Mazagan. The honour of reconquering it fell to his grandson Sīdī Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh. The sultan came in person to besiege it at the end of January 1769. The fortress resisted victoriously for five weeks, but the order to evacuate came from Lisbon, and the governor capitulated on honourable terms, and troops and civilians returned to Portugal with their arms and baggage. In abandoning the fortress, on 10 March 1769, the Portuguese left mines there, the explosion of which caused great damage; the sultan took possession of a devastated town, which he partly repopulated, but which remained in such a sorry state that it was called al-Mahdumā, "the ruin", until the time when, under the reign of Sīdī Muhammad b. Highām, in 1240/1824-5, it was restored by Sīdī Muhammad b. al-Tawīyib, kāfīd of the Dukkāla and of the Tāmasna, who gave it the name of al-Djadida.

**Bibliography:** St. Gsell, Hist. ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord, ii, 1928; Luís Maria do Couto de Albuquerque da Cunha, Memorias para a historia da praça de Mazagão, publ. Levy Maria Jordão, Lisbon 1864; Alfonso de Dornellas, A historia da praça de Mazagão, Lisbon 1913; J. Goulven, La place de Mazagao sous la domination française, Paris 1917; Vergilio Correia, Lugares dañim, Lisbon 1923; Agostinho de Gavy de Mendonça, História do cerco de Mazagão 1562, Lisbon 1891; Discurso da formada de D. Gonçalo Coutinho à villa de Mazagam, Lisbon 1629; Jorge de Mascarenhas, Descrição da fortaleza de Mazagão (1625-19), publ. Belisario Pimenta, Lisbon 1916; G. Hést, Den Marokanske Kajser Mohammed ben Abdallah's Historie, Copenhagen 1791; R. Ricard, Mazagan
et le Maroc sous le règne du sultan Moulay Zidan (1608-27), Paris 1956, with the bibliography therein; Nāṣīr, Kitāb al-isībān, trans. Fumey in AM, ix and x; Guides bleus, Maroc, 1954, 172-7. (G. S. Colin and P. de Cenival)

**DJADIS** [See TaSm]

**DJADU** (Djadou) in Arabic, or Braou in Teda, designates at once the principal palm-grove and the bulk of a massif bounded by the 12° and 20° N. parallels and the 12° and 13° E. meridians. This massif is a short branch of the plateau of primary sandstones which, from Tassili of the Ajjers to the massif of Afāfli, joins the Ahaggar to the Tibesti. Changes of level are not marked: one passes from 5—800 m. on the plateau to 450 m. at the foot of its western declivity; the impression of relief is given less by the height than by the appearance of the sandstones, looking almost like ruins, cut up, in bands running from south to north, by the beds of the “enneris”.

These intermittent streams flow towards a zone at the southern point of the massif where they expand; fed in part by the vast “impluvium” formed by the sandstones, their subterranean course is intermittent streams flow towards a zone at the southern point of the massif where they expand; in part by the vast “impluvium” formed by the sandstones, their subterranean course is marked by the line of wells. The fall of the plateau to the west is marked in its northern part by the “guéeltas” (Er Roui), and in the south-west by a string of oases.

The richness in underground reservoirs allows life to flourish in this region where the desert characteristics of the climate, violent temperature contrasts and extreme dryness, are very noticeable; there is a cold season from December to February (night temperature -5° or -4° C. [5 to 7 degrees of frost F.], day temperature 25° to 30° C. [77°-86° F.]), when violent sandstorms from the north-east obscure the horizon; from March the temperature rapidly to day maxima of 45° to 48° C. (113°-118° F.) with night temperatures of 16° to 20° C. (61°-68° F.). The rains fall at this time, very irregularly, the total annual rainfall varying between 2 and 50 mm., sometimes in a single shower. The intense evaporation explains the rhythm of the variations in the water-level in the wells and numerous springs at the southern end of the massif: from March to November the springs weaken and the ponds and some of the wells dry up; then, at the beginning of December, the level again rises, the ponds expand to an area of about one thousand in the oases. Palms need no irrigation, and tomatoes, spices, millet, and tobacco grow in the gardens. There are numerous salt-mines.

In the north and north-east of the massif the region of the “guéeltas” and that of the wells are the hàdd pasture-lands.

Djadou is also favoured by its proximity to a crossing of caravan routes: the old commerce route from Murzuk to Chad, joined at this point by the route which runs to Ghat and Ghadames in Ezzan, bifurcates, like the line of wells towards the south, on the one hand towards Fashi, running to Air or the Nigerien steppes, on the other towards Kawar and Chad; there were the traditional routes of the Sudan-Mediterranean traffic studied by Nachtilag, doubled across the Tenere by the local traffic carried by the aaslay [q.v.].

The wealth in water and the natural communication have been a twofold source of profit; but they have also been the cause of troubles, as the state of the oases testifies: the mud villages ranged one above another on the flanks of the mounds of derelict palm plantations, and would return in August at harvest time, when the population of the oases would rise to some thousand persons.

The French administration attempted to revive these deserted oases, and from 1943 an aaslay again worked the Djado road, while the palm orchards were in part restored. The Djado oasis produced for it alone some 60 tons of dates from 7000 trees; this production, with that of the other oases in the massif, Drigana and Djaba, and that of Kawar, represented 1/5 of the production of the former French West Africa, Mauretania producing the remaining 4/5.

**Bibliography:** J. Despois, Le Fezzan; Ch. and M. Le Cour, Enquêtes dans les confins nigeriens (Cercles de Gouré et de Bilma); L. le Rouvreur, Notice sur le Djado (toneo, C.H.F.A.M.); Administrative reports of the Bilma Circle.

**Djado** (Djadou), the old capital of the eastern region of the Djabal Nafusa in Tripolitania, nowadays a large village in the Fassato district situated on three hills of unequal height. The population of about 2,000—towards the end of the 19th century there were about 500 houses—mostly consists of Berbers of the Ibádi tribe of Nafusa. The ruins of the old town are nothing but a pile of broken stones and caves with a mosque in the centre. Near the mosque was formerly the business quarter and the market (sâk), near which one can still see today the site of the Jewish quarter, synagogue, and cemetery.

According to J. Despois, to whom we owe this description, the former large settlement of “Old Djado” has been replaced by five modern villages, Djado (Djadou), El Gsir (al-Gsir), Oucheba (Uzhebati), Loudjelin (Yuudjlin), and Temougouet (Temoujet). This information is not quite accurate. It appears, in fact, that at least two of these villages, Yuudjlin and Temoujet, have nothing to do with the old town of Drajd, and that they already existed alongside this town long ago. According to J. Despois, the present Djado would be about four centuries younger than the old town, which was exactly when it was abandoned. The last mention of Drajd found in the Ibadi chronicles is connected with a celebrated Ibadi skayhk who lived in the 6th/7th century (al-Shamākkhi, Kitāb al-Siyar, 541).

Little is known of the first days of Djadou. Nevertheless it appears that this town was founded long
before the Muslim conquest of North Africa and that it owed its creation and prosperity to the fact that it was situated on the ancient highway joining the city of Tripoli (and probably Sabratha and Leptis Magna) with the Fezzān and the central Sudan (on this highway, see A. Berthelot, *L’Afrique saharienne et soudanaise. Ce qu’en ont connu les anciens*, Paris 1927, 274-6). It seems to us, in fact, that it is with the name Djadū that the tribal name Gadaiae mentioned by Corippus (549 A.D.) must be connected. It must, however, be said that the first certain mentions of this town date from much later, the end of the 2nd/8th and the beginning of the 3rd/9th centuries. At this time we hear already of a caravan of traders composed of men from Djadū in an anecdote concerning the ṣayyāḥ Abū ‘Uṯmān al-Mazāṭā and related by the Ibadī biographer al-Dardjī (q.v.). For some time, in the second half of the 3rd/9th and about the beginning of the 4th/10th century, Djadū, according to the Ibadī historians, was the political and administrative centre of the entire Djabal Nafūs. It was the residence of Abū Mansūr Ilyās, the governor of the country appointed by the Rustamid imām of Tāhār, and later of Abū Yahiyya Zakariyyā al-Iraqī, who ruled the Djabal Nafūs as an independent imām. Djadū was at this time also a considerable commercial city. Ibn Hawkal (363/973) says that it possessed a mosque and a minbar. According to Abū ‘Ubayd al-Bakrī (461/1068), who got his information about the Djabal Nafūs from the geographical work of Muhammad b. Yūsuf al-Warrāḵ (d. 363/973), Djadū was a large city with bazaars and a considerable Jewish population. According to this geographer the caravans going from Tripoli to the town of Zawila in the Fezzān (today Zuulla N.E. of Murzuk), a sizeable centre for the export of slaves to Iffīkiyya and the neighbouring lands in the Middle Ages, used to pass through Djadū. A march of 40 days separated Zawila from the Sudanese country of Kānem, with which the Djabal Nafūs, and in particular the town of Djadū, had close, but as yet very little studied, relations.

In this connexion it is relevant that al-Djanawānī (a.d. 927/1522) on behalf of the imām of Tāhār in the first half of the 3rd/9th century, knew, besides Berber and Arabic, the language of Kānem (lughā kānāmiyya). Another fact attests the existence of close relations between Djadū and the Sudan: the name of the birthplace of al-Djanawānī, Djināwūn (situated below Djadū), which is known from the middle of the 2nd/8th century onwards, is the Arabicized form of a name still used today, which is the masculine plural of the Berber word aqnae “dumb > negro, black man” (cf. G. S. Collin, in *GLECS*, vii, 94-5). It is therefore probable that the village of Djināwūn (Ignawn) “the Negroes” owes its name to an ethnic group of Sudanese origin, probably natives of Kānem, who had established themselves there some time previously to the 2nd/8th century (T. Lewicki, *Études ibadites nord-africaines*, i, Warsaw 1955, 94-6). So one may speak of Djadū as having been from that period at least a stage on the ancient track Tripoli-Zawila-Kānem.

The inhabitants of other places in the Djabal Nafūs used this town as market at Djadū, which was above all an economic centre for the whole of the eastern region of the country. It even had, about the 4th/10th century, a special magistrate in charge of the market of the town. In spite of its mixed population, Djadū was also an Ibadī religious centre of great importance. According to al-Shamākhlī it was a meeting-place for the Ibadī scholars of the country. From a very distant period, the second half of the 2nd/8th century at least, Djadū was also a political centre, the chief town of the eastern region of the Djabal Nafūs, which is called in the old Ibadī chronicles “the region of Djadū”, “Djadū and its villages”, or “Djadū and its neighbourhood”. This region comprised the present districts of Fassātā, al-Rūqābān, and al-Zintān. We know the names of some fifteen villages and strongholds (*būdār*) which existed in this neighbourhood in the early Middle Ages, as well as the names of several Ibadī Berber tribes who lived there side by side with the Nafūsī proper. Of these tribes the Banū Zamīr and the Banū Tādārīr deservet special mention. We do not know whether the region of Djadū enjoyed autonomy under the Rustamīds and their governors in the Djabal Nafūs. But after the downfall of the imām of Tāhār, from the second half of the 4th/10th century onwards, at the time of the greatest economic prosperity of Djadū, there were ḫākimīn (local Ibadī chiefs) of this town (or perhaps of the whole region), known as al-Djanawānī side by side with other ḫākimīn of the Djabal Nafūs. The first ḫākim of the people of Djadū whose name we know was Abū Muhammad al-Darīfī, a contemporary of the ḫākim of Nafūs Abū Zakariyyā al-Tīndīmirī. He lived in the famous Dār Banī ‘Abd Allāh which was situated on the siḥ of Djadū. This house, which afterwards became the meeting-place of the ṣayyāḥs of the town, was considered later to be one of the holy places of the Djabal Nafūs. After the death of Abū Muhammad the office of ḫākim of Djadū passed to his son Abū Yahiyya Yūsuf, who lived about 390/1000. Along with the ḫākimīn of Djadū there were also in the region of this town from the 4th/10th to the 5th/11th centuries ḫākimīn special to the Banū Zamīr.

**DJADWAL** — **DJAF**

**DJADWAL**, pl. **diaddwil**, primarily "brook, water-course", means further "table, plan". Graefe suggested that in this meaning it might derive from *schédua*; but perhaps one should rather think of *di-l* "to twist!", cf. S. Fraenkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen*, 224, and the similar development of the meaning of adā, as stated by E. Honigmann, *Die sieben Klimata*, 1929, 117 ff. In this second sense the word becomes a special term in sorcery, synonymous with ḥāllim; here it means quadrangular or other geometrical figures, into which names and signs possessing magical powers are inserted. These are usually certain mysterious characters, Arabic letters and numerals, magic words, the Names of God, the angels and demons, as well as of the planets, the days of the week, and the elements, and lastly pieces from the Kurān, such as the *Fālīka* [q.v.], the *Surā Yāsin*, the "throne-verse", the *fawdtify*, etc. The application of these figures is manifold: frequently the paper on which they have been drawn is burnt in order to curse someone with its smoke; or the writing may be washed off in water and drunk (cf. Num., v, 23 ff.); along with the da’wa (conjunction) and often also the *basam* (oath) the diadwal forms the contents of an amulet (iris. [q.v.]). The very popular *dawrat al-shams*, for example, is prepared as follows: it is quadrangular, divided into 49 sections by six lines drawn lengthwise and six drawn across its breadth, and contains Solomon's seal and other peculiar figures: seven consonants, Names of God, names of spirits, the names of the seven kings of the *diins*, the names of the days of the week, and the names of the planets. The underlying notion is that secret relationships exist between these various components, and the *diadwal* is therefore made to obtain certain certain results from the correlations of the elements composing it. The highly developed system of mystic letters, which is based on the numerical values of the Arabic letters, is very frequently used for the *diadwal*. A special class is formed by the squares called *waft* [q.v.] in the fields of which certain figures are so arranged that the addition of horizontal, vertical and diagonal lines gives in every case the same total (e.g., 15 or 34). The celebrated name buḍā is nothing but an artificial talisman word formed from the elements of the simple threefold magic square, i.e., from the letters in the four corners in the alphabetical order of the abjad,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name buḍā evidently passed at an early date into South Arabic, became used there as a feminine proper name and as a feminine epithet, "fat!", and was confused with the root *bud* (LA, III, s.v. *bud*). It has no other meaning in Arabic. In magical books there are even a few cases of the word being personified (e.g., Ya budā, in Ḥāfīdī Ṣa’dūn, *Al-fāth al-ḥafīdī*, 21; in Ḥāfīdī Ṣa’dūn, p. 271, in *Al-fāth al-ḥafīdī*). This has become a Ḥajjīn whose services can be secured by writing his name either in letters or in numbers (*Ja*, sér. 4, xii, 521 ff.; Spire, *Vocabulary of colloquial Egyptian*, 35; Doutté, *Magie et religion*, 296, along with *Kayyûm* as though a name of Allāh; Klunzinger, *Upper Egypt*, 387). The uses of this word are most varied, to invoke both good and bad fortune: thus, in Doutté, *op. cit.*, against menorrhagia (234), against stomach pains (229), to render oneself invisible (273), against temporary impotence (295); Lane's *Egyptian megahib* also used it with his ink mirror, and so in several treatises on magic. It is also engraved upon jewels and metal plates or rings which are permanently carried as talismans, and it is inscribed at the beginning of books (like habakādā) as a safeguard, e.g., in *Fāth al-djāl*, Tunis 1290. By far its commonest use is to ensure the arrival of letters and packages. Besides the references above, see also Reinaud, *Monuments musulmans*, ii, 243 ff., 251 ff., 256 ff. for the meanings of *diadwal* cf. the notes s.v. in Dozy's *Supplement and Redhouse's Turkish and English lexicon*. The K. al-budā of Dājībār b. Ḥayyān mentioned in the *Fihrīs* is in fact a *kitāb aldād华尔*, cf. P. Kraus, *Törb ibn Ḥayyān*, i, 1943, p. 26, no. 47, and J. W. Fück, in *Ambis*, iv (1951), 128, no. 36.


(E. Graefe-D. B. Macdonald-M. Plissner)

**DJAF**. A large and famous Kūrdis tribe of southern (Yrāk) Kurdistan, and of the Sananadāj (Senna) district of Ardalan province of Western Persia.

The tribe, cattle-owning and seasonally nomadic, was centred in the Djāwarnd wrought at the area of the latter province in the early 11th/17th century, and is first mentioned in connexion with the operations and Turko-Persian treaty of Sultan Murād IV. About 1112/1700, following bad relations with the Ardalān authorities, the main body of the tribe (estimated at 10,000 tents or families) moved into Turkish territory, leaving substantial sections in their own original homes. The Djāf who settled in the Turkish and border districts occupied, in summer, the highlands around Pāndjūn in spring and autumn, the plain of Shahriūr, with headquarters at Ḥalabjā: and in winter, lands dependent upon Kifr, on the right bank of the Sirwān (Diyālā).

Other Djāf elements at various periods became incorporated with the Ġūrān, others with the Sinnābāyān, others the Bāḏgalān Dājībā, others the Shahrafāyānī, others the Bāḏgalān Dājībā (all more or less outside the reputed frontier, which was not fixed until 1265/1847), and separated from their original tribe.

The main body of the Djāf, although grouped in many distinct sections, sometimes of formidable size and self-consciousness, showed far general cohesion under capable leaders. For a century and a half (1112-1267/1700-1850) they interminently (but
never much more than nominally) formed part of the dependencies of the Bābān [q.v.] empire. Their nomadic habit and indiscipline involved them in endless quarrels with neighbours and settled folk, and their fashion of living was such that, except in the unusual periods of peace in the Turkish districts, all their energies were devoted to incessant fighting. In the years following their incorporation into the Turkish administrative system, about 1276/1859, and in spite of increasing contacts of their leaders with Turkish officialdom and forces, they remained effectively ungoverned until the first World War, dominated the area in which they camped and grazed (as well as the town of Halabjadi, which was a Djasf creation), and paid infrequent dues to the Treasury in the form of lump sums, as reviewed by them in the early years of the 18th century. Their more unmanageable reason of their formidable numbers, and the rivalries between claimants for power among their own Beg-zada, who frequently courted, or were champions by, both Governments in turn. Even after their nominal incorporation in the Turkish administrative system, about 1276/1859, and in spite of increasing contacts of their leaders with Turkish officialdom and forces, they remained effectively ungoverned until the first World War, dominated the area in which they camped and grazed (as well as the town of Halabjadi, which was a Djasf creation), and paid infrequent dues to the Treasury in the form of lump sums, as reviewed by them in the early years of the 18th century.
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Mirs Djasfar or Mir Muhammad Djasfar Khan (Siyar al-mutakhhirin, vol. ii in both the text and rubrics, and not Djasfar Ali Khan), son of Sayyid Ahmad al-Nadjarf, of obscure origin, rose to be the Nawwab of Bengal during the days of the East India Company. A penniless adventurer, like his patron Mirza Muhammad Ali entitled Allwirdi Khan Mahbub Djang (see the article al-werdg khan), he married a step-sister, Shah Khanim, of Allwirdi, and served his master and brother-in-law as a commandant, before the latter ascended the masnad of Bengal in 1553/1740 after defeating and killing Sarraz Khan, son and successor of Shudja Khan, to the masnad of Bengal, c. 1740.

His brother-in-law, the Bakhshi or paymaster (bakhshi) of the army, to which post he had been appointed by Siradi al-Dawla, who had by his various indiscretions alienated not only the Turkish officialdom and forces, they remained effectively ungoverned until the first World War, dominated the area in which they camped and grazed (as well as the town of Halabjadi, which was a Djasf creation), and paid infrequent dues to the Treasury in the form of lump sums, as reviewed by them in the early years of the 18th century. Their more unmanageable reason of their formidable numbers, and the rivalries between claimants for power among their own Beg-zada, who frequently courted, or were champions by, both Governments in turn. Even after their nominal incorporation in the Turkish administrative system, about 1276/1859, and in spite of increasing contacts of their leaders with Turkish officialdom and forces, they remained effectively ungoverned until the first World War, dominated the area in which they camped and grazed (as well as the town of Halabjadi, which was a Djasf creation), and paid infrequent dues to the Treasury in the form of lump sums, as reviewed by them in the early years of the 18th century.
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Mirs Djasfar or Mir Muhammad Djasfar Khan (Siyar al-mutakhhirin, vol. ii in both the text and rubrics, and not Djasfar Ali Khan), son of Sayyid Ahmad al-Nadjarf, of obscure origin, rose to be the Nawwab of Bengal during the days of the East India Company. A penniless adventurer, like his patron Mirza Muhammad Ali entitled Allwirdi Khan Mahbub Djang (see the article al-werdg khan), he married a step-sister, Shah Khanim, of Allwirdi, and served his master and brother-in-law as a commandant, before the latter ascended the masnad of Bengal in 1553/1740 after defeating and killing Sarraz Khan, son and successor of Shudja Khan, to the masnad of Bengal, c. 1740. After the death of Siradi al-Dawla's incompetence and unpopularity, his ultimate defeat and flight into Awadh again brought Mir Djasfar to the masnad, which he occupied till his death in 1178/1765. Taking account of the standards of the time, the prevailing atmosphere of political chicanery and doubtful entitlement to high offices of State, of the way his contemporary Allwirdi Khan had obtained the nizamat of Bengal, of Siradji al-Dawla's incompetence and unpopularity, it is rather difficult to justify the charge of national treachery commonly levelled against Mir Djasfar, much less to dub him "Lord Clive's jackass". His last years were not very happy or comfortable as it is rather difficult to justify the charge of national treachery commonly levelled against Mir Djasfar, much less to dub him "Lord Clive's jackass". His last years were not very happy or comfortable as his doubtful attitude during the attempted Dutch invasion of Bengal in 1713/1759 and partly because of his having been in arrears with his payments to the Company. The declaration of war against the Company by Mir Kasim in 1177/1763 and his ultimate defeat and flight into Awadh again brought Mir Djasfar to the masnad, which he occupied till his death in 1178/1765. Taking account of the standards of the time, the prevailing atmosphere of political chicanery and doubtful entitlement to high offices of State, of the way his contemporary Allwirdi Khan had obtained the nizamat of Bengal, of Siradji al-Dawla's incompetence and unpopularity, it is rather difficult to justify the charge of national treachery commonly levelled against Mir Djasfar, much less to dub him "Lord Clive's jackass". His last years were not very happy or comfortable as his doubtful attitude during the attempted Dutch invasion of Bengal in 1713/1759 and partly because of his having been in arrears with his payments to the Company. The declaration of war against the Company by Mir Kasim in 1177/1763 and his ultimate defeat and flight into Awadh again brought Mir Djasfar to the masnad, which he occupied till his death in 1178/1765. Taking account of the standards of the time, the prevailing atmosphere of political chicanery and doubtful entitlement to high offices of State, of the way his contemporary Allwirdi Khan had obtained the nizamat of Bengal, of Siradji al-Dawla's incompetence and unpopularity, it is rather difficult to justify the charge of national treachery commonly levelled against Mir Djasfar, much less to dub him "Lord Clive's jackass". His last years were not very happy or comfortable as his doubtful attitude during the attempted Dutch invasion of Bengal in 1713/1759 and partly because of his having been in arrears with his payments to the Company. The declaration of war against the Company by Mir Kasim in 1177/1763 and his ultimate defeat and flight into Awadh again brought Mir Djasfar to the masnad, which he occupied till his death in 1178/1765. Taking account of the standards of the time, the prevailing atmosphere of political chicanery and doubtful entitlement to high offices of State, of the way his contemporar...

DJAFA'AR b. ABI TĀLĪB, cousin of the Prophet and brother of 'Ali, whose elder he was by ten years. When his father was reduced to poverty, his uncle al-'Abbās took Dja'far into his house to solace him, while Muhammad took care of 'Ali. Soon being converted to Islam (Dja'far occupies the second list of the first Muslims), he was among those who emigrated to Abyssinia (his name heads the second list given by Ibn Ḥišām, 209); his wife Asmāʾ b. Umayyā followed him. When the Kuraysh sent Abū Rabiʿa Ibn al-Mughira al-Makhzūmī and 'Amr b. al-ʿĀṣ to the Negus to demand the detention of the emigrés, Dja'far, by reciting Kurānic verses on the Virgin (from Sūra XIX) before the sovereign, and at a subsequent audience verses on Jesus (from Sūra IV), obtained his protection for himself and his companions; it is even said that he converted him to Islam. During this period of exile the Prophet expressly commended Dja'far to the Negus; at the time of the famous Pact of Fraternity between Muhādžirūn and Anṣār, he allotted Muḥāsaid b. Dja'bal to him as adoptive brother, and, unless the tradition is in error, he considered him as present at the battle of Badr, since his name figures among the Badrites.

On his return from Abyssinia, Dja'far met the Prophet on the day of the capture of Khaybar (7/628). Muḥammad, embracing him with the greatest fervour, cried "I know not what gives me the greater pleasure, my conquest or the return of Dja'far!"

The name of Dja'far is found in the sources in connexion with an episode concerning 'Āmmāra, daughter of Ḥamzah the uncle of the Prophet. The girl had stayed at Mecca; to withdraw her from the pagans while respecting the pact of Ḥudaybiya, 'Ali proposed to take her as wife to Medina. Zayd b. Ḥārīḥa protested that he was her waṣī in his capacity as Ḥamzah's brother and heir, and that Dja'far was also on account of his kinship with her (he was Ḥamzah's nephew and brother-in-law of 'Āmmāra's mother). Muhammad agreed that Dja'far should be the girl's guardian, but restrained him from marrying her because of his double bond of relationship. Dja'far welcomed the decision of the Prophet, skipping (kaddāla) around Muḥammad in the way in which the Abyssinians did around the Negus. It was on this occasion that the Prophet is reputed to have said: "This art like me in thy features and thine manners (aqshabā khalīti wa khlusīlī)".

In the year 8/629, when the Prophet decided to send an expedition beyond the Byzantine frontier, he appointed Zayd b. Ḥārīḥa as commander-in-chief, and, in case the latter should be killed, Dja'far, and then, as Dja'far's eventual replacement, 'Abd Allāh b. Rāwāḥa. All three fell in the battle of Mu'ta (Dumādā i 8/629) and were buried in the same tomb which had no distinctive markings. A tomb is in existence at Muṭa on which Dja'far's epitaph in Kūfic characters is partly preserved, which shows the antiquity of the tradition concerning him. Dja'far fought at Mu'ta (he died bravely at this time, about forty years old); he is said to have hamstrung his horse before the battle so that he should have no means of flight, and that he was the first in Islam so to do; having had his hands cut off one after the other, he carried the standard against his chest with his stumps; more than sixty wounds were counted on his body. The Prophet, through his supernatural powers of perception, witnessed the battle from his minbar. The following day he went to Dja'far's house and revealed to his widow, by his tears, the sorrow which had fallen upon her.

Dja'far was the one of Muḥammad's kinsmen who most closely resembled him. He was summoned Abu 'l-Maṣākin (or Abu 'l-Maṣākin) for his charity towards the poor. After his death he was called Dja'far dhū 'l-djanahayn or Dja'far a-Tayyār because of his tw emigrations, to Abyssinia and to Medina, which seems strange since, on account of his exile, he could not have had the opportunity of following Muḥammad on his hijārā.

Of the sons Dja'far had by his wife al-ʿĀmmās, 'Awn and Muḥammad fell at Karbala beside al-Ḥusayn; only 'Abd Allāh gave him any descendants.

Ibn Aḥī 'l-Ḥadīd tells us of the arguments of those who considered the merits of Dja'far to be superior to those of 'Ali: he had embraced Islam after puberty; he had died a martyr's death, whereas 'Abd Allāh had lived to an old age. Ibn Aḥī 'l-Ḥadīd concludes that Dja'far was superior to both of his sons. It is generally agreed that Dja'far was the more meritorious of the two sons of Muḥammad; it was he who had embraced Islam after puberty; he had died a martyr's death, whereas there was dispute as to whether 'Ali's had been a shahīd, etc. Abū Ḥāyān al-Tawhīdī has also treated of this subject in the 57th part of his K. al-Baṣīrī.


DJAFA'AR b. 'ALI b. ḤAMDĀN AL-ANDALUSI, a descendant of a Yemeni family which settled in Spain at an unknown date, eventually moving to the district of Mṣila, in the Maghrib, at the end of the 3rd/9th century at the latest. Like his father 'Ali, he was at first a loyal supporter of the Fāṭimid cause, as Governor of Mṣila; then, probably inspired by jealousy of the Zirids [q.v.] who were increasingly favoured by the Fāṭimid caliphs, he changed sides in 360/971 and swore obedience to the Umayyad
caliph of Spain. After a few years in favour, he incurred the displeasure of the all-powerful hādīb al-Mansūr b. Abī 'Amir [q.v.] who had him assassinated in 372/982.


(Ref. TURNER)

**DJAFAAR B. AL-FADL** [see Ibn al-Furāt].

**DJAFAAR B. HABB.** Abu l-Fadl Dja'far b. Harb al-Mansūr b. Hamadhānī (d. 326/840), a Zaydi of the Baghdad branch, was first a disciple of Abu 'l-Huwhayl al-Allāf at Baṣra, and then of al-Murdār at Baghdad, whose asceticism he tried to imitate; this is what inspired him to give to the poor the large fortune which he inherited from his father.

In agreement with the Mu'tazila, he defended the doctrine that God knows through Himself from all eternity, that His knowledge is His very being, and that the object of His knowledge can exist from all eternity. He said that we have, in the divine wisdom, the guarantee that God does not commit injustice and does not lie; indeed that we cannot reasonably conceive the idea of a God who in fact commits an injustice. The infidel who is converted by his own effort, he said, has greater merit than one who is converted by divine grace. Again in agreement with the Mu'tazila, he admitted that the Word of God—the Kur'an—is created; it is therefore an accident and its place is the Prophet. He considered the soul to be essentially different from the body and united to it accidentally. He said that we act according to the last decision we have taken, provided it is not halted by another decision or by an obstacle.

Dja'far was a Zaydi: he said that the imāmate falls on the most worthy and not on the person who deserves it by right; and 'All b. Abī Talib is the most deserving in the community after the Prophet.


(Albert N. Nader)

**DJAFAAR B. MANSÛR AL-YAMĀN** [see supplement].

**DJAFAAR B. MUBASHSHIR AL-Kāsabī (also al-Kasabī), a prominent Mu'tazillī theologian and ascetic of the school of Baghdad, d. 234/848-9.** He was a disciple of Abū Mūsā al-Murdār, and to some slight degree also influenced by al-Naqẓām [q.v.] of Baṣra. Little is known of his life except some anecdotes about his abnegation of the world, and the information that he introduced the Mu'tazili doctrine to 'Ain [q.v.] and held disputations with Bīghr b. Ghiyāth al-Mawsī [q.v.]. He is the author of numerous works on ḥikb and kalām (al-Khayyāt 81; *Fihrist* 37) and he had numerous disciples who, together with the disciples of his like-minded contemporary Dja'far b. Harb [q.v.], were called Dja'fariyya, a branch of the Mu'tazila of Baghdad, by later heresiographers. Nothing of his literary output seems to have survived, except one long quotation on various opinions concerning the Kurʾān, from which it appears that he had anticipated al-Ash'ārī's style of literary exposition (Maḥālī al-ʾĪslāmiyyīn, 389-98). His principle in *fiḥr* was according to al-Khayyāt (80), to follow the *zhāhir* meaning of Kurʾānīn, *sunna* and *iqdām*, and to avoid ra'yī and biyyāh, and among his writings are mentioned works directed against the askhāb al-ra'yīn wa-'l-biyyāh, and against the askhāb al-hadīthīn. His opinions in theology remain within the framework of the various doctrines held by the Mu'tazila; some of them seem directly to reflect his unworlly attitude, such as the denial of predestination as not as the "world of faith" but as the "world of unrighteousness" (*dār fiṣḥ*, in the technical meaning of the word; *Maḥālī al-ʾĪslāmiyyīn* 464); this seems to have been the basis for Ibn al-Rwendi's [q.v.] charge, repeated by later heresiographers but rejected as false by al-Khayyāt (81), that Dja'far regarded some Muslim sinners (jussāb) as worse than the Jews, Christians, Zindiks and Dahriyya. As regards the caliphate, Dja'far held, in common with Dja'far b. Harb and al-Iṣkāfī [q.v.], that 'All was the most meritorious of men after the Prophet, but that the appointment of his less meritorious predecessors before him was valid; he and the other Mu'tazila of Baghdad are therefore regarded as a branch of the Zaydīyya (al-Ḥāfiz 27).

Dja'far's brother, Ḥubayḥ b. Mubāshshīr (d. 258/872), was a faṣākī and a fakīh who is claimed both by Sunni and by Shi'a biographers (al-Khattīb al-Baghdādī, no. 436; Ibn Ḥāḍir al-Aṣkalānī, *Takhdhib* al-Tahhābī, ii, no. 363; al-Māmākani, *Tambkīh al-Mākhlūf*, Najāf 1349 ff., no. 2237); it is reported that Dja'far refused to talk to him because he was a Ḥaṣwī (al-Māṣfī, *Murtūj*, iv, 443).


(A. N. NADER and J. SCHACHT)

**DJAFAAR B. MUḤMAḤAD [see ABU MAṢṢAR].**

**DJAFAAR B. YAHYĀ [see AL-BARĀMIKA].**

**DJAFAAR BEG** (?-926/1520)—the "Zafir aga, eunuco" listed in the index to Marino Sanuto, *Diarii*, xxi, col. 825—was Sandjak Beg of Gallipoli, i.e., Kağan of the High Admirals of the Ottoman forces. He was appointed to this office, not (as Kāmās al-ʾālīm and Siğilli-i ʿOthmānī assert) in 927/1521, but in 923/1516. His tenure of the office coincided with the Ottoman conquest of Syria and Egypt (922-3/1515-6) and with the extensive naval preparations that Sultan Selim I (918-26/1512-20) urged forward during the last of his reign. Dja'far Beg was noted for his harsh character (cf. Hamner-
DJA'FAR AL-SADIK

Purgstall, Gör, iii, 7). His misdeeds brought about his execution at the beginning of the reign of Sultan Sulayman Rāhūn (926-7/1520-60).


V. J. PARRY

DJA'FAR CELEBI (864/1459-921/1515), Ottoman statesman and man of letters, was born at Amasya (for the date see E. Blochet, Cat. des ss. turcs, ii, 1-2), where his father Tādji Beg was adviser to Prince (later Sultan) Bayezid I (in 864/1459-60). After the battle of Caldiran he was given Shah Fethməsi; back in Istanbul, however, he was accused of having encouraged the discontent of the Janissaries and was dismissed at the insistence of the Janissaries (Djumada II 917/1515). He made no sharp break with the non-Shi'i majority—even a Shi'i follower of his could appear in Sunni idāms (and his heir, 'Abd Allāh, was accused by later Shi'iS of Sunni tendencies); but he seems to have been a serious Shi'i leader nonetheless. He taught also a wide circle who consulted him along with other masters; 'Abū Ḥanīfah, Mālik b. Anas, and Wāṣīl b. 'Aṭā', among other prominent figures, were known to have been influenced by him. It is in his time, at the earliest, that distinctive Shi'i positions in fiqh begin to appear; but it is uncertain how far the subsequent Twelver or Isma'ili (or Zaydi) systems may be ascribed to his teaching, though he is given a leading role in the two former.

At the time of Zayd's revolt (122/739), Dja'far served as symbol for those Shi'iS who refused to rise; and during the revolts after the death of al-Walid (126/744), when most Shi'iS were expecting that at last the 'Aid family would come to power, he remained neutral. His support and possibly his candidacy may have been solicited by the Kūfā Shi'iS at the time of 'Abbāsid victory, but he seems to have declined to recognize any other Shi'i candidacy than his own, while, if he did think of himself, he held to the principle of bu'a, that the true imām need not attempt to seize power unless the time be ripe, and can be content to teach. At the time of the Shi'i revolt of Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zākiyya in the Hijāz (145/762), he was again neutral, leading the Husaynids in their passivity in that largely Ḥasanid affair, and was left in peace by al-Mansūr.

Dja'far attracted a circle of active thinkers, most of whom, such as his son, Musā, notably Hishām b. al-Hākām and Su'lūk b. Khalīfah, were inclined to an anthropomorphist system in contrast to that of the early Mu'tazilites with whom they disputed. Dja'far himself is assigned (with uncertain authenticity) a position on the problem of ba'ad which claims to be between determinism and free-will.

Dja'far died in 148/765 (poisoned, according to the unlikely Twelver tradition, on the orders of al-Mansūr) and was buried in the Bakī' cemetery in

80/699-700 or 83/702-3 in Medina, his mother, Umm Farwa, being a great-granddaughter of 'Abū Bakr. He inherited al-Bākīr's following in 119/737 (or 114/733); hence during the crucial years of the transition from Umayyad to 'Abbasid power he was at the head of those Shi'iS who accepted a non-militant Fātīmī imāmate. He lived quietly in Madina as an authority in hadith and probably in fiqh; he is cited with respect in Sunnī idāms.

He made no sharp break with the non-Shi'i majorit-

y—even a Shi'i follower of his could appear in Sunnī idāms (and his heir, 'Abd Allāh, was accused by later Shi'iS of Sunni tendencies); but he seems to have been a serious Shi'i leader nonetheless. He appears to have permitted his own zā'īn, his personal following, to regard him, like his father, as sole authoritative exponent of the šarī'a, divinely favoured in his 'ilm, religious knowledge (and in principle as the only man legitimately entitled to rule). But he taught also a wide circle who consulted him along with other masters; 'Abū Ḥanīfah, Mālik b. Anas, and Wāṣīl b. 'Aṭā', among other prominent figures, were known to have been influenced by him. It is in his time, at the earliest, that distinctive Shi'i positions in fiqh begin to appear; but it is uncertain how far the subsequent Twelver or Isma'ili (or Zaydi) systems may be ascribed to his teaching, though he is given a leading role in the two former.

At the time of Zayd's revolt (122/739), Dja'far served as symbol for those Shi'iS who refused to rise; and during the revolts after the death of al-Walid (126/744), when most Shi'iS were expecting that at last the 'Aid family would come to power, he remained neutral. His support and possibly his candidacy may have been solicited by the Kūfā Shi'iS at the time of 'Abbāsid victory, but he seems to have declined to recognize any other Shi'i candidacy than his own, while, if he did think of himself, he held to the principle of bu'a, that the true imām need not attempt to seize power unless the time be ripe, and can be content to teach. At the time of the Shi'i revolt of Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zākiyya in the Hijāz (145/762), he was again neutral, leading the Husaynids in their passivity in that largely Ḥasanid affair, and was left in peace by al-Mansūr.

Dja'far attracted a circle of active thinkers, most of whom, such as his son, Musā, notably Hishām b. al-Hākām and Su'lūk b. Khalīfah, were inclined to an anthropomorphist system in contrast to that of the early Mu'tazilites with whom they disputed. Dja'far himself is assigned (with uncertain authenticity) a position on the problem of ba'ad which claims to be between determinism and free-will.

Dja'far died in 148/765 (poisoned, according to the unlikely Twelver tradition, on the orders of al-Mansūr) and was buried in the Bakī' cemetery in

80/699-700 or 83/702-3 in Medina, his mother, Umm Farwa, being a great-granddaughter of 'Abū Bakr. He inherited al-Bākīr's following in 119/737 (or 114/733); hence during the crucial years of the transition from Umayyad to 'Abbasid power he was at the head of those Shi'iS who accepted a non-militant Fātīmī imāmate. He lived quietly in Madina as an authority in hadith and probably in fiqh; he is cited with respect in Sunnī idāms.

He made no sharp break with the non-Shi'i majorit-

y—even a Shi'i follower of his could appear in Sunnī idāms (and his heir, 'Abd Allāh, was accused by later Shi'iS of Sunni tendencies); but he seems to have been a serious Shi'i leader nonetheless. He appears to have permitted his own zā'īn, his personal following, to regard him, like his father, as sole authoritative exponent of the šarī'a, divinely favoured in his 'ilm, religious knowledge (and in principle as the only man legitimately entitled to rule). But he taught also a wide circle who consulted him along with other masters; 'Abū Ḥanīfah, Mālik b. Anas, and Wāṣīl b. 'Aṭā', among other prominent figures, were known to have been influenced by him. It is in his time, at the earliest, that distinctive Shi'i positions in fiqh begin to appear; but it is uncertain how far the subsequent Twelver or Isma'ili (or Zaydi) systems may be ascribed to his teaching, though he is given a leading role in the two former.

At the time of Zayd's revolt (122/739), Dja'far served as symbol for those Shi'iS who refused to rise; and during the revolts after the death of al-Walid (126/744), when most Shi'iS were expecting that at last the 'Aid family would come to power, he remained neutral. His support and possibly his candidacy may have been solicited by the Kūfā Shi'iS at the time of 'Abbāsid victory, but he seems to have declined to recognize any other Shi'i candidacy than his own, while, if he did think of himself, he held to the principle of bu'a, that the true imām need not attempt to seize power unless the time be ripe, and can be content to teach. At the time of the Shi'i revolt of Muhammad al-Nafs al-Zākiyya in the Hijāz (145/762), he was again neutral, leading the Husaynids in their passivity in that largely Ḥasanid affair, and was left in peace by al-Mansūr.

Dja'far attracted a circle of active thinkers, most of whom, such as his son, Musā, notably Hishām b. al-Hākām and Su'lūk b. Khalīfah, were inclined to an anthropomorphist system in contrast to that of the early Mu'tazilites with whom they disputed. Dja'far himself is assigned (with uncertain authenticity) a position on the problem of ba'ad which claims to be between determinism and free-will.
Medina, where his tomb was visited, especially by Shi'is, till it was destroyed by the Wahhabis. He left a cohesive following with an active intellectual life, well on the way to becoming a sect. But some of the differing tendencies which he had usually managed to reconcile now seem to have caused historic splits in it, occasioned by a disputed succession to his imamate. He had designated Isma'il, his eldest son; but Abd Allah died without sons a few weeks later. The majority thereupon accepted Musa, whose mother was Hamida, a slave (and whom some, including prominent philosophers, had hailed as imam from the start); these developed into the Twelve Shī'a, for whom Dja'far was the sixth imam.

Most of Dja'far's following, however, accepted Abd Allah, Isma'il's uterine brother and the eldest surviving son, on the ground that Dja'far had generalized that an imam's successor must be his eldest son; but Abd Allah died without sons only a few weeks later. The majority thereupon accepted Musa, whose mother was Hamida, a slave (and whom some, including prominent philosophers, had hailed as imam from the start); these developed into the Twelve Shī'a, for whom Dja'far was the sixth imam. A few asserted that Dja'far was not really dead, but absent, and would return as Mahdi (these were called the Nawusiyya). Some of Dja'far's following looked to Musa's young brother Muhammad, who later became the Imam of the Shumaytiyya, for whom Dja'far was the sixth imam.

Among most Shi'is, Dja'far has been regarded as one of the greatest of the imams and as the teacher of fiqh par excellence. The Twelvers, when referring to themselves as a madhab, have called it the Dja'ariyya. To Dja'far have been ascribed numerous utterances defining Shi'i doctrine, as well as prayers and homilies; he has been ascribed, by both Sunnis and Shi'is, numerous books, probably none of them authentic, dealing especially with divination, with magic, and with alchemy, of which the most famous is the mysterious Dja'far [q.v.], foretelling the future. He is regarded as the chief teacher of the alchemist Djabir b. Hayyan (who did in fact revere him as a religious teacher). He is also regarded as a master Sufi. Especially among the Shī'a, so many sayings on all sides of all controverted questions have been ascribed to him that such reports are almost useless for determining his actual opinions in a given case.


(D. G. S. Hodgson)

Dja'far Sharīf b. 'Alī Sharīf b. Kurayshī al-Naqārī, whose dates of birth and death are unknown, wrote his Kānān-i Islām at the instigation of Dr. Herklots some time before 1832. He is said to have been "a man of low origin and of no account in his own country", born at Uppūlūrū (Ellore) in Kistna District, Madras, and was employed as a munāzah in the service of the Madras government. He was an orthodox Sunnī, yet tolerant towards the Shi'as, who had considerable influence in southern India in his time, learned yet objective in his approach to his faith, knowledgeable in magic and sorcery yet writing of it in a depreciatory and apologetic tone, and a skilful physician of the Yūnānī school. In the course of his duties he met with Gerhard Andreas Herklots (b. 1790 in the Dutch colony of Chinsura in Bengal of Dutch parents, d. Wāddājībād 1834), who had studied medicine in England and had been appointed Surgeon on the Madras establishment in 1818. Herklots, struck by the lack of any information on the Indian Muslims comparable with the Manners and customs of the Hindoos of the Abbé Dubois, had started a collection of material when he met Dja'far accidentally, whom he encouraged to produce the work himself acting "merely as a reviser", occasionally suggesting "subjects which had escaped his memory".

The original was written in Dakhkhīn Urdu, which Herklots had intended to publish also, but his death prevented this and the original has now been lost. To the translation Herklots added notes and addenda incorporating additional material from Mrs. Meer Hassan Ali's Observations on the Mussulmans of India, 1832, and Garcin de Tassy's Mémoires sur les particularités de l'islam musulmane dans l'Inde, Paris 1832, that the work might embrace "an account of all the peculiarities of the Mussulmans ... in every part of India". His Qanun-e-Islam was published (London, late 1832) with a subvention from the East India Company.

Dja'far's account traces the religious and social life of the south Indian Muslims from the seventh month of pregnancy to the rites after death, with full descriptions of all domestic rites and ceremonies and festivals of the year, including necromancy, exorcism, and other matters of magic and sorcery; Herklots's appendix adds information on relationships, weights and measures, dress, jewellery, games, etc., and a glossary. The work was rearranged and partially rewritten by W. Cooke for the new Oxford edition of 1921, enhancing its value as an authoritative account of Indian popular Islam with particular reference to the Deccan. See also E. G. B. Johnson, Dja'far Sharīf, London 1827, and A. F. C. Biard, Dja'far Sharīf, London 1827.

Dja'far Sharīf b. 'Alī Sharīf b. Kurayshī al-Naqārī. The particular veneration which, among the Shi'as, the members of the Prophet's family enjoy, is at the base of the belief that the descendants of Fātima have inherited certain privileges inherent in Prophethood; prediction of the future and of the destinies of nations and dynasties is one of these privileges. The Shi'i conception of prophecy, closely connected with that of the ancient gnosis (cf. Tor Andrae, Die Person Muhammeds in Lehre und Glauben seiner Gemeinde, Stockholm 1918, c. vij) made the prophetic afflatus pass from Adam to Muhammad and from Muhammad to the 'Alids (cf. H. H. Schaeder, in ZDMG, lxxv, 1925, 214 ff.). The Banū Hāshim, to whom 'Abbās Abī Ţālīb belonged, had long since claimed superiority over the Banū Umayya, as having the Prophet's appanage. Immediately after his conversion, seeing the armies of Muhammad filing off ready for the conquest of Mecca, the Umayyad Abī Ṣufyān said to 'Abbās, the Prophet's uncle, who was standing beside him, "Your nephew's authority has become very great!"; and al-'Abbas replied, "Yes, wretched one, that is Prophethood!" (Tabarī, iii, 1635).
A Batim tradition tells that the Prophet, when on the point of death, said to 'Ali b. Abi Talib, "O 'Ali, when I am dead, wash me, embalm me, clothe me and sit me up; then, I shall tell thee what shall happen until the day of resurrection". When he was dead, 'Ali washed him, embalmed him, clothed him and sat him up; and then Muhammad told him what would happen until the day of resurrection (Ps. al-Djafri [read al-Djaffi]; cf. F. Wustenfeld, Register, 7, l. 123). K. al-Hajj wa l-urkilla, ed. 'A. Tamir and I.-A. Khalifa, Beirut 1960, 135; on the K. al-djafir, attached to the Ps. [see Ibn Abi al-Hadj, S. I, 75]. Here clearly defined is the terminus a quo of the djafir, which in origin was identified with the hidjab, and the maladim.

In the desperate struggle for the Caliphat carried on by the descendants of 'Ali, early divided and weakened amongst themselves and suffering from the severe persecution of which they had been victims—notably in 237/851 under al-Mutawakkil—an esoteric literature of apocalyptic character arose, created in order to bolster the hopes of the adepts, who were near to despair, and to sustain in the minds of the ruling Caliphs that quasi-religious respect which they felt they should owe to the descendants of the daughter of the Prophet. This literature appears in different forms, all grouped under the generic name of djafir, to which is often added the term gdima or the adjective gdim. It is of a fatidical and sibyline character, and in its later form is summarized in a table in which the djafir represents fate (kadar) and the gdima a destiny (kadar). "It is", says Hâdîdî Khalîfa (ii, 603 ff.), "the summary knowledge (of that which is written) on the table of fate and destiny, which contains all that has been and all that which will be, totally and partially". The djafir contains the Universal Intellect and the gdima a the Universal Soul. Thus, the djafir tends to be a vision of the world on a supernatural and cosmic scale. Deviating from its original form of esoteric knowledge of an apocalyptic nature, reserved to the imâms who were the heirs and successors of 'Ali, it became assimilated to a dívivatory technique accessible to the wise whatever their origin, particularly to the mystics (see 1m Al-Qâdiri, Apokalîpsis, pp. 386 ff.; Sarav Ab, III, 359, etc.). Among the various authors who contributed to the development of this technique, four main names must be cited: Muhîî al-Dîn Abu l'-Abbâs al-Bûnî (d. 622/1225), in Shams al-ma'ârîf, a work which exists in three recensions, the smallest, the mean, and the great; the last-named was edited in Cairo in 1322-4 (1903-6) in 4 vols. It should be noted that the small work called DJAFR al-imîm 'Ali b. Abî Talib or al-Durr al-munassas ... attributed to Ibn 'Arabi (cf. ms Leipzig 833, 17; cf. Paris 2665, Aleppo-Sbath 57 and 390), is nothing but paragraphs 33 and 34 of the Shams al-ma'ârîf (cf. Hartmann, Eine arab. Apokalypse ... , 109 ff.). Muhîî al-Dîn b. 'Arabi (d. 638/1240), MiJîdah al-djafir al-gdîmî (ms. Istanbul-Hamidiye, Ism. Ef, 280; Paris 2669, 14, etc.). Ibn Talbâ al-'Adâwî al-Râdni (d. 652/1254), with the same title or under the title al-Durr al-munassas fi l-sirr al-Â'sâm (ms. Paris 16834); Istanbul, Armutlu Huseyin P. 347; Sarav Ab, III, 3507, etc.). 'Abd al-Rahmân al-Bistâmî (d. 858/1454), with the same titles (ms. AS 2813/3; Vat. V. 1254; cf. Nicholson, in J. R. A. S., 1899, 907).

In all these writings, and in many others, there is great confusion as to the procedures to be followed. Other heterogeneous elements, belonging to other forms of obscure thought, have been added; one finds the occult properties of the letters of the alphabet (hurûf) and of divine names (al-asma' al-'usma', gematria and isopsephy (isîbâb al-djumma', the indication of the numerical value of a name which one wishes to keep secret, the transposition of letters in a single word, for the purpose of forming another word, the combination of letters composing a divine name with those of the name of the object desired (al-hâs wa l-basht), the substitution of one letter in a word by another according to the abâsht system (a table of concordance in which the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet corresponds to the last, the second to the penultimate, etc.), the formation of a word by putting together the first letters of the words of a phrase, in other words all the procedures made use of by the cabbala (cf. J. G. Fervier, Histoire de l'écriture, Paris 1948, Appx. III, 588-91).

These speculations on the numerical value of the letters have played a considerable part in Muslim mysticism, where not only the letters composing the divine names, but also the seven letters not found in the fâitha, have been the object of a special veneration. In the Islamic hurâfiyya neo-Platonic and cabballistic traditions join with the speculations of certain exalted Sîfîs, to form a body of esoteric knowledge of such an obscurity that "only the Mâldî, expected at the end of time, would be capable of understanding its true significance" (Hâdîdî Khalîfa, wâ'asîs). This diversity of approach can be further complicated by divergences in the methods of classification. Certain authors, in fact, follow the long alphabet (alîf, bêt, zê, dâd, etc.) while others follow al-âbjadîyya (alîf, bêt, dâm, etc.).

The first method is called al-djafir al-habîr and includes one thousand roots, the second al-djafir al-saghar and includes only seven hundred. There is also a djafir mutassassî based separately on the lunar and solar letters; this last method is preferred by the authors, and is used generally in talismanic compositions (Hâdîdî Khalîfa, loc. cit.).

Beside this numerical and mystical aspect of the letters, which by its technical and mystical character puts the djafir on the level of the al-sîra (q.v.), mention must be made of its astrological aspect. According to Ibn Khalûdîn (Mubâhadîmûn, ii, 1912; Rosenthal, loc. cit.), the Abbasids' library, thrown into the Tigris by Hûlûqî, killed the Al-Mutawakkil, the last caliph. However, it appears that a part of this work reached the Maghrib under the name al-Djafir al-saghar, and must have been there adapted to the calendar of the B. 'Abd al-Mû'mîn.

According to the Ps. Djafîhî (Bâb al-sîra wa la-sagîr wa l-firasa atâ la-madhhab al-Furs, ed. Inostranzev, St. Petersburg 1907, 4) this astrological aspect of the al-djafir is of Indian origin; "Al-djafir" he says, "is the knowledge of the [auspicious and inauspicious] days of the year, the knowledge of the direction of winds, of the appearance and withdrawal of lunar mansions ... . The book called al-djafir
contains the predictions for the year, arranged according to the seasons and the lunar mansions; each group of seven lunar mansions, constituting a quarter of the remaining sign, occupies a Material reference to the Persian script (the Persians take omens from it for rains, winds, journeys, wars, etc. It is from India that the Chosroes and their people have learnt all these sciences . . . ."

The last and most important of the aspects of the djafir is the apocalyptic. This is properly the original aspect, already well developed under the Umayyads and much expanded in 'Abbāsīd times, in the form of books of oracles, called kutub al-hidtdn (cf. references in De Goeje, Carmathes, 115 ff.). The starting-point of these speculations was the book of Daniel. Books of predictions attributed to Daniel were being read in Egypt in the year 61/670 (Tabari, ii, 359; on the Arabic apocalypse of Daniel cf. the references in A. Abel, in Stud. Isl., ii, (1954), 28 n. 2). Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Hamādhānī (d. 521/1127), who continued al-Tabari's chronicle up to 489/1095 (ms. Paris 1469, f° 457, quoted by De Goeje, Carmathes, 225 ff.; cf. ed. A. J. Kanaan, in Al-Machriq, 1955 ff.; and cf. Ibn Khaldūn, Mukaddima, ii, 198, Rosenthal 227-8) relates that under the vizierate of (Abū Dja-far al-Karkhī (324/936) there was in Baghdad a bookseller, called al-Dānīyālī, who exhibited ancient books attributed to the prophet Daniel, in which there figured certain prominent persons together with their descriptions. He enjoyed great success with the statesmen (cf. an anecdote in Tabari, iii, 496 ff., in the story of Mahdī, cited by Ibn Khaldūn, Mukaddima, ii, 192, Rosenthal 219, illustrating the tricks employed by forgers in this genre of writing). This literature is also known under the name of Malākim (cf. the astrological ms. Berlin 5903, 5904, 5912 and 5975, the last two of which are attributed to Daniel, as is Istanbul-Bağdatî Vehbi Ef. 2324). It has been widely diffused in the Maghrib. Written in verse or prose, sometimes even in a dialect, it deals sometimes with events which were to happen within the Islamic community in general, sometimes with those concerning one dynasty in particular. The greater part of these writings is attributed to famous authors, although it is not possible to find their authentic authorship. A list of malākim is given by Ibn Khaldūn (Mukaddima, ii, 193 ff., Rosenthal 220 ff.), mostly of Maghribi origin and dealing in general with the Hafsid dynasty. Two names in this list deserve particular attention: Ibn ʿArabi, in whose name there was current, in the time of Ibn Khaldūn, a makhbama entitled Ṣawākat al-bām (on this work cf. A. Abel, in Arabica, v (1958), 6 n. 3), and al-Bādjarbākī (d. 724/1323) to whom a poem on the Turks is attributed. The latter belonged to the Karandaliyya (or Kalandarīyya; cf. references in Dozy, Suppl., ii, 340), and founded a sect called al-Bādjarbākīyya (Ibn Khaldūn, Mukaddima, ii, 199 ff., Rosenthal 229; cf. TA, vi, 283). Other sources on al-Bādjarbākī are cited by Rosenthal, 230 n.). There are also many citations from these malākim to be found in the writings of Ibn Abī Usaybāʾī (d. 668/1270), and concerning its inner meaning. The statements have the excellent authority of Dja-far al-Sādīk (cf. Brockelmann, S. I, 104), notably a Kitāb al-djafr (B. M. 426, 10; cf. Steinschneider, Zur pseudograph. Literatur, 71). The foundation of this "pneumatic" exegesis seems to rest on this saying of Jesus: "Nāhī maʿdānā al-anbiyyā nāḥīkum bi 'l-lanzīl wa ammā 'l-tawīl fa-sāyātā bihā 'l-Bārāshīl al-lārida sayyīkum ba'dī. 'We the Prophets bring you the revelation; its interpretation the Paraclete [the Holy Spirit], who shall come after me, will bring ye" (Ḥājjī Khalīf, 603; cf. John, xiv, 26).

Bibliography: In order sufficiently to cover the range of this literature, the lists of writings on the djafr to be found in the manuscript catalogues should be consulted, especially Ahlwardt, iii, nos. 4213-29, and Fihrist al-kutub al-ʿarabīyya al-mahfūza bi 'l-kutubkhiyā al-khadiwiyya al-Misriyya, v, 333 ff.; numerous djafr treatises are to be found in the various collections at Istanbul. The principal works of reference are: R. Hartmann, Eine arabische Apokalypse aus der Kreuzzugzeit. Ein Beitrag zur Gaf-Literatur, in Schriften d. Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Gesellschaftsw. Kl., Berlin 1924, 89-116 (Study of an extract of Ibn ʿArabi, Mukhdarat al-abār, ed. Cairo 1324/1906, i, 197 ff., completed by the Berlin ms. no. 4219); cf. especially 108 ff.; A. Abel, Changements politiques et littérature apocalyptique dans le monde musulman, in Stud. Isl., ii (1954), 23-43; idem, Un hadīf sur la prise de Rome dans la tradition eschatologique de l'Islam, in Arabica, v (1958), 1-14; Fr. Goldziher, Vorlesungen, 224 ff., 263 ff.; Fr. trans. Arin, Paris 1920; idem, in ZDMG, xli (1897), 125-3.
AL-DJAGHBUB, a small oasis to the south-east of Cyrenaica, the site of the tomb of Muhammad b. Allah-al-Sanusi, founder of the brotherhood of the Sanusiyya. It is the farthest east, the smallest and the least prosperous of the oases along the important traditional route which leads from the valley of the Nile and Siwa to Fezzan and the region of Tripoli, passing through a chain of depressions where are to be found the palm-groves of Djalo, Awjilla, Marada, and Djufra, which are close to the 29th parallel.

The depression of Djaghbub consists of a sinuous basin called Wadi Djaghbub covering 700 sq. km., and going down to 20 m. below sea-level: in the north it is dominated by the plateau in sand and limestone of the Mar marec (Miocene period); this gives way in the south to soft hills covered by dunes of Libyan erg. The depression is carpeted in red earth and yellow sand and the beds occupied by sebkhas or, to the east, by salt lakes (bahr).

The only traces of the distant past are the tombs dug out of the northern cliff, similar to those at Siwa. Djaghbub owes its existence to Muhammad b. Allah-al-Sanusi, who came from Cairo in 1856 with his family, followers and servants, and founded the mother zdwiya of the brotherhood on a slight hill to the N-E of the depression. Later a large mosque was built while gradually a town grew up, which, according to Rossi, had already by 1881 nearly 5,000 inhabitants, of which 750 were tolba and 2,000 slaves. But the departure in 1885 of Muhammad al-Mahdi—the son of the founder of the town, who died in 1859—for Kufra, marked the start of the decadence of Djaghbub, which is briefly mentioned by some travellers: Rohlfis (1889), Rosita Forbes and Hassanein Bey (1921 and 1923) and Bruneau de Laborde (1923). The town was occupied by the Italians in 1926: they put up two forts and encouraged agriculture. The British took it in 1941 and ceded it to Cyrenaica, a province of the Libyan federal union which was founded in 1951.

Djaghbub is a very small settlement of 200 inhabitants. Its enclosure of huge dry stones surrounds the great mosque and the zdwiya, both of which have a large porticoed courtyard, their annexes and a small number of houses which are often covered in stories. The tomb of Muhammad b. Allah-al-Sanusi, situated under the dome of the great mosque, is a place of pilgrimage for all the followers of the brotherhood, and the zdwiya a place of learning. Masters, tolba and officials of the zdwiya and the mosque form the greater part of the population, together with the negro servants who work in the few gardens in the date-grove; the latter consists of scarcely more than 2,000 cultivated date-palms; the gardens, watered by the brackish water of a shallow well, have been improved thanks to the drilling done by the Italians, who bored an artesian fondness for her brother, Dara Shukoh, and enjoyed an allowance of 600,000 rupees, and one of her works, [q.v.], order of Münis al-arwa'd, a medical work, an extract from the canon of Ibn Mikum, passim (in index); Sarton, Introduz., III, 659-700.

Djagir, land given or assigned by governments in India to individuals, as a pension or as a reward for immediate services. The holder (djadjar) was not liable for land tax on his holding (see PARIBA), nor necessarily for military service by virtue of his tenure. See further 1915.

Djahân Shah (i) [see SUPPLEMENT].

Djahân Shah (ii) [see NUSHAL].

Djahânâra Bégam, the eldest daughter of Shahdijahan and Muntâz Mahall (the lady of the Tâdj at Âgra) and their first child, was born on 21 Safar 1023/23 March 1614. She bore the complimentary title of Fatima al-Zamân, which was decreed by her father, Muhammad al-Mahdi, and his first wife, and it reflected in her aforesaid Court title. Through-out her life she remained staunchly devoted to her father and even kept company with him during his incarceration after his deposition by Awarngâl, whose displeasure she earned through her excessive fondness for her brother, Dârâ Shukhî [q.v.], his rival.

An accomplished lady, she is the author of two Šûf works: (i) Mu'nis al-arwâd and (ii) Ṣâhibiyâ, an incomplete biography of her father, Mullâ Shâh Kâdîrî. According to her own statement (see Oriental College Magazine, Lahore 1914), she was the first woman in the line of Tûm to have taken to mysticism. Originally a disciple of Mullâ Shâh Kâdîrî, she contracted her bay'â in the Chîfî order [q.v.], and one of her works, Mu'nis al-arwâd, is on the life of Khâdîja Mu'în al-Dîn Chîfî [q.v.]. She wielded great influence during the reign of her father, and enjoyed an allowance of 600,000 rupees, half in cash and half in lands, settled on her by the Emperor; Awarngâl doubled this amount during
his reign. During Shahjahan's captivity she served as a link between the deposed emperor and the reigning monarch, Awrangzib, all the important political correspondence passing through her. She died unmarried in 1002/1691 and was buried in Delhi, according to her wishes, in the compound of the shrine of Nizam al-Din Awliya [see Delhi, Monuments] in a simple marble tomb, built by herself attached madrasa, was built by Jahangir. This is the first mosque of major dimensions built under the Mughals, except for Akbar's at Fatehpur Sikri [q.v.].

**Bibliography:** Autobiographical statements at the end of the Sāhibiyā (MS. Aş-Şāhī Rāū, Bābū, New Delhi Library, Ahmadabad); *ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Lābī, Bhāghāhānā (Bib. Ind.), (I. 1, 94); *Muḥammad Šāhī Nāhmī, ʿal-iṣlah Khān (Bib. Ind.), (I. 80); *Muḥammad ʿAlī Mustaʿlī Khān, Maʿṣūrīr-i ʿAlāmghīr (Bib. Ind.) 213; ʿAlāʾuʾd-Dīn ʿAlī Khān, Maʿṣūrīr-i Ulīmārā? (Bib. Ind.) s.v.; ʿAlāʾuʾd-Dīn ʿAlī Khān, Maʿṣūrīr-i Ulīmārā? (Bib. Ind.) s.v.; *G. Yazdani, Jahānāna in JPHS, ii/2 (Calcutta 1914), 152-66; *Maḥbūb al-Rāhāmān, Dīḥānānā (in Urdu), ʿalīghīr 1918; ʿA. ʿAli, Persian letters from Jahānāna, daughter of Shāh Jahān . . . . . to Rāja Bīdū Parkhāvān of Simla, in JASBSB, lxxvii, 449-58; K. R. Qanungo, Dara Shukoh, Calcutta 1935, iii, 10; *N. Muḥānci, Storīa do Dojor, tr. W. Irvine, London 1907, i, 217 and index; *Carr Stephen, The archaeology and monumental remains of Dīlī, Calcutta 1876, 108-9; R. C. Temple, Shāhjahan and Jahānāna, in Indian Antiquary, xlv, 1915, 111-2; *Nāẓākat Shāhī Tāmūrī, Doctoral thesis Punjab University, 1959; *Abū ʿAlī al-Rāhāmān, Bazm-i Timurīya, Aʿzamgārī 1367/1948, 447-455 (where other references especially on her poetic talents are given); *Banarsi Prasad Saksena, A History of Shāhjahan of Dīlī, Allahabad 1932, index; *Sayyd Aḥmad Shāh, Ḥāfīz al-Ṣanīdī, Kānpūr 1946, s.v.

**Dīḥāndār Shāḥī, Muʿīz al-Dīn, Mughal emperor regnant 21 Safar 1124/7 March 1712 to 16 Muḥarram 1125/11 February 1713. Born 10 Ramadān 1071/10 May 1661, eldest son of Bahādūr Shāh [q.v.], at the time of his father's death he was governor of Mūltān. Pleasure-loving and indolent, he was able to participate actively in the struggle among Bahādūr Shāh's sons for the throne only through the support of the ambitious Dhu ʿl-fikār Khān, ʿal-iṣlah Khān and ʿabādār of the Deccan who was anxious to exclude ʿAẓīm al-Shāhī from the succession and to win the wāsirāt for himself. After three days fighting near Lahore, ʿAẓīm al-Shāhī was defeated and killed. With the help of Dhu ʿl-fikār Khān, diets Dīḥāndār Shāh disposed of his other brothers Dīḥān Shāh and Raʾf al-Shāhī. At the time of his accession Dīḥāndār Shāh was 52 (lunar) years of age. His sybaritic tastes and devotion to the dancing girl Lai Kunwar, quickly seized upon (lunar) years of age. His sybaritic tastes and devotion to the dancing girl Lai Kunwar, quickly seized upon...
His alleged romance with a palace-maid called Anarkall, which resulted in a tragedy, finds no corroboration in history. The mausoleum known as Anarkall's tomb, in Lahore (see S. M. Latif, *Lahore, its history, architectural remains...*, Lahore 1892, 186-7) is said to have been raised over the mortal remains of his lady-love by the baulked lover, prince Salim. The marble sarcophagus, still preserved in a corner of the plain whitewashed octagonal building, bears the intriguing inscription "madjnun Salim-i Akbar". The entire affair is so thoroughly imbued with nothing convincing as to be said about it. The usual interpretation of it, while on the one hand may be interpreted to reveal the depth of prince Salim's intense grief on the cruel death of his beloved, said to have been built up alive in a wall by the order of Akbar, on the other hints at a compromise having been reached between the emperor, as head of the royal family, and the demoted prince, the heir to the 'Great Mogul'. Why none of the contemporary historians or Djahangir himself makes any mention of this tragedy is difficult to comprehend. Latif (op. cit., 187) gives the date 1008/1599 as the date of Anarkall's death. This date, according to him, is inscribed on the sarcophagus along with another date 1024/1615 and the words "in Lahore" which is considered to be the date of the construction of the mausoleum, but in 1008/1599 Djahangir was 31 (lunar) years of age and already married to a number of wives. Moreover, Djahangir was at Allahabad in 1008/1599 when he rose in open revolt against his father. Was the cruel fashion in which Anarkall was done to death the real cause of this rebellion? Akbar's leniency towards the rebel prince seems to be precalculated as he apparently wanted to soothe the lacerated heart of the erratic prince carried away by passion and distress by adopting a mild policy.

Akbar's attempts at a reconciliation were thwarted by the ambitious prince who in 1010/1603 marched at the head of a large army to Agra. On Akbar's showing signs of resistance the rebel prince retreated to Allahabad where he assumed the royal title and set up a regular court. Temporary reconciliation was again brought about by the widow of Bayram Khan [q.v.], Salima Sultan Begam, but the youthful prince soon after took to his old ways. He went back to Allahabad where he again set up his Court. In the meantime Salima was convinced that Abu 'l-Faḍl [q.v.], the talented minister of Akbar, was responsible for his troubles and that he was constantly poisoning the ears of the emperor against him. He, therefore, designed an attack on Abu 'l-Faḍl and while the latter was on his way back from the Deccan in 1013/1605 he was set upon by the retainers of the Bundelkch δeftian, Bhr Singh Dēw, who had been commissioned by Djahangir to perform the deed; his head was cut off and sent to Djahangir at Allahabad. This cold-blooded murder was unjustifiable, but Djahangir was so much convinced of the villainy of Abu 'l-Faḍl that he felt no compunction, but rather, was relieved at the removal of a stumbling-block from his way. (Tāsūk-i Djahangirī, tr. Rogers and Beveridge, i, 25).

On the death of Akbar in 1013/1605 Djahangir ascended the throne under the title of Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Nūr al-Din Muḥammad Djahangir Pāḏawār-i Ḍāl, which also appears on some of his coins. Soon after his accession he had to face the rebellion of his eldest son Khusraw in 1015/1606. Although a reconciliation was effected, the emperor never forgave the audacity of his son, whose death in suspicious circumstances in 1031/1622 at Burhānpur relieved Djahangir of considerable worry. The Sikh guru (spiritual leader) Aṅgūn, who had helped and sheltered Khusraw during his rebellion, was punished with death by the emperor. This punishment, however, was interpreted as an atrocius act on the part of the Mughal emperor, and it laid the foundations of that deep-rooted hostility which continued to embitter the relations between the Indian Muslims and the Sikhs over the centuries, at its worst during the supremacy of the Sikh general, Banda Bāyragī, in the 12th/18th century, and during the large-scale disturbances in India on the eve of Independence in 1947.

In 1016/1607 Djahangir was able to crush a conspiracy to murder him while camping at Kābul. Four of the ringleaders were executed while prince Khusraw, the moving spirit, was partially blinded by the orders of the emperor. With his marriage to Nūrādīhān, daughter of Shīr Afkān, known in history as the Ṭimāūd al-Dawla, in 1020/1611 Djahangir commenced a new phase in his life as a ruler. Contemporary sources make no mention of the popular story of Djahangir's passionate love for Nūrādīhān and the premeditated murder of her husband, 'Alī Kūn Kān Iṣṭāfīḏī (Shīr Afkān), at the instance of Djahangir, in 1016/1607. None of the European travellers who visited India during the reign of Djahangir makes even an oblique mention of Djahangir's complicity in the murder of Shīr Afkān and his anxiety to marry Nūrādīhān, then known as Mihr al-Nisā'. After her marriage to the emperor, Nūrādīhān gradually assumed all power and wielded great influence in affairs of state. Her name, along with that of the emperor, was inscribed on gold coins and she came to be recognized as the de facto ruler.

The Shi'i scholar Nūr Allah al-Shīṝstāri, who had been appointed kādī of Lahore by Akbar and who had so far practised taḥṣīyya, successfully concealing his faith from the people, emboldened by the meteoric rise to power of Nūrādīhana, herself an orthodox Shi'i, began to pronounce judgments which created doubts in the minds of the Sunni majority. This led to a Court conspiracy against the kādī, headed then in the queen's favour. He was accused of professing the Shi'i faith while boldly acting as a Sunni kādī. This revelation resulted in his execution by order of the emperor, who punished him for practising a fraud (Nūḏīḥam al-samah, 15-6). This act of bigotry on the part of a latitudinarian and eclectic like Djahangir, whose own consort Nūrādīhana was a Shi'i, is rather surprising but it shows, at the same time, the measure of influence that the disgraced theologians and 'ulamā' had again come to exercise in state affairs, after their calculated downfall during the reign of Akbar. No less surprising is Djahangir's estimate, based on intelligence reports, of šaykh Ahmad Sirhindī [q.v.] whom he described as an impostor (šayyāf), and his famous Ṭakhtā (as a tissue of absurdities (Ṭaṭā, Engl. tr., ii, 91-2). He was so much convinced of the šaykh's fraudulence that on the pretext of his having transgressed the limits of Šofic propriety in his Ṭakhtā (i, no. 12), he ordered his imprisonment in the fort of Gwāḷḷyār [q.v.], where political criminals were generally confined, but after a year or so revised his opinion and liberated him.

In 1032/1623 Djahangir had to face a filial revolt when prince Shāhjāhān rebelled, driven to this predicament by the machinations of
Nurdjahan who wanted her son-in-law Shahryar, a step-brother of Shahdjahan, to succeed to the throne at first successful, to the queen's discomfiture; but Āṣaf Khān, having first fled, later joined Mahābat Khān at Kābul at Nurdjahan's instigation, and provoked disension among the Imperial followers. On Mahābat Khān's flight and his subsequent alliance with Prince Khurrum, Nurdjahan appointed Khān-i Dījahān Lōdī as Imperial commander, with orders to subdue the rebels; but her plans were thwarted by the death of Dījahān, whose health had been shattered by excessive drinking, his greatest weakness, pursued since his early youth. Some hagiological works attribute Mahābat Khān's conduct to the maltreatment and disgrace that Ābdūl Khān Sirhindi suffered at the hands of Dījahān. It has further been claimed that prince Khurrum, (Azad Bīrgami, Nīdāḥān al-maṭ‘ādīn, Bombay 1903/ rāshī 898, xviii, 218, 221-22), cōrporate rankers nobles had secretly contrived their bāy'a with the shaykh and held him in high esteem; and that the treatment meted out to him was bitterly resented by them all. Before any decisive action could be taken against Mahābat Khān, Dījahān died while on his way to Bhimār from Rādjrāwī, on 27 Safar 1037/28 October 1627 in the 58th solar year of his age and the twenty-second of his reign. His body was brought down to Lahore where it was laid to rest, without its receiving an appropriate funeral on account of the disturbed conditions, at a spot designated by Nurdjahan over which she erected a magnificent mausoleum at her own expense. (For a description of the tomb, see Lāhawr).

A well-read man, a patron of literature and art, a keen observer of men and matters, Dījahān was the most polished and cultured of the House of Timūr. He was a sensible ruler, kind-hearted and generous, who hated oppression and had a passion for justice. Immediately after his accession to the throne he ordered a chain of gold, adorned with bells, to be hung from the imperial palace in Āgrā which an aggrieved person could shake at any moment of the day or night and get justice. (See Tāžuk, Rogers and Beveridge, i, 7). He was lover of nature; Dījahān's Tāzuk is full of descriptions of the scenic beauty of Kāšmīr and other lovely places and of the fauna and flora of the regions he visited. An accomplished prose-writer, his memoirs are in no way inferior to those of Bābur, although he sometimes portrays himself as a violent and unprincipled man whose personal account arouses our disgust and contempt. But unlike Bābur he must be credited with greater honesty and frankness in whatever he writes except in one or two instances when he deliberately tried to conceal the truth.

He makes no secret of his addiction to wine and opium, which ultimately ruined his robust health and hastened his end. He was exceedingly cruel sometimes, having once got a sodomite flayed alive and another castrated. Similarly he ordered the bones of Naṣhr al-Dīn Khandī, ruler of Mīlwa, who was guilty of poisoning his father, to be exhumed and thrown into the Nārbaḍā, when he visited Māndū (q.v.) in 1027/1617. As a rule, his reign brought peace and prosperity to the people; industry and commerce flourished; architecture, painting and literature progressed and on the political side there was stability and strength only marred by a few wars in Mewār and the Deccan, and some minor disturbances in Bengal as the ineffectual revolt of 'Ulūmān Khān Afgān.

Bibliography: Tāzuk-i Dījahānī (with numerous variants), ed. Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Ghazipur 1884 (Eng. transl. Rogers and Beveridge, London, i 1909, ii 1914, Urdu transl. Lahore 1960); there is another version of the memoirs called Ta‘rīkh-i Salīm Shāh translated into English by Major David Price (Calcutta, 1906), quite un-der-lying being a forgery and a fabrication; Šāhmān al-Dawla Shāh Nawāz Khān, Ma‘ādhī al-umardān, (Eng. transl. Beveridge), i, 57-54; Mu‘ātmad Khān, ḫalid-nāmāt-i Dījahānī, (Bibl. Ind.), Calcutta 1885; Beni Prasad, History of Jahangîr, Allahabad 1940 (contains an exhaustive bibliography and gives a fairly balanced account of Jahangîr's reign; certain statements by the author are, however, not unbiased); Cambridge History of India, iv, s.v.; Jahangîr and the Jesuits (transl. C. H. Payne), London 1939; Calcutta 1892, xcvi, 495; cf. Rogers, Major David Price (Calcutta, 1906), quite un-der-lying being a forgery and a fabrication; Sabāb al-Dīn Abī Hamad al-Ramān, Bazī-ī Timūriyya (in Urdu), A‘ṣamgâhar 1357/ 1948, 128-68; Storey, i, 556-64; Mirzâ Mu‘āmammad ‘Ali, Nūdgîm al-samâ‘ (for an authentic account of the death of Nūr Allâh al-Shâstârî) Lucknow 1302 A.H., 9-16; Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe, ed. William Foster (Hakluyt Society); Francis Gladwin, The History of Hindustan during the reigns of Jahangîr, Shah Jahan and Aurungzeb, Calcutta 1878, (based mainly on Kamgâr Husaynl’s Ma‘ādhī-i Dījahānī, still in MS.); V. A. Smith, Oxford History of India, s.v.; Dījahān Khāl Dīlahwâl, Ta‘rīkh-i Hind (in Urdu), vi, ‘Alîgâhar 1917, the only detailed account in Urdu; ‘Abî al-Ḥâyî Nadwî, Nuṣhāt al-ma‘ādûdîr, Haydarâbâd 1375/1955, v, 120-22, (the only brief account in Arabic known to me).

For the buildings of Dījahān, see Hind, Architecture; MUGHALS; also Āgra, Lāhawr, Palamādō.

For the Mughal garden, which Dījahān specially cultivated, see Būstān, Kāšmīr, Sīndgâr.

For miniature painting, which reached its highest point in India under Dījahān’s patronage, see Hind, Art.

Mughal coinage reached its highest point of elaboration in the variety of pieces and the refinement of designs during Dījahān’s reign. For Dījahān’s coins see Sikka.

(A. S. BAZME‘ ANSARI)
are two examples from among the most familiar:

1. Some traditionists like al-Baghawi, with an extremely literal and uncritical outlook, considering the precise wording of the dialogue (taweez) in the Kur'an, L. 30, between God and Gehenna, regard the latter as a fantastic animal of hell which they describe with endless hyperbole. It will be drawn along by 70,000 angels, its guardians, at the time of the resurrection, the width between the shoulders of each guardian angel being equal to 70 years’ march, etc. The description, supported by hadith, is repeated in al-Shar'i’s Mushharar (for this sort of commentary in Muslim thought, see Dianna).

2. Descriptions which show hell as a place made up of concentric layers of increasing depth generally put Gehenna in the higher zone, that reserved for members of the Muslim community who have committed “grave sins” about which they have not repented and whom God, in accordance with his threats, decides to punish for a time with infernal torments. It is thereby admitted, even by those who uphold the eternity of hell, that Gehenna will cease to exist. It will be wiped out when the last repentant sinner among the believers leaves it to enter paradise. We may note that the etymological reference to the idea of “depth” is suppressed here.—This interpretation, which occurs in the tafsir of Khazin and elsewhere is freely expounded in the manuals of the Ash'ari school (e.g. al-Baidari, Ḥāfiya ... ala Diawrat al-awza'id, ed. Catro 1352/1954, 107). For the place of Gehenna in the circles of Hell according to Ibn ‘Arabi, see the diagrams reproduced by Asin Palacios, La Escatologia musulmana en la Divina Comedia, Madrid-Granada 1943, 147.

Bibliography: In the article; detailed references will be given in the article Nār.

(L. Gardev)

Djahān-Scz, Allā Dīn Husayn B. Al-Ḥusayn, Ghūrid ruler—poet, notorious for his burning of Ghazna in 546/1151. The cause of the violence between the Ghūrids and Bahram Shāh of Ghazna [q.v.] would appear to have been an attempt by Kūf al-Dīn Muhammad, (eldest brother of Allā Dīn) to seize Ghazna through an intrigue with some of its inhabitants. Bahram Shāh had him poisoned; an attempt by another brother, Sayf al-Dīn Sūrī, to avenge his brother ended, after the temporary occupation of Ghazna by the Ghūrid forces, in his ignominious death at the hands of Bahram Shāh. Death (from natural causes) prevented another brother, Bahā’ al-Dīn Sām, from action, whereupon Allā’ al-Dīn marched against Bahram, defeating him in three battles and occupying Ghazna. The city was probably sacked so ruthlessly through rage at the fickleness of its inhabitants but also with the intention of securing ‘Allā’ al-Dīn’s rear for his wider ambitions against the Sālqīn possessions to the west and north of Ghūr. In the year following (547/1152), with Bahram Shāh a fugitive in the Pandja, ‘Allā’ al-Dīn moved against Sālqīn, in alliance with the mughf of Harat, only to be defeated and captured at the battle of Harat. He was released before Sālqīn’s quarrel with the Ghuzz in 548/1153 and appears to have ruled quietly at Frūz-Khū until his death in 556/1161. Several of his poems in self-praise survive both in the histories and in the biographies of the poets.

Bibliography: Ibn al-‘Arī, ed. Tornberg, xi, 89-90, 107-8; Minḥāḏ b. Sirāḏ Djūḏḏānī, 


Djāhbadh (pl. džāhrīdja), a term of Persian origin, perhaps derived from a *gahbād in the Sāsānian administration, (the term is suggested by Herzfeld; Paikuli, gloss. No. 274) used in the sense of a financial clerk, expert in matters of coins, skilled money examiner, treasurer receiver, government cashier, money changer or collector (Tādī al-ʿArās, ii, 558; Dozy, Supplement, i, 226; Vullers, Lexicon Persicum, i, 544; Ibn Mammātī, 304, etc.).

From the end of the 2nd/8th century on, bearers of this title in the time of the ʿAbbāsīd Caliphs Mānsūr, Harūn, and Mahdī are mentioned (Faḥrīshārī; Masʿūdī, vi, 227) also frequently in Arabic papyri (Karabaekte, Becker, Grohmann, Dietrich, etc.).

In an economy based on bimetallism, dinār and dirham, with their fluctuating weights and values and their diversity in circulation, the function of the Djāhbadh assumed an ever-increasing importance, as manifested by repeated references in Arabic sources of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries to:

(a) Māl al-Djāhbaḏīa, also known as Ḥākḥ al-Djāhbaḏīa, which represents the fee of the Djāhbaḏ for his services to the government, levied as a charge on the taxpayer and which, though somewhat dubious in its legality, became an integral part of the public budget (Kremer, Einahmebudget; al-Sāḥī; Tabafydt-i Nāsīrat, trans. H. G. Raverty, Calcutta, 1905-1908); and above all to:

(b) Dīnār al-Djāhbaḏha, whose chief was required to prepare a monthly or yearly statement accounting for all the items of income and expenditure of the treasury (Kudāma b. Dja ṣ, I, 308; Lekkegaard; Cl. 1953-54; see further Dāftar); and above all to:

(c) Individual bearers of the title Djāhbaḏ by name with precise information about their activities.

The text of an official appointment of a Djāhbaḏ (Taʿrīḵī Kumm, 149-53) specifies his function, his salary, and his obligation "to be just and fair in the collection of taxes and to give an official receipt for all incoming amounts in the presence of witnesses".

The 4th/10th century Arabic sources (Miskawayh, Tānḡiḵī, Sāḥī, Sūlī, etc.) indicate that it was customary for viziers to have their own Djāhbadh with whom they deposited large, legally or illegally acquired, amounts of money as the safest method of securing their fortune.

In the time of the ʿAbbāsīd Caliph al-Muqtadir, (930-932/1525-1527) however, the Djāhbaḏ emerged also as a banker in the modern sense, who, in addition to his functions as an administrator of deposit, and as a remitter of funds from place to place through the medium of the sakk and especially of the sulṭāda (qq.v.)—then a widely used instrument of the credit economy.—was called upon to advance huge sums to the Caliph, the viziers, and other
court officials on credit terms with interest rates and securities.

The Dähdbidha were mostly Christians and Jews whose appointment to this office despite their status as Dämim was legalized by a special decree issued in 295/908 by the Caliph (Mukaddasi, ed. de Goeje, 183). Among the Dähdbidha listed in the sources were Ibrâhim b. Yuâhannâ, Zakariyâ b. Yuâhannâ, Sahî b. Nazîr, Ibrâhim b. Ayyûb, Ibrâhim b. âHmad, Isrâ'îl b. Sâlih, Sulaymân b. Wâbî, and, above all two Jewish merchants and bankers, Yusuf b. Fînhâs and Hârin b. 'Imrân of Baghdâd. They were appointed at the office of Dähdbidhath al-Îldra of a Persian province of Ahwâz, and then became the court bankers (Dähdbidhat al-Îhadra) of al-Mûtâdîd and his viziers, and the pillars of the financial administration of their time. By virtue of their vast resources and commercial connections, these Jewish merchants and Dähdbidha and their associates were instrumental in establishing the first State bank in Islamic history (ca. 302/913), through which the urgent financial needs of the State could be satisfied and the financial ruin of the State stalled off. The sources indicate the amounts they lent, the contracts they concluded with the vizier 'Abî b. ʻIsâ, and other details of the methods of their credit transactions. They were given interest on their loans and securities in the form of the tax revenues of the province of Ahwâz (Fischel).

Under the successors of al-Mûtâdîd, the Dähba- bidha continued to play a rôle not only in Baghdâd, but also in Baṣra and other cities of the 'Abbasîd Empire. Under the Buwayhid Amirs mention is made of one 'Abî b. Hârin b. 'Allân (d. 329/941), and of ʻAbî b. Fâdîlân (d. 383/993). At the beginning of the 7th/13th century, Abû Tahir b. Dähba, the "chief of the Jews in Baghdad" occupied the position of a court banker (Ibn al-Fuwâtî). In later centuries the Dähdbidha lost his central significance as a Court banker; his functions were equated with that of a sayrafi (Kalkashandi, Subh, v, 466).

The double opposition and didhilîyâ is applied to all which is anterior to Islam, while didhilîyâ al-islâm to all which is posterior. Thus marks an evolution and a departure from the sect. (The word didhilîyâ al-isldm is inclined to distinguish two periods, the first corresponding to the were men who have not been initiated into the mysteries of God" but rather that of "knowledge of God, etc." and the second corresponding to the "time of barbarism", but he has not been followed to the letter by translators of the Kûrân who render didhiliyya as "not knowing God, the Prophet and the Law", or "lawless", and didhiliyya as "time of ignorance", "heathendom" [cf. however T. Izutu, The structure of the ethical terms in the Kûran, Tokyo 1959, index]. The fact is that the nine attestations of didhiliyya in the Kûrân scarcely permit of their sense being precisely determined; however, in the feeling of Muslims and of the commentators, didhiliyya is opposed to ʻâlim "one who knows God, etc.", and didhiliyya to islâm taken not in the sense of "submission to God" but as "practice of "knowledge of God, etc."

The word didhilîyâ as an abstract is thus applicable to the period during which the Arabs did not yet know Islam and the Divine Law, as well as to the believers current at that time. One the basis of the Dähba, didhilîyâ is opposed to ʻâlim "one who knows God, etc.", and didhiliyya to islâm taken not in the sense of "submission to God" but as "practice of "knowledge of God, etc." [compare the Druze terminology (see DURUZ), where didhilîyâ is opposed to ʻâhil, and designates all those who have not been initiated into the mysteries of the sect. The structure of the ethical terms in the Kûran, Tokyo 1959, index]. The fact is that the nine attestations of didhiliyya in the Kûrân scarcely permit of their sense being precisely determined; however, in the feeling of Muslims and of the commentators, didhiliyya is opposed to ʻâlim "one who knows God, etc.", and didhiliyya to islâm taken not in the sense of "submission to God" but as "practice of "knowledge of God, etc." [compare the Druze terminology (see DURUZ), where didhiliyya is opposed to ʻâhil, and designates all those who have not been initiated into the mysteries of the sect. The word didhilîyâ as an abstract is thus applicable to the period during which the Arabs did not yet know Islam and the Divine Law, as well as to the beliefs current at that time. One the basis of the Kûrân, XXXIII, 33, where the expression al-didhilîyâ al-ʻâmil "the first didhilîyâ" appears, one is inclined to distinguish two periods, the first didhilîyâ extending from Adam to Noah (or to other prophets), and the second corresponding to the "interval" between Jesus and Muhammad [see PATRÅ. The relative adjective didhilî formed from didhilîyâ is applied to all which is anterior to Islam, in particular to the poets who died before Muhammad's preaching; those who knew both periods are called muhâbrâm, and those born after Islam islâmî. The double opposition didhilîyâ and didhilîyâ islâm thus marks an evolution and a departure from the primitive sense of didhiliyya. The history of the Arabs during the didhilîyâ has been dealt with under al-ARAB, the geography and ethnography under DÄÄRAT AL-ARAB, the language under ARABIYYA, and nomadism under BADW; on all these points the articles on the different
regions, on the major tribes, and on the towns, should be consulted; for the economic situation see especially under VILAIK.

A point calling for some remark is, rather than the true state of pre-Islamic Arabia, the distinctive characters attributed by Muslims to their pagan ancestors, that is to say the traits which allow their conception of ḏāḥiliyya to be defined.

The ideas of the Muslims on pre-Islamic paganism are based on the Qurʾān and on traditions which, in spite of their contempt for everything before Islam, they have collected in the framework of their historical and linguistic researches; in the article Qurʾān will be found a résumé of the pronouncements of the Sacred Book on earlier beliefs; in the articles HADJDJ and KABILA an account of the ancient cult and the history of the Sacred House; under ŞANAM a study of idolatry. Also to be consulted are the various articles on the principal manasik, and also the articles on the adepts of the revealed religions, NASARA and YAHUD.

While attributing to the ḏāḥiliyya the faults condemned in the Qurʾān, Muslims do not fail to recognize a certain number of virtues among the ancient Arabs, such as honor [see ’IRD], courage and dignity [see MURUWWA], and hospitality [see DAVF].

For relevant information on social organization see QIILA, QIILA, QARILA, etc., and, for the position of women, NIKAH and TALAK. (ED.)

DJIHIM [see NAR].

DJIHIR (BAU), one of the families of government contractors characteristic of their period who almost completely monopolized the caliph’s vizierate during the protectorate of the Great Saldjūkids, and deriving their particular importance from that fact. The founder of the political fortunes of the dynasty, Fakhr al-Dawla Abū Naṣr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Ḏīhir, born in al-Mawsil in 398/1007-8 of a family of rich merchants, entered the service of the Shīʾi Ḥakīm princes of that town; then, after one of them, Kirmāshš, fell in 414/1024, as a result of somewhat obscure feuds he went to Aleppo where at one time he was vizier to the Mirdāsid Shīʾi Muʾizz al-Dawla Ṭīmān, and finally (in 442/1055) when he became vizier to the Marwānid of the Diyar Bakr, Naṣr al-Dawla (401-53), a Sunni and vassal of the Saldjūkids from before the time of Tughrul Beg’s entry into Baghādād (447/1055). After his protector’s death, the rivalries between the sons apparently caused him some anxiety, and he was able to take advantage of the difficulties of which caliph al-Raʾīm was experiencing in choosing a vizier who would be persona grata to the sultan and at the same time ready to safeguard the prerogatives of the caliph, to have the post offered to himself (454/1062), for which no doubt he was further recommended by the administrative talents he had revealed at Mayyāfārīk. The family was to hold the position of vizier almost without a break for half a century, and Fakhr al-Dawla himself was to remain as vizier, apart only from four months in 460-1/1068, until 471/1080 when he fell into disgrace, to be replaced, however, after some months by his son (born in 435) and close colleague ʿAmīd al-Dawla. Ibn Ḏīhir calculated that, if he was obliged on the one hand to defend the rights of the caliphate and to avoid wishing to appear to act without the caliph’s orders, on the other hand he could only enjoy a really secure position if he maintained close personal relations with the sultanate and his eminent and powerful vizier (from the time of Alp Arslan’s reign 455/1063), Naṣr al-Mulk; these ties were strengthened, after the incident in 460-1/1068, by the marriage of ʿAmīd al-Dawla to one of Naṣr’s daughters, and then after her death (on the eve of the affair in 471/1080 which possibly her death precipitated) by his subsequent marriage to her niece: thanks to this it was possible at last to put to a stop the hostile intrigues of Gōhūrān, the sultan’s representative in Baghādād, in that year. However in the second half of Malikshāh’s sultanate (463-85/1070-94), in face of the Saldjūkīd hold over Baghādād which was increasing, the caliph Fakhr al-Muktadī (467-87/1075-94) in 476/1083 replaced the Ḏīhirds by Miskawayh’s successor, Abū Ṣuḥdā‘ Rūḏhrāwārī who, without being in any way anti-Saldjūkīd, was perhaps a truer representative of the vizier in his heart, and more attentive to the religious, orthodox aspect of the caliphate’s own policy. It was then that the Ḏīhirds embarked on another venture, the explanation of which, if not from their point of view at least from that of the sultan’s government, seems far from clear. Taking advantage of the Marwānīds’ difficulties, Fakhr al-Dawla in fact arranged that Malikshāh, who provided him with the necessary troops, should entrust him with the task of conquering the principality in which, it was true, he had maintained his interests and relations, but of which neither Malikshāh nor his predecessors had ever had cause to complain. Furthermore, the military operations were difficult, being complicated by the intervention of the ʿUkaylīd of al-Mawṣil, Muslim, who saw clearly that if an autonomous neighbouring state were to disappear, his own, which he had put to far more questionable uses, would not long survive, and even by the somewhat equivocal attitude of the Saldjūkīd Turkomān leader Artuk. Actual sieges were necessary to take Mayyāfārīkīn, ʿAmīd and other fortresses in the Diyar Bakr, and the war in which ʿAmīd al-Dawla’s brother al-Kāfī Zaʿīm al-Ruṣāsī ʿAbū ʿl-Kāsim ʿAlī also took part was only concluded at the beginning of 478/1085. Fakhr al-Dīn hunted out and apparently squandered the Marwānīds’ treasure, appropriating a portion of it for himself, and from the end of 481/1086 until 482/1087 he was in view of his unpopularity to replace him by a less self-seeking representative as head of government in the province. However, in 482 ʿAmīd al-Dawla obtained the right to farm taxes from the province, paying ten million dirāms in three years, while his father received the administration of al-Mawṣil which meanwhile had also come into Malikshāh’s possession; he won a good reputation with everyone by the remission of taxes, and the family was able to retrieve its fortunes before the death of Fakhr al-Dawla which occurred in al-Mawsil in 483. In the following year Nāṣr al-Mulk persuaded the caliph to reappoint ʿAmīd al-Dawla to the office of vizier which he was to retain after the death of the great Saldjūkīd administrator, Malikshāh and al-Muktadī until 493/1100; to govern the Diyar Bakr he had left his brother al-Kāfī as representative, later succeeded by his son.

But harsher times were to befall the family. In 487/1094, after Malikshāh’s death, his brother Tutuṣh took possession of the Diyar Bakr; after retaining al-Kāfī as vizier, perhaps for a short time, he recalled him and, under the Turkomān leaders who were to partition the province between themselves, we hear no more of the Ḏīhirds. In Baghādād the new sultan Bākyārāk, running short of funds
during the wars he was obliged to wage against his brothers, and possibly not being certain of al-Dawla's loyalty to his cause, had him arrested and finally to al-Fath b. Khakan [q.v.] and then after the latter's fall from power, he was made an allowance by the authorities, if not inspired by them, and relating to topical events; notwithstanding some degree ofácidence grise, so to speak, or of unofficial adviser at least. We have seen already that the writings which won him the recognition of the Caliphate and were certainly intended to justify the accession to power of the 'Abbasids; they were the prelude of a whole series of opuscules addressed to the authorities, if not inspired by them, and relating to topical events; notwithstanding some degree of article in risālas beginning: "Thou hast asked me about such and such a question .... I answer thee that ...", it may be presumed that in many cases the question had in fact been asked and he had been requested to reply in writing. For, if he was never admitted to the intimacy of the Caliphs, he was in continuous contact with leading political figures and it is rather curious that he should have attached himself successively to Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Zayyāt [q.v.], then after the latter's fall from favour (233/847) which almost proved fatal to both men, to the Kādi al-kudūd (d. 240/854) Ahmad b. Du'ā'īd [q.v.] and to his son Muhammad (d. 239/853) and finally to al-Fath b. Khākān [q.v.] (d. 247/861).

He nevertheless retained ample independence and was able to take advantage of his new position to
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further his intellectual training and to travel (particular- 
ly to Syria; but al-Mascudi, Murudí, i, 206, was 
to criticize him for having attempted to write a 
geography book) an almost entirely lost—without 
having become old enough. In the course of this, he 
found a rich store of learning in the many translations 
from Greek undertaken during the Caliphate of al-
Ma'mun and studying the philosophers of antiquity
—especially Aristotle (cf. al-Hâjijîrî, Tobkridî 
muṣâṣ arisâtâliyya min K. al-Ḥayawâni, in Muṣâllat 
hulîyyat al-ddâbî, Alexandria, 1933 ff.)—enabled him 
to broaden his outlook and perfect his own 
theological doctrine, which he had begun to elaborate 
under the supervision of the great Mu'tazâlis of the 
day, of whom al-Nâzâmî and Thûmâmâ b. Ašqâras 
[qq.v.], who seems to have had a strong influence on 
him, should be placed in the first rank.

Towards the end of his life, suffering from 
pleurisy, he retired to his home town, where he 
died in Muharram 255/December 865-January 866.

Like many Arabic writers, al-Djahîz had a very 
great output. A catalogue of his works (see Aрабика, 
1956) lists nearly 200 titles of which only about 
forty, authentic or apocryphal, have been 
perennially preserved, in their entirety; about fifty others have 
been partially preserved, whilst the rest seem irretrievably 
lost. Brockelmann (S I, 241 ff.) has attempted to 
classify his works according to real or supposed 
subjects and gives us some idea of the breadth and 
variety of his interests. Considering only the extant 
works, which now for the most part are available 
in editions of varying quality, two broad categories 
may be distinguished: on the one hand, works 
coming under the head of Dabajîhînad adab, that is 
said to be written in a rather entertaining manner 
to instruct the reader, with the author intervening 
only insofar as he selects, presents and comments on 
documents; on the other hand, original works, 
dissertations where his ability as a writer and to some 
extent his efforts as a thinker are more clearly shown.

His chief work in the first category is K. al-
Ḥayawâni (ed. Hârûn, Cairo n.d.; 7 vols.) which is 
not so much a bestiary as a genuine anthology 
based on animals, leading off sometimes rather 
unexpectedly into theology, metaphysics, sociology 
etc.; one can even find embryonic theories, without 
the influence of Aristotle (cf. al-Hadjiri, 
Takhridî
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which summarize or indicate points where al-Djahiz differs from other Muttazilis. Too little is known of the doctrine itself for one to be able to do more at this stage than simply refer to the article mu'tasila, pending the completion of a thesis specifically concerned with the question.

Meanwhile, even though al-Djahiz’s place in the development of Muslim thought is far from negligible, he is chiefly interesting as a writer and an adab, for with him form is never overshadowed by content; even in purely technical works. If he is not the first of the Arab professional writers, if in rhetoric `Abd Allah b. al-Mukaffa’ [q.v.] and Sahl b. Härün [q.v.], to name but two, are his masters, nevertheless he gave literary prose its most perfect form, as was indeed recognized first by politicians who made use of his talent for the `Abbāsid cause and then by Arab critics who were unanimous in asserting his superiority and making his name the very symbol of literary ability.

Al-Djahiz’s writing is characterized by deliberately contrived disorderliness and numerous digressions; the individuality of his alert and lively style lies in a concern for the exact term—a foreign word if necessary—picturesque phrases and sentences which are nearly always unrhymed, but balanced by the same idea in two different forms; what would be pointless repetition to our way of thinking in the mind of a 3rd/9th century writer simply arose from the desire to make himself clearly understood and to give ordinary prose the symmetry of verse; though difficult to render and appreciate in a foreign language, the flow of his sentences is perfectly harmonious and instantly recognizable. Nevertheless, for the majority of literate Arabs of al-Djahiz remains, if not a complete buffoon, at least something of a jester; his place as such in legend can undoubtedly be attributed in part to his fame and his ugliness, which made him the hero of numerous anecdotes; but it must also be attributed to a characteristic of his writing which could not but earn him the reputation of being a joker in a Muslim world inclined towards soberness and gravity; for he never falls, even in his weightiest passages, to slip in anecdotes, witty observations and amusing comments. Alarmed at the boredom enshrouding the speculations of a good many of his contemporaries, he deliberately aimed at a lighter touch and his sense of humour enabled him to deal entertainingly with serious subjects and help popularize them. But he realized he was doing something rather shocking and one cannot help being struck by the frequency with which he feels it necessary to plead the cause of humour and fun; the best example is in K. al-Tahib wa l-tadawir (ed. Pellat, Damascus 1955) a masterpiece of ironic writing, as well as a compendium of all the questions to which his contemporaries whether through force of habit, inactive instinct or lack of imagination offered traditional solutions or gave no thought at all. Without stepping outside the boundaries of the faith—this itself was something of a strain—he takes for granted the right to submit to scrutiny accepted attitudes to natural phenomena, ancient history and legends handed down as truths, to restate problems and skilfully suggest rational solutions. Nor is that all; for at a time when mediaeval Arabic culture was taking shape, he was a passionate defender, or on Greek thought, always careful however to curb the intrusion of the Persian tradition, which he considered too dangerous for the future of Islam, into the culture he longed to bestow on his co-religionists. This vast undertaking, based on the spirit of criticism and systematic doubt in everything not directly concerned with the dogma of Islam, was unfortunately to be to a considerable extent narrowed and side-tracked in the centuries to follow. It is true that al-Djahiz was to have admirers as noteworthy as Abū Rayyān al-Tawḥīdī, imitators and even counterfeiters, who made use of his name to ensure greater success for their works; but posterity has only kept a deformed and shrunken image of him, seeing him at the most as a master of rhetoric (see Pellat, in al-And., 1956/2, 277-84), the founder of a Mu'tazil school—whose disciples no one bothers to enumerate—and the author of compilations to be drawn upon for the elaboration of works of adab, a sizeable share of recorded information on dhikāliyya and the early centuries of Islam.

Bibliography: The main biographies are those of Khāṭib Baghdādī, xii, 212-22; Ibn ʾĀsikīr, in MMIA, ix, 203-17; Yākfūt, Ḥirādī, vi, 56-80. A general outline is to be found in manuals of Arabic literature, as also in: Sh. Diābī, al-Djahiz mušallīm al-ʾabī wa l-tadabbur, Cairo 1351/1932; K. Mardam, al-Djahiz, Damascus 1349/1930; T. Kayyūlī, al-Djahiz, [Damascus] n.d.; H. Fākhūrī, al-Djahiz, Cairo 1953; M. Kurdi ʿAll, Umarid al-bayān, Cairo 1355/1937; H. Sandūbī, Adab al-Djahiz, Cairo 1350/1931; Ch. Pellat, Le Milieu basrien et la formation de Gāhī, Paris 1953; idem, Gāhī ʿaṣbādāt wa l-Sāmārā, in RSO, 1952, 47-67; idem, Gāḥisāna in Arabic, 1954/5, 1955/6 and mainly 1956/7: Essai d'inventaire de l'œuvre gāḥiyye, with an account of mass, editions and translations (one should add to the bibliography: A. J. Arberry, New material on the Kitāb al-Fīrāst of Ibn al-Nadīm, in Ist. Research Assoc. Miscellany, i, 1948, which gives the notice from Fīrāst on Dajīz, missing in the editions; and also: F. Gabrieli, in Scritti in onore di G. Furlani, Rome 1957, on the R. fi manṣūb al-Turk; the Tunisian review al-Fīrāst, Oct. 1957 and March 1958, on the article; J. J. Finkel, in Abū al-Fayyūd et la société de son temps (in Arabic, Beirut 1957 (?), not consulted here). It should be pointed out that in addition to the editions quoted in the course of the article, the following collections have been published: G. van Vloten, Trua opuscula, Leyden 1903; J. Finkel, Three essays, 1926; P. Kraus and M. T. ʾAṭārī, Muṣīma rasāʾil al-Djahiz, Cairo 1943 (a French translation of these texts is being prepared); H. Sandūbī, Rasāʾil al-Djahiz, Cairo 1352/1933; Iḥdā ʿaghratā risāla, Cairo 1342/1906; O. Rescher, Excerpta und Übersetzungen aus den Schriften des ... Gāḥī, Stuttgart 1931 (analytical translation of a good many texts). The texts in the three manuscript collections: Dāmad Ibrāhim PāSHA 314; Br. Mus. 1129 and Berlin 5052 (see Oriens, 1954, 85-6) have in a good many cases been published; those not yet published, along with some other texts of less importance, will be included in our Nuṣṣ Gāḥiyya ghayr manṣūra, K. al-ʿUrdidn, etc. has been recently discovered in Morocco, but is of no great interest. (CH. PELLAT)
Djahlahwän — Al-Djahshiyari

Brahols (or Brahui). Area, 21,128 sq. miles, population unknown, estimated 100,000. The capital is Khuzdar and the population is mainly Brahöhi with a few Balochi ans to the Tjaks and from age by opponents.

Bibliography: Baluchistan Gazetteer, vi, B. Bombay 1907; M. G. Pikulin, Beludghi, Moscow 1959.

Djahm b. Saffāwī, Abu Mushriz, early theologian, sometimes called al-Tirmidhī or al-Samarqandī. He was a client of Rāsīb (a bā′īn of Azd) and appears as secretary to al-Hārīrī b. Suraydī, "the man with the black banner" who revolted against the Umayyads and from 116/734 to 128/746 controlled tracts of eastern Khurāsān, sometimes in alliance with Turks. Djahm was captured and executed in 128/746, shortly before al-Hārīrī himself.

The basis of this movement of revolt, of which Djahm was intellectual protagonist, was the demand that government should be in accordance with "the Book of God and the Sunna of His Prophet" (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 1570 f., 1577, 1583, etc.); and the movement according to which men acted only metaphorically, as the sun "acts" in setting. They held that God had a distinct eternal attribute of knowledge, called "the Book of God and the Sunna of His Prophet" (al-Shifāʾ al-Dajhmiyya, in Dār al-Fālün Ilāhīyyat Fikhlustātī, v-vi (1927), 313-27).

Other views ascribed to him are those of the sect of Djāhmiyya [q.v]., which is not heard of until seventy years after his death, and whose connexion with him is obscure. (W. Montgomery Watt)

Djahmiyya, an early sect, frequently mentioned but somewhat mysterious.

Identity. No names are known of any members of the sect, apart from the alleged founder Djahm [q.v.]. The basic fact is that "after the translation of the Greek books in the second century a doctrine (makhla) known as that of the Djāhmiyya was spread until Bishr b. Ghiyath al-Marṣī [q.v.] and his generation (Ibn Taymiyya, Akhīda Hamawuyi, ap. M. Schreiner in ZDMG, llii, 72 f.; lii, 544). A pupil of Abu Yūsuf (d. 182/798), Bishr (d. 218/833 or a little later) was questioned about his strange views under Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī (c. 202/817) (Ibn Abī l-Wafā′, al-Djawharī al-muḍīfī, i, nos. 1146, 371). Apart from this the early Baloch and Tjaks, known as the Djahmīs, appear as secretaries prior to the advent of Bishr al-Marṣī (al-Fikh al-akbar, 200; translation by A. S. Halkin, 14) says there were Djahmīyya in Tirmīzhī in his own time, of whom some became Ashīratīs.

Doctrines. They held an extreme form of the doctrine of ḥabar, according to which men acted only metaphorically, as the sun "acts" in setting. They held that God had a distinct eternal attribute of knowledge, called "the Book of God and the Sunna of His Prophet" (al-Shifāʾ al-Dajhmiyya, in Dār al-Fālün Ilāhīyyat Fikhlustātī, v-vi (1927), 313-27; al-Dārīmī (d. 282/895), Kitāb al-Radd ʿalā l-Dajhmiyya, ed. G. Viteslam (with introduction and commentary) Lund and Leiden 1960.

(W. Montgomery Watt)

Al-Dajshiyari, Abu ʿAbd Allāh Muḥam-mad b. Abūdūs, a scholar born in al-Kūfah, who played a role in the formation of the early 10th century on account of his relations with the viziers of the time. He succeeded his father in the office of hāḏīb to the vizier Allā b. Isā, of whose personal guard he was in command in 306/912. Later, he is found among the supporters of Ibn Mūkla whom he helped to be proclaimed vizier and whom he concealed after his fall; several times he was imprisoned and fined, either by the viziers or by the amirs Ibn Rāʾīkh and Badḵam. He died in 327/942.

Al-Dajshiyārī is principally known as the author of a Kāṭib al-awzarā′ wa l-kuttābī which traced the history of the Secretaries of State and viziers until 296/908; only the first part, stopping at the beginning of al-Muʿāmmīn's caliphate, has been preserved for us intact. This work, which reveals the true spirit of inquiry of a chronicler as well as an undeniable taste for adornments and much emphasis upon men's characters and intellectual qualities as upon their administrative or political activities. Al-Dajshiyārī also wrote a voluminous chronicle of al-Muṭakādir's caliphate, from which certain passages are thought to have been recovered, and a collection of stories (asmār) which seems to be lost despite the opinion of those who would like to
attribute to al-Djahshiyari the K. al-Hikdydt al-\[iba, an anonymous work published recently (see Arabic, iv, 1957, 214). In his life, see M. Canard, Akhhr ar-Radd billa\[, Algiers 1946, i, 143 n. 3; J. Latz, Das Buch der Westire und Staatssekretäre von Ibn Âbdûs al-Gakhdiyrî, Anfänge und Ummi-\[yadzeit, Walddorf-Hessen, 1958, 3-6; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat âabbâdsâ, Damascus 1959-60, index; Ibn Khallîkân, ed. Cairo 1948, vi, 23. On his writings, see G. A. S. I, 219-20; in addition to the facsimile edition of the K. al-Hikdydt al-\[iba, ed. by H. von Mîk (Leipzig 1926), the edition by Mustafâ al-Sakhîd[], etc., which appeared in Cairo in 1357/1938, should be added; the pages devoted to the beginnings and the Umayyad period have been translated into German by J. Latz (supra); the character of the work has been studied by D. Sourdel, La valeur littéraire et documentaire du "Livre des Vizirs" d'al-\[Gakhdyirî, in Arabicî, ii, 1955, 193-210; the surviving fragments of the second part have been published or recorded by Mîkhâîl \[Awâdîd, in MIMA, xviii, 1943, 318-32 and 435-42, and D. Sourdel, Mélanges L. Massonîn, iii, Damascus 1957, 271-99. On the \[Abbâd al-Muqâthdîr, see D. Sourdel, Mélanges L. Massonîn, iii, 271 n. 2. (D. SOURDEL)

DJA^ZARIDS. The terrible conflict brought about by the fall of the Umayyad Caliphate led the Cordovans, under the direction and advice of the influential and respected vizier Abu Hazm Dja^warz b. Mikhailmad b. Dja^warf, to declare incapable and expel from the city all the members of the imperial family. They proclaimed a form of republic (422/1032) at the head of which they placed the vizier, who had already demonstrated his great political talents at the court of Ushâm II. Once elected, however, he refused to assume all the reigns of power, and formed a democratic government which administered all public affairs. He himself claimed to be no more than the executor of the Council's decisions on behalf of the people. Order and calm were restored at Cordova, the vizier earned the respect of the petty Berber kings in the neighbouring areas, and even the Banû âAbbâd of Seville learned to leave him in peace. Trade took on a new lease of life, prices came down, and the tax collected on the control of the al-Qarâbî, the last of which lasted for 12 years until his death in 435/1043. His son Abu 'l-Walîd Mikhailmad, called al-Raghdî, succeeded him. Without assuming the title of Sultan, he followed the line of conduct established by his father. In order to avoid a rupture with the Mu'tâdîd of Seville, he recognized the deceitful face of Ushâm II, and intervened as a mediator in the war between the Mu'tâdîd and Ibn al-Alfâs of Badajóz. But he was not of the same mettle as his father, and, lacking the energy to command, he delegated the administration of his small state to his vizier Ibn al-Râkî, who became the virtual sovereign of Cordova. He earned the hatred of Mikhailmad's younger son, 'Abd al-Malik, who, drawn into the intrigues of al-Mu'tâdîd, treacherously assassinated the vizier in Muharrâm 450/March 1058. His son, from proposing to him, for the deed, his father appointed him crown prince, giving him a free hand in governing and the right to use Caliphate titles. The Cordovans rapidly developed a strong dislike for him on account of his illegal dealings. Whereas al-Mu'tâdîd dethroned the reyes de tatlas of the south, 'Abd al-Malik continued his arbitrary rule. In 460/1069, when al-Mu'tâdîd and the vizier Ibn Râkî were dead, Ibn al-Alfâs saw his chance to seize Cordova, and 'Abd al-Malik sum-

moned the assistance of al-Mu'tâmid. The latter sent a cavalry detachment of 1300 men, and they raised the siege set by Ibn al-Alfâs. But the Cor-
dovans allowed al-Mu'tâmid's generals to capture 'Abd al-Malik and his aged father who had ruled for 25½ years, and they were both exiled to the island of Saltis, off Huelva, where the Odil flows into the sea.

Bibliography: The main source is Ibn Hayyân, which is used by Ibn Bassâm, Dja^warî, [ii], 174, 176; D. SOURDEL, "Livre des Vizirs" d'al-Gahsyirî, ed. Leiden 1845, note (biographical note and references); Bouvat, Barmîcîdes, 104-5; Mas'udî, Murâdî, viii, 261-2; Afghânî, index; Khâfbî Baghdâdi, iv, 65; Ibn Khallîkân, i, 41; Thâ'îlîbî, Thâmûr al-âbdîd, 183; Ibn Hâgîrî, Lissân al-mišàn, i, 146; Yâkûtî, Mu'tâm al-udâbâb', ii, 241-82. (CH. PELLAT)

DJA^Z, a term used in a general way to denote permissible acts, that is to say acts which are not contrary to a rule of the law. However, in the classical division of acts into five categories (al-âkhâm al-âkâm; cf. Dict. Tech. Terms, i, 379 ff.; I. Goldzîher, Die Zährlit, 66 ff.; Juynboll, Handbuch, 59 fl.) adopted by the writers on jurisprudence, the term is usually considered synonymous with âbdîd or charitable acts (mâkhîr), as from which it is forbidden (harâm) or simply considered reprehensible (mâtrîh).

In writings on jurâsî, that is to say of the Muslim jurisconsults, the term dja^zîs assumes a different significance. The juridical act which is not completely null and void (bâhilî) or merely defective (fâsidî)—according to the Hanâfîs—is regarded as sahîh, that is, as valid. It is the act carried out in conformity with the prescribed form. It must in principle produce all its effects. A valid act of this kind is certainly dja^zî, or permissible; but the correct term to denote it is sahîh.

Hanâfî authors, however, preferred to use the term dja^zîs, not to denote a valid act but, in particular, to specify that the act was legitimate or licit, in point of law. In their works, the study of each contract under consideration generally begins with...
a preamble in which the writer is at pains to state that the contract is djā'iz by reason of some text, or custom, or omnis contenus, or simply its practical usefulness (muṣafahah) to the parties, which for the purpose of the obligation en droit musulman, i, 105, no. 112). This is true of the contract of hire (Kāsānī, Badā'ī, iv, 174); of guarantee (ibid., vi, 3); and of deposit (Sarākhshī, Māsbā, xi, 108). In all these texts the writer raises the question whether the contract is or is not djā'iz, quite apart from the fact that it can be valid or not, according to whether the conditions of its conclusion or validity have or have not been fulfilled. Thus, with regard to the contract of locatio operis ( sistiṣnā), the conditions of legality are made clear, independently of conditions of conclusion (inšīkhād, validity (ṣiḥhah), irreversibility (luzum) or efficacy (nafādī). (Kāsānī, v, 209). Sometimes the term maṣṣrū is used in place of djā'iz, as for example in the contract of crop-sharīf (mussa'ra') (Kāsānī, vi, 175); and in the contract of association (ibid., vi, 220). In fact the djā'iz act is, correctly, the lawful act, maṣṣrū in point of law. But lawful must here be understood in a special sense. It is not a question of the legality of the object or cause of the contract, but rather of the act considered in itself, as to how far it is sanctioned by law. And thus, in the final analysis, the term djā'iz as used by jurists in writings on jurīṣ, by indirect means comes to approximate the term muṣafahah which is found in works on usūl, in the writings of fuḥū logicians.

Furthermore the term djā'iz, taken in the sense of maṣṣrū, goes beyond the limits of juridical acts. It underlies the theory of criminal responsibility, since it is established that a lawful act cannot give rise to damages (al-dī'awḍ al-sharī', al-A,119). Thus it is that the contract can be djā'iz when it is revocable. (For the Mālikis, see Kāsānī, Karafi, iv, 15; for the Śafi'īs, Suyūtī, Adbāb, 141; for the Ḥanbalis, Ibn Rūḍāna, iv, 119). Thus it is that the contract can be djā'iz for one of the parties, that is to say revocable by him, and not djā'iz, or irrevocable, for the other—just as it can be djā'iz for both, that is to say revocable by both parties (al-A,awlī, Būghyat al-mustarṭihīn, 112).

In logic, djā'iz means what is not unthinkable, whether it be necessary, probable, improbable, or possible (Dict. Tch. Terms, i, 207 fl.)

Bibliography: the works on usūl, e.g. al-Tasfahānī, al-Talāshī, 1304 H.; Chafrī Chehata, Théorie générale de l’obligation en droit musulman haniṣif, i, Cairo 1936; J. Schacht, G. Bergstrasser’s Grundzüge des islamischen Rechts, 31-3; al-Kāsānī, Badā’ī al-Sandā’ī, Cairo 1327; al-Sarākhshī, Māsbā, Cairo 1324. (Chafrī Chehata)

Djā'iza [see Ǧila].

Djakarta, town on the north coast of Java, a few miles to the east of 107° E. Long. The name is believed to be the abbreviated form of Djakarta, Victorious and Prosperous; in its turn it was corrupted into Jakarta (Jacatra) by the first Dutch visitors (1610). Judging by the name, we may suppose old Djakarta to have been the residence of a more or less independent prince, who was Javanese by descent or by culture. The Dutch settlement was given the name Batavia, from Batavi, one of the Latin names for the Netherlands; Jan P. Coen, local representative of the Dutch Chartered Company, decided to establish his headquarters here in 1619. In 1628 and 1629 Batavia was heavily attacked by Anjaku krasumu alias Sultan Agung, king of Mata rams. The narrow escape was followed by a long period of peace and prosperity which made the Indonesians use the expression unung Batawi, ‘Batavian luck’. Several stories were invented to explain that luck, the most interesting being the one which Cohen Stewart published in 1850 (Geschiedenis van Baron Sakendh, Batavia); it says that Jan P. Coen was the son of a Javanese princess with a flaming womb who had been given in marriage to Sukmul, twin-brother of Sekendh (Iskandar Dhu ’l-Karnayn, Alexander the Great).

The town was the seat of a Dutch Governor-General from 1619 to 1942, with a British interregnum from 1811 to 1816. As such it developed into an international centre of trade, and within the Indonesian Archipelago into a centre of administration. Under the Chartered Company (1619-1799) it attracted a multitude of merchants, from various parts of Indonesia as well as from various foreign countries (China, India, Arabia). Especially in the second half of the existence of the Netherlands Indies (1800-1942) Batavia was the gateway for various kinds of missionary activities, in the field of religion as well as in the field of school education. Both factors—commerce and propaganda—have contributed to the cosmopolitan character of the town; it may be true that the majority of the Indonesian population is Muslim, it is as true that the town does not owe its importance, character and function to the Muslims as such.

From the viewpoint of Islamology it deserves attention that Batavia was an observation-post for the study of Muslim life ever since it came into existence as a European town under Dutch rule. When Snouck Hurgronje was appointed adviser to the Colonial Government for Muslim and native affairs (1889) his office in Batavia became a centre for theoretical and applied Islamology. The Batavian Faculty of Law, founded in 1924, had a chair for Muslim law and Islamology from the very beginning. This is why Indonesian Islam, in many respects different from the type of Islam which one finds in Egypt and similar countries, is fairly well known. See Ǧawah, Indonesia, Java, Sumatra.

Batavia became Djakarta once more in 1942, when the Japanese conquered Indonesia and put an end to the colonial empire of the Dutch. The Indonesian Republic, proclaimed in 1945 and recognized by the Dutch in 1949, maintained Djakarta as its capital. The town which counted a population of approximately 400,000 people in 1940, is rapidly growing. It still has a cosmopolitan character, though its present function might detract from this character in a near future. (C. C. Berg)

Djakat [see Zakkāt].

Dalj [see Taṣīr].

Dalā'īr, Dalā'īr [see Dalā'īr, Da- lā'īrīd].

Dalā'īl al-Dawla, honorific title of various princes, notably the Būyīd (see below), the Ghazzawīd Muhammad (q.v.), and the Mirdasīd Nasr (q.v.).
DJALAL AL-DAWLA, Abū Tahir b. Bahāʾ AL-DAWLA, a Buyid, born in 383/993-4. When Sultān al-Dawla, after the death of his father Bahāʾ al-Dawla in 403/1012, was named amir al-umaraʿ, he established at al-Mansūrīya in Baghdaḍ the office of governor of Başra. The latter stayed there for several years without becoming involved in the private quarrels of the Buyids. In 415/1024-5 Sultān al-Dawla died and his brother Mustashrīf al-Dawla died in the following year. Djalāl al-Dawla was then proclaimed amir al-umaraʿ, but, as he did not appear at Baghdaḍ to take the provincial dignity, an inscription was given instead to Abū Kālīḏār, son of Sultān al-Dawla, who was also unable to accept the office. When Djalāl al-Dawla heard that he was no longer named in public prayers he marched on Baghdaḍ with an army, but was defeated and had to retreat to Başra. However, in Ramadān 418/October 1027 he entered the capital at the request of the Turks who were unable to keep on good terms with the population of Baghdaḍ and were afraid of the influence of the Arabs. But friendly relations with the Turks were short-lived. In the following year an insurrection broke out in Baghdaḍ, and Djalāl al-Dawla restored order only with difficulty. At the same time Abū Kālīḏār took possession of Başra without striking a blow and in 420/1029 succeeded in capturing Wāsīt. As Djalāl al-Dawla was preparing an expedition against Ahwāz, Abū Kālīḏār wanted to start peace negotiations; but Djalāl al-Dawla preferred to sack Ahwāz, and took prisoner the women of Abū Kālīḏār's family. At the end of Rābiʿ I 421/April 1030 the latter marched against Djalāl al-Dawla but was defeated after a three days' battle and had to flee, while the victor first took Wāsīt and then entered Baghdaḍ. Başra was also conquered, but Abū Kālīḏār's troops soon reoccupied it, though in Shawwal/October of the same year they suffered a further defeat near al-Madhār. In the capital, the insubordination of the Turkish mercenaries increased constantly, and the amir al-umaraʿ soon lost the last vestiges of his authority. In 423/1032 Djalāl al-Dawla's palace was sacked, and he was obliged to leave the town and flee to ‘Ukbarā, where Abū Kālīḏār was proclaimed amir al-umaraʿ by the Turks in Baghdaḍ. Abū Kālīḏār then came to Ahwāz and, as the amir held no particular power, Djalāl al-Dawla was able, after about six weeks, to return to his capital where, however, the situation was steadily worsening. In the following year his palace was once again attacked and pillaged, and for the second time the Buyids, who from now on was completely powerless, was forced to take to flight. This time he went to al-Karīk where he was protected by the Ṣafīn, remaining there until the rebels called him back to Baghdaḍ. In the same year the governor of Başra, Abū ‘l-Kāsim, revolted against Abū Kālīḏār who was intending to depose him, and called in Djalāl al-Dawla's son al-ʿAzīz to Başra. But in 425/1033-4 al-ʿAzīz was driven out, and the population again took an oath of loyalty to Abū Kālīḏār. During this period complete anarchy dominated the capital and in 427/1035-6 a new revolt broke out in the army which however was brought back to loyalty by the caliph's intervention. In 428/1036-7 Barṣtoḡān, who was one of the most powerful Turkish leaders in Baghdaḍ and whose position was threatened, called on Abū Kālīḏār for assistance. Once more Djalāl al-Dawla was driven out of Baghdaḍ but, after being helped by Kirwāsh b. al-Mukallād al-Musliḥ and Dubayṣ b. 'All of Hilla, while the Daylamites broke away from the Turks in Baghdaḍ, he was soon able to expel Barṣtoḡān and occupy the capital. Barṣtoḡān was then taken prisoner and put to death, and Abū Kālīḏār at last made peace with Djalāl al-Dawla. The final reconciliation was sealed by the marriage of one of Djalāl's daughters with Abū Maṣʿūr, Abū Kālīḏār's son. On this occasion Djalāl al-Dawla took the ancient Persian title "king of kings", which in fact was far from justified by his own lack of authority and the general anarchy. In 431/1039-40 or, according to others, in 432/1040, he had to face a further Turkish revolt in the capital. Djalāl al-Dawla died on 6 Shābān 435/9 March 1444, leaving the Buyid kingdom in a state of the deepest degradation.

Bibliography: see Buwayhids.

(K. V. Zettersten)
Ottoman Chamber of Deputies (medîlis-i meb'utdn) he served as deputy for Erzurum, temporary presiding officer, and co-founder of the Nationalist Party (Vatan) group; upon the death of Reşâd Hikmet, he was elected (March 1920) President of the Chamber. Two weeks later, after the reinforced occupation of the capital and the adjournment sine die of the Chamber, he led the flight of deputies to Ankara, where he urged his colleagues to join the Grand National Assembly convened by Mustâfâ Kemal [Atatürk]. He became the Assembly's Second President (rezâ-i dînî, Minister of Justice in the Ankara government (January 1920 and July to August 1922), and its diplomatic representative in Rome (1921-3). His differences with Kemal became apparent as early as the autumn of 1920 during an extended stay in his native Erzurum. A proposal that 'Arif be appointed governor-general over the Eastern wilayets went unheeded, and he in turn delayed for two months before accepting Kemal's invitation to return to Ankara and held him in high esteem of justice he was considered one of the parliamentary leaders of the conservative opposition (i�ındaî grub) in the Assembly. After 1923 he retired from political and diplomatic life. He died in Paris on 18 January 1930.


DJALAL AL-DIN HUSAYN AL-BUKHÂRI, surnamed Mağdîm-i Dihiînî-yân Dihaîgâhî, one of the early pîrs of India, was the son of Sayyid Ahmad Kabîr whose father Sayyid Jalâl al-Dîn-i Surkh had migrated from Bukhâra to Multan and Bhakkar [q.v.]. A descendant of Ísmâm 'Ali al-Nâki, his father was a disciple of Rûkân al-Dîn Abu 'l-Fath, son and successor of Bahâ al-Dîn al-Zarkiyyâ [q.v.]. Born 707/1308 at Uchç, where he also lies buried, he was educated in his home-town and in Multan but seems to have left for the Hijaz at a very young age in search of more knowledge. He is reported to have visited, in the course of his extensive travels which he received his education in his home-town and in Multan but seems to have left for the Hijaz at a very young age in search of more knowledge. He is reported to have visited, in the course of his extensive travels which he left the capital almost immediately and to make for the territories formerly allotted to him by his father and corresponding more or less to the modern Afghânîstân and Afghanistan. The Mongols had posted observation parties along the northern frontiers of Khurasân but Djâlal al-Dîn succeeded in breaking through this cordon and reaching Ghazna, where he found himself


Bibliography: Shams-i Sirâj 'Aflî, Fârîq, Fûrû elucidating the sense of "Eternal [God]" and employing the iism of "Eternal [Spiritual] Reality" (for mîmârîn). The spelling is that proposed by d'Ohsson, from the Turkish mengi [where this] he went to Gurgand which they reached some little time shortly before his death on an island in the Caspian Sea. The Mongols had posted observation parties along the northern frontiers of Khurasân but Djâlal al-Dîn succeeded in breaking through this cordon and reaching Ghazna, where he found himself

... and the last ruler of the dynasty. The spelling is that proposed by d'Ohsson, from the Turkish mengi [where this] he went to Gurgand which they reached some little time shortly before his death on an island in the Caspian Sea. The Mongols had posted observation parties along the northern frontiers of Khurasân but Djâlal al-Dîn succeeded in breaking through this cordon and reaching Ghazna, where he found himself

... and the last ruler of the dynasty. The spelling is that proposed by d'Ohsson, from the Turkish mengi [where this] he went to Gurgand which they reached some little time shortly before his death on an island in the Caspian Sea. The Mongols had posted observation parties along the northern frontiers of Khurasân but Djâlal al-Dîn succeeded in breaking through this cordon and reaching Ghazna, where he found himself
army the only serious defeat that the invaders suffered during the whole campaign. However, deserted on the very battlefield by almost half of his followers he was obliged to retreat southwards pursuing the Mongols out of the reach of the main Mongol army. He was overtaken on the banks of the Indus and after offering desperate resistance (8 Shawwal 618/24 November 1221) escaped to safety by riding his horse into the river and swimming the farther side. After a successful expedition against a petty rādža in the Salt Range Djalal took the field against Nāsir al-Dīn Kūbāqa [q.v.], the ruler of Sind, and sought in vain to form an alliance with Sultan Shams al-Dīn Iltumish [q.v.] of Dūhail. He remained nearly three years in India and then decided to make his way to ‘Irāk-i ‘Adjam, where his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn had now established himself. In 621/1224 he appeared in Kirmān, where Burāk Hādījī [q.v.] had seized power. Djalal al-Dīn found it expedient to confirm him in his usurped authority before continuing his journey to Fārs, which he reached as usual in the course of the Atabeg Sa’d [q.v.] and to ‘Irāk-i ‘Adjam, where he was at once successful in dispossessing his brother. The winter of 621-2/1224-5 passed in Khūzistān, his troops colliding with the forces of the Caliph al- Nāṣir. He then proceeded to attack and overthrow the Atabeg Öz-Beg [q.v.] of Ḥābdāriyān, whose capital Tafriz he entered on 17 Rādjab 622/25 July 1225. From Ḥābdāriyān he invaded the territory of the Georgians capturing Tiflis on ‘Aṣār 619/1222, and met his death in the battle of Arzindjan (28 Ramadan 627/10 November 1227). The Mongols then broke up and pursued by Cingiz-Khan in person at the head of the main Mongol army. He was overtaken on the banks of the Oxus. After another campaign against the Georgians capturing Tiflis on ‘Aṣār 619/1222, to the town of Akhlat [q.v.] in the territory of the Atabeg Sa’d [q.v.] but was obliged to raise the siege and retreat almost immediately owing to the severe cold. In the following year the Mongols reappeared in Central Persia and Djalal al-Dīn engaged them in a great battle before the gates of Iṣfahān. The result was a Pyrrhic victory for the invaders who at once retreated northwards and had soon withdrawn beyond the Oxus. After another campaign against the Georgians Djalal al-Dīn again, in Shawwl 626/August 1229, laid siege to Akhlat. With the fall of the town in Shawwl 627/August 1230 Burāk Hādījī [q.v.] reentered Sivas, stayed for some four years in Akshehir near Kay-Kubād I [q.v.], the Sultan of Rūm. Defeated in the battle of Arzindjan (28 Ramadan 627/August 1230) he withdrew into Ḥābdāriyān and had no sooner concluded peace with his opponents than he was threatened with the approach of new Mongol armies under the command of Corgmālūn. A Mongol force overtook him in the Mughān Steppes and he fled first to Akhlat and then to the vicinity of Āmid. Here the Mongols made a night attack in his encampment (middle of Shawwl 628/17 August 1231): roused from a drunken sleep he made off in the direction of Mayyāfarḵīn and met his death in a nearby Kurdish village, where he was murdered for reasons either of gain or of revenge. The ruler of Āmid recovered his body and gave it burial, but many refused to believe that he was dead, and time and again, in the years that followed, pretendors would arise claiming to be Sultan Djalal al-Dīn.
however, withdrew to Kayseri after some time and died there, probably in 637/1239-40. His tomb is in Kayseri. According to Alaâî, Djalâl al-Dîn went to Aleppo and Damascus after the arrival of the Sâyyid to complete his studies. Burhân al-Dîn is supposed to have made him aware that his father possessed, besides exoteric learning, other learning that could be won not through study but through inner experience. After the death of Burhân al-Dîn Djalâl al-Dîn was alone for five years. On 26 Dju'mâ 2/1244 the wandering dervish Shams al-Dîn Muḥammad Tabrîzî came to Konya and put up in the house of Shams's house at Djalâl al-Dîn met and talked to him; Shams asked him about the meaning of a saying of Bâyyazîd Bîstâmî, Djalâl al-Dîn gave the answer. According to Alaâî, Djalâl al-Dîn had already seen Shams once in Damascus (Furûzânî, Mawlânâ, 65-6). However that may be, the appearance of Shams-i Tabrîzî made a decisive change in the life of Mawlânâ. In the Şûfî manner he fell in love with the dervish and took him into his home. It will be possible to say something about Shams's remarkable personality only when his collected sayings, the Makâlât, have been edited. He constantly wore a black cap (kâdûkh) and because of his restless wandering life was called parandâ "the fierler". Although, as his Makâlât show, he had the usual theological conceptions of his time, he tried to keep Mawlânâ away from the study of books. It seems from his sayings that he had a certain bluntness of character. Shams-i Tabrîzî is called in the sources sulân al-mâ'ârîkhân, "prince of the loved ones", and Mawlânâ's son Sulân Walad, who knew Shams well, and was aware of the relationship of Shams with his father, develops in the İbtidânâmâ a theory that there is another class of "lovers who have reached the goal" (îdâkhân-i mâyî) besides the "perfect saints" (auliyâ-i kâhmî). Beyond these there is a further stage (mâhâm), that of the "beloved" (ma'ârîkhân). Until Shams appeared nobody had heard anything about this stage, and Shams had reached it. Shams showed Mawlânâ this way of Şûfî love, and Mawlânâ had to re-learn everything from him. Mawlânâ's love for Shams-i Tabrîzî turned him into a poet, but at the same time caused him to neglect his wirûds and disregard his khalîfâs. The wirûds were angered by this and maintained that they were more important than the foreign, unknown dervish and are even said to have threatened Shams's life. Thereupon Shams fled on 21 Shawwâl 643/11 March 1246 to Damascus. But the wirûds did not achieve their end. Mawlânâ was quite disconsolate, and sent his son Sultan Walad to Damascus. Shams could not resist the spoken entreaties of Sultan Walad and the written poetical entreaties of Mawlânâ, and returned on foot with Sultan Walad to Konya. But at once the wirûds began to murmur again and took pains to keep Shams away from Mawlânâ. Shams is said to have declared that he would now disappear for ever and no-one would be able to find him again. On 5 Şa'bân 643/5 December 1247 Shams was murdered with the participation of Sultan Walad's brother 'Aîdâ al-Dîn, or at his instigation, and the corpse was thrown into a well and later found by Sultan Walad. It seems that his coffin has been discovered in the latest repairs done on the burial-place in Konya, (A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlânân' dan sonra Mevlevîkân, 83). It is understandable that Sultan Walad says nothing of this murder in the İbtidânâmâ, not wanting to make the family scandal public. Shams's death was obviously kept from the Mawlânâ, as he went to Damascus twice to look for him. His spiritual condition is depicted in touching verses by Sultan Walad (Waladânâmâ 56-7): he became all the more a poet, devoted himself to listening to music and to dancing (samâ') to an extent that even his son obviously felt was immoderate, and found the lost Shams in himself. In most of his gazzâls the takhallus is not his own name, but that of his mystic lover.

Shams had, however, flesh and blood successors. In the year 647/1249 Mawlânâ announced that Shams had appeared to him again in the form of one of his wirûds, Şâlâh al-Dîn Zakrîyâ of Konya. He appointed him his khalîfâ, who was immediately distinguished by his handsome and pleasant character, as bhalûf, and thus as the superior of the other wirûds. He himself wanted to retire from the offices of gâyahk and preacher. The wirûds found that Shams al-Dîn, the Tabrîzî, had been more bearable than the uncultured goldsmith's apprentice from Konya, whom they had known from childhood. Plans were even made to murder him, and then revealed. The wirûds noticed that Mawlânâ threatened to desert them completely, and they asked remorsefully for forgiveness. We may assume that the loyal attitude of Sultan Walad himself and the modest, pleasant personality of Şâlâh al-Dîn helped to surmount this second crisis. For ten years Şalâh al-Dîn filled the office of a deputy (mâhûb and bhalûf), then he became ill and died, according to the inscription on his sarcophagus, on 1 Muhtarrâm 657/9 December 1258 (A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlânân' dan sonra Mevlevîkân, 355). His successor, Celebi Hûsân al-Dîn Hasan, whose family came from Urmia, was to be the inspirer of the Małrunâ. Hûsân al-Dîn's father was the chief of the akhis in Konya and the surrounding districts and so was known as Aghî Türk. Hûsân al-Dîn lived with Mawlânâ for ten years until the latter's death on 6 Dju'mâ 7/8 December 1273; his appointment as Şâykh must therefore fall approximately in the year 662/1263-4, and there must therefore be five years between the death of his predecessor and his own taking office (according to this the statement in İsl. xxvi, 124-5, should be corrected). After Mawlânâ's death Hûsân al-Dîn offered the office of bhalûf to Sultan Walad, the son of the master, who, however, turned him down. See also 656-7.

On the people's insistence Sultan Walad now accepted the title of Şâykh and held it until his death on 10 Radjab 712/1312. He was followed by his son Ülû 'Ârif Celebi (d. 719/1319), followed by his brother 'Abîd Celebi, followed by his brother Wâgid Celebi (d. 742/1341-2). A list of the Celebis to the present day can be found in A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlânân' dan sonra Mevlevîkân, 152-3, and in Tahsin Yazıcı's translation of the Mandikâlî-i Sârînî, II, 62-6 of the Önsöz.

The real history of the order begins with Sultan Walad. He founded the first branches of the order and helped it to gain greater respect. Already in the lifetime of Mawlânâ the members of the order had the title Mawlâvi (Aflâkî, i, 334). At first they were recruited from among artisans, which gave offence (Aflâkî, i, 151). The central part of the religious practices was held by listening to music, and dancing, which were indeed common among other orders, but never had the greatest importance, as with the Mawlâws. The dance ceremony in the regular, solemn form which is usual later, was, as Gölpınarlı has proved, first introduced by Pir Aâlî Celebi (d. 864/1460) (Mevlânân' dan sonra Mevlevîkân, 99-100). On this ceremony cf. H. Ritter, Der Reigen der tanzenden Derwische, in Zeitschrift für vergleichende Musikwissenschaft, i; A. Gölpınarlı, Mevlânân' dan...
sonra, 370-59, and Mevlevi dâhileri (Istanbul konservatuarı nesriyati, Turk Klasiklerinden VI-XV cild) 1933-9, publ. by Istanbul Music Conservatory.

Mawlana's piety and thought have not yet been the object of a thorough examination. Anyone undertaking such an examination would have to take care not to rely too much on the Ma'ânnawi commentaries, which read into the work the views of their own time or their personal views. Also the Divân of Mawlana has only now become available in a critical edition, so that the examination can really begin. According to A. Golpinarli, himself a former Mawlawi dervish, the Mawlaws do not regard their order as a Sîfî order in the strict sense. Gölpınarı is inclined to connect the order with the Malâmatiya movement from Khorâsân. Even in reading the sermons of Mawlana's father one notices a gladness praised there which reminds one of the gladness praised there which reminds one of the merriness of hearts (tibât al-kulub) of the Kalandar dervishes, as Ulu 'Arif Celebi, and still more his brother 'Abîd Celebi, and the Divânâh, Mehmed Celebi, who was used in the expansion of the order (Gölpınarlı, Mevlâd'î dan sonra, 101-22). But of course this does not prove anything for Mawlana himself. He appears to have been of a philanthropic, anything but fanatical, spirit, and to have worked off his excitement in the dance. Whether his religious ideas possess anything original besides the general mystical piety of his time, will have to be shown by the analysis of his works, which are:

1) The Divân, containing ghâsals and quatrains.
There are also Greek and Turkish verses in this, the presence of which shows a certain connexion with sections of the common folk and also with the non-Muslim elements of the Konya population. His takhallus is "Khâmîsh". This, however, is usually replaced with the name of Shams-i Tabriz. In some ghâsals Şâlâh al-Dîn also appears as the takhallus. Former impressions and editions of the Divân have now been superseded by the good edition of Bâdid al-Zaman Furûzanfar, published in 1924, (The title comes from a verse of Ibn al-Arabi). Cf. Nicholson, Selected poems from the Divân Shahsi Tabrizis, edited and translated, published in 1935.)

2) Ma'ânnawi-i mâ'ânnawi. Didactic poetical work in double verses, in six dârtars. (The seventh dâftar supposedly discovered by Rûshidî İsmîlî Dede is spurious). The long poem was dictated by Hüsâm al-Dîn Celebi, who suggested to Mawlana that he should produce something like the religious ma'ânnawi of Sanâ'î and 'At'târ. Mawlana is supposed to have at once pulled the famous eighteen verses of the introduction out of his turban already written. The rest he dictated to Hüsâm al-Dîn. The date when the work was begun is not known. We know only that between the first and second dâftar was a pause of two years, caused by the death of Hüsâm al-Dîn's wife. The second dâftar was started in 662/1263-4, as the poet says himself (il, 7). Mawlana dictated his verse whenever it occurred to him, whether he was dancing, in the bath, standing, sitting, walking, sometimes in the night until morning. Then Hüsâm al-Dîn read out what was written and the necessary corrections were made. The whole is composed very informally and without any thought of a well-planned structure. Thoughts hang together in free association, the interspersed stories are often interrupted and continued much later on. (On the style, cf. Nicholson's 'Mîrâj al-Ma'ânnawi', the preface to Gölpınarlı's translation). The classic edition is that of R. A. Nicholson, The Ma'ânnawi of Jalalu'ddin Rûmi, edited from the oldest manuscripts available; with critical notes, translations and commentary, London 1924-40 (GMS, vi, r-8). Latest Turkish translation: Mevleva, Mesevî, Veled İbûdah tarafsandanda tercîme edilmiş, Abdülâhî Gölpınarlı tarafindan muhitli serkeler karsılâstırılmış ve eser bir âçma ifâde edilmiştir, Istanbul 1942 ff.


Bibliography: H. Ritter, Philologika XI. Mevlâna Galâl-iddîn Rûmî ve onun Kreis, in Islam, xxvi, 1942. (Life. Sources for biography, manuscripts of the works along with the works of his father, his son, and of Shams-i Tabriz). The most important biographical sources are: Sultan Walad, İbtîdânâme, published by Djalâl Hûmâyûn, Mawlâmî-i Waladî hâ tâbihî ve muhadîmen, Tehran 1935; Fûrdûn b. Ahsâm Sipahîlî,


ii) It is not easy to summarize systematically the main lines of Djalal al-Dīn’s thought. He was not a philosopher (in his works there are often attacks against the vanity of purely intellectual philosophy) and claimed not to be a classical poet (both in the Dīvān and the Mathnawī he proclaims his dislike for rhymes and poetical artifices) but above all he was a passionate lover of God who expressed his feelings in a poetically unorthodox, volcanic way, thus creating a style which is unique in the entire Persian literature. Historically, influences on him by the religious and philosophical thought of Ghazzālī, Ibn ʿArabī, Sanā‘ī, and ʿAttār have been traced. The importance of the influence of Ibn ʿArabī on him has been perhaps exaggerated. The following account outlines as shortly as possible some of the main trends in Djalal al-Dīn’s thought. Quotations from the Mathnawī are from Nicholson’s edition mentioned in Bibliography.

God: The absolute transcendence of God seems conceived not only spatially and intellectually but even morally. God is Himself the Absolute Value, Good, and the ideal to which both human and his is directed (ii, 2617 ff.). Reality is ordered in four “spaces”: the Realm of Nothingness, of Phantasy, of Existence, of Senses and Colours (ii, 3092-7). God is beyond Nothingness and Being. He works in the Nothingness, which is His Workshop (ii, 688-90; i, 760-2; iv, 2341-83). In this sense it is difficult to speak of a real “pantheism” in Djalal al-Dīn: in any case immanence is totally foreign to his turn of mind.

Creation: Djalal al-Dīn seems to accept the Ash‘ari idea of the discontinuity of time and creation, God creates and destroys all in discontinuous atoms of time (i, 1140-8). He creates things moving enchanting words in their ears while they are still asleep in the Nothingness (i, 1447-55).

The World: The non-human World is something created by God in preparation for the creation of Man. Nature is a hint of God: every tree that germinates from the dark earth extending its branches towards the sun is a symbol of the liberation of Spirit from Matter (i, 1335-6; 1342-6). Creation has been however progressive. In a famous passage (v, 3637 ff.) Djalal al-Dīn sketches a theory of mystical evolution (not to be mistaken for a scientific and Darwinistic evolution). The emergence of Man (who always remained Man, even in his former stages of development) from the animal kingdom is a first step indicating further journeys to the realms of the Angels and of the Godhead.

Man: Man is not simply a compound of body and soul. The human compound is formed by a body, His manifest part, a deeper soul (rūḥ, ʿuyûn), and the concealing mind (ʿalāk and, even deeper, a rūḥ-i waṣī (spirit partaking of Revelation) present only in Saints and Prophets (ii, 3253 ff.). Djalal al-Dīn’s spiritual anthropology does not accept an indiscriminate possibility for every one to reach the highest stages of sanctity. Saints and Prophets are “different” from ordinary men. In a very interesting passage Djalal al-Dīn shows the pragmatic utility of bowing in veneration to the Holy Men: it is the only way of breaking the ever-reappearing humanistic pride and superfluity of Man (i, 811 ff.).

God speaks through the mouth of the “man of God”. The Prophet, the Holy Man is the manifest sign of the Unity of God and he is above the normal human standards (i, 2257 ff.).

Ethics: Djalal al-Dīn is far from speaking the language of modern “liberal” religious thinkers. The exterior practices of worship are binding for all. The reason given for this is also of a typically Muslim pragmatic character: the exterior rites are useful, like the presents of a lover to his Beloved. If Love were purely a spiritual thing why should God have created the material World? (i, 2624 ff.). On the problem of freedom and destiny he acutely remarks that there is a great difference between the momentaneous act of God (ṣūr) and the result of that act (māznī) between ṭabā (the act of deciding or predestining) and manā (the predestined thing). One has to love the ṣūr of God, not his māznī like an idolator (iii, 1360-73). When his spiritual eyes are open, man recognizes that he is, at the same time, totally “operated” and moved by God (i, 598 ff.) and totally free, of a freedom unmeasurably above the petty freedoms of ordinary men (i, 956-9). To reach this deeper freedom in God, efforts and action (ḥikmat) are necessary (i, 1074-7). Excellent examples of this supreme freedom are the Saints and the Prophets (i, 635-7).

Life after death: The nearness to God in the world beyond is never felt by Djalal al-Dīn as a real absorption in God without any residue. The metaphors he uses to express this are both in his Workshop and in his Workshop. The Mathnawī (iii, 3669 ff.) are for instance the following: The flame of the candle in the presence of the sun (but yet the candle exists and “if you put cotton upon it, the cotton will be consumed by the sparks”) or a deer in presence of a lion, or, elsewhere, as red-hot iron in the fire, when iron takes the properties of fire without losing its own individual essence. In that state it can claim to be fire as well as iron. The
soul near God becomes then one “according to whose desire the torrents and rivers flow, and the stars move in such wise as He wills” (iii, 1885 ff.). In another passage Djalal al-DIn tells of a lover who, as he reached the presence of his Beloved, died and “the bird, his spirit, flew out of his body” for “God is such that, when He comes, there is not a single hair of thee remaining” (iii, 4677 ff.). Djalal al-DIn goes even so far as to admit an element of activity in the otherworldly plane, so that the highest degree in the life of spirit “is not attainment but infinite aspiration after having attained”: “... there is a very occult mystery here in the fact that Moses set out to run towards a Khidr ... This Divine Court is the Infinite Plane. Leave the seat of honour behind: the Way is thy seat of honour!” (iii, 1557 ff.).

Djalal al-DIn Rumi’s style: The style of the ghazals of Djalal al-DIn’s Divan is conditioned by the fact that many of them were “sung” by the poet himself or were destined to be sung. A well known tradition shows us Djalal al-DIn improvising odes while gently dancing around a pillar in his school, and another story tells how he found one of his beloved pupils and companions, the already mentioned goldsmith Shalal al-DIn Zarkub, while listening enraptured, in a street, to the rhythmic beat of his goldsmith’s hammer. His powerful sense of rhythm is not always accompanied by equal attention to the strict rules of classical quantitative Persian poetry. He often complaints against metres (“musafilun musafilun musafilun killed me!”) and more than one verse both in his Divan and in his Mathnawi shows strong irregularities. In his Divan two styles can be distinguished, a “singing” and a “didactic” style. Often some ghazals begin in the former (strong rhythm, double rhymes etc.) to pass slowly into the second or vice versa. In the Mathnawi, which is a single uninterrupted discourse, where the Speaker is often drawn by a word or a casual connexion of the past into ever newer subjects, anecdotes and sub-accidents, three styles can be distinguished. The purely “narrative” style; at the end, or during the telling of a story, however, comments are introduced in a “didactic” style. Here and there, either in the context of a story or of its comment, the author seems to be suddenly taken away as by rapture and then he uses his “ecstatic” style, in which some of the best verses of the Mathnawi are composed. Both the narrative and the didactic styles are of a remarkable simplicity and colloquialness, almost unique in the Persian literature of that time. Elements of colloquial language penetrate sometimes even into the more refined language of the ghazals and of the “ecstatic” style of the Mathnawi. We have even some verses of Djalal al-DIn containing a few words and sentences in colloquial Greek. Because of this strongly personal features Djalal al-DIn’s style found practically no imitators, but it is highly—and rightly—valued by modern Persians (even by those who do not fully agree with his mystical views) and perhaps exerted a certain influence in the movement of simplification and modernization of Persian literature begun in the past century.

Bibliography: To the bibliography above add:
Life: Allâkî, Manâkbî al-şârîfîn, is partly trans-
he died at least 50 years after the reform, Khayyāmī, if he ever took part in that consultation, must have been very young. By the term Tārīkh-i Djalalī is meant a new calendar instituted in 629/1231 by the above mentioned sultan Malikgāh. This was, as a matter of fact, rather a reform of the common Persian calendar that had remained in general usage in Iran, side by side with the Arabian calendar with lunar year and months used by Muslims, after the downfall of the Persian empire and the domination of the Arabs in Iran in the 7th century A.D. Through this reform the Persian vague year of 365 days was stabilized and brought into exact agreement with the astronomical tropical year of 365.2422 days (or strictly speaking 365 days 5 hours and about 49 minutes). This regulation was effected by adding one day in every four and sometimes five years to the vague year, thus making it 366 instead of 365 days. This was in a way more or less similar to the Julian calendar.

The Persian year was, from the time of its institution probably in the 5th century B.C., a vague year of 12 months of 30 days each and five odd days (andargāh, Arab. al-mustaraba) added at the end of the year as intercalary days. This is believed to have been the original order which was re-established towards the end of the 4th/10th century in the great part of Persia by one of the Buyid kings of Fārs, who transplanted the epagomenae from the end of Abān where they then were, to the end of the 12th month where they remained in those parts of the country and also with the Zoroastrians of Iran and the Parsis of India. As a matter of fact the place of the five supplementary or intercalary days, i.e., the above mentioned andargāh (the so-called epagomenae) has not been always at the end of the year after the 12th month, but they had been periodically advancing in the civil year by being moved forward a month every 120 years. That is to say, after being at first at the end of the last month for 120 years, they were moved to the end of the first month, where they remained for another 120 years, and then they were again moved forward and put at the end of the second month and so on, until they were brought to the end of Abān the 9th month probably in the 5th century A.D. (of course after some 960 years from the institution of this process). This periodical and regular movement or change of the place of the epagomenae in the civil year was a consequence of the periodical shifting of the places of the six Zoroastrian religious festivals of 5 days each, called gāhanbārs, a whole month forward in the civil year once every 120 years, with a view of keeping those most important religious feasts fixed in their original astronomical places in the tropic year.

The epagomenae, which were, as a matter of fact, the Avestan 5 Gādā days, also constituted one of those gāhanbārs, the sixth one, i.e., the Avestan ḤamaspaspaṇaBaya, and hence it moved in the civil year in the same way as the other gāhanbārs. This operation of shifting forward the gāhanbārs periodically, and consequently the epagomenae as well, was described in the Muslim books of chronology, as an intercalation of one month in the year (in reality in the ecclesiastic fix year) carried out by a special process which cannot be fully explained in this article.

The above mentioned periodical operation, executed more or less regularly in the pre-Islamic ages, ceased to be carried out during the last century or the last two centuries of the Sāsānid period, and was no longer carried out after the downfall of that dynasty and the Muslim conquest of Iran. Therefore the epagomenae remained, as has already been said, at the end of Abān till about 1000 A.D. in the southern provinces of Persia, and still later in the northern provinces of the country e.g., in Mazandarān (and, as I have been recently informed, also in the district of Sāngar near Simnān) even at the present time.

The effect of the calendar reform of Malikgāh was (1) to fix the beginning of the Persian solar year in the day of vernal equinox. The New Year or the first day of the first month was (2) to provide a rule for keeping New Year's Day always fixed in the same astronomical point of time by counting every fourth (or sometimes fifth) year 366 days instead of 365. This was, in fact, an intercalation of one day every four or five years at the end of epagomenae, somewhat similar to that effected in the Julian year, where once in every four years (leap years) an intercalary day is placed at the end of February.

However, just as the above mentioned intercalation in the Julian calendar did not bring the Julian year into exact agreement with the tropical year, because the latter is about 11 minutes shorter than the Julian year, which is 365 and a quarter days, the difference amounted to about 45 minutes in 4 years or one day in about 128 years, and therefore a further adjustment was found necessary; the Djalālī year would have been as imperfect as the Julian if the intercalation of one day in the year were limited to every fourth year.

In both calendars a means for eliminating the imperfection was elaborated. While in 1582 A.D. the Pope Gregory XIII introduced a new arrangement in the order of the above mentioned yearly intercalation in the Julian year, by establishing a rule according to which the epagomenae would be omitted in the last year of every century except in those divisible by 400, such as 1600, 2000, 2400 A.D. etc., the initiators of the Djalālī calendar or rather reform made the intercalation of one day in the year dependent on the vernal equinox occurring in the afternoon of the 366th day, provided that it had been in the preceding year before midnight.

The equinox or the exact point of time when the sun (in reality the earth) reaches the equinoctial point of the ecliptic, which in astronomy is conventionally called "the first point of Aries", was the real commencement of the year. In other words the Djalālī year, being a solar tropic year, always began on the vernal equinox and the exact time of this astronomical beginning could be found out every year by calculation. Thus the first day of the calendar year (civil year New Year's Day), was always the day on which the sun at midday was already in Aries, having entered that sign sometime between that point of time and midday of the preceding day.

Now as a rule every time the equinox occurred in the afternoon after having occurred the last time (i.e., at the beginning of the preceding year) before noon, the year just coming to a close would be a leap year, i.e., an intercalation of one day would be
effected. This happened normally once in every four years, when the fourth year was of 366 days instead of 365. However, if in a given fourth year when, as has been said, an intercalation would normally have been due, the equinox did not fall in the afternoon but occurred before midday, even though it also occurred before noon in the preceding year, such a year in spite of the fact that it followed three successive common years (of 365 days each) would not be a leap or bisextile year and the intercalation would be effected only in the next year (i.e., in the fifth year). The period of time of this quinquennial or five-yearly intercalation was never fixed by a regular rule by the reformers. It was left absolutely dependent on the result of the astronomical calculation each year, that is to say it was to be estimated by deductive method. A similar process is followed in the modern calendar of Persia instituted in 1925 A.D. It was, however, noticed that this case (the postponement of intercalation to the fifth year) occurred only after some 6 or 7 or 8 quadrennial intercalations. In other words some oriental astronomers like Ulugh Beg (d. 1449) believed that the quinquennial intercalation would follow at times the sixth, and at other times the seventh, quadrennial ones, however without giving any regular sequence for the alternative cycles. Again, other astronomers like Küth al-Din of Shiraz (d. 1312) put the alternative periods as 7 or 8. This means that according to the former the quinquennial intercalation would fall in the 29th (instead of 28th) or 33rd (instead of 32nd) year, and according to the latter in 33rd or 37th year. If by alternative numbers the regular sequence were meant, the first system (that of Ulugh Beg) would mean 15 intercalations in 62 years and the second (that of Küth al-Din) 17 intercalations in 70 years. Possibly every author worked out these cycles according to his own opinion of the length of the tropic year.

By calculation on the basis of the length of the fraction of the day (over 365 days) in the tropic year, according to the modern measure, there will be still an error of one day in 3844 years in the case of some or 7 or 8 quadrennial intercalations. In other words some oriental astronomers like Ulugh Beg (d. 1449) believed that the quinquennial intercalation would follow at times the sixth, and at other times the seventh, quadrennial ones, however without giving any regular sequence for the alternative cycles. Again, other astronomers like Küth al-Din of Shiraz (d. 1312) put the alternative periods as 7 or 8. This means that according to the former the quinquennial intercalation would fall in the 29th (instead of 28th) or 33rd (instead of 32nd) year, and according to the latter in 33rd or 37th year. If by alternative numbers the regular sequence were meant, the first system (that of Ulugh Beg) would mean 15 intercalations in 62 years and the second (that of Küth al-Din) 17 intercalations in 70 years. Possibly every author worked out these cycles according to his own opinion of the length of the tropic year.

By calculation on the basis of the length of the fraction of the day (over 365 days) in the tropic year, according to the modern measure, there will be still an error of one day in 3844 years in the case of some or 7 or 8 quadrennial intercalations. In other words some oriental astronomers like Ulugh Beg (d. 1449) believed that the quinquennial intercalation would follow at times the sixth, and at other times the seventh, quadrennial ones, however without giving any regular sequence for the alternative cycles. Again, other astronomers like Küth al-Din of Shiraz (d. 1312) put the alternative periods as 7 or 8. This means that according to the former the quinquennial intercalation would fall in the 29th (instead of 28th) or 33rd (instead of 32nd) year, and according to the latter in 33rd or 37th year. If by alternative numbers the regular sequence were meant, the first system (that of Ulugh Beg) would mean 15 intercalations in 62 years and the second (that of Küth al-Din) 17 intercalations in 70 years. Possibly every author worked out these cycles according to his own opinion of the length of the tropic year.
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Djalayir, Djalayirid (Djalayir, Djalayirid). Originally the name of a Mongol tribe (see Ragh' al-Din, Tawhik-i Grassani, esp. bbb a), the term Djalayir (and Djalayirid) in Islamic history principally denotes one of the successor-dynasties that divided up the territories of the defunct Ilkhanid empire. The spelling 'Djalayir' is given by al-Ahrl, the contemporary, and very likely official, chronicler of the dynasty. Djalayirid genealogies usually begin with Tikâ Nîyun (hence the dynasty’s other name Ikanî), a follower of Hülagâ, and proceed through Ahsâbâ and Husayn to Hasan ‘Buzurg’, the founder of the dynasty, who was Ulûs Beg and governor of Rûm under Abû Sa’îd.

When Abû Sa’îd died without heirs in 735-6/1335 A.D., the great chiefs of the Ilkhanid empire struggled to control the succession, and elevated in turn three obscure Hülagûds: Arpâ (735-6/1335-6), Mûsâ (736-7/1336-7), and Muhammâd (737-9/1336-8). These rapid changes at the top did not seriously disturb the structure of the empire: Muhammâd, the protegé of Hasan Buzurg, ruled over as large a realm as had Abû Sa’îd.

The breakdown of the empire began with the defeat of Hasan Buzurg and execution of Muhammâd by the Cubânid, Hasan “Kûtûk” (so-called to distinguish him from the Djalayirid Hasan), in 738-9/1338-9. Hasan Kûtûk, who ruled in the name of Sâbitbîk (739/1339) and Sulaymân (740-1/1340-1), could not control the whole Ilkhanid realm. Hasan Buzurg and his followers established themselves at Baghdad, and continued to dispute Cubânid authority, as did Eretna, the governor (and, after 741/1341-2, independent ruler) of Rûm, and the ruler of Khurâsân, Tughâ Timurr. Hasan Kûtûk’s attempts to subdue the Djalayirids (741-2/1341-2) and Artaanâ (743/1343) failed, while the great chiefs, Ahsâbâ and Husayn, at the end of 743/1343, hijacked Hasan Buzurg and fled with him to Ashraf, seized power and forced Sulaymân and Sâbitbîk to flee to Hasan Buzurg. Ashraf (who ruled in the name of a certain Anâghirwân) also failed to dislodge the Djalayirids from Baghdad (748/1347-8), and, moreover, lost control of the provinces of Isfâhan, Kirmân, Yazd and Shîrzâd that had owed allegiance to Hasan Kûtûk.

Although Hasan Buzurg was instrumental in the breakdown of the Ilkhanid empire, he seems to have hoped rather for its restoration—on his own terms—than its collapse. He used only the title Ulûs Beg that he had held under Abû Sa’îd, and either acknowledged legitimate Dîjingids as sovereigns—Tughâ Timurr (739-40/1338-9), 740-1/1340-1, Dîhân Timurr (739-40/1338-9), and 741-2/1341-2—and, or left sovereignty unattributed (746-7/1346-7). Hasan Buzurg died in 759/1359, leaving Djalayirid leadership to his son, Uwayw. When, in the same year, Sultan Dinbâk of the Golden Horde overthrew Ashraf, the Djalayirids in Baghdad recognized Dinbâk as their sovereign. But the Mongol empire in Iran was not to be renewed. Dinbâk died in 758-9/1358-9, and his son, Bîdîbâk, abandoned Ashraf to Dinbâk’s former supporters, led by a certain Ahsâbâ. Uwayw then assumed personal sovereignty (759/1358) and undertook to annex Ashraf’s territory. His first campaign failed, but after his retreat, Muhammâd b. al-Muzaffar, who had seized Fârs and Isfâhan in the years following Hasan Kûtûk’s death, RAIDED ADHABRAYD (760-1/1360-1), and so weakened Ashraf. Although Hasan Buzurg had looked to Uways’ second invasion succeeded (761/1361).

There were further Djalayirid successes during the years 762-5/1361-4, especially in Fârs, where the Muzaffarid princes, Shâh Mûmûd and Shâh Shudîjâ, having deposed their father, Muhammâd, were quarrrelling over the succession. Shâh Mûmûd acknowledged the Djalayirid suzerainty, and was enabled by Uways to hold Isfâhan and seize Shîrzâd. But after 765/1364 a series of reverses precluded further Djalayirid expansion. Until about 770/1370 Uways was busy suppressing revolts by the Shîr-wânshâh, by Khâdîja Mîrdânî in Baghdad, and, by the Karakoyunlu Turkomans in the Diyârbakr region. While meeting these challenges, Uways faltered in his support of Shâh Mûmûd, who was driven from Shîrzâd. Another enemy appeared in 772/1371-2, when Amîr Wall of Astarabâd began to attack Ravy. Uways died in 775-6/1374, and was succeeded by his son, Husayn, after the great amirs had murdered an unpopular elder son, Hasan. Other harbingers of decline appeared during Husayn’s reign (776-86/1374-82): Husayn came to depend entirely upon Amîr ’Adîl for leadership; and Husayn’s brothers, Shâykh ’Ali, Ahmad, and Shâh Ismâl, were left at large and even given positions of power despite the example Husayn had set of profiting from a brother’s murder. Abroad, the death of Shâh Mûmûd in 776-7/1375 enabled Shâh Shudîjâ to occupy Isfâhan and attack Adhâr-baydân (777/1375-6, 783/1381; Amîr Wall continued to threaten the border at Rayy; and the Karakoyunlu had again to be subdued (779/1379).

The dangers implicit in these events were soon realized. Shâykh ’Ali rebelled in 780/1378-9, held Shîbûtstar against Husayn and ’Adîl, and, in 782/1381, seized Baghdad. Then, in 783/1382, ’Adîl led the army against Rayy, leaving Husayn at Tabriz. Ahmad, seeing Husayn unprotected, gathered a force from his own domains in Ardâbîl and slew his brother. When attacked in turn by Shâykh ’Ali, coming from Bagh-dâd, and by ’Adîl, returning from Rayy with Bâyazîd, Ahmad called in the Karakoyunlu. Shâykh ’Ali was killed, and ’Adîl and Bâyazîd retreated to Sultanîyya.

Before Ahmad could consolidate his position in Adhâr-baydân, the intervention of the Golden Horde and then Timûr drove him away. Ahmad retreated to Baghdad (787/1385), and later fled before Timûr to the Ottomans, and then to Egypt. After Timûr’s death in 807/1405, Ahmad regained Bagh-dâd, and briefly reoccupied Tabriz, only to be driven out by the Timûrid Abû Bakr, who was, in turn, ousted by the Karakoyunlu. When Ahmad tried again to take Tabriz (812/1410), he was captured by the Karakoy- nunlu, and executed on the pretext of having violated an agreement to cede Adhâr-baydân to Karâ Yusuf Karakoyunlu, made while they were fellow-exiles in Egypt.

Although Baghâd fell to the Karakoyunlu in 814-5/1412-13, Djalayirid princes survived in lower Mesopotamia for some years. The last of these, Husayn II, fell during the siege of Hilla by the Karakoyunlu in 835-6/1432.

Djalayirid patronage has left us the khan and mosque of Mirânî in Baghdad, Salâm Sâwâdî’s poems, and the miniatures of Shams al-Dîn Ahmad, himself a poet, unsuccessfully offered his support to Hâfiz, who would not leave Shîrzâd.

The Hague 1954; Hafiż-i Abru, Dzhayl-i Dżamlu al-lavval-i Rażhidil, ed. and trans. Kh. Bayânî; i-text: Tehran 13175/1938; ii-trans.: Paris 1936; A. Markov, Katalog Džalairidskikh monet, St. Petersburg 1897; idem, Invendarniy katalog musulmanskich monet ... Ermizala (1 vol. and suppls.), St. Petersburg 1896, 1898; Lane-Poolo, Cat., vi and x; Cl. Huart, Mémoire sur la fin de la dynastie des Ishāqis, in JA, 7ème sér., viii (1876); C. Defrémy, Histoire de la destruction de la dynastie des Mosa‘ffiirs, in JA, 4ème sér., iv (1844) and v (1854); Spuler, Mongolen; H. Howorth, History of the Mongols, iii, London 1888; ‘Abbas al-‘Assāwī, Ta‘rīkh al-‘Irāq bayn ādāblayn, ii, Baghdad 1354/1936; M. H. Ymaq, art. Cellyār, in JA. See also CABĀMDS.

(D. J. SMITH, JR.)

DJIΛLI (see DIAWALIL.)

DJIΛLIL, a family and quasi-dynasty in Mosul, where seventeen members held the position of wa‘ṣil of that wilāya for various periods between 1139/1726 and 1250/1834. If legendary origins in eastern Anatolia can be ignored, the founder of the family, ‘Abd al-Djalil, seems to have begun life as a Christian slave of the local and equally famous ʿUmar family in the later 11th/17th Century. His son Isma‘īl al-Djalīl and grandson Fadlullāh, attained the Pashalik of Mosul by exceptional merits after a long career of public office, and governed it with distinction for some years from 1139/1726; and the easy succession of his son, Ḥādīḍi Ḥusayn Pasha, in 1143/1730 to a position which, with interruptions, he held until 1173/1759, showed that the family was already a firm claimant to hereditary rule of the province. Ḥādīḍi Ḥusayn, an outstanding personality, attained lasting fame for his part in the defence of Mosul against Nādir Shâh, notably in 1156/1743; he held also at intervals other wilāyas and high positions in ʿIrāq and elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire, as did for the next fifty years his sons and relations, to an extent doubtless unique among ʿIrākī families before or since. The chronic tribal and country-side disorders of northern ʿIrāq, and of Mosul itself, at this period rendered all government precarious, and tenures shortlived; but a Djalill pre-eminent in northern ʿIrāq and elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire, achieved a remarkable degree of stability in the last great period of the Sūlṭān. Eminent among these were Amin Pasha (son of Ḥādīḍi Ḥusayn) who was six times wa‘ṣil, in part during his father’s lifetime: his son, Muḥammad Pasha, who ruled the wilāya more or less at peace for 18 years (1204-22/1789-1807); and Ahmad Pasha, who rebuilt the walls of Mosul at intervals from 1228/1813.

The local annals of the ninety years covered by Djalill pre-eminence in northern ʿIrāq are unedifying in their tale of violent, selfish and corrupt misgovernment, and are of interest mainly for the light they throw on the contemporary administration of the remotest Turkish provinces; but the virile persistence, and at times the superior qualities, of the effectively irreplaceable Djalill dynasty for so long a period entitles them to a place in history. Their descendants in Mosul are still numerous, but no longer influential.


DJIΛNĪS, Arabic for Galen, born in Pergamon, in Asia Minor A.D. 129, died in Rome about 199; the last great medical writer in Greek antiquity, outstanding as an anatomist and physician as well as a practising physician, surgeon and pharmacologist. He also became known as an influential though minor philosopher. More than 120 books ascribed to him are included in the last complete edition of his Greek works (ed. by F. Kühn (Leipzig 1871-1912)); they represent by no means his whole output: some works have survived in Arabic, Hebrew or Latin translation only, others are unretrievably lost.

Although Djalins stands nowhere in the first rank, his popularity especially as a physician grew steadily in subsequent centuries, and he eventually became the most influential teacher of medicine together with Hippocrates (Bukrāt (q.v.) who had helped to establish as a model physician and a pattern of perfection, and whose treatises he had explained in many elaborate commentaries. When the teaching of Greek philosophy and medicine was definitely made part of the Christian syllabus of learning in ± 500, the preservation of the greater part of his numerous works was assured and his supreme position established for the next millennium. Whereas the far superior works of his predecessors in Alexandria and elsewhere have perished, his codification of the great achievements of the Hellenistic physicians, whose independence of mind he still understood and taught himself, was handed on to posterity and was instrumental in establishing a fundamentally unbroken tradition of scientific medicine which never lost sight of him.

As in the case of philosophy and other sciences, Syrian and Arabic medicine follow the late Greek syllabus almost without a gap. We are not too badly informed about the Syriac translations of Djalins, by Sergioius of Rashā‘ayna (d. 536) and Job of Edessa (about 825) for instance. We have Ḥunayn b. Ishākh’s (q.v.) detailed survey of 129 major and minor works by Djalins translated into Syriac and/or Arabic by himself and others, which are fully digested and understood and taught himself, was handed on to posterity and was instrumental in establishing a fundamentally unbroken tradition of scientific medicine which never lost sight of him.

There can be no doubt—although details have still to be ascertained and interpreted in monographs—that Galen’s medical works in their entirety, his methods and his results, were fully digested and appreciated by all the later Arabic physicians and became an integral part of their medical learning, in their original form as well as in summaries, commentaries and new works based on them. This by no means applies only to such outstanding physicians as Muḥammad b. Zakariya al-Rażī (q.v.) or Ibn Sinā (q.v.) but to many others as well (cf., e.g., J. Schacht-M. Meyerhof. The medico-philosophical
controversy between Ibn Butlan of Baghdad and Ibn Riddan of Cairo, Cairo 1937, passim). A comparison between Djalinus and Ibn Sinâ's Kullu fi 'l-fish would yield very interesting results indeed. Djalinus deserves a major chapter in any future history of Arabic medicine down to the first half of the 20th century. The Galen studies in medieval and Renaissance Europe owe very much to the Arab precedent and to Galen-translations from the Arabic.

A number of otherwise lost medical and philosophical works of Djalinus has been recovered from Arabic translations, and it seems appropriate to mention them here.


The Arabic versions of books by Galen which are preserved in the original Greek may often prove useful for the establishment of the Greek text, especially in cases where only late Greek manuscripts are available. Moreover, they are very important for the general history of medical terminology, and work in this direction has scarcely been begun. The Arabic text of Galen's commentary on Hippocrates KAT [wəpəs] to emigrate), will be published in 1962 as part of the Corpus Medicorum Graecorum. A Ger. tr. of the Arabic text of Pēpel ḫīšūjīy by P. Pfaff is to be found in the Corpus Medicorum Graecorum Supplementum, iii, 1941.

A survey of Arabic MSS of Galen, as far as it could be established at the time of the compilation, is to be found in H. Diels, Die Handschriften der antiken Ärzte, Berlin 1906. Additions: H. Ritter- R. Walzer, Arabische Übersetzungen griechischer Ärzte in Stabularius Bibliotheken in Berichte der Berliner Akademie, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1934 and in many miscellaneous publications.

An intensive and detailed study of Arabic medical writers will no doubt eventually yield more texts of Galen and will make it possible to write the history of his very important impact on the development of Arabic medicine. Important results would yield very interesting results indeed.

Bibliography: In addition to references in the article: G. Sarton, Introduction to the history of science, passim; idem, Galen of Pergamon, Kansas Press 1954; D. Campbell, Arabien medizin and its influence in the middle ages, ii, Leiden 1926, 13-220; H. Schipperges, Ideologie und Historiographie des Arabismus, Wiesbaden 1961. (R. Walzer)
States. Since then nine mosques have been built, of which the most imposing is that of Washington, D.C., founded in 1952 and patronized by the embassies. Of the estimated 33,000 Muslims, mostly Palestinians and Yamanites, 5,000 live in Detroit, attracted by employment in the automobile factories. In 1924 New York housed six newspapers (in 1960 five) and three monthlies. The oldest newspaper extant, al-
Hudā, celebrated on 22 February 1960 its sixty-second anniversary. A census taken in 1929 lists 102 Arabic periodicals and papers, extant and extinct, which saw the light in North America and 166 in South America. (Ibid., 1957.)

The first to reach Brazil was again a Lebanese in 1874. The movement acquired mass proportions in the 1880’s following Emperor Pedro II’s visit to Lebanon and Palestine. In 1892 an Ottoman-Brazilian treaty gave further impetus. Argentina was equally interested in new emigrants to develop its vast resources. The Syro-Lebanese community in Brazil is larger than that of the United States; that of Argentina numbers about 150,000, of Mexico 60,000. A number of streets in Latin American countries bear the names of Syria, Lebanon or of a citizen born there. In South America such emigrants felt more at home than in North America; they also prospered more and maintained a stronger Arab tradition. In wealth and influence the São Paulo colony, headed by the Jafet (Yāfhī) family—founded by a Christian from al-Shuwayr, Lebanon—compares favourably with that of Cairo. In 1959 the São Paulo community maintained two sport clubs (one Syrian, one Lebanese), two chambers of commerce, one hospital, one orphanage, two secondary schools and a score of philanthropic organizations. Its Greek Orthodox Cathedral, begun in 1939, is the most imposing place of worship erected by Syro-Lebanese emigrants anywhere.

Though originating mostly in villages the bulk of the emigrants to the two Americas took to business. The general pattern was to start from peddling, carrying a kāsā (from Portuguese caixa) and knocking at doors, move on to shopkeeping and graduate to large store owning and perhaps to a leading position as a merchant or industrialist. Arabic papers abound in “success stories” of pen-niles emigrants (30,000,000, according to a United States source). Arabic-speaking merchants are credited among other things with contributing to the introduction and popularization of kimonos, lingeries, negliges, linens, laces, Oriental rugs and Near Eastern food articles. The “folks back home” were generally never forgotten. Remittances to relatives and friends in the course of the first World War have been credited with saving numberless lives. Even as late as 1952 Lebanese official statistics credit Lebanese emigrants with remittances to relatives, friends and religious and educational institutions amounting to $22,000,000. Descendants of emigrants have entered all kinds of professions. In 1939 California sent to the House of Representatives in Washington the first son of a Lebanese emigrant; in the same year a second-generation girl singer was admitted to the Metropolitan Opera in New York. In 1960 an American citizen whose father was born in Zahlah (Lebanon) was elected mayor of a large city (Toledo, Ohio).

More striking perhaps has been the literary contribution. New York boasted a literary circle, founded by Kahil Gibran (Djabrān Khalīl Djabrān, [q.v.]), whose influence has been felt throughout the Arab world. Its counterpart in São Paulo published for twenty years a magazine (al-Andalus) which had a wide vogue. These writers treated new themes, struck fresh notes, introduced modern styles and reflected the Western influences to which they were exposed in their adopted lands. By their writings, correspondence and return visits Arabic-speaking emigrants contributed substantially to the liberalizing, modernizing trend of their native lands. Some of the tenderest and most often quoted modern verses have been composed by Arabic poets in New York and São Paulo.

Legislative restrictions on immigration into the New World had speeded the movement into Australia where the Syro-Lebanese community is estimated at 20,000 largely clustered in Sydney.

The wave of migration which rolled from the eastern Mediterranean in the decade preceding the first World War sent sprinkles to the remotest corners of the habitable world. The Canadian community now counts about 30,000.

Abḥāth, xii, pt. 1 (March 1959), 59-72; Institute of Arab American Affairs, Arabic-speaking Americans, New York 1946; Nadīm al-Maqdīsī, The Muslims of America, in The Islamic Review, xiii, no. 6 (June, 1955), 28-32; Diārā Saydah, Abādūn wa-
part run along the shoulders and the upper part of the arms. The head and neck are put through the holes at each side; they could be left uncovered if armlets were not sewn on to the edges of the armholes. These armlets are very short. At their lower extremity is a slit (nifuk) for the elbow and at the top a second slit (jatha) across, through which, when necessary (e.g., for the ritual ablution) the bare fore-arm can be thrust. The diallab is made either of native cloth or (in prosperous towns) of European. The former is woolen, rarely and only quite recently of cotton or cotton and wool. These cloths are dyed in different colours in different districts; red, brown, black, white, of uniform colour, striped or spotted. The European materials are thick, usually navy blue, black or dark grey. — The diallab of native manufacture consists of a single piece of cloth, which is made of the required size. The hood is not added but consists of a quadrangular piece of cloth woven on the sides, of which are folded together behind and sewn. In the diallab of European cloth, the hood is cut separately and put on. The seams of the diallab are covered with braid and often ornamented with tassels, knots and rosettes. — The cut, the form of the diallab and the hood, the ornamentation, the style of weaving, the sewing and of lining vary much in different districts. — This garment is called diallab (diallabá, diallabíyya), throughout the greater part of Morocco and in the west of Algeria; it is also used in other parts of the Maghrib, e.g., in the south of Algeria and in the Mzb but it is given another name there. Among the Andalusian Muslims, however, the word diallabíyya was the name of a garment, the shape and use of which we do not know; in Egypt, we find a phonetic equivalent of the word, gallabíyya (with g for d), but the garment it denotes is quite different from the diallab of the Maghrib. The origin of the word is uncertain. Dozy considers the form diallabíyya to be the original one and diallab, diallabá to be corruptions. He therefore gives to the original meaning of "garment of a diallab, i.e., a slave dealer". This view seems philologically untenable. It is much more probable that diallabá is connected with the Old Arabic diallabb "outer garment". The dissimilative dropping of the b in this word of foreign origin (cf. Noldeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, 55) is not surprising; moreover it has also taken place outside the Maghrib in the modern forms of the word gillab; thus for example in the dialect of "Umân we find gilláb with the meaning of "women's veil".

Bibliography: Dozy, Dictionnaire étalé des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes, 122 ff.; idem, Suppl., i, 204, 205, with numerous references; Budgett Meakin, The Moors, 58 ff., 59, 59, with an illustration; Moulieras, Le Maroc islamique, ii, 16; Archers marocains, xvii, 122; Bel, La population musulmane de Tieemken, Pl. xix, Fig. 17; Bel and Ricard, Les industries et le travail de la laine à Tlemcen. (W. Marçais)

DJALOR, a town in the Indian state of Rajasthan, some 75 miles south of Dindobur on the left bank of the Sukri river. Although the troops of ʻAlá al-Din Khâlid had passed through Djalor on their return from the conquest of Gujûrât in 966/1267, it was not then occupied by them. In Qumâddi I 705/December

1305, however, that king sent ʻAyn al-Mulk, governor of Multân, on an expedition to Djalor, Ujdâyân and Cândér; he was opposed by an army of 150,000 Hindus on his entry into Mâlâw, and his victory over them, which brought Ujdâyân, Dâhr, Mândâ, and Cândér (qq.v.) into Muslim possession, so impressed the Câwhân râdâj of Djalor that he accompanied ʻAyn al-Mulk to Dihil to swear his allegiance to ʻAla al-Din. Two years later this râdâj's arrogance caused ʻAlâ al-Din to attack Djalor, which was taken for Dihil by Kamâl al-Din Gurg. On the weakening of the sultanate's position in the south of India, it seems to have relapsed into Câwhân possession.

At some time in the 8th/14th century a body of Lohâni Afgâns left their adoptive province of Bihâr and came to Mârâf, where they entered the service of the Câwhân râdâj of Djalor. On the latter's death by a trick at the hands of a neighbouring râdâj in 794/1392 their leader, Malik Khurram, assisted the râdâj's widow in carrying on the government, but after disagreements between the Khâns and the Râdjûts he established himself as ruler over the city and its fort, Songir (Sanskrit: svarna-giri "golden hill"), and sought through Zâfar Khân, shâbâddar of Gujûrât under the Tughâlûcks, a farman from Dihil confirming his title; this was given, 796/1394. After Tîmu'ûr's depredations in north India in 801/1399 the Djalors became independent rulers for a time, before later becoming feudatory to the new and powerful sultanate of Gujûrât.

At some time in the early 10th/16th century the Djalorî family had added Pâlanpur (q.v.) to its dominions, and by mid-century its ruler had acquired the title of Nawwâb. By about 1110/1699 the Nawwâb moved his seat from Djalor to Pâlanpur, which remained an independent Muslim state until 1956; for the history of the dynasty, see Pâlanpur.

Monuments. The fort of Djalor was built by the Paramâra Râdjûts, and remained substantially unchanged under Muslim rule except for the modification of its perimeter wall for artillery. The oldest monument is the mosque in the city, built from temple spoil probably at the time of ʻAlâ al-Din, 564 m. square, with cloisters of three arcades on north, south, and east, broken by doorways, and a deeper than ordinary entrance on the west. A later period is faced with a screen wall of later date, probably of the time of Muâzaffar II of Gujûrât (917-921/1511-1515); an inscription including the name of Muhammad b. Tughûk stands over the north door, implying an extension or restoration in his time. The arcades have been enriched by the addition of graceful and delicate stone lattice screens of the middle Gujûrât period. Known as the Tughûkîa masjid, it was for long used as an arsenal. A smaller mosque stands in the fort; although said by Erkine (Raiyutana Gazetteer, iii A, 1909, 189 ff.) to have been built by ʻAlâ al-Din's armies, it seems to be in its present form entirely a construction of the period of Mahmûd I (863-917/1458-1511) or Muâzaffar II of Gujûrât, and bears an inscription of the latter.

A town in 'Irāk (Babylonia) and, in the mediaeval division of this province, the capital of a district (nassādī) of the Ṣafad-Kubdāh circle to the east of the Tigris, was a station on the important Kūhrāsān road, the main route between Babylonia and Irān, and was at about an equal distance (7 parasangs = 28 miles) from Dastādīr [q.v.] in the south-west and from Kābūlnā in the north-east. It was watered by a canal from the Diyālū (called Nahī Dīlūlā), which rejoined the main stream a little further down near Bādīsār [q.v.]. Near this town, which seems from the statements of the Arab geographers to have been particularly important, the Arabs inflicted a severe defeat on the army of the Sāsānian king at the end of the year 16/637.

According to Mustawfi, writing about 740/1340, the Saldīn Sūltān Malikgāhā (465-85/1073-92) built at Dīlūlā a watch-house (ribāt, popularly rubāt) which probably served also as a caravanserai; after his time the place was usually called Ribāt Dīlūlā. This statement helps us to locate the site of Dīlūlā with certainty; for indeed there can be no doubt that Ribāt Dīlūlā must be identified with the modern Kūzīrūbāt, especially since the distances given by the Arab geographers for Dīlūlā apply perfectly to Kūzīrūbāt. Its geographical position is 34° 10′ N., 45° 3′ E.; it lies within the mountains, at the east end of the pass through the Djabal Hamrin. The Dīlūlā flows by at some distance to the east of the town. The name Kūzīrūbāt ("red caravanserai") is popularly corrupted to Kazilābād and Kazrābād (cf. Petermann, Reisen im Orient, ii, 274) or abbreviated to Kizzābāt (cf. Herzfeld, in Petermanns Geogr. Mitt., 1907, 51). Like its mediaeval predecessor, the modern Kūzīrūbāt is of only moderate importance; it still has no other rôle than that of a transit and relay station on an important caravan route.

Bibliography: in addition to references in the article Bāg‘ūbah, see in particular M. Streck, Babylonien nach den arabischen Geographen., i, 8; Le Strange, 62; and, on Kūzīrūbāt, cf. Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, 418, 489; Ker Porter, Reisen in Georgiaien, Persien u. Armenien, etc., Weimar 1833, ii, 234. (M. Streck)

The Goliath of the Bible appears as Dālūt in the Kurān (ii, 248/247-252/251) (the line of al-Samaw‘al where the name occurs is inauthentic), in which it commands three superposed stages of truncated conical form, with an interior staircase (over 160 steps); the height of this minaret (about 60 m.) puts it between the Kūtb minār of Dīlūlā [q.v.] and the minaret of Būghārā [q.v.]. One of the inscriptions on this minaret, which is entirely covered with a striking decoration, gives the name of the prince who ordered its construction: Ghiyāth al-Dunya wa l-Dīlahā (Kutb minār de Djdm: la découverte de la capitale des sultans Ghūrids [XIe-XIIe siècles], in Mém. Delegation archéol. française en Afghanistan, xvi, Paris 1959, 91 pp., 17 plates and two maps).

Further research (H. Massé) is needed to clarify general ideas, and to show what system underlies the expression of grammatical number, as regards the Arabic plural and collective. The Arabic language distinguishes between: 1) the singular, 2) dual, 3) plural, 4) collective. Arabic grammarians have paid close attention to the first three: 1) the singular: al-wāhid, mutrah is applied to the "simple" noun (as opposed to marubah, applied to the "compound" noun) by the Muṣīf 4; but it has also been used for "singular!", likewise jārd [q.v.].—2) the dual: al-muthannd, for units numbering three or more, with the subdivision: dijam sālim "sound plural", the external plural and dijam muhassar "broken plural", the internal plural. As

Talmud of Jerusalem Shabbat vi, 2 [26c]; cf. H. Lewy, MGWI, lvii, 1933, especially 179). With the help of these linkings, even though the Bible story in its authentic form must have been known to a writer as particular about first hand information as al-Ya‘kūb, Dīlūt became a kind of collective name for the oppressors of the Israelite nation before David. The battle against Dīlūt is localized in the Ghor or lower valley of the Jordan (see AVN DILU7).

Bibliography: K. al-Tiqājm, Ḥaydarābd 1347/1928, 178 f.; Ya‘qūb, Tābrīz, 51 f. (Smit, Bijbel en Legende, 61 f.); Taβarī, i, 370-86, cf. 278-80; Mu‘āṣir, Murūḏī, i, 105-8; ii, 241; Kīsa‘ī, Vita Prophetarum, 250-1; Muḥḥāṣar ‘al-‘ādīb (Abūt ibn Murūḏī), translated by Carra de Vaux, 101; M. Grünbaum, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagenkunde, 191 f.; J. Horovitz, Koramische Untersuchungen, 106; R. Blachère, Le Coran, 803-5. (G. Vajda)
regards 4), the collective, they have no general word to denote it. In relation to the noun of unity they have distinguished between: the *ism al-djins* "specific name*, which possesses a noun of unity, made by means of the suffix -at, added to it, e.g.: *tam* "dates", noun of unity *tamer* "a date*; the *ism al-djam* which denotes a *djam-*a* "collection, assembly of beings*, but does not possess a noun of unity or else forms it in a manner different from that given above: without a noun of unity, like *baam* "tribe, group to which one belongs*, with noun of unity provided by another word, like *ibl* "camels*, *is* "birds*, *af* "Chinese", *mata* "snow*, *massa* "dust*, etc. This does not create any difficulties. It remains to examine the external plural for substantives which are only substantives (proper names included). The difficulty noted above, for the *'ukald*, arose precisely from the participial adjectives (the *'ifa*) which can become substantives.

B. — The external plural for substantives and proper names.

a) Proper names: the question of the *guand* naturally affects the external plural for proper names and also of diminutives.

For the former, Sibawayhi (ii, ch. 350) leaves a choice between the external plural and the internal plural when the name is capable of forming it, e.g.: for Zayd (masc. proper name): *sawdana* or *ayyad*, *swaَdَ*; for Hind (fem. proper name): *hinaida* or *ahnida*, *huwaَ*; but -at for the plural of men's proper names terminated by -at*: *talha* "Talha*, *taladat* (according to the Basrans, 4th disputed question, Ibn al-Anbari, *K. Al-Inshad*, ed. Weil, 18 ff.).

As to the diminutive (like *showaَy*îr, diminutive of *shai* "poet"): for the masc. *djam*: *shoowaَy*îr*una*; *shoowaَy*îrd for the feminine; -at for the plural of the diminutive for non-rational beings: *kitâb* "book*, diminutive *kutâyib*, pl. *kutâyibat*.

Substantives which are purely substantives: a small proportion reverts to the suffix -an*una: biliteral nouns like *sanad* "year*; *sina una and some isolated ones, like *djam* "world*, *djamâna*. The suffix -at is used much more widely. It is given to:

1. feminine substantives with the suffix -at or -at*; *sahraw* "desert*; *dikâra* "memory*.

2. names of the letters of the alphabet: *alif*, *alef*.

3. names of the Muslim months: *ramadân*, *ramâdân*.

4. infinitives of the derived Forms of verbs used as substantives: *la*ri* "definition*, *la*ri*ât.

5. foreign nouns: *si* *îd* "stable*, *si* *îldait*; the same, denoting men: *bâshä* "Pasha*; *bâshâd*.

The modern language still carries on this procedure: *tisîfa* "telephone*, *tisîfâdât.

6. biliteral substantives: *sanad* "year*; *sanawat* and a few isolated ones, some feminine like *arad* "earth*, *aradât*, others masculine like *djadâm* "mineral*, *djadâmâd*.

7. a particular and important usage can be included here: agent-nouns or passive nouns of
all Forms of the verb and of adjectives with the suffix -at are regarded as neuter, e.g.: al-šāhāt "Good" (Kurān, II 23/25, 76/82, etc.), al-sāyínah "Evil" (Kurān, IV 22/18, VII 154/153, etc.), aš-maḏḥabbah the "creatures", etc. This usage still exists in modern Arabic: al-maḏḥabbah "refreshments", etc.

To sum up, for the ġawla the external plural is the proper plural of relative adjectives, the agent-nouns and passive nouns fa'ul and maš'ul, muḏ'ul (and still more, Forms which take only the external plural), of the Forms fa's'ul, fa'ul, fa'uld (for adjectives with one or two short vowels, the external plural is also given as the standard form (the šiyās) but not for the other adjectives subject to greater variation. With substantives, the ġawla apply only in respect of proper names and diminutives. In this special treatment of rational beings is to be found the indication of a true Class, operative in classical Arabic. It was important to place it.

C.—External plural, plural for small numbers.

Another assertion by the Arab grammarians is that the external plural is a plural for small numbers (Muğul § 235, Ibn Ya'qūb, 612-2) (which characteristic can cross its influence with the preceding). There is thus a way of explaining, in certain instances, the coexistence of the external plural and the internal plural for the same word, e.g.: karaydah (small number), ḥura* (large number) for a singular karayda* "village". This seems to be particularly noticeable for the external plural in -di and to have had an influence on dialects: the plural for a small number, described by E. F. Sutcliffe in A grammar of the Maltese language, London 1936, 36, is of this kind. The question of small numbers will occur again in connexion with internal plurals.

II.—The internal plural

The internal plural is found sporadically (as it were, still on trial) in Western Semitic languages in the north (Hebrew-Aramaic) (Brockelmann, Précis, § 165). It is the Western Semitic languages in the south which made use of the procedure, particularly Arabic (only ten Forms of the internal plural in Gees). But from what do these internal plurals derive? Are they the plural of a singular following a genetic connexion or, on the other hand, are they independent words linked simply by the singular-plural relationship? This genetic connexion cannot be established: even in the case of sing. ju'ul; pl. ju'ul, sing. ju'ul, pl. ju'ul, the question is not clear (cf. below); some ju'dān plurals are seen to come from a suffix -ān: kakkūnān > kakkūnān "brothers", djāran > djārān "neighbours", but the words thus pluralised are lost in the mass of internal plurals of the Form ju'dān, independent of a singular. Thus the second position is adopted by many Orientalists (see Barth, Nominalbildung, 417-8). Internal plurals are therefore considered to be derived from collectives which are connected with abstract words (M. Bravmann has recently maintained the contrary view, in Orientalia, xxii, 1953, 7-8, but he is not convincing).

Internal plurals are collectives clarified by the plural: collectives offered a mass, through this use of the plural, individualities have become distinct in this mass (see below, III) and can be numbered (that is to say, counted precisely according to the different numbers), or else remain simply with a vague, not fixed, number—the indeterminate plural.

The human mind can easily make the transition from the collective to the indeterminate plural because, while being a true plural, it retains some subtle element of the former through the vagueness and imprecision of the number of units comprised. This is also true in Arabic, the same word without any internal change or variation in its external form may be looked upon in one connexion as a collective and in another as an indeterminate plural. A good example is provided by Raḍl al-Dīn al-Astarābādī (Ṣh. Sh., ii, 196, 1-3) when he states explicitly that the ism al-dīn (coll.) for the noun of unity with -ā', takes the plural in -ā for a small number and uses the same form without -ā for a large number, as for example for "ant": namāl (n. of un.) pl. namāli (small number), nam (large number). This is his example (loc. cit.) even though there exists the internal plural for a large number nīmil. This concept of an indeterminate plural, for a vague number of units, brings an element of clarity, here and in other instances, e.g. for baum (see below). A true plural, it forms a link and transition between collective and plural.

The link between collectives and abstract nouns, it seems to us, cannot be denied; a collective on the way to becoming an abstract word (this cannot be developed here (see my Traité § 71); conversely, an abstract word which becomes collective, e.g. ḍā'āb "youth" (abstract word), ḍā'āb "young people" (coll.). The collective thus proves to be the link between the abstract word and the internal plural. But not all collectives derive from an abstract word. Can one therefore refuse the language the power of directly creating, for natural masses, collectives to which it has opposed nouns of unity to designate separate members of these masses? In this question of the internal plural it is well to consider the complexity of the collective from which it derives, a complexity increased by the diversity of the collective waiz, which have passed into the internal plural.

How has the relationship between singular and plural for internal plurals been established? Semantic analogies have been followed, e.g. fi'sulāt for animals, and also formal analogies, e.g. the so-called plural of quadrilaterals, also extensions purely analogical by simple propagation of a waiz. All this has varied from one region of the language to another, either in diachrony or in synchrony throughout the vast expanse of Arabia.

Behind the internal plural lies a long and complicated history which we have no longer the means to unravel. In classical Arabic they appear as a product that had been moulded in the general process of internal flexion. A good way of approaching the question is to consider this product within the framework of internal flexion, according to the series affected: initial basis and development, as a sort of outline. No doubt an outline simplifies and neglects cross-currents, but it is not altogether without its value in introducing a systematic arrangement based on the general progress of the language.

In this way one can distinguish four main series, with progression in them according to the lengthening of the vowels, the gamination of the second root consonant or the use of the affix:

a) Series: fi's'ul, fi's'ul, fi's'ul (fi's'ul + a'), af's'ul (= a' + fi's'ul, or fi's'ul > af's'ul > fi's'ul, see below), fi's'ul (fi's'ul + a' or secondary parallel formation of fi's'ul).

b) Series: fi's'ul, fi's'ul, fi's'ul (fi's'ul + a'), af's'ul (= a' + fi's'ul), fi's'ul (fi's'ul + a).
c) Series: *a damages (these only collective), *a damages

(see *a damages + *a), a damages (= *a damages + a damages), a damages = (*a damages + *a damages), a damages = (*a damages + a damages), a damages = (*a damages + a damages), a damages, a damages.

Series: a damages = (*a damages + a damages) and a damages (probably a damages + a damages). The plural forms of quadrilaterals will be discussed later. But a damages like **a damages servants** is a collective (ism al-dam), similarly a damages (like **a damages “asses”) and a damages for a singular a damages (like **a damages “ring”), **a damages is also a collective (ism al-dam).

As for a damages (sing. a damages), a damages (sing. a damages), they are indubitably acknowledged by Arab grammarians to be broken plurals. A problem arises with the development: a damages, a damages. Is this the plural of a damages (Brockelmann’s solution, Grundriss, i, 430, Anm. 2)? Or merely the external plural of the singular a damages, a damages (with supplementary vowel for the second root consonant) (see Nöldeke, in ZA, xvii, 72)? Arab grammarians had proposed the solution adopted by Brockelmann; Ibn Ya’ish refutes them (650, l. 6-8); a damages, a damages, a damages, applied in the usage for a single number!), cannot be the plural of a plural, a kind of plural which is valid for a large number. The question could be discussed further. The situation is not clear. But the solution is, more probably, to be found in the direction: simple external plural.

Internal plurals for a small number.

The distinction is made between plurals for a large number and plurals for a small number (3 to 10 inclusive) in the general teaching of Arab grammarians (see e.g. Muwj, § 235). They did not invent it. But to what extent they fixed what had been a flexible usage, or imposed a distinction which departed from the spoken language and which was preserved only in the traditions of fine language (poetry), one cannot tell exactly. A study of the practice of the different authors will certainly produce interesting results. We know already that poets have not always conformed with rules. The language itself did not always provide the means to observe them, e.g. *salam “reed cut for writing” has only one plural *salam (plural for a small number), similarly *rasan “horse’s nose-band” *arsan; on the contrary, *sera; applied to a plural for a large number (according to Ibn Ya’ish 652 l. 14; like Sibawayhi, he does not recognize any plural except *sibat, see L. 4, x, 10.16). The so-called internal plurals of quadrilaterals are incapable of expressing the distinction, e.g.: **turhan “talon, claws”, pl. **baradharin (for a small or large number). From all this one can discern that in practice there was considerable variation. It remains to say that Arab grammarians have put forward, for a small number, the Forms a damages, a damages, a damages (in frequent association respectively with a damages, a damages, a damages), and a damages (seldom used), and besides the external plural noticed above. This subdivision of the internal plural was noteworthy.

Apart from this last (a damages), the other Forms (of the plural for a small number) have the peculiarity of having an initial hamsa. It seems to me that this hamsa is not unconnected with the indication of the small number and acts in the linguistic sense as a formative prefix (however a damages is not considered as a plural for small numbers). Barth (Nominalbildung, 422, l. 16-17) already considered it to be “ein spezifisches Mittel der Pluralbildung”, but did not see how to explain its precise origin. It seems that some research work is to be done to investigate the possibility that a hamsa, originally prothetic (in a damages > */a damages > a damages), was later reinterpreted as a formative hamsa and capable of generalization and of extension to other Forms.

The so-called internal plurals of quadrilaterals.

The so-called formation of “quadrilaterals” is considered separately. In fact it possesses a special characteristic. It includes not only quadrilaterals properly speaking like *a damages “scorpion”, but words which, with three root consonants, add another as prefix, like a damages “for a small number (according to Ibn Ya’ish 652 l. 14; like Sibawayhi, he does not recognize any plural except *sibat, see L. 4, x, 10.16). The so-called internal plurals of quadrilaterals are incapable of expressing the distinction, e.g.: **turhan “talon, claws”, pl. **baradharin (for a small or large number). From all this one can discern that in practice there was considerable variation. It remains to say that Arab grammarians have put forward, for a small number, the Forms a damages, a damages, a damages (in frequent association respectively with a damages, a damages, a damages), and a damages (seldom used), and besides the external plural noticed above. This subdivision of the internal plural was noteworthy.

Apart from this last (a damages), the other Forms (of the plural for a small number) have the peculiarity of having an initial hamsa. It seems to me that this hamsa is not unconnected with the indication of the small number and acts in the linguistic sense as a formative prefix (however a damages is not considered as a plural for small numbers). Barth (Nominalbildung, 422, l. 16-17) already considered it to be “ein spezifisches Mittel der Pluralbildung”, but did not see how to explain its precise origin. It seems that some research work is to be done to investigate the possibility that a hamsa, originally prothetic (in a damages > */a damages > a damages), was later reinterpreted as a formative hamsa and capable of generalization and of extension to other Forms.
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III—The collective

It is important to have a clear conception of the collective. Collectives are not plurals. Plurals denote a plurality of distinct beings or objects, collectives on the contrary denote a sum or assembly of several objects, inter- or intraacting from the component units (see the Lexique de la terminologie linguistique by J. Marouzeau, Paris 1933, 47 and 145). The collective is the mass in which the individuality of those “massed together” is blurred: it is this mass which is envisaged and which constitutes as it were a unit, a kind of singular. A collective, considered purely as such, cannot be numbered, unless one wishes to indicate the plurality of the unit represented by the mass of its components. When the collective can be numbered to denote the plurality of the latter, it is a sign that it has ceased to belong to the collective category through becoming plural: the individuality of the “objects massed together” has become distinct (see above for the determinate plural).

At the beginning of this article the Arabs’ terminology was explained: it now remains to examine the question of gender and the distribution of collectives in the light of the *u'kala*.

The *ism al-ḏżaḥiyn* (n. of un. with -ʿa-) is formed for natural masses of non-rational beings, e.g. *naḥl* “bees”, *naḥāl* “a bee”, very rarely for objects made by man. As for gender, it can be considered as either masculine or feminine, according to e.g.: *Kurʿān*, LIV, 20 and LXIX, 7. This is the teaching of *Muṣf*, § 271, Ibn Yaʿṣīh, 701, l. 20-2. But according to the *Sh. Sh.* (ii, 195, l. 2-3) the masculine gender is dominant.

The *ism al-ḏジャー* (n. of un. with -yy-) is formed for the *u'kala* (with very rare exceptions), e.g. *yahād* “Jews”, *yahāḏiyyah* “a Jew”. The question of gender is not discussed in grammars; according to the usage of the *Kurʿān*, *yahād* is used as masculine plural or feminine singular (for the verb which precedes, e.g.: *kālāti*-i-yaḥāḥu*).

The *ism al-ḏジャー* without an individual noun or with the individual noun provided by another word: masculine or feminine for the *u'kala* feminine for the others.

The *ism al-ḏジャー* with the noun of unity provided by another Form of the same root. It exists both for the *u'kala* and for the others. *활owell* (i, 192-45) expresses himself clearly, Wright (i, 182 A) is not sufficiently thorough. For Sibawayhi in his ch. 249 (ii, 210-1), the masculine is dominant; the same view is held by al-ʿAstārābādī (*Sh. Sh.* ii, 204, l. 7-8); Ibn Yaʿṣīh (673, l. 23-4) is even more positive.

As regards the *u'kala*, there exists an important collective which Arab grammarians have not fitted exactly into their categories (*Muṣf*, § 267, Ibn Yaʿṣīh, 695). It is formed by means of the suffix -ʿa added to the agent-noun: *al-sabīlah* “the travellers”, *al-muḥāšīl* “the combatants”, *al-muṣīla* “the Muslims”, etc., and in particular to the relative adjectives: *al-murarāyiyāh* “the Marwanids”, *al-subāyriyya* “the Zubayrites”, etc. This procedure allows one to designate sects, groups, parties, and it is freely used in the modern language. Used in this manner, -ʿa has formed the collective in the reverse way from that used for the *ism al-ḏジャー* (n. of un. with -ʿa-).

*Note:* *jaʿati* (coll.) can provide a complete system, e.g.: *ṣabb* (coll.) “companions”, *ṣabbī* (n. of un.), *asḥāb* (plural for small number), *ṣikaḥ* (plural for large number), or else *ṭaff* (coll.) “birds”, *ṭabur* (n. of un.), *ṭyūr* (plural for small number), *ṭyūr* (plural for large number). But this system cannot be generalized: it is not *hiyyā* (al-ʿAstārābādī, *Sh. Sh.* ii, 203). One habitually says: *ṣabbī pl. aṣḥāb, ḍilīsī pl. ḍilīṣās, etc.* But generally these internal plurals derive from *jaʿati* (coll.) and not from the noun of the Form *ḏジャー*.

There are at least two aspects to the collective: the collective-unit, the mass considered as a sort of unit, whereby use in the singular is possible: *kaum karim* “a noble tribe”, *al-hamād al-muṣaḥāwāḥ* “the ring-dove”; the collective-object which inclines towards the neuter, and hence the tendency to denote the anonymous mass by a feminine singular, even for rational beings: *rubī raʿīya* “grazing camels”, *kaum bīṣārī* “a nomadic tribe”. The internal plurals of nouns have inherited from their former status as collectives the possibility of being treated in this way: *ijdāl kāḥīra*. But if the component parts resume their distinct individuality in the mass, the collective passes into the indeterminate plural: *kaum karima*, *kaum muḥrīmāna* “noble people”.

These different considerations have been able to exert their influence to a greater or lesser degree, and in the same way with greater or lesser regard for the *u'kala*, among the various tribes throughout the vast territories of Arabia. Arab grammarians intended to portray the *araʾīya* as an entity and have been at pains to show its unity and harmony. It was necessary to simplify the diversity, but by selecting which aspect? Hence the divergencies of opinion. Only precise monographs furnished with statistics and based on texts will give a clear view of the situation.


For all the questions discussed in this article:
(H. Fleisch)

**DJAMACA**, meeting. As in the religious language of Islam it denotes “the whole company of believers”, *djama*at al-mu'minin, and hence its most usual meaning of “Muslim community”, *djama*da islamiyya. In this sense *djama*da is almost synonymous with umma [*q.v.*]. The two terms must, however, be distinguished.

The term umma is Kur'ānic. It means “people”, “nation”, and is used in the plural (umam). It accepts its religious language of Islam it denotes “the whole community”, and is almost synonymous with *umma* [*q.v.*]. In this sense *umma* is hence its most usual meaning of “Muslim community”, and is used in the plural (umam). “nation”, and is used in the plural (umam).

Acquires its religious significance particularly in the example in the (diplomatic) “Documents” reproduced by Ibn Sa'd and ascribed by him to the Prophet. Letter from Muhammad to the Sāhib of Bahrayn: “and that you enter into the Community by the space of a single span, withdraws his neck from the halter of Islam”, and: “Whosoever of the 3rd-4th/9th-10th century, would define the *djama*da as “the ancient religion” (al-dīn al-ṣāhir), by which we understand the practices, beliefs and customs of the Companions during the period of the first three “rightly guided” Caliphs (e.g. Abu l'-Hasuyn b. al-Farrā', Tabāhī al-hanbāli, ii, 32-3, cited by H. Laoust, Ibn Batī'a, 9, n. 2). But if the *djama*da in its strict sense is the community of the Companions, there remains the fact that every Muslim is bound, down through the centuries, to follow it and conform to it. “To follow the Community”, *luzūm al-djama*da, is a duty of the believer upon which the Ḥanbalīs have consistently insisted (e.g. Ibn Batī'a, Ibn al-Ḥanbal, 5/10). By the same token, “the *djama*da of the Ancients” is kept alive down through the ages. At every epoch those Muslims who are wholly faithful to the Tradition are integrated in the *djama*da. The first credo (*Ašida, i) of Ibn Ḥanbal describes them as ahl al-sunnah wa l-*djama*da wa l-*ʿāthār*, thus joining to the first two terms the “precedent” of the Prophet and the Companions (cf. H. Laoust, Ibn Batī'a, 11, n. 1). The expression ahl al-*ḥadīth* (“traditionists”) was to become an approximate equivalent, until the appearance of ahl al-*khabb*, which was to have a tendency to prevail later.

The stream of Hanball doctrine was to remain faithful to this notion of a Community centred upon the faith of the Ancients as the only absolutely authentic faith. Ibn Taymiyya for example was to speak of both umma and *djama*da. He was to stress the obligation of the ahl al-*sunnah* wa l-*djama*da to follow the “precedents” (*iḥār*) of the Prophet “just as much in the depths of their inmost beings (ḥātim) as in their external behaviour (ṣāhir)”, and to follow in the same way the paths of the Companions (*Wāsitiyya, 34, cf. H. Laoust, ibid., 10,n*).

This reverential attachment of Ḥanbalism to the *djama*da finally arrives, in a manner of introverted devotion, at the point where the faithful of the Medina period grouped around Muhammad are recalled, and where this is the “religion” revived by each generation of believers until the last hour of the end of time.

The same was not to hold good for the other schools. For example, to the extent that the *ṣījām* is understood (e.g. the Shāfiʿī school) to be the consensus of the scholars living in a given generation, and becomes the fourth “source” (distinct from the *sunnah*) of Islamic law, *al-djama*da loses its strict
historical reference to the first years of Islam. Already al-Tabari (cited by Rashid Rida, Khildfa, 14) had argued against a *djamāʿa* restricted to the group of the Companions, according to him the *lusūm al-djamāʿa* ought to be defined, without reference to any particular period, as the obedience of the Muslim community to the sovereign that it has chosen for itself; and "whosoever breaks his contract with the sovereign leaves the *djamāʿa*". The verb here employed which signifies "to obey the sovereign" evokes the notion of "the one who commands authority", and must be taken to refer to the Imām, the guidance of whom constitutes the essence of the *djamāʿa*. The first Muslims alone, but to every Imām recognized as legitimate. It will become, according to this point of view, a factual reality rather than a value primarily doctrinal, and will thenceforth tend to be supplanted by *umma*.

This is most noticeable in the *Wilām al-kalām*. By underlining his affirmed respect for Ibn Hanbal, Al-Ashafī, and Aḥmad, two celebrated credo of the Ṭabi‘a and the Maḥbūl simply as the agreement of the *ahl al-sunna*. Once only is the notion of "community" there in operation: the intercession of the Prophet for "the great sinners of the Community", and *umma* is the term employed (Maḥbūl, i, 332). In the *Luma* likewise, whether it is a question of the attitude (condemned as dissidence) of the Muťazilites, or of the consensus of the Community as the foundation of the *idjāmāʿa*, it is always *umma* which alone appears. It was no part of the task of *kalām* to devote a chapter to *al-djamāʿa*. As for the works which deal with "Public law" they look at the *Imāma* or the Khālīfa from the aspect of the conditions of power, and have no concern to analyse the formal constituent elements of the Community. More and more it is the term *umma* which comes to epitomize the communal fervour of the believers.

And yet *djamāʿa*, with its connotation of doctrinal unity, never entirely disappeared from the technical vocabulary. It could be found, *passim*, in many works; such, too, is the case in the contemporary period. It is found also, incidentally, in the *Zuhr al-Islām*, 199, of Aḥmad Amlān citān Mās‘ūdī. The adjective *djamūʿi* was to indicate the movement of the Community. The same applies to the more restricted, more localised meaning of the word, Every assembly of Muslims gathered together in order to "perform the prayer" (ṣalāt [ṣalā]) is a *djamāʿa*. This definition is eminently suitable for the obligatory ritual of the *zuhr* on Friday, *djamāʿa*, which, is, accordingly, the day of meeting par excellence; and the mosque, *djamāʿa*, where the ritual is performed in the place which gathers together the believers. The same holds good for the obligatory prayers performed in congregation on the prescribed festivals. It is in relation to the congregational prayers that the two credo of Al-Ashafī speak of *djamāʿa* in the singular in the Maḥbūl, i, 323, and in the plural in the Ṭabi‘a, 22. This *djamāʿa* of Muslims united in the performance of the prayer, as testimony to their faith, will be of a form and nature which is not so much determined by principle as fixed by the description of its own particular imām "little imām".


The word has been most regularly used in Morocco. In Algeria, records at least a hundred years old confirm the existence under the name "djmaa", of local administrative assemblies. Their competence to own property was confirmed as regards the patrimony of the "douar", but was suppressed

Hanbals, readily admits the definition of Tabari referred to above, and identifies *djamāʿa* with the "men who bind and loosen" in each period. In the same paragraph he uses *umma* in a fairly approximate, but nonetheless not identical, sense. For him the *djamāʿa* is the whole group of those who hold the reins of authority and who must be followed when they are in agreement (*idjāmāʿa*). It is the *umma* which is liable to be split by disturbances; the best line of conduct to observe, therefore, (the *hadith* of Ḥuḍayfah b. al-Yaman) is to remain faithful to the *djamāʿa* and its Imām. Furthermore, the title of Rashīd Rida's chapter, *al-Imām al-idā‘i*, the meaning of the term *djamāʿa* is characteristic.

In the *salāfī* sense, then, it may be said that the people who constitute the *djamāʿa* are those Muslims whose faith and truth are guaranteed and who are thereby in perfect line of continuity with the faith of the Ancients (*salāf*). To them belongs the right to designate the supreme Imām to whom they promise allegiance (bay‘a) in the name of all, and who, by the same token, will be the duly appointed leader of the entire *umma*. The *djamāʿa* only attains its full import when united with its Imām.

The same applies to the more restricted, more localised meaning of the word, Every assembly of Muslims gathered together in order to "perform the prayer" (ṣalāt [ṣalā]) is a *djamāʿa*. This definition is eminently suitable for the obligatory ritual of the *zuhr* on Friday, *djamāʿa*, which, is, accordingly, the day of meeting par excellence; and the mosque, *djamāʿa*, where the ritual is performed in the place which gathers together the believers. The same holds good for the obligatory prayers performed in congregation on the prescribed festivals. It is in relation to the congregational prayers that the two credo of Al-Ashabi speak of *djamāʿa* in the singular in the Maḥbūl, i, 323, and in the plural in the Ṭabi‘a, 22. This *djamāʿa* of Muslims united in the performance of the prayer, as testimony to their faith, will be of a form and nature which is not so much determined by principle as fixed by the description of its own particular imām "little imām".


(i) The word has been most regularly used in Morocco. In Algeria, records at least a hundred years old confirm the existence under the name "djmaa", of local administrative assemblies. Their competence to own property was confirmed as regards the patrimony of the "douar", but was suppressed
politically and juridically (decree of 25 May 1863; ruling of 20 May 1868; decree of 11 September 1873, with particular reference to Kabylia). However, even before the 1914 war, public opinion was demanding a liberalization of the system. This was in part the aim of the 1915 reform which established elected “djemaas” within the “mixed commune”. The administration was later to attempt, not without circumspection, to develop from these first assemblies the communal evolution of which they contained the nucleus.

As for Algeria, it was no doubt in the Berber regions, and especially in Kabylia, that the first observers had noted the most revealing features of these collective undertakings. The ajmā'as (and variants), which included all the adults but paid regard to individual and family influences, and much nearer to a "senate" than to an ekklesia, met regularly, deliberated on all matters of concern to the village and showed a vitality which has endured side by side with official life, even to the point of continuing to exert influence, in certain cases, through the codification of the kāmbūs, an accepted function of public law.

But it is in Morocco, in the High and Middle Atlas, that investigation has demonstrated the system functioning in its purest form. A constant theme of the research conducted up to the present time has been to bring out the triple incidence of these communal customs upon political life which becomes organized, within the canton, in a sort of spontaneous democracy, upon judicial life which is governed by regulations of extraordinary detail, and upon the tenure of property. In 1922, L. Milliot defined the djamā'as as “representative assemblies of the different groupings of tribe, subdivision, douar, family which make up Muslim society in Morocco. These groupings exercise over vast stretches of territory rights characterized by occupation in the form of cultivation leaving widely scattered areas of fallow-land, and grazing . . . .”

This economic aspect, stimulating the competition of the two systems of cultivation, the European and the native, the intensive and the extensive, has throughout the colonial period constituted a constant preoccupation for the legislator, administrator and judge through its actual effects on practical life. Juridical definitions have reflected the successive phases of the proceedings and have taken a particular turn in Algeria (‘arsh or sabga (sābka) land) in Morocco (bīd al-djama’a), and lastly in Tunisia where this regulation seems to have reached its latest development. Tunisia, however, provides the example which reveals most clearly, through the interference that has taken place between private ownership of estates, collective property and religious foundations or hubus, both the richness and the danger of this form of tenure which is so exposed to spoliation from all sides.

The juridical designation of the djamā’a, elevated to the small tribal or cantonal senate, gave rise in Morocco to an evolution that was taking shape at the time of the beginning of the Protectorate and which has proceeded to develop more and more with regard to property, but also in civil and penal matters. The culminating point was reached at the time of the beginning of the Protectorate and which has proceeded to develop more and more with regard to property, but also in civil and penal matters. The culminating point was reached at the time of the beginning of the Protectorate and which has proceeded to develop more and more with regard to property, but also in civil and penal matters. The culminating point was reached at the time of the beginning of the Protectorate and which has proceeded to develop more and more with regard to property, but also in civil and penal matters. The culminating point was reached at the time of the beginning of the Protectorate and which has proceeded to develop more and more with regard to property, but also in civil and penal matters. The culminating point was reached at the time of the beginning of the Protectorate and which has proceeded to develop more and more with regard to property, but also in civil and penal matters.


**DJAMAKIYYA.** A term current in the Muslim World in the later Middle-Ages equivalent to salary. Its origin is the Persian dāmā = “garment”, whence djamākhi, with the meaning of a man who receives a special uniform as a sign of investiture with an official post. From this came the form djamākiyya with the meaning of that part of the regular salary given in dress (malbāš, libās) or cloth (kumādij). Ultimately it took the meaning of “salary”, exactly as the word dījārīya, which meant originally a number of loaves of bread sent daily by the Sultan to someone, took the sense of salary in the terminology of the Azharis during the Ottoman period. Djamākiyya first seems to have acquired the sense of salary under the Salādūs, since the official terminology of the Fātimids did not use this term for this salary, only with regard to property, but also in civil and penal matters. The culminating point was reached at the time of the celebrated “Berber dahir (ṣāḥib)” of 16 May 1930 which the nationalist opposition, with the support of Islamic opinion throughout the world, at once denounced as an attack upon the religious Law. One of the first measures taken by Morocco after gaining independence was therefore the revocation of this dahir, and the establishment of lay judges incidentally contributed a further step towards modernity. In short, whatever may be the hazards of this long history, they have served to emphasize the intimate connexion which, in the rural Maghreb, associates the use of this term with certain forms of effort by local groups and of its connexions with the soil. These forms, hitherto characterized by their anachronistic particularity, seem at the present day to be adapting themselves to the demands of a more intensive agriculture and of administrative decentralization. That is why, particularly in Morocco, the djamā’a is always found as the central point of the reform. It is possible that, by remarkable sociological conjuncture, certain contemporary evolutions are being based upon the rich communal potentialities comprised, in the Maghreb, by the djamā’a, an ancient word and a reality of long standing.

The Basrans split into two parties: some followed the governor nominated by the Sultan, others broke away. Without revealing her intention, A'isha decided to go to Basra, where she remembered a certain place offering the best prospects for the success of the insurgent movement. In the provinces nearest to Mecca, she collected several hundred men with their mounts (600 or 700?) and set off for Mecca, hearing of this, realized that he must react in order not to be isolated in Medina. After bringing together, slowly and with difficulty, a contingent of 700 warriors, she too set out (according to al-Tabari, i, 3139, the last day of Rabii II). His aim was to intercept the troops, he set off again, in the direction of al-Irak. At the same time the rebels were hurrying to find there the money and troops needed for the expedition. A'isha agreed to join the expedition; she was to rouse the people, as Talha and al-Zubayr seemed hardly qualified for that role; not only had they so stirred up opinion against 'Uthman that they could be accused of being murderers of the Caliph, but they had also paid homage to 'Ali immediately after the election; in rebelling against him they were thus violating their pact, so that they had to claim, in order to justify themselves, that they had been forced to pay homage by violence. Haša bint 'Umar [q.v.], whose first intention was to follow the rebels, was dissuaded by her brother 'Abd Allah [q.v.]. After collecting several hundred men with their mounts (600 or 700?) they set off. 'Ali, hearing of this, realized that he must react in order not to be isolated in Medina. After bringing together, slowly and with difficulty, a contingent of 700 warriors, he too set out (according to al-Tabari, i, 3139, the last day of Rabii II). His aim was to intercept the insurgents, but he did not succeed in reaching them; at al-Rabadha, he learned that they had already passed that halt, and, with her mind at rest, she carried on (cf. Yakut, ii, 352, etc.); this episode is worth mentioning only because of the importance attached to it in the sources. When they reached the outskirts of Basra, the leader opened negotiations and began to make propaganda. A'isha, through an emissary and letters to certain notables in the town, tried to persuade the Basrans to join the insurrection, the aim of which, she proclaimed, was išāla; a word that implied the restoration of the Islamic law and its hadid and hence revenge for 'Uthman, the re-establishment of the disrupted social order, the placing of power in the hands of a Caliph legally elected by a committee orğud, but, for 'Ali, the restoration of his authority, a return to the observance of the Sunna of the Prophet, and the suppression of privileges. The Basrans split into two parties: some followed the governor nominated by
Ali, Uthman b. Hunayf, who, without deliberately opposing the rebels, temporized while awaiting the arrival of Ali; others made common cause with Aisha and her two associates, whose forces had grown on the way. In a meeting at al-Mirbad, an esplanade three miles from Basra, the rebel leaders addressed the people and their propaganda was successful. Disorders followed, then a mêlée at the "place of the tanners" and on the following days fights near the Dår al-Ruzāk, or supply store (the sources do not agree on details). It is there that the chief of police, Huqaym b. Aqabah, was killed. He was too pro-Ali to stand aside and wait without acting. At last, an armistice was concluded: to settle who would hold power in the town of Basra, they were to await the return of a messenger sent to Medina to find out whether it was true that Taḥa and al-Zubayr had been forced to pay homage to Ali (evidently the governor was trying to gain time). In the meantime, the situation was not to be altered: the governmental palace, the great mosque, and the bayt al-māl were to stay in the hands of the governor Ibn Hunayf; but because of the significance attached to the leadership in prayer, it was agreed that this office would be performed by two imāms, the governor himself, and another nominated by the insurgents. Taḥa and al-Zubayr quarrelled, as each wanted to have this function, but Aisha decided that they would exercise it on alternate days, or, according to another version of the facts, that their respective sons Muḥammad and Abū AbdAllāh would exercise it in turn. The inquiry of the messenger sent to Medina was favourable to Taḥa and al-Zubayr, but a letter which had reached the governor declared exactly the opposite of what they asserted. Consequently Uthman b. Hunayf would not give up his office and a brawl broke out in the mosque. But the most serious fact was the assault made by the rebels on the bayt al-māl; they killed or made prisoner (and later decapitated) its guards who were Zūtū [q.v.] and Sayābīdža [q.v.]. The attackers moreover forced Uthman b. Hunayf to leave the palace and pulled out his hair and his beard: he succeeded in getting himself released and joining Ali by threatening them with reprisals against their families in Medina and withdrawing his authority. In these brawls and fights, who were the aggrieved? Some traditions praise the moderation of the rebels (Aisha is said to have forbidden her men to use their hands except in self-defence) but it is evident that it was they who were the attackers, as they needed provisions and money, and were afraid of being caught later between the advancing forces of Ali and those of the governor. With Basra occupied, the rebels placed an order calling on the population to surrender all who had taken part in the siege of the House (the house of the Caliph Uthman), called nufūr in the sources, so that they might be killed like dogs. The people obeyed and those killed, it was said, numbered six hundred (only Ḥurūk b. Zubayr [q.v.] was able to escape because he was protected by his tribe). This slaughter and the distribution of gifts and supplies which Taḥa and al-Zubayr made to their partisans angered part of the population of Basra, and 3,000 men went to join Ali at Dīl Kār, among them the Banū Abī al-Kays. The tribe of the Tamīm, the most important in Basra, on the other hand, remained neutral with its chief al-Āhnaf b. Kays [q.v.]. While these events were taking place (the parleys with the governor had lasted, it is said, for twenty-six days), Ali had advanced as far as Dīl Kār, for, instead of marching on Basra, he had preferred to approach Kūfah so as to win over its inhabitants to his cause. Unfortunately for him, the governor Abū Mūsā al-Asghar, although he had recognized Ali's election as valid, exhorted the Kūfahans to stay neutral in the approaching civil war and the envoy sent by Ali to Kūfah (al-Asghar, Ibn 'Abbās, al-Ḥasan, Āmmār b. Yāsir) had to make a great effort to persuade part of the population (6, 7 or 12 thousand men?) to leave the town and join him. Abū Mūsā was deprived of his office. At last Ali arrived on a mule, with the outskirts of Basra and negotiations were opened between him and the insurgents. Although everyone was convinced that agreement was near, fighting began between the two armies. The same question arises here—who started it? According to some traditions, Ali had ordered his men not to attack, and it was only after the murder of some of his partisans that he felt himself entitled to fight against opponents belonging to the ahl al-bītā (Aḥmad, xvi, 152; al-Masʿūdī, Murādī, iv, 314 ff. etc.). But al-Ṭabarī (i, 838-3) reports another tradition which explains why and how the battle began: Ali is said to have shown his intention of not according protection to the persons implicated in the murder of the Caliph Uthman, and these, anxious about their fate, are said to have provoked the conflict by a sudden attack unknown to Ali. The battle lasted from morning to sunset (according to the (pseudo-) Ibn Kūṭayba, Cairo 1377, 77, seven days). The sources differ on the date when it took place: the most frequent date is 10 Djuʾmādāʾ II 36/4 December 656, but according to Caetani (A.H. 36, § 200) the date 15 Djuʾmādāʾ II/9 December is to be preferred. It is a striking fact that the warriors often belonged to the same tribes, to the same clans, and sometimes even to the same families, and they fought one another regardless of kinship. Aisha is said to have forbidden her men to use their hands except in self-defence) but it is evident that it was they who were the attackers, as they needed provisions and money, and were afraid of being caught later between the advancing forces of Ali and those of the governor. With Basra occupied, the rebels placed an order calling on the population to surrender all who had taken part in the siege of the House (the house of the Caliph Uthman), called nufūr in the sources, so that they might be killed like dogs. The people obeyed and those killed, it was said, numbered six hundred (only Ḥurūk b. Zubayr [q.v.] was able to escape because he was protected by his tribe). This slaughter and the distribution of gifts and supplies which Taḥa and al-Zubayr made to their partisans angered part of the population of Basra, and 3,000 men went to join Ali at Dīl Kār, among them the Banū Abī al-Kays. The tribe of the Tamīm, the most important in Basra, on the other hand, remained neutral with its chief al-Āhnaf b. Kays [q.v.].
development of the battle from the tactical point of view; the general picture that emerges from the battlefield consists of a series of duels and encounters along the opposing ranks, and not of a general engagement. The most serious fighting was undoubtedly that which took place around the camel. It is impossible to calculate the numbers of combatants or of casualties because of the great variation in the figures (which vary, for the dead, between 6,000 and 30,000; the latter figure is considerably exaggerated, since for the forces of 'Ali alone, the numbers who left Medina and those who joined him later can hardly have exceeded 15,000 men). 'Ali was taken prisoner, but far from being ill-treated was shown great respect. 'Ali decided, however, that she must return to Medina and on that point he was inflexible. He granted aman to all the insurgents, and certain compromised individuals (Marwān b. al-Ṭākam, for example) were able to join Mu‘awiya in Medina. An act which caused a stir among the Yemenis, and especially among the Muslims, was his refusal to allow them to take captive the women and children of the conquered or to seize their goods, with the exception of things found on the battlefield (al-Tabarī, i, 3277; al-Mas‘ūdī, Murādī, iv, 316 ff., etc.); they asked why enemies whose blood it had been judged lawful to shed should be treated in this way; the Khāridjites made this afterwards one of their points of indictment against ‘Ali.

After the battle ‘Ali received the homage of the inhabitants of Baṣra, of which he nominated Ibn ‘Abbās governor (with Ziyyād b. Abīhi at his side) thus causing the indignation of al-ʿAḍḥar, as two other sons of al-ʿAbbās had the same office, one in the Yemen, and the other in Mecca.

In the whole insurrection of al-Djamal, the pre-eminent personality is ‘Aḥṣa; she appears as energetic, resolved (except for a moment at al-Hawab) to gain her end and respected in her decisions; while Ṭaḥā and al-Zubayr, under her orders, quarrelling with each other, making weak excuses to defend themselves against the accusation of having broken faith with ‘Ali, withdrawing during the battle consisted of a series of duels and encounters, look like men impelled only by ambition and at the same time lacking the energy and firmness necessary to succeed. Caetani assumed that there was an organizer (such as al-Zubayr), 213 ff. (part played by al-Zubayr), 213 ff. (part played by Ṭaḥā). Besides the well-known histories of the enterprise behind the widow of the Prophet, namely Marwān, who followed the insurgents; the theory is attractive, but there is nothing to confirm it; if Marwān was in fact the insurgents’ counsellor, he operated so discreetly that the sources hardly speak of his actions.

**Bibliography:** Tabarī, i, 309-23 (in detail, excluding episodes): ‘Ali prepares to fight his opponents: 309-1; ‘Aḥṣa excites the people in Mecca and calls for vengeance for the murder of ʿUṯmān, agreement and march of the rebels, who occupy Baṣra: 3096-106, 3111-38; march of ‘Ali halting in Dhu‘ Kār: 3206-11, 3141-3, 3154 ff.; situation in Kūfah and ‘Ali’s efforts to win the inhabitants to his cause, removal of Abū Mūsā: 3147 ff., 3155-54, 3092 ff., 3129 ff.; ‘Ali’s march towards Baṣra: 3138-40; negotiations between ‘Ali and the rebels: 3155-8, 3175 ff.; events preceding the battle, neutrality of al-Abnaf: 3143-5, 3162-9; battle: 3174-98; ‘Ali and ‘Aḥṣa after the battle: 3224-6, 3231; homage of the Baṣrans and nomination of Ibn ‘Abbās as governor of the town: 3229 ff.; Tabarī trans. Zotenberg iii, 658-64 (with some additions); Baladhūrī, Anṣāb, ms. Paris, ff. 467 recto-493 verso (contains traditions neglected by Tabarī: cf. G. Levi Della Vida, Il Califfato di ‘Allī secondo il Kitāb Anṣāb al-ʿArṣāl ila al-Baladārī, in RSO, vi (1913), 440-9); Ya‘qūbī, ii, 209-13; Abū Ḥanīfa al-Dinawarī, al-Aḥābbār il-tawālī, 150-63 (pseudo) Ibn Kutayba, K. al-Imāma wa ʾl-siyāsā, ed. Muḥ. Maḥmūd al-Rāfī, Cairo 1322/1904, i, 88-133; idem, ed., Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Halabī, second ed. 1377/1957, i, 52-79 (speeches, letters and details missing elsewhere); Fr. Buhl, Ṭaddāri, 304-23, 324-37; idem, Ṭaddāri, 295; Ibn Miskawayh, Tādjarī al-unam, facsimile of the Istanbul ms., i, 518-26; Ibn al-ʿAṭir, K. min, iii, 164-218 (rēsumé of Ṭabari); Ibn Abī ʾl-Hadlīdī; ʿṢarḥ al-ʿUshār al-baladārī, Cairo 1329, ii, 77-82, 497-501 (passage interesting for details of the occupation of Baṣra); Ibn Ṭahārī, Ṭaddārī, vi, 229-44 (with details missing elsewhere); Ibn Khālidūn, iii, App., 155-61 (good resume of ‘Ali’s military career); and especially the Kharidjites, Ibn Taghribirdī, Dhabābī, and Abu ʾl-Fīdā’ are not important. Much information about al-Djamal and especially about its episodes and the verses declaimed on that occasion are to be found scattered among the books of adab (such as Mubahraad; Aḥānī; ʿṬābī; Šāhī, Ṭahā, Ṭabāsīn; Ibn Kutayba, ‘Uṣayn; Ḥāfī, Bayān, etc., and in bibliographical collections, e.g. in Ibn Saʿd; Ibn al-ʿAṭir, Usd; Ibn Ṭahārī, Ṭaddārī; Ibn Khallikān etc. The following are passages with a certain historic interest; Ibn Saʿd, iii, i, 20; v, 16; Aḥānī, xvi, 131; Ṭādī, ed. Bulāk, 1293, ii, 275-84; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Istābāb, Bayḍārāba, 1318-29, 209 (part played by al-Zubayr), 213 ff. (part played by Ṭaḥā). Besides the well-known histories of Weil, A. Müller, and Muir, see also: Fr. Buhl, ‘Ali som prætendent og Kalif, Copenhagen 1921, 40-55; N. Abbott, Asbāb al-Ṭamāl, Chicago 1942 and especially Caetani, Annali, 36. A.H., §§ 21-302.

(Lecca Vaglieri)

**Djamal** [see ‘Im al-Djamal].

**Djamal al-Dīn al-Afghānī**, al-Savydd Muhammad b. ʾṢafdar, was one of the most outstanding figures of nineteenth century Islam. Cultured and versed in mediaeval Muslim philosophy, he devoted his life to the task of awakening the Muslims from their lethargy and regression, and to awakening the forces of the Muslim revival. He was, in the words of E. G. Browne, at the same time a philosopher, writer, orator and journalist. Towards colonial powers he was the first to take the political attitude since 1900 and 1950 by Muslim apologists. By the spoken and written word he preached the necessity of a Muslim revival, both in thought (the need to throw off blind fatalism and give intelligence and freedom their place) and in action (the need for a Turkish and European type of Education and the need to organize political and economic forces to resist the aggressions). The first phase of his career was that of a political agitator (such as in his Al-Mujāhīd, 1901 and his Al-Mujāhīd, 1902), who opposed the view of Western civilization, considered by him as a Pan-Islamic ideology and a means of achieving a political solution of the問題s of the Muslim world. He was the first to insist on the necessity of a Muslim revival. He was, in the words of E. G. Browne, at the same time a philosopher, writer, orator and journalist. Towards colonial powers he was the first to take the political attitude since 1900 and 1950 by Muslim apologists. By the spoken and written word he preached the necessity of a Muslim revival, both in thought (the need to throw off blind fatalism and give intelligence and freedom their place) and in action (the need for a Turkish and European type of Education and the need to organize political and economic forces to resist the aggressions).
proper place in life) and in action. Courageous and uncompromising, he aroused and strengthened the enthusiasm of his audiences wherever he went in his long years of exile. In Egypt he influenced the youth of Cairo and Alexandria, so that his personality left its mark both on future moderate leaders and partisans of immediate violence. He supported movements working for constitutional liberties and fought for liberation from foreign control (Egypt, Persia). He showed Muhammad Abduh, Muslim, that political reform or did not show enough resistance to European encroachments. He even envisaged the possibility of political assassination. His ultimate object was to unite Muslim states (including Shi'ite Persia) into a single Caliphate, able to repulse European interference and recreate the glory of Islam. The pan-Islamic idea was the great passion of his life. He remained unmarried, made do with the absolute minimum in the way of food and clothing and took no stimulants other than tea and tobacco.

His family descended from Husayn b. 'Ali through the famous traditionalist 'Ali al-Tirmidhi, whence his right to use the title Sayyid. According to his own account he was born at Asadabad near Konar, to the east and in the district of Kâbul (Afghanistan) in 1254/1838-9 to a family of the Hanafi school. However, Shî'ite writings give his place of birth as Asadabad near Hamadan in Persia; this version claims that he pretended to be of Afghan nationality, in order to escape the despotic power of Persia. He did in fact spend his years of childhood and adolescence in Afghanistan. At Kâbul he followed the usual Muslim pattern of university studies and in addition began to pay attention to philosophy and the exact sciences, through the still receiving medical used at that time. Then he spent more than a year in India, where he received a more modern education, and made the pilgrimage to Mecca (1273/1857); on his return, he went back to Afghanistan and entered the service of the amir Dast Muhammad Khan [q.v.], whom he accompanied on his campaigns against Herât. The amir's death led on his campaign against Herât. The amir's death led to civil war between his sons over the succession [see AFGHANISTAN]. Djamal al-Dîn taking sides with the amir's activities in Egypt had helped to stir up unrest. The revolt failed because of the British intervention of 1882 ending in the occupation of the country by the Khedive Tawfik, then at Calcutta, where the British requested him to remain as long as the Urabi Pasha affair lasted. It was while staying in Haydarabad that he composed in Persian his refutation of materialists [see A. Ford]. He begins with an attack on Darwin's ideas and goes on to assert that only religion can ensure the stability of society and the strength of nations, whilst atheistic materialism is the cause of decay and debasement. He stresses this assertion by detailing all that belief in God and religion gives a society, first in terms of the collectivity: pride in the knowledge of one's superiority to animals and of belonging to the finest community, i.e., Islam, and also in terms of the individual: fear of stricture, loyalty and truthfulness. He attributes the loss of political supremacy of certain states to materialism (Epicureanism in Greece, the doctrines of Voltaire and Rousseau in France etc.). He ends with an apologia for Islam, rendered antonomastically as religion.

During this time the situation in Egypt was becoming explosive. In 1881 'Urabi Pasha rose up against the Khedive, the Circassian officers in the army, and foreigners. It is certain that Djamal al-Dîn's activities in Egypt had helped to stir up unrest. The revolt failed because of the British intervention of 1882 ending in the occupation of the country by the Khedive Tawfik, then at Calcutta, where the British requested him to remain as long as the Urabi Pasha affair lasted. It was while staying in Haydarabad that he composed in Persian his refutation of materialists [see A. Ford]. He begins with an attack on Darwin's ideas and goes on to assert that only religion can ensure the stability of society and the strength of nations, whilst atheistic materialism is the cause of decay and debasement. He stresses this assertion by detailing all that belief in God and religion gives a society, first in terms of the collectivity: pride in the knowledge of one's superiority to animals and of belonging to the finest community, i.e., Islam, and also in terms of the individual: fear of stricture, loyalty and truthfulness. He attributes the loss of political supremacy of certain states to materialism (Epicureanism in Greece, the doctrines of Voltaire and Rousseau in France etc.). He ends with an apologia for Islam, rendered antonomastically as religion.
only refer to 23 September 1882 although a number of studies in Arabic prefer 1883. But let us look at his subsequent activities. On 18 May 1883 in the Journal des Débats of Paris he published a reply to the lecture which Ernest Renan had given at the Sorbonne on 29 March 1883 on *L'Islam et la science* and which had caused a great deal of feeling in Muslim circles in Paris. In his reply he asserted that Islam is compatible with science, that in the past there had been Muslim scientists, some of them Arabs; only the present state of Islam could support the opposite view. On 3 September 1883 Blunt met and discussed Pan-Islam with the Shah of Persia, a campaign against British policy in Muslim countries. Leading newspapers published articles by him which made an impact on influential circles (on the Eastern policy of Russia and Great Britain, the situation Turkey and Egypt, the importance and justification of the movement brought about in the Sudan by the Mahdi). But the outstanding feature of his stay in Paris was the meeting with Muhammad 'Abdul 'Aziz, who had joined him and acted as his editor, of an Arabic weekly *Urwa al-Wuthqah* (The Indissoluble Link). This journal was the organ of a secret Muslim society of the same name which financed it. The first number appeared on 15 Diwānād I 1301/13 March 1884 and the eighteenth and last on 26 Diwān '1-Hijjah 1301/16 October 1884. Sent free of charge to members of the association and anyone else requesting it, its entry into Egypt and India was barred by the British (confiscations and heavy fines for being in possession of it). In spite of various stratagems (such as sending it in closed envelopes, as Djamal al-Din later revealed) it did not reach enough readers and had to lapse. Its influence was nevertheless considerable. It attacked British action in Muslim countries. It emphasized the doctrinal grounds on which Islam should lean, in order to recover its strength. In 1885 Muhammad 'Abdul left his mentor and went to Beirut; from then on the two men followed politically divergent paths. Muhammad 'Abdul temporized, concentrating mainly on reforms that were immediately possible, above all in teaching. Djamal al-Din continued as a lone pilgrim along the road to pan-Islamism.

In 1885, on the suggestion of W. S. Blunt, British statesmen approached Djamal al-Din, in spite of their attacks on him and his activities, over steps to be taken with regard to the movement of the Mahdi in the Sudan. The discussions led to no practical result. Shortly afterwards (1886) Djamal al-Din was invited by telegram to the court of Shah Nasir al-Din in Tehran. He was given a lavish reception and was earmarked for high office. But very soon his increasing popularity and influence became offensive to the Shah and he was forced to leave Persia “for health reasons”. Next he went to Russia where he established important political contacts and on behalf of Russian Muslims obtained the Tsar’s permission to have the Kurʿān and religious books published. He stayed there till 1889. On his way to the Paris World Fair he met the Shah in Munich, and was persuaded by him to return to Persia. During his second stay there Djamal al-Din had cause to realize how changeable the sovereign was. Djamal al-Din had drawn up a plan of legal reforms; by criticizing it the jealous Hamid had twice summoned him through his ambassador in London (1892). After first declining, Djamal al-Din consented to go. Was the sultan sincere in inviting the illustrious champion of a pan-Islamism, in which Turkey would have played a major part, and did he really intend to work with him towards its realization? Or, as Ahmad 'Amin suggests, did he want Djamal al-Din near him to be able to neutralize his influence more effectively? It is difficult to say. The newcomer was given a fine house on the hill of Nishantash, not far from the imperial palace of Yildiz. He received 75 Ottoman pounds a month and was allowed to keep contact with people wishing intercourse with him. The sultan behaved kindly towards his guest, listened to him to begin with at least and persuaded him to drop his resentful attitude to the Shah. He even offered him the post of shaykh al-Islam, but he declined it. That was the turning-point. Intrigues and rivalries, especially on the part of Abu 'l-Huda, the leading religious dignitary, made Djamal al-Din’s position impossible. Relations between the sultan and his guest became extremely frigid. Djamal al-Din made several requests for permission to leave, which always met finally with a negative reply. We have some idea of his position at that time from the visitors he received. He was paid and deserted by the sight of so much cowardice around him. He
criticized Muslims for their boastfulness and inactivity. His ideas were twisted so that he was accused, for example, of wanting to recognize the young Khedive Abd al-Husayn as Caliph because the latter had gone out of his way to meet him during a walk one day. But he continued to profess the same ideas on the need for constitutional liberties and on Islam, the one solid foundation of reformed Muslim states of the future. When on 11 March 1896 the Shah fell victim to an assassin who was a loyal follower of Djamal al-Din, he was accused of guiding the assassin. Abd al-Kadir al-Maghribi, his personal enemy against the charge, notably in his statements shortly afterwards to the correspondent of the Paris newspaper Le Temps. But his position was even more precarious.

He died on 9 March 1897 from cancer of the chin; rumour had it that Abu 'l-Huda ordered the doctor only to pretend to treat him, or even poisoned him. He was buried in the cemetery of Ninhantash. At the end of December 1944, his remains were taken to Afghanistan and laid to rest on 2 January 1945 in the suburbs of Kabul near 'Ali-Abad, where a mausoleum had been raised to him.

Despite his knowledge of Muslim theology and philosophy, Djamal al-Din wrote little on these subjects. His treatise on the refutation of materialists was soon translated [see DABRIYYA]. He has left an extensive succinct outline of the history of Afghanistán called Talimmat al-bayd' (lith., Cairo, undated, 45 p.) and the article 'Abd in the Da'irat al-Maš'ir of Butrus al-Bustani; commentaries on various libraries; with the exception of a moral lesson; finally he went into the hall of the madrasa, his lesson being given as they walked along; according to Tahir Bursali, 1388 according to Adnan al-Din; however, this tradition derives from an unreliable source and must be treated with reserve. Djamal al-Din is said to have held office as Diawharl's Arabic lexicographical work, an indispensable requirement of anyone seeking to obtain this appointment. Like the ancient Greek philosophers he split up his very numerous pupils into three classes: those in the first class, known as meshiiyyun (peripatetic), met outside the door of his house and accompanied their master to the madrasa, his lesson being given as they walked along; those in the second class, known as niekibiyun (stoics), awaited him under the pillars of the madrasa where his master, still standing, gave his second lesson; finally he went into the hall of the madrasa to join the pupils of the third class, known as kathiiyin (stoics), met outside the door of the house of his master to accompany their master to the madrasa, his lesson being given as they walked along; and trade in Miṣr (Alexandria 1296, 5 Djamâdâ I); two articles on despotic governments (fi 'l-hukmât al-istisbâdîyâya) in al-Manâr, iii. Considerable information is to be found in articles from periodicals on visits to Djamal al-Din and interviews with him. Cf. in German Berliner Tageblatt (23 June 1896, evening edition) and Beilage zur Allgemeine Zeitung (Munich, 24 June 1896). Muhammad al-Makhzumi, Khâfirat Djamal al-Din, Beirut 1931 (a fundamental work, reporting many conversations between the author and Djamal al-Din, in the course of which most of the topics of modern Muslim apologetic are raised in turn); 'Abd al-Kadir al-Maghribi, Djamal al-Din, Cairo, collection Ikba', n. 68; Charles C. Adams, Islam and Modernism in Egypt, London 1953, 4, 17; Ahmad Amin, 'Az'mâm al-Islâm fi 'l-ṣaâr al-badîd, Cairo 1948, 59-120; Mahmoud Kasim, Djamal al-Din al-Afghani, bayânahu wa-falsafatihu, Cairo (undated, about 1953), with a bithero unpublished letter; Mahmûd Abûrîyâ, Djamal al-Din al-Afghani, Cairo 1958, a popularization but with an interesting bibliography; Kabûl alamanakh, year 1323, 344-7 (in Pashtû). I. GOLDZIHER-J. JOMIER

Djamal al-Din Aksarayi, a Turkish philosopher and theologian, who was born and died (791/1389-?) at Aksaray. According to tradition Djamal al-Din Mehmed, who during his lifetime was known by the name of Djamâli, is said to have been the great-grandson of Fâghr al-Dîn Râzi. He was appointed instructor at the madrasa of Zindjîli, at Aksaray, after learning by heart the Sâhib, al-Djawhari's Arabic lexicographical work, an indispensable requirement of anyone seeking to obtain this appointment. Like the ancient Greek philosophers he split up his very numerous pupils into three classes: those in the first class, known as meshiiyyun (peripatetic), met outside the door of his house and accompanied their master to the madrasa, his lesson being given as they walked along; those in the second class, known as niekibiyun (stoics), awaited him under the pillars of the madrasa where his master, still standing, gave his second lesson; finally he went into the hall of the madrasa to join the pupils of the third class, known as kathiiyin (stoics), met outside the door of the house of his master to accompany their master to the madrasa, his lesson being given as they walked along; and trade in Miṣr (Alexandria 1296, 5 Djamâdâ I); two articles on despotic governments (fi 'l-hukmât al-istisbâdîyâya) in al-Manâr, iii. Considerable information is to be found in articles from periodicals on visits to Djamal al-Din and interviews with him. Cf. in German Berliner Tageblatt (23 June 1896, evening edition) and Beilage zur Allgemeine Zeitung (Munich, 24 June 1896). Muhammad al-Makhzumi, Khâfirat Djamal al-Din, Beirut 1931 (a fundamental work, reporting many conversations between the author and Djamal al-Din, in the course of which most of the topics of modern Muslim apologetic are raised in turn); 'Abd al-Kadir al-Maghribi, Djamal al-Din, Cairo, collection Ikba', n. 68; Charles C. Adams, Islam and Modernism in Egypt, London 1953, 4, 17; Ahmad Amin, 'Az'mâm al-Islâm fi 'l-ṣaâr al-badîd, Cairo 1948, 59-120; Mahmoud Kasim, Djamal al-Din al-Afghani, bayânahu wa-falsafatihu, Cairo (undated, about 1953), with a bithero unpublished letter; Mahmûd Abûrîyâ, Djamal al-Din al-Afghani, Cairo 1958, a popularization but with an interesting bibliography; Kabûl alamanakh, year 1323, 344-7 (in Pashtû). I. GOLDZIHER-J. JOMIER
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Bibliography: Brockelmann, SI, II, 328; T. Bursali, 'Othmdnî Muellifleri, i, 265; A. Adnan Asik, 'Evraklar, s. Y., 1939, 17; Türk Anstikopedisi, s.v. Cemaldebinı Aksarayi.

DJAMAL AL-DIN (T. Cemaldebinı EFENDI, 1848-1919, Ottoman Shaykh al-Islam, was born in Istanbul (9 Djumada I 1265/13 April 1848), the son of the kâddî ashker Mehemmed Kâmil Efendi. Educated by his father and by private tutors, he attained the rank of mudarris and entered the secretariat of the Shaykh al-Islam's department. In 1295/1880 he was appointed Secretary (mekûbbâd), with the rank of mûsîle-i Suleymâniyye, then became kâddî ashker of Rûmen, and in Muhamram 1290/14 August 1874 Shaykh al-Islam. He held office until 1327/1909, retaining his post in the cabinets formed immediately after the revival of the Constituent Assembly in 1908. He became Shaykh al-Islam again in 1912, in the cabinets of Ghaçî Ahmed Müktîr Paşa and Kâmil Paşa, but lost office with the fall of Kâmil Paşa's cabinet in the coup of 1332/1913. Like many prominent personalities who were known to be opposed to the Society for Union and Progress he was banished from Istanbul, and spent his last years in Egypt, where he died in Rabî'â II/1913. He is buried in Istanbul. A shrewd and affable man, he won the confidence of Abd al-Hamîd II and managed to conform to the exigencies of his time. He was a writer of some power and an amateur of divân literature.
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For details of MSS., and additional biographical information, see Storey, ii/1, 189-92, and i/2, 1254-5. (R. M. Savory)

DJAMAL PASHA [see DJAMAL PASHA]

DJAMALI, MAWLANA 'ALÎ AL-DIN 'ALÎ B. AHMAD B. MUHAMMAD AL-DJAMALI, Ottoman Shaykh al-Islam from 908/1502 to 932/1526, also called simply 'Alî Celebi or Zenbîlî 'Alî Efendi, was of a family of shaykhs and scholars of Kâramân who had settled in Amasya. Djâmîl was born in this city (H. Husâm al-Dîn, Amasya ta'rikhî, i, Istanbul 1327, 105, 321). After his studies under such famous scholars as Mollâ Khusraw in Istanbul and Hûsmâyîde Muštîlî al-Dîn in Bursa Djâmîl was appointed a mufti in Amasya, and then a mufti in Istanbul. His cousin, Shaykh Muhammad Djâmîl in Amasya, was using his influence in favour of Bâyazid against Djem, rivals for the succession to Mehmed II (cf. Madjdi, Hadâ'îk al-gâhâkîb, Istanbul 1269, 285).

All Djâmîl had to resign when Kâramân Mehmed, who eventually was Djem, became grand vizier in 881/1476. But with Bâyazid II's accession to the throne in 886/1481 Djâmîl was again made a mudarris and then in 888/1483 a mufti in Amasya where he was appointed in addition a mudarris at the Theşmînîye Madrasa in Istanbul in 900/1495, thus reaching the highest degree in the career of tails. His biography (Madjîl, 302-8) suggests that he retained a spiritual influence on Bâyazid II as did his cousin Shaykh Muhammad.

All Djâmîl left Istanbul for the hadîj but had to stay one year in Egypt where he learned of his appointment to the post of Shaykh al-Islam [q.v.] in Djâmîl II 909/November-December 1503. Under Bâyazid II, Selim I, and Suleyman I he kept this post for twenty four years until his death in 932/1526. By his personal influence and bold interferences in certain important governmental affairs (cf. Madjdi, 305-7) he was responsible for making the office of Shaykh al-Islam one of the most influential in the state. When Selim I argued that his interference meant an infringement of the Sultan's executive power in the affairs of the sultanate which should be absolutely independent, Djâmîl replied that as Shaykh al-Islam he was responsible for the Sultan's salvation in the other world. The Sultan eventually agreed to modify some of his decisions to meet Djâmîl's objections. As a sign of his admiration Selim wanted to confer on him the office of kâddî ashker [q.v.] of both Rumeli and Anadolu. He declined the offer, saying that he would never accept a position in hadîj [q.v.]. However, he was to overshadow the kâddî ashkers who were most influential in the government as the heads of the administration of tails and hadîj.

In the tradition of the shaiesh attached to the Ottoman Sultans, Djâmîl was interest in tasawwuf [q.v.] and was attached to a maîrî called Şîfî 'All Djâmîl. He is said to be the author of a treatise on tasawwuf entitled Rûsid*î fi bâbî al-dawwârîn. He was venerated as a man after his death and various manbîses were told about him. He was buried in the garden of the small mosque he had built in Zeyrek street in Istanbul. A selection of his fatûdu are collected in Mâkhâjarî al-fatâwî. He is also the author of a Mûhâjarî al-kadîyâ.


DJAMALI, HÂMÎD B. FA'DIL AL-ÂLÎ OF DIHIL (d. 942/1536), poet and Şîfî hagiographer. He travelled extensively throughout the Dâr al-Islam from Central Asia to the Maghrib, and from Anatolia to Yemen. His hagiographical work, al-Şîfîs, including Djâmîl [q.v.], with whom he had interesting discussions in Harât. His travels constitute a link.
between the Indian Sufi disciplines and those of the rest of the Muslim world; while it is possible that the style of the Persian poetry of the court of Harat travelled to India in his wake, creating the sahk-i Hindī of the 10th/16th century. Though a Sufi, with a reputation for asceticism, DJAMĀLī, like other Suhrawardī mystics before him, associated intimately with the Sultans of Dīhil. His relations with Sikandar Lodi were especially cordial, on whose death he wrote a mathnāwī. After the overthrow of the Lords by the Mughals [q.v.], he developed friendly relations with Bābur [q.v.] and Humāyūn [q.v.], often accompanying them on his military expeditions. His son Shaykh 'Abd al-Rahmān Gaddāt became sadr early in the reign of Akbar [q.v.].

He compiled a lengthy diwān and a mystical mathnāwī, Mirādī al-maʿāni; but his fame chiefly rests on Siyar al-ṣāfiyīn, a tadhkira of the Indian saints of the Cishtiyya and Suhrawardiyya orders, which is one of four months near Baghdad, and about two months in Damascus and Tabriz), he lived quietly in Harat, dividing his time between his studies, poetry and music and singing, and by them earned his living while still a youth; taking his inspiration from popular dombra, he developed friendly relations with him, and died at Harat on 18 Muharram 898/9

Of these there were seven, according to him, who had for some time been preparing to celebrate his centenary in 1941 were preparing to celebrate his centenary while he was still alive.

His original works, transmitted orally or in writing, were collected and published in Alma Ata in 1946, at the same time and in the same town as the collected edition of his poems translated into Russian.

The Soviet authorities who had previously awarded him the Order of Lenin and a Stalin Prize in 1941 were preparing to celebrate his centenary when he died in 1946.

His original works, transmitted orally or in writing, were collected and published in Alma Ata in 1946, at the same time and in the same town as the collected edition of his poems translated into Russian.


ED.

DJAMĀR. The word djamār is a contraction of Pers. dīmār, "clothes-keeper", cf. Dozy, Suppl.

This word is not, as stated by Sobernheim in EI, a "title of one of the higher ranks in the army in Hindustān . . .", although djamār, popularly djamār, Anglo-Indian Janamdar, "leader of a number (djamā) of men", is applied in the Indian Army to the lowest commissioned rank of platoon commander, but may be applied also to junior officials in the police, customs, etc., or to the foreman of a group of guides, sweepers, etc.

In Mamlūk Egypt the djamārdiyya (sing. djamār), "keepers of the sultan's wardrobe", were all Royal Mamlūks (mamlūk sulṭānīyya). Many, but not all, of them belonged to the sultan's corps of bodyguards and select retinue (khāṣṣakīyya). A head or commander of the djamārdiyya was called ra's nawab al-djamārdiyya. Of these there were seven, according to Khallī b. Shāhīn al-Zahrī, Zubdat kaḏīf al-mamlākī, 115-6.


DJAMĪ, MAWLANA NUR AL-DIN 'ABD AL-RAHMAN, the great Persian poet. He was born in Kardžīrd, in the district of Dījam which is a dependency of Harat, on 23 Shābān 817/17 November 1414 and died at Harat on 18 Muharram 898/9 November 1492. His family came from Dašqīt, a small town in the neighbourhood of Iṣfahān; his father, Nizām al-Dīn Abīmdār, was called qaṣīm, and died at Harat; consequently the poet had for some time signed his works with the title of Dāvūdī Dāshīr before adopting the name Dījam. In the regular course of his studies, he became aware of his deep passion for mysticism, and took as his spiritual director Šād al-Dīn Muhammad al-Kāshghāri, the disciple of and successor to the great saint Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naḥghbūnd, founder of the order of the Naḥghbūndīs [q.v.]. Two biographers, 'Abd al-Qāhir Lārī (his disciple, buried in 912/1506 beside Dījamī's tomb) and, in particular, Mir 'Ali Shīr Naḵwā, a famous minister and scholar, have described the events of his life: apart from two pilgrimages, one to Mašqhad, the other to the holy cities of the Ḥīdżār (in 877/1472, with a further stay of four months near Bagdad, and about two months in Damascus and Tabriz), he lived quietly in Harat, dividing his time between his studies, poetry and
spiritual exercises, honoured by the sovereigns of the time whom he in no way flattered with excessive panegyrics by dedicating his works to them. Bābur [q.v.] in his Memories says that he was without an equal in his time in the field of the concrete and speculative sciences; Mehemmed II tried to attract him and was present during his last days, does not confirm this statement (which recalls St. Jerome's about the madness of the poet Lucretius). Djami's funeral, conducted by the prince of Harat, was attended by great numbers; his tomb, near that of Sa'd al-Din his director, is well cared for. Of his four sons (he was son-in-law of Sa'd al-Din), three died in infancy, the fourth in early youth (when reading these panegyrics on him and commenting on Sa'd's life and works, one is reminded of the term 'Fakhr al-Islam', he conceived the idea of writing his Bahāristān).

His writings, which are both diverse and numerous, testify to the flexibility of his genius, the depth and variety of his knowledge, and his perfect mastery of language and style. Although he wrote a great deal in prose, he is mainly known for his poetic panegyrics by dedicating his works to them. Babur praised collection, the second (cf. introd. by Bricteux, 47 ff.); the lastly, the Tadhkirat al-awliyā, a collection of memorials and in a number of lyric poems we find the language and the themes of pantheistic mysticism, challenging comparison with the works of the very greatest poets of Sufism; if Djami is not, as he is often said to be, (perhaps through Daulat-Shah's influence) the last of the classical poets, he is probably the last of the great mystical poets.

Of his very numerous works in prose (commentaries on the Qur'ān, on mystical questions and poems—in particular on the KHAMRĪYÂ of Ibn al-Farid), mention must be made of the highly prized collection NAṣḥāt al-umūs ("The breath of divine intimacy", ed. Calcutta 1859), biographies of mystics, preceded by a comprehensive study of Ṣūfism (trans. Silvestre de Sacy, in Not. et extr. des mss. B.N., ii, (1831), 287-436; for this work, Djami made use of the Tādghirat al-a'lisīyā of Farid al-din Aṭṭār while completing it); the treatise Shawkāh al-nubuwwa ("Distinctive signs of prophecy"), which is clear and precise; the short treatise on mysticism Lāwârī ("Shaking or light"), which treated with invocations and poems, introd. by Whinfield and Muhammad Kazwini, Or. Translat. Fund, 1906); lastly, the Bahāristān (1478), a collection of memorable able sayings, witticisms, striking anecdotes, short notes on poets and stories about animals (several ed.); Ger. tr. Schlechta-Weserfeld, 1846; Fr. tr. H. Massé, 1925).

Bibliography: the manuscript of the complete works (KUlliyāt) of Djami, in his own hand, is preserved in the Institute of Oriental Languages at Leningrad (cf. Victor Rosen, Collections de l'institut les manuscrits persans, 215-61). In addition to the references given in the article, see: Gr. I. Pk., ii, 233-305 and 305-7; E. G. Browne, iii, index s.v. Jami; and in particular 'Ali Aqṣārā Hakmat, DJAMI (in Persian; Tehran 1230/1954): life and works, 1-228; selected pieces, 228-373). (Fr. tr. H. Massé).

DJAMI [see MASDJID].

DJAMI'ā. From the root djamā'ā (to bring together, to unite), this Arabic term is used to denote an ideal, a bond or an institution which unites individuals or groups, e.g., al-Djami'ā al-Islāmiyya (Pan-Islamism); Djami'ā al-Duwal al-'Arabiyā (League of Arab States); Djami'ā (Uni-
versity). This article is limited to the last-mentioned meaning and deals with university institutions in the Islamic countries.

Although Diāmi'a, in this sense, includes, in popular and semi-official usage, traditional institutions of higher religious education (such as al-Diāmi'a al-Azhariyya; see, for example, Mub. 'Abd al-Rahmān Ghānima, Ta'rikh al-Diāmi'at al-Islāmiyya al-Kubra, Ta'ifān 1953), officially it is restricted to the modern university, established on western models. Thus, Law no. 184 of 1958, organizing the diāmi'at of the United Arab Republic does not name al-Azhār among these universities. This article will, consequently, deal with "modern" universities. It should be stressed, however, that in Islamic countries higher education had a remarkable tradition in the older institutions of the mosque, the madrasa and other centres of education and learning. For these traditional institutions, see the articles AL-AZHĀR, DāR AL-TULUM, DEOBAND, MASLIGHT, etc.

The term diāmi'a seems to have come into use towards the middle of the 19th century, and to have been translated from "université" or "university". Butrus al-Bustānī does not have an article on it in his Dīrārat al-Ma'dīrī (vi, Beirut 1882). Originally, it seems to have been used as an adjective qualifying madsara. (The earliest such use I have been able to trace is by Ahmad Fāris al-Shīdhīyak, in al-Sād 'ala al-sād, Paris 1855, 513, where he speaks of mādārisim al-dīmim'. But there may have been earlier ones. This adjectival form continued down to the early years of the twentieth century. See Dūjdī Zaydān, al-Hilāl, viii/15, 1 January 1900, 24, and xi, 18 and 19, 1 July 1904, 590; madsarat Oxford al-dīmim').

Furthermore, there was no clear distinction in those years between diāmi'a and kulliyā as one was used as equivalent to "college". Badger's English-Arabic Lexicon (London 1881) includes madsara diāmi'a as one of the Arabic equivalents of "college", whereas for "university" he gives: "dār kulliya at al-tulim", and "dār al-'ulām wa l-faṣālīn": Neither Bellot's Vocabulaire arabe-français (Beirut 1893), nor Hava's Arabic-English Dictionary (Beirut 1899), includes diāmi'a, but both include kulliyā, the former translating it by "l'université" and the latter by "college".

Similarly, other dictionaries published in the nineteenth or early twentieth century either do not include diāmi'a (such as al-Bustānī's Muḥi al-mukāhī, 1867-70, Steingass, Arabic-English Dictionary, 1881, or Şartūnī's Aḥbar al-ma'dīrī, 1889-93), or use it as an adjective qualifying madsara, without distinguishing it properly from kulliyā (Abcarius, English-Arabic Dictionary 1905; Hammām, Mu'dīm al-jālīlī, 1907; Saadeh, English-Arabic Dictionary, 1911).

The first definite use of diāmi'a in the technical meaning of university appears to have been in the movement of some intellectual leaders and reformers in Egypt in 1906 for the establishment of a diāmi'a misriyya. On 12 October 1906 a group of such leaders, the most active among whom seems to have been Kāsim Amin, met in the house of Sa'īd al-Fattāḥ Badār, al-Amāl Fu'ād wa naṣṣal al-dīmim' al-misriyya, Cairo 1950, 6 ff.). From then on, the use of diāmi'a began to be established in the Arab countries as equivalent to "university", whereas kulliyā is now reserved for a faculty or an independent college.

In other Islamic countries, other terms came into use, either derived from the national language, such as Dārzād (the abode of knowledge) in Iran, or borrowed from the West such as "Université" in Turkey, "University" (U. Yāniwa'st) in Pakistan, and "Universitas" in Indonesia.

Survey of university activity in Islamic countries

In recent years, university education has undergone rapid and extensive development in Islamic countries. Established universities are yearly increasing their facilities, courses and student enrolments, and new universities are being planned or opened to meet the increasing demand for higher education. Any statement about them is likely to become out-of-date the time it is published. Consequently, only a general summary of their history and present situation will be attempted here. For current details the reader will have to consult the catalogues or handbooks of individual universities, national or regional handbooks or reports, or a general work of reference such as the International Handbook of Universities. No attempt will be made to refer to independent colleges, or any other institutions of higher learning that do not bear the name Diāmi'a or its equivalent.

Since the establishment of universities is closely bound up with the cultural and national development of their respective countries, or regions, the following summary will follow the lines of the various cultural areas in the Islamic world.

United Arab Republic: Egypt. Technical and professional education began in Egypt in the reign of Mūhammad ʿAlī. The contacts which Egypt had with the West since Bonaparte's campaign and the autonomy it enjoyed within the Ottoman Empire laid the ground for the educational efforts and reforms under Mūhammad ʿAlī. Use was made of foreign, particularly French, advisors and professional men; educational missions were sent to Europe, and a number of specialized technical and professional schools were established, mainly to meet the needs of forming an army and a civil service on modern lines. These years (1841-44) were a movement of active educational expansion. In 1827 a School of Medicine was established and was followed by various military schools, and by Schools of Pharmacy, Maternity, Engineering, Agriculture, Civil Administration and Accountancy, Languages and Translation, etc. This movement received a set-back under ʿAbbās I and Sa'īd (1848-63). Most of these Schools were closed, but they were reopened under Isma'il. In 1871, Dār al-'Ulām for the training of teachers of Arabic was opened; in 1880 Teachers' Training College; and in 1882 a School of Administration (changed in 1886 to School of Law).

In 1906, there arose a movement for the establishment of a national university. A committee of prominent citizens and intellectual leaders was formed and funds were sought from the Government and the public. This university—commonly known as al-Diāmi'a al-Misriyya to distinguish it from the later state university—was opened on 21 December 1908. Its teaching was limited to courses in literature, history, philosophy, and social sciences, and a number of leading European orientalists and other professors were invited to teach in it. Following World War I, the Egyptian Government took steps to establish a state university. This university, con-
sisting of the former national university as the nucleus of the Faculty of Letters, of the Schools of Law and Medicine already established and of a new Faculty of Science, was instituted by law in March 1925. It continued to develop by the incorporation of existing Schools into Faculties, or by the creation of new ones.

In 1938 a branch of this University was established in Alexandria comprising branches of the Faculties of Letters and of Law. In 1941 a third branch, of the Faculty of Engineering, was opened. In 1942 a full-fledged university was founded in Alexandria. This was followed by another university in Cairo in 1950. These three universities which in course of time came to bear the names of, respectively, Fu'ād I, Fārūk, and Ibrāhīm, have since the Revolution been called the Universities of Cairo, Alexandriana and 'Ayn Shams. Following a policy of spreading facilities of higher education throughout the country, the Egyptian Government began in 1954-55 to plan for another university in Asīlīt. This university opened its doors in October 1957 with a Faculty of Science and a Faculty of Engineering. Other Faculties are being instituted gradually, the scientific ones taking precedence over others. Of the four universities in Egypt, the oldest and most developed is the University of Cairo. In addition to its twelve faculties and its various institutes in Cairo, it administers a branch in Khartoum comprising faculties of Law, Letters, and Commerce.

In 1919 the American University at Cairo was established. An independent private institution, it now includes a faculty of Arts and Sciences, a faculty of Education, a School of Oriental Studies, a Social Research Centre and a Division of Extension, and is smaller than the state universities in facilities, number of staff and students, and educational influence.

Syria. In 1902, under Ottoman rule, a School of Medicine was established in Damascus with Turkish as the medium of instruction. During World War I, it was transferred to Beirut, where a School of Law had been opened in 1912. Both institutions were closed at the end of the War. They were reopened in Damascus in 1919, with Arabic as the medium of instruction. In 1924, they were joined together in the Syrian University, which continued to be limited to the Higher Education faculty of Letters, Sciences, Law and Economic and Political Sciences, etc.) were established and made dependent to various ministries. In 1951, a "Council of Higher Education" was set up to co-ordinate the work of the Faculties, "in preparation for the establishment of the 'Irāk University". Following the formation of the U.A.R., the name of the Syrian University was changed into that of the University of Damascus. Law no. 184 of 1958, published on October 21, 1958 governed the organization of universities in the U.A.R. In addition to the five universities mentioned above, it instituted a University at Aleppo (which was due to open in 1960-61) and created the Higher Council of Universities, with seat in Cairo, to co-ordinate the activities of these institutions. Since 28 Sept. 1961, the former organization was reestablished in Syria.

Lebanon: The universities in Lebanon, in order of founding, are: The American University of Beirut, the Université St. Joseph and the (state) Lebanese University, all of which are located in the capital, Beirut. The oldest, the American University of Beirut was established by the American missionaries in the sixties of the last century, but was from the start made separate from the Mission, and governed by an independent Board of Trustees. Its original name was the Syrian Protestant College and under this name it was granted a charter by the State of New York. On April 1864. University work in the School of Arts and Sciences began in 1866. The School of Medicine opened in 1867, the School of Pharmacy in 1871, the School of Commerce in 1900, the School of Nursing and the Hospital in 1905. On November 18, 1920, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York changed the name of the institution into the American University of Beirut. In 1951, the School of Engineering was established, in 1952 the School of Agriculture and in 1954 the School of Public Health. The medium of instruction is English.

The Université St. Joseph was founded by the Jesuits in Beirut in 1875. It received the title of University from Pope Leo XIII in 1881, but in Arabic it continued for many years to be called Kūliyyat Mīr Yūsuf (See Cheikhano's article on its fiftieth anniversary, Al-Mārāqī, xxxiii 5, May 1925, p. 321 ff.). Originally, its higher instruction was limited to theology and philosophy. In 1883, under agreement between the Jesuits of Syria and the French Government, the School of Medicine was established, and, in 1888, the School of Pharmacy, both becoming in 1889 the Faculté française de Médecine et de Pharmacie. In 1902 was founded the Faculty of Oriental Studies which was closed with the rest of the University during World War I. In 1913, the School of Law was opened; in 1919, the School of Engineering; and in 1937 the Institute of Oriental Studies. The medium of instruction is French.

The Lebanese University started in 1952 with a Higher Teachers' Institute for the training of teachers for secondary schools. It was formally organized by Legislative Decree no. 25 of 6 February 1953 (revised by Leg. Decree no. 26 of 18 January 1955), but its activity remained restricted to the Higher Teachers' Institute with its two divisions, literary and scientific, of three years each leading to the Licence, and a fourth year of pedagogical training. In 1959 a Faculty of Law and Economic and Political Sciences was established, and in the same year a regulatory decree (no. 2883 of 16 June 1959) gave the University its inner constitution. This decree provided for faculties of Letters and Sciences, Higher Teachers' Institute, Pedagogical and Political Sciences, for a Higher Teachers' Institute and an Institute of Social Studies, and, like similar state university constitutions or charters, for other faculties, colleges or institutes which might later be created. Also, like other state universities in Arab countries, the language of instruction is Arabic, unless otherwise decided in particular fields.

'Īrāk. Before World War I, there was only one institution of higher education in 'Īrāk: a School of Law. In 1923, the 'Irāk Government decided to establish a university called Djāmī‘at Āl al-Bayt, but this plan was later abandoned. Instead, between 1920 and 1949, a number of Faculties or Colleges (Medicine, Education, Engineering, Business and Economics, etc.) were established and made dependent to various ministries. In 1951, a "Council of Higher Education" was set up to co-ordinate the work of the Faculties, "in preparation for the establishment of the 'Irāk University". Following many commissions and reports, the University of Baghdad was established by Law no. 60 of June 6, 1956. This Law provided for the establishment of a "Constituent Council" which was charged with the study of each of the existing Faculties and Colleges
to decide on its inclusion in the University. On 15 September 1958 a new Law was issued to replace the previous one. According to it, the University is composed of the Faculties of Letters, Sciences, Law, Commerce, Education, Engineering (Women), Engineering, Agriculture, Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine and such other Faculties and Institutes as may be established in the future.

Sa'di Arabia: The King Sa'd University was established in Riyadh by Royal Decree no. 17 of 21 Rabii' II 1377/14 November 1957. It started with a Faculty of Letters. In 1958 a Faculty of Science was added, followed by a Faculty of Pharmacy and a Faculty of Commerce. Each of these Faculties is being developed at the rate of a class a year. A project has been drawn up for an extensive campus and ample building facilities, and plans are under study for curricular and other developments.

Kuwait: The Government of Kuwait asked a committee of experts to study the question of establishing an university in that Principality. The committee met in Kuwait during the month of February 1960, and presented its recommendations to the Government.

Sudan: The University of Khartoum was officially constituted by Act of Parliament on 24 July 1956, seven months after the establishment of the new Republic of the Sudan. It developed from the University College of Khartoum, which was founded in 1951 by the fusion of Gordon Memorial College and the Kitchener School of Medicine. The former had in 1945 grouped together the Schools which had been set up from 1936 onwards to give post-secondary training in Arts, Law, Public Administration, Engineering, Agriculture and Veterinary Science. The academic standard of the College was recognized in 1945 by the University of London which admitted it to Special Relationship. The Kitchener School of Medicine was founded in 1924, and from 1940 onwards its final examination was supervised by a visitor appointed by the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons of England.

The University of Khartoum includes at present the following Faculties: Agriculture, Arts, Economic and Social Studies, Engineering, Law, Medicine, Sciences, and Veterinary Science. The only other institution of higher education in the Sudan is the Military Academy, which is based on the previously mentioned branch in Khartoum of the University of Cairo including faculties of Law, Letters, and Commerce.

Libya: The University of Libya was founded in 1955-56. The Law establishing it was issued on 15 December 1955. It started with a Faculty of Letters and of Pedagogy in Benghazi. Since then a Faculty of Commerce in Benghazi and a Faculty of Science in Tripoli have been added. Plans for the development of these Faculties and for the creation of new ones are under way.

Tunisia: al-Djami' a-l-Mi'am, the traditional centre of higher religious instruction in Tunisia has in recent years been popularly called al-Djami' a l-Zaytuniyya, but the only post-secondary education it has given is in the fields of Islamic studies and Arabic language and literature related to them. Modern university studies were recently started in schools or institutes on the French model and using generally the French language. Thus, the Institut des Hautes Études, founded in 1945 and attached to the Sorbonne, covered the fields of Law, Arabic Studies, Sciences, and Social Sciences. In 1960, the Tunisian University was founded incorporating existing institutions and establishing new ones. Law no. 2 of 1960 (31 March 1960) established the Tunisian University as a public institution, Decree (Amir) no. 98 of the same date set up its organization, and a ten-years plan for its development has been formulated.

Algeria: The University of Algiers was until 1962 a French university organized and administered as other French state universities. Growing out of a School of Medicine and Pharmacy (1859) and Schools of Law, Science and Letters (1879), it was formally established as a university in 1909. It included these Faculties and certain specialized institutes and used French as the medium of instruction.

In Morocco, as in other countries, modern higher instruction in Morocco started with separate institutions: the Institut des Hautes Études Marocaines, Centres d'Études Juridiques and Centre d'Études Superieures Scientifiques. With the acquisition of independence, there was a movement for the establishment of a national university. This university, the University of Rabat, was inaugurated in December 1957, and was formally organized by royal decree (Zahir Šarif) no. 1.58.390 of 29 July 1959. It consists of Faculties of Holy Law (Šarî'î'î), Legal, Economic and Social Sciences, Letters, Physical and Natural Sciences, and a Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy to be established. Here again the relation of this University (and particularly its Faculty of Holy Law) with the traditional Islamic higher education centred around the celebrated Djâmi' al-Karawiyîn in Fâs depends upon future developments.

Turkey: Modern technical and professional education started in Turkey towards the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century, to meet the needs of the army, navy and civil service. In 1773 a Muhendisîkhane [q.v.], or School of Engineering for the needs of eastern Turkey. This was done with the traditional Islamic higher education centred around the celebrated Djâmi' al-Karawiyîn in Fâs depends upon future developments.

In 1955 the Aegean University (Ege Universitesi) was established in Izmir. In 1956 Atatürk University was founded in Erzurum to serve the needs of eastern Turkey. This was done with the assistance of the University of Nebraska, under contract between this University and the Technical Cooperation Administration of the U.S.A. All these
universities are state institutions. By the University Law of 1946, they were granted administrative and financial autonomy.

In 1957, the Middle East Technical University was established in Ankara, by special act of parliament, with powers including faculties. The United Nations and UNESCO have been closely associated with the Government of Turkey in the planning and development of this university. Whereas the other universities use Turkish as their medium of instruction, this uses English and hopes to attract students from other countries of the region.

Iran: The oldest and the most important of the universities of Iran is the University of Tehran, Dānishgāh-i Tehran. Growing out of the polytechnic school, Dār al-Funun (1851), and of other more recently established schools, it was constituted as a state university in 1934. It now includes eleven Faculties: Arts, Fine Arts, Islamic Sciences (‘Ulām-i Ma‘ṣbāl wa Manḥāl), Law, Science, Engineering, Agriculture (at Karadā), Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy and Veterinary Medicine. Other universities to serve the needs of the provinces have been established since World War II. In 1947, the University of Tabrīz (Āḏharbājyān) was founded, and was followed by the Universities of Maḥbāb (Khorāsān), of Shīrāz (Pars), of Isfahān, and of Ahwāz (Khurāsān).

These provincial universities have as yet a limited number of Faculties (mostly professional), but their development in this short period indicates the concern of the Government of Iran to extend the facilities of university education and to spread it throughout the country. The language of instruction in all the universities of Iran is Persian.

Afghanistan: Higher university education in Afghanistan began with a Faculty of Medicine in 1932. Other Faculties were later established and all were incorporated in the University of Kābul, which was founded by Royal Decree in 1946. This University now includes Faculties of Medicine (including Women’s Division and School of Nursing), Law and Political Science, Science, Letters, Islamic Law, Agricultural Engineering, a Women’s Faculty (Social and Physical Sciences) and Institutes of Economics and of Education. Instruction is through the medium of Persian and Pashto.

India and Pakistan: It was not until the early decades of the nineteenth century that schools and colleges on western models began to be established in the sub-continent of India. These institutions used English as the medium of instruction. Following the recommendations of Sir Charles Wood, the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras were established in 1857, and remained for twenty-five years the only universities in India. In 1882 the University of the Panjab was created at Lahore, and in 1887 the University of Allāhābād. No other university was established before World War I. Subsequently there were two periods of rapid development of university institutions: 1915-1929, and after partition. The latest edition of the Common-wealth Universities Handbook (1960) lists thirty-seven universities in India, of which eighteen were established or achieved full university status after 1947. Of the six universities of Pakistan, only two, the University of the Panjab (1982) and the University of Dacca (1921), existed before independence, although many colleges were affiliated to universities in India before partition.

In India, two universities have been active in the field of higher education for the Muslim community. The older, the ‘Allīgahr Muslim University, has played its particular role in the intellectual life of this community. Founded in 1875 by the author and reformer Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khān, as the Moham-medan Anglo-Oriental College, with the object of imparting modern scientific education, it received its charter as a university in 1920, and has since its establishment served as an influential centre of Indian Muslim intellectual life.

The other University, Osmania, at Haydarābād, Deccan, was founded in 1918 and has also paid special attention to Islamic studies. In addition to these two universities, there are Muslim colleges which either form part of, or are affiliated to, other Indian universities. Among other institutions of higher education, mention should be made of the Jamia Millia Islamia (q.v.) at Jāmānagar, Dīhil, whose courses in the arts and social sciences lead to an examination recognized by the government as equivalent to the B.A. degree of an Indian university.

In Pakistan, there are six universities: University of the Panjab at Lahore (1922), University of Dacca (1921), University of Calcutta (1947), University of Karachi (1950), University of Punjab (1950), and University of Rajshahi (Rādsjāhī) (1953). Although these institutions are entirely secular and pursue liberal, scientific and professional education on modern lines, they are permeated by Islamic traditions and spirit.

The first universities established in the sub-continent of India in the middle of the last century took as their model the then newly established University of London. This University was at that time a purely examining body. Thus the early universities were slow to develop teaching of their own. At present, the universities of India and Pakistan are of various types, but most of them are both teaching and affiliating. Post-graduate teaching is generally carried on by the universities themselves, whereas first-degree teaching is still largely done by affiliated colleges under university supervision and examination arrangements.

Malaya and Singapore: The University of Malaya was founded in 1949 by the combined actions of the governments of the Federation of Malaya and the Colony of Singapore. It grew out of two existing colleges in Singapore, King Edward VII College of Medicine. The other was the Victoria College, whose courses in the arts and social sciences lead to an examination recognized by the government as equivalent to the B.A. degree of an Indian university. This University was at that time a purely examining body. Thus the early universities were slow to develop teaching of their own. At present, the universities of India and Pakistan are of various types, but most of them are both teaching and affiliating. Post-graduate teaching is generally carried on by the universities themselves, whereas first-degree teaching is still largely done by affiliated colleges under university supervision and examination arrangements.

Indonesia: Although Faculties (largely professional) had been instituted in Indonesia in the period between the two World Wars, the movement for the establishment of universities began in 1949 and has progressed rapidly since the country acquired its sovereignty. These universities have incorporated previously existing Faculties and created new ones. In 1949 Universitas Gadjah Mada was instituted at Djogdjakarta by merger of five Faculties, whose number has grown to eleven. Universiteit Indonesia was founded in 1950 at Djakarta and now includes Faculties of Medicine, Law and Social Sciences, Philosophy and Letters, Economics, Mathematics
and Natural Sciences (at Bandung), Technology (at Bandung), Veterinary Medicine (at Bogor) and Agriculture (at Bogor). Other Faculties of the University established at Surabaya, Bukittinggi and Makassar, have since formed the nuclei of separate universities: Universitas Airlangga (1954), Surabaja (also incorporating the former Faculty of Law of Universitas Gadjah Mada in Surabaja); Universitas Andalas (1956), Bukittinggi; and Universitas Hasannuddin (1956), Makassar. A new university is being established in Bandung independently of the Faculties of the Universiteit Indonesia set up there.

In addition to the above, some of all state universities there are a number of private institutions. Of particular importance for us are the Universiteit Islam Indonesia, Diogjakarta (theology, social economics, law) and the Perguruan Tinggi Islam Indonesia, Medan (law and social sciences, theology).

Reference should finally be made to universities in some of the predominantly Muslim Republics of the U.S.S.R. which also serve the needs of the Muslim population, such as the University of the U.S.S.R. at Baku (1919), the Tadjik State University at Stalinabad (1948), and the Uzbek State University (1933). These Universities follow the pattern of universities in the Soviet Union, and use, along with Russian, local languages in their instruction.

Bibliography: As the majority of the universities in the Islamic countries are state institutions, the basic sources on their constitutions and organization are the government-promulgated charters embodied in laws, decrees, or other government acts, as well as the catalogues, reports, or handbooks issued by the individual universities, national associations of universities, or the government ministries. For universities in Arab countries, Sāḥiṣ al-Jaṣṣāṣ's Ḥākwiyat al-Nawzā bi al-arabiyya, published by the Cultural Section of the League of Arab States (5 vols., Cairo, 1949-57), summarizes the governing legislation and other acts, and gives pertinent information on the programs and activities of the universities up to 1956. For Pakistan and India see the Handbook of the Universities of Pakistan, 1955-6 (Inter-University Board of Pakistan, 1956) and the Handbook of the [Indian] Universities, 1955-6 (Inter-University Board of India, 1956). For universities in these two and other countries of the British Commonwealth, see Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, 1960, (37th edition, ed. J. F. Foster, London, 1960). General information about universities (outside the Commonwealth and the U.S.A.) is given in the International Handbook of Universities (1st edition, ed. H. M. R. Keyes, International Association of Universities, Paris 1959). Discussions of various problems will be found in Universität und moderne Gesellschaft, edd. C. D. Harris and M. Herkheimer, Frankfurt 1959; Science and Freedom, 12, Oct. 1958; J. Jomier, Ecoles et universités dans l'Egypte actuelle, in MIDEO 1955, ii, 135-60, 1956, iii, 387-90; H. de l'Isle, Les universités islamiques d'Indonésie, in Orient, no. 21, 1962, 81-4. For accounts of current university activity and development see the Bulletin of the International Association of Universities (quarterly, published since February 1953). The International Association of Universities (6, Rue Franklin, Paris, 16) also maintains a documentation and information centre on universities, including those treated in this article.
to be the most perfect representative of the Udhra poets, who "when loving, die".


(F. GABRIELI)

**DJAMIL (b.) NAJLAH AL-MUDAWWAR, Arab journalist and writer, born in Beirut in 1862, died in Cairo on 26 January 1907.** Djamil came from a wealthy, intellectually active, Christian family, and grew up in conditions which were very favourable to his development as a writer. His father (1822-80), who lectured on Arabic grammar, French, and Italian in Beirut, was an interpreter at the French Consulate, and a member of the Beirut town council; he also took part in editing the Beirut newspaper *Haddat al-Aḥbār*, as well as being a member of the *Société Asiatique*, Paris, and of *Al-Djam’yya al-ilmīyya al-sūriyya*, Beirut.

Djamil pursued Arabic studies, and also studied French language and literature at Beirut University. He soon began to show a preference for the history of the peoples of the ancient Orient. Later on, he became editor of several journals. He collaborated in the semi-monthly *Al-Dīnān*, and also in *Muṣhtafat*. The second of these moved its offices from Beirut to Cairo in 1888. Finally, he brought out the pan-Islamic paper *Al-Mu’āyyad* in Cairo.

**Djamīl al-Mudawwar reached fame with his *Haddat al-Islām fī Dār as-Salām*, Cairo 1888, 1905, 1932.** This work is of great literary importance, because it is a completely new departure in Arabic literature. It was probably modelled on J. Barthélemy’s (1716-95) *Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce*, and takes the form of letters. It quotes many lesser-known singers and ḳīyān, Maḥbād (q.v.), Ibn ʿAṣīḥa (q.v.), Ḥābābā and Sāliḥā received their training. Artists as great as Ibn Surayjā (q.v.) would come to hear her, and would accept her critical judgments, while her salon was regularly frequented by such poets as ʿUmar b. Abī Rabīʿa, al-ʿAwās, and al-ʿArḍjī. When at one time she was on a pilgrimage, all the singers and musicians of the Ḥijāz gathered to accompany her, or to welcome the ‘star’ of Medina to Mecca. They then accompanied her back to Medina, where an enormous festival of music and song lasted for 3 days. Although the story is of doubtful authenticity, being regarded as false by Abu ʿl-Faradj al-Isfahānī himself, it is nevertheless an indication of the fame which has always surrounded the figure of Djamil. The date of her death is unknown.

**Bibliography:** The basic reference-work is the *Ḳitāb al-ʿAṣīḥā*, vii, 124-48 (Beirut ed., viii, 188-234); it has been extensively used by Caussin de Perceval, *Notices anecdotiques sur les principaux musiciens arabes des trois premiers siècles de l’Islamisme*, Paris 1828 (A. Seyd, 1834), and by Ambris, *Al-Djamāli al-muḥannīyi* (A. Schade and J. Pellat)

**DJAMIYYA.** This term, commonly used in modern Arabic to mean a “society” or “association”, is derived from the root *DJ·M·S*, meaning “to collect, join together, etc.”. In its modern sense it appears to have come into use quite recently, and was perhaps first used to refer to the organized monastic communities or congregations which appeared in the eastern Uniate Churches in Syria and Lebanon at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries (e.g., *Djamīyyat al-Muhābbat*, the Salvatorians, a Greek Catholic order founded c. 1708). In the middle of the nineteenth century the term came into more general use first in the Lebanon and then in other Arabic-speaking countries, to refer to voluntary associations for scientific, literary, benevolent or political purposes. Perhaps the first of them was *Al-Djamīyya al-sūriyya*, founded in Beirut in 1847 through the efforts of American Protestant missionaries with learned tastes, for the purpose of raising the level of culture. Its members were all Christians, and included the famous writers Nasif al-Ẓaydījī and Butrus al-Bustānī (q.v.), as well as a number of missionaries and the English writer on the Lebanon, Colonel Charles Churchill, then living near Beirut. The society met regularly
until 1852; in 1857 it was succeeded by al-Diam'iyya al-shariyya, a larger society on the same model but including Muslims and Druzes; it had corresponding members in Cairo and Istanbul, includingPrime Minister Fuad Pasha, and in 1868 received official recognition from the Ottoman government. In 1880 the French Jesuit missionaries in Beirut created a similar organization, al-Diam'iyya al-shariyya; its membership was partly foreign, partly local and wholly Christian.

At a slightly later date there arose societies with more practical aims: for example, the first feminist society, Diam'iyyati b'dakura Suriyya, founded in Beirut in 1881 or earlier, and a number of benevolent associations. Perhaps the first of these was al-Diam'iyya al-khayriyya al-islimiyya, founded in Alexandria in 1876, as an expression of the new public consciousness which was appearing in Egypt at that time. Its aim was to found national schools for boys and girls; one school was established in Alexandria and placed under the direction of the famous scholar Muhammad Abduh. Another society, the Sharif Husayn and the British authorities in Cairo, which led to the revolt in Arabia against Turkish rule; the military leader of the revolt, Husayn's son Faysal, was himself a member of the society. A generation later, in Egypt, there was founded another daim'iyya which has played an important role in politics: al-Ikhwan al-Muslimin [q.v.], started in 1928 by Hasan al-Banna [q.v.], had the explicit purpose of bringing about a moral reform in Islam, but in course of time it became more openly political in its aims and methods, and in the confused decade after 1945 seemed near to taking over power in Egypt, until suppressed by the military régime in 1954. In general however the word daim'iyyat [q.v.] had by then become almost synonymous with political movements, although the latter term still remained in use for charitable, cultural and other such voluntary organizations.


Ottoman Empire and Turkey

The most common term for "society" or "associa-
tion" in Ottoman and modern Turkish is daim'iyyat (cem'iyyet or cemiyet), to which partisans of istârâhe prefer dernek or more rarely, birik. Since the late 19th century daim'iyyet has been the word used for voluntary associations, secret or open, for political, benevolent, professional and other purposes. In the early twentieth century, political parties began to call themselves firka or, occasionally, birik, both of these yielding, in common usage since the 1920's, to parti. Among the near-synonyms of daim'iyyet, endûrûmen (encümen, from P. andûrûman [q.v.]) designates (i) a parliamentary committee and (ii) a quasi-public organization such as the Turkish History and Turkish Language Societies, its istârâhe equivalents in these two senses being, respectively, (i) komisyon and (ii) kurum; keyd or keyet ("committee") designates a temporary or ad hoc grouping; gurup or parti gurubu a parliamentary party; and kulub (club) a more informal cultural, social, or convivial organization.

Legislation granting and regulating the right of association has been a product mainly of the 20th century. The Ottoman reform decrees of 1839 and 1856 promised civic equality and security of person and property, but the 1876 constitution for the first time included a specific if limited guarantee of freedom of association (art. 13: "Ottoman subjects have the right within the limits of existing laws and
regulations to found all manner of associations for commercial, industrial, and agricultural purposes"), buttressed by promises of freedom of the press (art. 12: "...free within the limits of the law...") and of the organizations or of those with headquarters outside Turkey also were outlawed, except where special permission should be granted by cabinet decree in the interests of international cooperation (art. 10). By a major amendment of 5 June 1946 (law no. 4919), the prohibitions against associations contrary to the Six Arrows and against those based on class were lifted, and that against regional associations limited to political parties. Other laws of international restrictions: Laws no. 334 (15 April 1923) and 556 (25 February 1925) prohibited propaganda for restoration of the sultanate or caliphate and the abuse of religion for political purposes. A decree of 1922 outlawed Communism and art. 163 against religious-political associations. Law no. 5018 of 20 February 1947 (arts. 141 and 142 being directed chiefly against Communist and art. 165 against religious-political associations). Law no. 5018 of 20 February 1947 for the first time specifically regulated trade unions and employers' associations (both being termed sindikat, from Fr. syndicat). The Constitution of the Second Republic of 9 July 1961 provides broad and specific guarantees of the freedom of association (art. 29: "Every individual is entitled to form associations without prior permission. This right can be restricted only by law for the purposes of maintaining public order or morality") and of the right to form trade unions and employers' associations (art. 46) and political parties (art. 50).

The actual development of associational life was at times broader and at times narrower than the legislative history would indicate. Until the 1908 revolution, political associations within the Empire took the form of secret conspiracies, often with headquarters in exile. Among the first were those organized by nationalists among the Christian minorities, notably the Greek Ethnikie Hetairia (National Association) founded in Odessa in 1814, followed by the Armenian Hincak party (Geneva 1887) and the Dashnaktsutun (Armenian Revolutionary Federation, 1890). The earliest political movements among Ottoman Muslims lacked elaborate organization; rather they were short-lived and abortive conspiracies aimed at the quick overthrow of the reigning sultan. Such was the nature of the Kulei't Indirici Partisi (the "Revolutionary Federation, 1828 and the so-called Scelleri-Askiz Committee of the same year. A more elaborate society was formed in 1865 by a number of prominent literary and political figures with liberal and constitutionalist aims, including the poet Naim Mekel. When its members were banished or exiled in 1867, the centre of their activities shifted to Europe, where they adopted the name Yeni 'Othomnliiler (New Ottomans) or Juvenes Tures. From this time onward, "Young Turks" became the name commonly used by Europeans to designate the advocates of Ottoman constitutionalism; in Turkish, the name occurs only as a French loan word, Jon Turk. Returning from exile after the deposition of 'Abd al-'Aziz, the original "Young Turks" played a leading role in the events leading to the adoption of the constitution of 1876. With the establishment of 'Abd al-Hamid II's autocracy, the movement was at first eclipsed and then relegalated once again to secrecy, banishment, and exile. In 1889, a number of students at the Army Medical College (Mektebi Tibbiyyet-i 'Ashoriyye) in Istanbul, including Ibrahim Temo and Abdullah Djedwe, formed a secret political society known at first as Terakki-i Isitab and later as 'Othomnli Ittihat ve Terakki Dernegi (Ottoman Society of Union and Progress, later commonly known to Westerners as the Committee of Union and Progress). In Paris, the most prominent spokesman of the anti-Hamidian exiles was Ahmed Riza (Ridâ), editor of the journal Mecmuet (i.e., Mecmuet, "Consultation"). Defections and factionalism weakened the movement from time to time, whereas 'Abd al-Hamid's repressive measures supplied a steady stream of new recruits both for the secret internal and for the exiled opposition movement. Thus, whereas Ahmed Riza considered himself an adherent of Comtean positivism and hence an advocate of strong central government, his rival "Prince" Sabâb al-Din formed a "Society for Individual Enterprise and Decentralization" (Tegbehhü-a Shakhhi we 'Adem-i Merkeziiyet Djem'iyyet), Paris 1902). By 1906, the centre of gravity of the opposition movement had once again shifted from Europe to the Empire itself, whereas dismounted military officers and civil servants spread the conspiracy to the provincial centres to which they were posted. That year a small Fatherland and Freedom Society (Watî 'In Hurreyyet Djemîyyet) was formed in Damascus with the participation of Mustafa Kemal (the later Ataturk) and a
larger Osmanlı Hurreyyet Diem'iyyeti in Salonica with participation of Ta'at, Diemal (both later Paşhas) and other prominent future figures. By the end of 1907, the Salonica group had absorbed the remnants of the Damascus society and merged with representatives of the Paris exile movement under the name of “Committee (or Society) of Union and Progress—a name adopted out of respect to its predecessors rather than a name acquired by direct inheritance” (Ramsaur, 122 f.). The successful revolution of 1908 was the result mainly of pressure of Macedonian army units enlisted into the conspiracy by the powerful Salonica group.

From 1908 to the present, periods of proliferation of political and other voluntary associations have alternated with periods of suppression or coordination under the aegis of a single, powerful party. The number of parties and political associations listed for each of these periods in the index of Tunaya's work (772-7) may serve as a rough measure of this ebb and flow: 1814-1908: 18; 1908-13: 22; 1913-8: 2; 1918-23: 55; 1923-45: 5; 1945-52: 30. Among the many associations formed after the 1908 revolution were the New Generation Club (Nesl-i Djedid Kâlibâ, 1908, representing Sabâh al-Din's decennial trend), an Ottoman Press Association (Ma'ba'at-i 'Othmdniyye Diem'iyyeti, 1908), an Arab-Ottoman Brotherhood Society (1908), a pro-Unionist association of umla' (Diem'iyyet-i Fitâhidâyye-i Umoviyeyi, 1908), the Turkish Society (1908) and the Turkish Home Society (1911) both later (1913) merged and expanded into the Turkish Hearth (Türk Odâgâhî, for the next two decades the most important association of Turkish nationalist intellectual and cultural leaders with branches throughout the country). The list of constituent organizations which on 17 April 1909 formed the Ottoman Unity Committee (Hey'et-i Mütefikâ-i 'Othmdniyye) to oppose the threat of counter-revolution provides an indication of the variety of political and semi-political associations which had sprung up in the capital in the first few months after the 1908 revolution (see Tunaya, 275 f.): Ottoman Society of Union and Progress, Ottoman Liberal Party, Daşnaktsutün, Greek Political Society, Ottoman Democratic Party, Albanian Central Club, Kurdistan, Circassian Mutual Aid Club, Bulgarian Club, Club of Millîkiyye Graduates, Ottoman Medical Society, etc. Philanthropic and professional societies, such as the Red Crescent (Hilâl-i Ahmer Diem'iyyeti, later called Kızılay), the Children's Aid Society (Hümâyye-iElfâl Diem'iyyeti, today Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu), and the Istanbul Bar Association also date back to this period. On the political scene, the Society of Union and Progress was the most powerful organization in the country, and for the next decade it became known as the "Society—Diem'iyyet tout court"—even though in 1913 it officially proclaimed its transformation into a political party. Meanwhile, adherents of Sâbâhâddîn and a continuous stream of discontents from Unionist ranks formed a number of opposition parties, most of which eventually merged in the Freedom and Accord Party (see Tunaya, 324; cf. Frustor in World Politics, xi, 541). Many of these semi-political societies of the armistice period included the Kurdistan Resurrection (Te'dîlî Society, the National Unity Committee, the Society of the Friends of England and the Society for Wilsonian Principles (the last two respectively a collaborationist and a nationalist group), a Society for Mutual Aid Among Victims of Political Persecution (Mehdârîn-i Siyâsîyye Te'dâsin Diem'iyyeti). Once again the list of societies adhering to a non-partisan effort at national unity, the National Congress (Millî Kongre) of 29 November 1918, gives an indication of the wide variety of associations then in existence. It reads, in part, as follows: Turkish Hearth, Children's Aid Society, Teachers' Colleges Alumni Association, Navy Society, Galatasaray Students' Home, Mutual Aid Society of Kabataş (a quarter of Istanbul), Women's Employment Society (Kadinlarî Calış- tirmalînî Diem'iyyeti), National Defence Society, Press Association, Teachers' Society, National Instruction and Physical Education Association, Bar Association, Painters' Society, Farmers' Association, National Association of Private Schools, Craftsmen's Society, Women's Welfare Association (Diem'iyyet-i Khay- riyye-i Nisâwînîyye), Muslim Women's Employment Society, Society of Music-Loving Ladies, Society for the Modern Woman (Asrî Kadin Diem'iyyeti), Society for the Promotion of Fine Arts, etc. etc. (Tunaya, 420). During this same period we also encounter the first parties with a specific appeal to the lower classes, notably the Workers' and Peasants' Socialist Party of Turkey, the Ottoman Labour Party, and the Socialist Party of Turkey (ibid., 438, 458, 463).

While the capital and the central government were coming increasingly under the control of Allied occupation authorities, local societies were forming in most of the vilayet and kadî districts of Anatolia and Eastern Thrace for the purpose of opposing Allied occupation, partition, and annexation plans. In the case of one of the earliest and most prominent of these, the Ottoman Committee for the Defence of Thrace and Pashaeli (Edirne, 2 December 1918), we know that it was prepared and founded at the behest of Ta'at Paşa, who hoped that such local groups would be able to carry on the Unionist political cause after the defeat of the Empire and the demise of the central party organization (see Beyiklioğlu, 1, 123; cf. Rustow in World Politics, xi, 541). Many similar organizations were founded in other important cities within a few days or weeks of each other, in some cases also with direct participation of local Unionist leaders (Ottoman Society for Defence of Rights of Izmir, 2 December 1918; Society for the Defence of Rights of the Eastern Vilayets, founded in Istanbul, 4 December 1918, Erzurum branch opened 10 March 1919; Cilician Society, Adana 21 December 1918), one
may infer that there may have been a more comprehensive central plan. Whereas the earlier nationalist organizations rallied to the slogan of "DEFENCE OF RIGHTS" (müddfa-i hakk), those formed in western Anatolia at the time of the Greek occupation of Izmir (May 1919) commonly called themselves "REJECTION OF ANNEXATION" (redd-i ikbāḥ) societies. Regional congresses of these groups were held throughout the summer of 1919 at Erzurum, Balıkesir, Alâşehir, and elsewhere. Whatever the antecedents of the Defence of Rights movement, its nation-wide consolidation was the result of the activities of Mustafa Kemal Pasha [Atatiirk] [g.v.], who was elected chairman of the Erzurum Congress and himself called for a nationwide congress at Sivas (4-11 September 1919) which repudiated the Union and Progress Movement, defined the foreign policy aims of the nationalist resistance movement in the so-called National Pact (mīddfa-i millû), and created the consolidated Society for the Defence of Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia (Anadolu ve Rumeli Müddafa-i Hukuk Djâmîyyatii, later as the People's Party, later as the Republican People's Party), the greatest notoriety because of its campaigns for the re-introduction of the Arabic version of the Law for the Restoration of Order (Takrir-i Sukun Kanunu, 4 March 1925). The convening of a Grand National Assembly at Ankara on 23 April created a de facto nationalist government which was to become the foundation of the First Turkish Republic (proclaimed on 29 October 1923).

In the Ankara Assembly Kemal time and again faced a religious-conservative opposition, known as the Second Group, but the elections of 1923 resulted in the complete elimination of these opponents. Later that year the Defence of Rights Society was reconstituted as the People's Party, later as the Republican People's Party (Khâlb Fîrıkstî, Dîjmü'âriyyeyet Khâlb Fîrıkstî [g.v.], and eventually Cümhuriyyet Halk Partisi). The precipitate manner in which the Republic had been proclaimed and fears of personal rule by Kemal led to the formation of a new opposition group, the Progressive Republican Party (Terakkiperver Dîjmü'âriyyet Fîrıkstî, 17 November 1924), led by Kemal's closest and earliest associates of the 1919-20 period. Following the Kurdish uprising of February-April 1925, this party was charged with complicity in the insurrection and dissolved by cabinet decree (3 June 1925) under authority of the Law for the Restoration of Order (Takrir-i Sukun Kanunu, 4 March 1925). The following year, most of the members of its Assembly were tried, and seven of them sentenced to death and executed, on unproven charges of complicity in the attempt on Kemal's life discovered in İzmir.

Although the formation of opposition parties was never formally prohibited, the events of 1924-26 clearly discouraged any would-be founders for the next two decades. The only important exception was the short lived Free Republican Party founded (and reclosed within four months) at Kemal's suggestion by his close friend Ali Fethi [Okyar] [g.v.] in 1930. The dissolution of the Turkish Hearth (see above) in 1931 (involving the conversion of its branches into People's Houses to be administered by the People's Party), the merger of the posts of müdafa and müdvet chairman of the Republican People's Party (1936), the formation of a new Press Association under the chairmanship of Atatürk's long-time journalistic spokesman Fahîh Rifki Atay (11 June 1935), and the Law of Association of 1938 (see above) were so many steps toward the complete coordination of all associational and political activities within a single official party. Earlier, the formation under Atatürk's personal auspices of the Turkish Historical Society and the Turkish Language Society (Türk Tarikh Kurumu and Türk Dil Kurumu, 1932), provided a vehicle for Atatürk's concern with the promotion of a national-historical consciousness and of language reform. A radical shift toward a policy of democratization and liberalization came at the end of the Second World War, first heralded in President İnönü's speech of 19 May 1945, and confirmed after some wavering by his pledge of impartiality between government and opposition parties of 22 July 1947. (The 1946 revision of the Law of Associations and the new Labour Code of 1947 were parts of the new political course). As a result, the formation of political and other associations multiplied in unprecedented fashion in the years after 1945. Tunaya lists as many as 14 parties founded during the single year of 1946. During the same year voluntary associations of national prominence were numerically distributed among various categories as follows: trade unions and employers' associations 234; sports clubs 246; civic improvement associations 79; scholarly associations 22; trade unions and employers' associations 20; health societies 17; journalists' associations 13 (Türkiye Yılıği 1947, 266). The more liberal atmosphere also encouraged a secret revival of dervish orders which continued to be outlawed. (For specific cases of arrest see G. Jäschke, Die Türkei in den Jahren 1942-51, Wiesbaden 1955, index s.v. Derwischorden). Among these, the Tijdjanîyye attracted the greatest notoriety because of its campaigns for reintroduction of the Arabic version of the adîdieh and of smashing statues of Atatürk. The latter subsided after the passage in 1953 of a new law for the protection of the memory of Atatürk which imposed heavy penalties on such activity. A number of parties were disbanded after 1945 because of Communist leanings, notably the Socialist Toilers' and Peasants' Party of Turkey (closed 16 December 1946 by the Istanbul Martial Law Command) and the Socialist Party of Turkey (closed by the same decision, reopened after acquittal of its founders in 1950, and reclosed by court order on 17 June 1953). A number of other parties or associations of the extreme right were similarly dissolved, including the Islam Democratic Party (involved in an assassination attempt on the liberal journalist Ahmed Emin Yalman and closed by court order on 20 October 1952), the Great East ( Büyük Doğu) Society (dissolved itself 26 May 1951 while on trial for "reactionary" activities and after its leader, Necip Fasıl Kasıkçik, had been apprehended on a gambling charge), and the pan-Turkist and racist Turkish Nationalists' Association (Türk Milliyetçiler Derneği, dissolved by court order 4 April 1953). (Information in this paragraph furnished to author by Turkish Ministry of the Interior, January 1954).

The advent to power of the Democratic Party under Celâl Bayar and Adnan Menderes as a result of the 1950 elections soon brought more systematic legal and extra-legal restrictions upon the freedom of association. Whereas the parties just listed consisted mainly of small groups of obscure men whose aims were repudiated by the vast majority of thoughtful citizens, the major targets of Menderes's repressive policies, it soon became clear, were the major opposition parties themselves. In December 1953, the assets of the Republican People's Party
(in opposition since 1950) were taken over by the government treasury, and just before the 1954 elections the second largest opposition group, the Nation Party (Millet Partisi) was dissolved by court order on tenuous allegations of being in fact a religious association. The latter party soon reappeared as the Republican Nation Party, enlarged in 1957 into the Republican Nation Peasants' Party. Toward the end of the decade opposition parties were subject to stringent police controls at their meetings, suppression of their newspapers, and systematic harassment of their members throughout the country. At the same time many voluntary associations were pressed into joining the Patriotic Front (Vatan Cephesi) under Democratic Party auspices. The overthrow of the Menderes regime in the revolution of 27 May 1960 brought a temporary moratorium on all political activities under the provisional government of General Gürsel's Committee of National Unity. With the proclamation of the Constitution of the Second Republic, political and associational freedoms were once again restored, although the leaders of the deposed Democratic regime of Bayar and Menderes remained barred for the time being.


(D. A. Rustow)
One of the earliest societies to be formed during the reign of Nasir al-Din was the Madjmac-i Ughwewat founded by ‘All Khan Zahir al-Dawla b. Muhammad ‘All Khan, the Iguiddbsbgb in and singtons of Zahir al-Din’s successor ‘Ali Sháh as the leader of a group of Niftimtalláhervishes who had gathered round Safí ‘Ali Sháh as their pir. Although Madjmac-i Ughwewat was something in the nature of a Súfí fraternity rather than a literary or political society, it appears to have been regarded by some as the first of the “political” andjumans and on these grounds its premises were destroyed on the orders of Muhammad ‘Ali Sháh after the bombardment of the National Assembly (Mu‘ayyir al-Mamálík, Idgáli-i ʿAṣrrí Náṣírí, in Yáqmá, i/7, 1956, 326 ff.). Nevertheless the society appears to have continued in existence or to have been reformed (see Husayn Samíl, Maṭbūʿát wa maqālát wa taṣarrúf, Tehran n.d., 314 ff.).

Towards the end of Náṣír al-Dín’s reign various secret or semi-secret associations started to meet in Tehran and the provinces. When these andjumans (which came to be known individually by the term andjuman-i millí, i.e., a national or popular society), first started to meet their deliberations appear to have been mainly confined to discussions on the desirability of the liberation of the people from the yoke of tyranny, and of the benefits which accrued from freedom, justice, and education. Their members were held together by discontent at existing conditions and a belief in the need for modernization. After the assassination of Náṣír al-Dín in 1896 the activities of the andjumans increased and their members advocated reform more openly. Their membership appears to have been drawn predominantly from the middle ranks of the ‘ulámí. At this period the andjumans (or those of which we have records) seem to have considered their function was to combat illiteracy and even founded schools, which some of them did. In the second term the andjumans, known as the “popular” andjumans, the “political” andjumans or to have been reformed (see Browne, The Persian revolution of 1905-1909, Cambridge 1910, 245). One of the late 19th century andjumans, the Andjuman-i Ma‘arif founded in 1315/1897-8, was apparently something in the nature of a Súfí fraternity rather than a literary or political society, it appears to have been regarded by some as the first of the “political” andjumans and on these grounds its premises were destroyed on the orders of Muhammad ‘Ali Sháh after the bombardment of the National Assembly (Mu‘ayyir al-Mamálík, Idgáli-i ʿAṣrrí Náṣírí, in Yáqmá, i/7, 1956, 326 ff.). Nevertheless the society appears to have continued in existence or to have been reformed (see Husayn Samíl, Maṭbūʿát wa maqālát wa taṣarrúf, Tehran n.d., 314 ff.).

With the grant of the constitution in August 1906 the Andjuman-i Makhfi-i Thána wá was reconstituted and numerous other andjumans, with local and professional affiliations, sprung up in the capital and the provinces. In Tehran within a short space of time some two hundred andjumans were formed; some of the larger ones are said to have had several thousand members. Their purpose was to support the constitution, advocate reforms, watch over the actions of the government and its officials, and demand rectification of their grievances or alleged injustice. Two main types of andjuman came into existence: “official” andjumans and “popular” andjumans. The former were the provincial councils (andjuman-i ayyáltí wa wíláyáltí) which were originally set up in the provincial towns for the purpose of electing deputies to the National Assembly and were later recognized by Article 90 of the Supplementary Fundamental Laws promulgated on 7 October 1907. Article 91 lays down that they should be elected by the people and Article 92 states that they were to be free to exercise supervision over all reforms connected with the public interest. The second type of andjuman, the “popular” andjuman, was also recognized by the supplementary Fundamental Laws, Article 21 of which states “Societies (andjumans) and associations (iqfilimátí) which are not productive of mischief to religion or to the state and are not injurious to good order are free throughout the whole empire, but members of such associations must not carry arms, and must obey the regulations laid down by the law on this matter . . .” The provincial councils varied a good deal from place to place. The Andjuman-i Ayyalátí of Tabriz, which had been set up for the purpose of the election
of deputies to the new National Assembly, was dissolved by Muhammad 'Ali, the wali 'ahd and governor of Adharbaydjan, as soon as the deputies had been elected. It reformed almost immediately as the Angjuman-i Milli though it subsequently appeared that the original nationalist members had been replaced by officers and secretaries (Karim Tahirzada Bihzad, Kiyani-i Adharbaydjan dar inkilabi-i mahsuliyyat-i Iran, Tehran n.d. 148-9, 174 ff; cf. also Aubin, La Perse d'aujourd'hui, Paris 1908, 40). After the coup d'etat of 1907 it became, in the absence of the National Assembly, the focal point of the constitutional or nationalist movement in Persia. In Isfahan the Angjuman-nukaddas-i Milli-i Isfahan, opened on 6 Dhu'l Ka'ba 1324/22 December 1906, appears to have had executive as well as consultative functions and to have been run by the leading 'alam', merchants, and citizens of the town (see the weekly paper published by the Angjuman-nukaddas-i milli-i Isfahan, 1907-8; and also Muhammad Sa'dr Hashimi, op. cit., i, 290). The membership of the "popular" angjumans also varied from place to place to reflect the strongly developed in Tehran, Tabriz, Isfahan, and north Persia than in the south. Whereas prior to the grant of the constitution the Tehran angjumans were largely drawn from the religious classes and the intellectuals, in the second phase they had a strong connexion with the craft guilds; many of them also had local affiliations. In Tabriz each street tended to have its own angjuman; and in Tehran not only were there local angjumans but the inhabitants of different districts and provinces who lived in Tehran also formed their own angjumans. In Adharbaydjan from the first the angjumans were opposed to the large landowners and had a strong "middle class" bias. In Isfahan, on the other hand, the angjumans were largely dominated by the local religious leaders. In Rasht some of the members of the Angjuman-i Milli formed there are said to have been connected with the Social Democratic Party of Baku (Malikzadeh, Tarih-i inkilabi-i mahsuliyyat-i Iran, ii, 264). In general, however, the members of the angjumans had had no political experience, and there was a tendency on the part of some of them to an irresponsible interference in the administration of the country ( Cf. Cd. 4381 Persia No. 1 (1909), no. 176, p. 143). In spite of this they played an important part in creating a public opinion in favour of constitutional reform and were the one support which the National Assembly had against the reactionary party. Further, through the contact which the angjumans established with each other they fostered a certain sense of solidarity among those who were seeking to assert themselves against the arbitrary, and often tyrannical, rule of the provincial governors. Prior to this time any attempt by the people to assert themselves against the local authorities was likely to be isolated. The angjumans created a sense of a community of interest and this gave the people in widely separated districts courage to act. The success of the angjumans in providing a focal point for public opinion in support of the constitution was such that their opponents sought to counter this by infiltrating into existing angjumans to have been known by its original name hoping to confuse the issue by working in secret against the constitution under cover of nationalist associations.

Muhammad 'Ali, who succeeded his father, Musaffar al-Din, in January 1907, disliked the constitution from the start. After the appointment of Mirza 'Ali Asghar Khan Amn al-Sultân, the A'tabak-i A'zam, as prime minister in the late spring of 1907 there was a great increase in the numbers of the angjumans, secret and otherwise, formed for the defence of the constitution (Abdallâh Mustawfi, Shahr-i zindagi-i man, Tehran 1945, ii, 244-6; memorandum by Churchill, enclosed by Sir Cecil Spring Rice to Sir Edward Grey in a letter dated 23 May 1907, Cd. 4581, no. 26, p. 27). Little was done to implement the constitution. Disorders were fomented in the provinces. Russia was suspected of aiding and encouraging the Shah against the National Assembly, and the belief grew that there was secret collusion between the Shah and the Amin al-Sultân for the overthrow of the constitution and the sale of the country to Russia. On 31 August the Amin al-Sultân was assassinated by a certain Abbâs Âkâ (who immediately afterwards shot himself). On the assassin's body was found a paper stating that he was devotee (fiddâ'i-i milli) no. 41 of the Angjuman. Whether in fact such an angjuman whose members were thus known as fiddâ'is really existed remains an open question. There is, however, no doubt that the murder had the support of the Shah, and gave rise to the belief that the membership of secret societies whose members would not stop at political assassination to gain their ends was spreading. Popular sentiment approved the murder and regarded Abbâs Âkâ as the saviour of the country (Kasrawi, op. cit. (in Bibl.), 447 ff., Browne, op. cit., 150 ff.).

An abortive attack by the court party on the National Assembly in the winter of 1907-8 was frustrated by the help of the Tehran and provincial angjumans. Some of them meanwhile began to raise volunteers for a kind of national militia. In June 1908 a more serious attack was made against the National Assembly. The angjumans again rallied to its defence, this time in vain. The Cossack regiment bombarded the Assembly and the angjumans were dispersed after a brief resistance. The Assembly was closed and a number of prominent nationalists were arrested and some executed. The organization of the nationalist resistance, which culminated in the deposition of Muhammad 'Ali and the restoration of the constitution in July 1909, largely devolved on the angjumans. They were helped in this by angjumans formed by Persian communities abroad, especially the Angjuman-i Sa'adat in Constantinople. As soon as the Angjuman-* Sa'adat Assembly he sent instructions to the provinces for all the angjumans to be closed also (Kasrawi, op. cit., 672). Immediate and effective resistance came from Tabriz only. Government troops were expelled from the town, which was then blockaded, the siege being raised by Russian troops who opened the Julfa road in April 1909. The resistance of Tabriz organized by the Angjuman-i Milli-i Ayâlati, although the nationalists were eventually forced to capitulate, gave the nationalists in other cities of Persia, especially Isfahan and Rasht, time to recover after the coup d'etat of 1908. In Isfahan contact was eventually established between the angjumans and the Bakhtiyarís and in January 1909 Isfahan was taken. At the end of April a force of Bakhtiyarís and nationalist fighters (muğâhidîn) set out from Isfahan for the capital, while the Sipahdar-i A'mâm Muhammad Wall Khan, who had been in command of the government troops outside Tabriz and had gone over to the the nationalists and assembled a force of muğâhidîn in Gilân and Tunâkabûn, marched on Tehran from the neighbourhood of Kazâm. The two forces entered Tehran on 13 July and Muhammad 'Ali abdicated on 17 July.
With the restoration of the constitution the activities of the "popular" andjumans declined. For a brief period in 1912 when renewed attempts to change the constitution were made they were once again sporadically active; and various acts of violence were attributed to them. However, when the constitution was again suspended in 1912 on account of the opposition of the National Assembly to the Russian ultimatum demanding the dismissal of Mr. Morgan Shushter, the treasurer-general, the cumulative effect of internal disorders, the infiltration of hostile elements into the nationalist movement, the infiltration of all, Russian, did not make virtually impossible, the emergence of a popular movement of protest. The "popular" andjumans, thus, had no longer a function to perform and so they disappeared from the political scene.


(iv)—Tunisia. In Tunisia, the term djam'iyya does not appear to have been in use before the 19th century. Khayr al-Din al-Tunus used it in 1284/1867 in the sense of academy, scientific association; charitable society; municipal or cantonal organization (djam'iyyat al-khdnt), agricultural or industrial association; parish, parish council; various groups of teachers, notables, officials, local magistrates, municipal councillors. In the field of economics he used sharika (but djam'iyya for a joint-stock company). He even used the expression al-darabiyya (Akwas al-masadik). In the twentieth century djam'iyya signifies association, society, corporation, league, parliamen
tary assembly (al-djam'iyya al-thakdfiyya) and includes so-called voluntary associations of every sort (al-djam'iyya al-jam'iyya). Religious associations.—The oldest is the Djam'iyyat al-Askhd, in charge of the public harbou and with the right to inspect the endowments of private harbous and Zaulias (sawaya). It is social and religious in character. With it can be connected the Djam'iyyat ka'adyiya (charitable), the first of which was founded in 1323/1903. In 1380/1902 the Yearbook (Rasama) added the takhdy (sing: takhyiya), institutions dating from 1314/1905, under 'Ali Pasha Bey. Neither the traditional Islamic organizations nor the confraternities (fariba) bear this name. The non-confessional associations founded after 1900 added to their titles the adjective islamiyiya or tarabiyyiya, to be replaced by tunusiyiya or wataniyyiya between 1919 and 1938 (a period of intense Destour activity). In 1935 Shaykh 'Abd al-Aziz al-Bawandi founded the Djam'iyyat al-islamiyiya al-khurabiyyiya (Kurlanic readings).

Political associations.—To the "evolutionist" group are attributed numerous foundations connected with music (al-Hilal, 1322/1904 and al-Jussayniyya founded in 1907 in al-Nasriyya), sport (al-Islamiyya, 1905), the theatre (1905), etc. Special mention must be made, on account of its influence, of the "Association of North African Muslim students in France" (Djam'iyyat talabat shamli Iftikhyya al-muslinin bi-Fransa), which was presided over by several well-known Tunisians. From the time of its foundation (1934) the Neo-Destour created or controlled numerous associations (for example, Unj al-shubbdn al-muslmn). In 1945 there occurred a characteristic regrouping of existing associations (agricultural labourers, workers, officials, students, and teachers, women, young people etc.). The word hijze, party, denotes a purely political association from the time of the foundation of the Young Tunisian Party (1907).}

Economic associations.—The first of these appears to have been the association of food merchants: Djam'iyyat tudujdar al-ma'ta'ah (15 September 1888). After 1906 they became more numerous (at least nine societies were founded between 1910 and 1921); in this sphere, after 1906 sharika tends to replace djam'iyya. From 1888 to 1938, out of 38 societies only 6 bear this second name. At first societies had a symbolic name (nahda, i'tadun, 'aladud) with sharika as a secondary name, then changed or added the adjective tamimidhat al-sa'dikiyya) which rapidly acquired great political importance. Groups with aims concerned with sport, music, the theatre etc. also adopted or at least implied the title Djam'iyya.

Cultural associations.—The term djam'iyya applies particularly to unaffiliated associations of this sort. The earliest in date (18 Radjab 1314/22 December 1896) was the Djam'iyya al-khdamiyya whose aim was the teaching of modern science to Tunisian students, particularly those of the great mosque. The second (15 December 1903) was the Association of Former Pupils of Sadiki (Djam'iyyat kidama' al-talidimhat al-sa'dikiyya) which was founded in 1910, the National Commercial Society (al-Tarakki, 1910), the National Commercial Society (al-Amam, 1914); and the still more significant title al-Istihlab al-khusr.

Cultural associations.—The term djam'iyya applies particularly to unaffiliated associations of this sort. The earliest in date (18 Radjab 1314/22 December 1896) was the Djam'iyya al-khdamiyya whose aim was the teaching of modern science to Tunisian students, particularly those of the great mosque. The second (15 December 1903) was the Association of Former Pupils of Sadiki (Djam'iyyat kidama' al-talidimhat al-sa'dikiyya) which rapidly acquired great political importance. Groups with aims concerned with sport, music, the theatre etc. also adopted or at least implied the title Djam'iyya.

New associations.—With the coming of independence (20 March 1957), the associations underwent a transformation (juridical reforms, a new political, cultural, economic structure). What was called (ittihab) took the place of Djam'iyya. However, the term remained in use for cultural associations, as is shown by the recently established "Cultural Associations Centre" (Ddr al-djam'iyyat al-thakdfiyya).

publications) of associations and societies (in Arabic and French): a more detailed study is to appear in IBLA.

(A. Deemereeman)

India and Pakistan.—In Muslim India the word diamiyya is replaced by diamatul or diamat as a term for religious or religio-political as distinct from purely political organizations. The term, in this sense, is of recent though not of modernist origin.

The Diamatul-i mudajhidin, the religio-political organization formed by Sayyid Ahmad Barelvi, owed its name to its movement of diamah against the secularist party in 19th century and later against the British. Essentially it based its programme on the teachings of Shâh Wali Allah and his successors to purify Indian Islam from syncretic elements borrowed from Hinduism and to organize and strengthen the Muslim community socially and politically. It was a popular organization deriving its support from all cross-sections of Muslim society and operating its own bayt al-adl and bayt al-mdldh. The Diamatul-i al-ulama-i Hind was founded in 1919 at the peak of the Indian Muslim agitation in favour of the Ottoman Khilafat. Mawlana Mahmud Hasan, already a well-established religio-political leader was among its founders, and though the ulama of the Farang Mahall [see dar al-ulum] and members of the Nadwat-ul-ulama also participated in it, the element of Deoband [q.v.] remained by far the most powerful. It supported the nationalistic programme of the Indian National Congress and was opposed to separatist trends in Muslim politics and to the demand for Pakistan by the general Muslim consensus.

This led in 1945 to the formation, by a dissident group of Deobandis and other ulama, of the Diamatul-ul-ulama-i Islam, under the leadership of Shabbir Ahmad Uhmâni, which supported the Muslim League's demand for Pakistan. It moved to Pakistan in 1947, and during the various phases of that country's constitution-making championed the traditionalist view of the shari'ah. Another traditionalist organization which participated to some extent in the processes of constitution-making and legislation was the Diamatul-ul-ulama-i Pakistan.

The Diamatul-Islami differs from these traditionalist religio-political bodies in that it has a strong programme strictly on fundamentalism. It was founded in 1941 by Abu 'l-Alâ Mawdudl, with its centre at Pathankot, and moved to Pakistan in 1947, where it developed itself into a well-knit, well-organized religio-political group, extending its influence into urban and rural areas of West Pakistan and playing a controversial role on the question of the ideals and constitution of Pakistan as an Islamic state. Its fundamentalism is the complete antithesis of liberal modernism and vests all rights of legislation imutrably in God alone, denying them to all human agencies, individual or collective, thus preaching a theocracy which is to be run by the consensus of the believers according to the letter of the revealed law.

Bibliography: Among old writers, it is to be noticed that Husri (Zahr and Diam, see index) frequently quotes anecdotes and lines of al-Diammâz; Khatib Baghdadî, iii, 125-6, and Kutubî, 'Uyân al-tawdrlkh, MS. Paris 1588, 149 a-b, carry a notice of him; Marzubani, Mu'adham, 276, and Mul'dim, 431, concentrate more on the work than the man. See also: Djaluz, 163; Marzubani, i, 174-5, 395; see index; Ibn Kutayba, Mul'dam, 71; Tabari, iii, 1412; Ibn al-Athir, vii, 39; Âghami, index: Qasâ'ib, Thmâr al-bulshâ, 322; Ibn al-Hashadji, Hamâsa, 275; 'Askari, 'Indatayn, 50; Kâli, Amâlî, iii, 46; Yâkût, Irshad, ii, 60. Biographical data and a number of lines are contained in Sandûbh, 'Adab al-Djâlîz, 46-8; Hâgîri, in his edition of the Djâlîz of Djalîz, 315, gives a summary of his biography: (Ch. Pellat)

Djâmînâ, the usual modern Muslim spelling of the Indian river which rises in Tehrl in the Himalaya and falls into the Ganges at Allahabad. Generally called Jamna (older Jumna) on western maps, its Sanskrit name Yamuna has been largely re-adopted in modern India; it was known to Ptolemy as Gemina, which was quick and scathing at repartee, but his humour, following the taste of the time, was in general very coarse.
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etc.) to the south. Navigable for the greater part of its length in the plains, it was an important traffic route which is coming under the railways; this and the purity of its water have largely been responsible for its urban settlements in Dihlī, Mathurā (Muttra), Āgrā, Etāwā, Kulpī and Allahābād [qq.v.].

Of its canals, the East Jumna canal was a British enterprise. The western canal, however, was begun by Firoz Shāh Tughlūkh in 757/1356, as a monsoon supply channel to Hīdrār and Hānī, [224 ff.). They can be traced to an ancient pagan cult of planetary origin, but warned that the present state of knowledge does not permit of a definitive answer being given (see HADJDJ).


Djāmsīd (Avestan Yima Khshaeta “Yima the brilliant”), in abbreviated form Djam, an Iranian hero who has “remained alive in popular and literary tradition, from Indo-Iranian times until our own day (see the texts collected, translated and commented upon by A. Christensen, Le premier homme et le premier roi dans l’histoire légendaire des Iranians, ii.)

To the Indian hero Yama, son of Vivasvant, sometimes immortal man become god, sometimes the first human to have suffered death and to have become its god (Rig-Veda. Māhābhārata, Atharva-Veda; cf. the texts in Christensen, op. cit.) there corresponds, in the texts from ancient Iran, the hero Yima, son of Vivasvant, a hero of the millennium when men, rescued from the influence of the pristine dharma of priestly religion, did not know hunger or thirst, heat or cold, old age or death; he founded towns and villages in thousands, kindled the three sacred fires, organized the social castes, preserved humanity from perishing by providing a safe, vast refuge, underground but nevertheless light, the Var [cf. Noah’s ark], on the approach of a terrible winter followed by floods, provoked by a
sorcerer or demon; but, according to the texts, he taught men, who were then simply vegetarians, to eat animal meat (hence his condemnation by the Avesta which forbids sacrifices of blood; cf. text and commentary in Christensen, op. cit., ii, 119). Several historical personages bore the name of Djamshid (or Djam); among others, the son of the Sasānīd king Kavadh I (Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, index: Zham; idem, Les Kayanides, 40), a son of the Ottoman sultan Mehmed II (see Djamshid, Dr. Safa, Hamāsa-sarātī dar Īrān, 396 ff.; idem, Tāvīrīh-i adabiyat-ī Īrān, (index); H. Masse, Croyances et coutumes persanes (index I: Djamshid).

Bibliography: in addition to the works mentioned in the text, see: Desmaisons, Dictionnaire persan-français, art. Djamshid, the name denoting three sovereigns; Gr. I Ph. (s.v. Yima); A. Christensen, Les Kayanides (index: Yim); Sven S. Hartman, Gayomart (index: Gayomard, Demd-i Naṣrābaddār); B. Benveniste, Les classes sociales dans la tradition avestique, in JA, ccxii (1932), 117 ff.; G. Dumézil, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, 45 ff.; Browne (index: Djamshid as named in lyric poetry); Dr. Safa, Hamāsa-sarātī dar Īrān, 396 ff.; idem, Tāvīrīh-i adabiyat-ī Īrān, (index); H. Masse, Croyances et coutumes persanes (index I: Djamshid).

Djamshid was associated with the magic cup which credits Djamshid with the invention of wine (cf. Muhammad Mu'īn, Masdasyasā, Tehran 1326/1948, 267 ff.; Djamshid appears many times in the ghazals of Ḥāfīz (play of words on djam and Djam: ed. Kazwīnī-Ghāni, no. 78, 179, 431, 468).

In his early youth Djanab came under the influence of the last important group of supporters of Sasanid tradition: Christensen, op. cit., 74; later, he was avenged upon Ḥūshang through the hollow tree in which he had taken refuge (a borrowing from Talmudic tradition: Christensen, op. cit., ii, 124 ff.).

In his early youth Djanab came under the influence of the last important group of supporters of Sasanid tradition: Christensen, op. cit., ii, 124 ff.).

The poet Asadī (s.v.) of Tūs told of the romance between Djamshid and the king of Kābul with whom he had taken refuge from Zahhāk, who pursued them as far as China (Livre de Gerghasp, i, 37-91, text and trans. Cl. Huart); Djamshid's magic cup has given the name to a poem djam-i Djam (see art. Awarna; the vowel of the second Djam should be changed to a short a); a romance in verse by Salmān of Savē (s.v.) tells of the love of Djamshid, son of the emperor of China, and Khūshīrd, daughter of the emperor of Byzantium. As it is not possible to mention here all the poems in which Djamshid features, we will limit ourselves to the "Djamshid's daughter", following the popular belief which credits Djamshid with the invention of wine (cf. Muhammad Mu'īn, Masdasyasā, Tehran 1326/1948, 267 ff.; Djamshid appears many times in the ghazals of Ḥāfīz (play of words on djam and Djam: ed. Kazwīnī-Ghāni, no. 78, 179, 431, 468).

Bibliography: in addition to the works mentioned in the text, see: Desmaisons, Dictionnaire persan-français, art. Djamshid, the name denoting three sovereigns; Gr. I Ph. (s.v. Yima); A. Christensen, Les Kayanides (index: Yim); Sven S. Hartman, Gayomart (index: Gayomard, Demd-i Naṣrābaddār); B. Benveniste, Les classes sociales dans la tradition avestique, in JA, ccxii (1932), 117 ff.; G. Dumézil, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, 45 ff.; Browne (index: Djamshid as named in lyric poetry); Dr. Safa, Hamāsa-sarātī dar Īrān, 396 ff.; idem, Tāvīrīh-i adabiyat-ī Īrān, (index); H. Masse, Croyances et coutumes persanes (index I: Djamshid).

Djanab Shihāb al-Dīn

He was born in Monastir. Upon the death of his father, an army officer, killed at the battle of Plewna (1876), he settled in Istanbul with his mother and attended, as a boarder, various military high schools, graduating from the military School of Medicine in 1889 as an army doctor. He spent four years in Paris completing his medical studies. On his return to Turkey he served in various Department of Health offices in the provinces and in Istanbul. After the Constitution of 1908 and during the First World War he tried political life without success. On retiring from government service he joined the staff of the Faculty of Arts of Istanbul University (1914) but had to resign in 1922, following a student protest about his hostile attitude towards the Nationalist movement in Anatolia. After the establishment of the Republic (1923), and after a vain attempt to win the favour of the new Government in Ankara, he lived until his death a relatively secluded life, contributing essays and occasional poems to the revived literary review Taheret-ī Fūnān.

In his early youth Djanab came under the influence of the last important group of supporters of
the old school of literature and his first poems are in the classical tradition. But he soon freed himself of this influence and began to write poems strongly inspired by the work of the great modernist ʿAbd al-Jahak Ḥāmid and of ṭhe ṭMiddle of Kurʾān, LVI, 77-9. The distinction is based on the wording of Kurgan, ṭtayammum [q.v.].

The western group consists primarily of Bedouins, though some own property, e.g., the chief of the tribe, Djasir, who has land in ʿĪz, which is regarded as the tribal capital. Dīṣir also has a claim to the island of Maṣṭra, on which he stays for a time each year. The favourite range of the western Djanaba, the wadis in the vicinity of the town of Adīn, lies east of the range of the ṭDurūʾ.

The Djanaba belong to the Ghafiri faction, in which they are allied with the ṭDurūʾ in opposition to ʿAlī Wahiba, who are ṭHināwī. The enmity between these tribes is no longer as bitter as it once was. In ṭDjaʿān the Djanaba are allies of Banī Bū ṣAllī. The Djanaba call themselves Sunnis; Iḥādī doctrines have not made much headway among them, though they respect the Iḥādī ṭImām. Bibliography: B. Thomas, Alarms and excursions in Arabia, Indianapolis, 1931; W. Thesiger, Arabian sands, London, 1959; ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṯumayd al-Ṣālimī, ṭTuḥfat al-Aʿyān, Cairo, 1332-47. Also information from inhabitants of Oman.

(Ḡ. Ṭeṣṭīʾ)

Djanābshīhāb al-Dīn—Djanābshāb

Istanbul 1934; Ālī Ṭanī Ṭawīm, in Aylık Anıtıbāfühlū, Istanbul 1945, i, 298-9; Ṭenān Ṭukbīz, Bātī tāsirīne ʿūrā ṭīrī ṭuṣṭūlī, Ankara 1953, 205; Cenāb Mīṣāḥ, (Fahīr Ṭeṣṭīʾ) al-Djanābshāb (ṣing. Djanābshīb), one of the leading tribes of Oman. Apparently at one time the strongest of all the Bedouin tribes there, the Djanaba still number enough nomadic members to rank as peers of the ṭDurūʾ [q.v.] and ʿAlī Wahiba [q.v.] in the desert. The main divisions of the Djanaba are the Maḍjīlā (sing. Maḍjīl), pronounced Māʾālī, the ṭFawārīs, ʿAl ṭDubayyān, and ʿAl Ābū ṭGhālīb, of which the first is considered to be paramount. The present chief ṭraṣṭīd of the tribe is Dīṣir b. Ṭaḥmīb, whose predecessors were the descendants of al-Murr b. Ṭanīṣūr.

Covering a wide territory, the Djanaba generally speaking fall into two groups, an eastern and a western. In the east many have settled along the coasts, in Śūr on the Gulf of Oman, which is shared with Banī Bū ṣʿAllī, and in the little ports of the coast of the Arabian Sea as far south as al-Dīkār. These settled folk have largely turned their hand to nautical affairs, and some have done well as merchants, trading to Bombay, Zanzibar, and the Red Sea. The nomads in the eastern group have large herds of camels and goats, which they keep on the coasts in winter and in the interior in summer, sheltering themselves in caves from the south-west monsoon. Some are skilful fishermen, especially in catching sharks.

The western group consists primarily of Bedouins, though some own property, e.g., the chief of the tribe, Dīṣir, who has land in ʿĪz, which is regarded as the tribal capital. Dīṣir also has a claim to the island of Maṣṭra, on which he stays for a time each year. The favourite range of the western Djanaba, the wadis in the vicinity of the town of Adīn, lies east of the range of the ṭDurūʾ. In ṭDjaʿān the Djanaba are allies of Banī Bū ṣʿAllī. The Djanaba call themselves Sunnis; Iḥādī doctrines have not made much headway among them, though they respect the Iḥādī ṭImām. Bibliography: B. Thomas, Alarms and excursions in Arabia, Indianapolis, 1931; W. Thesiger, Arabian sands, London, 1959; ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭumayd al-Ṣālimī, ṭTuḥfat al-Aʿyān, Cairo, 1332-47. Also information from inhabitants of Oman.

(L. Ṭeṣṭīʾ)

Djanābshāb, the state of so-called major ritual impurity. It is caused by marital intercourse, to which the religious law assimilates any effusio seminis. One who is in this state of so-called major ritual impurity, the minor ritual ablation (wuduʿ [q.v.]). The ṭazāyamōmm [q.v.]. On the other hand, the law prescribes for a Muslim in the state of so-called minor impurity the minor ritual ablation (wuduʿ [q.v.]). The distinction is based on the wording of Kurʾān, V. 6. The ṭazāmān cannot perform a valid ṭahīl; he may not make a ʿfāṣil round the Kaʿbah, enter a mosque (except in cases of necessity), touch copies of the Kurʾān or recite verses from it; these last provisions are based on the traditional interpretation of Kurʾān, LVI, 77-9. Djanābshāb is also called “the ṭmajor ṭadāḥa” [q.v.], in opposition to the minor ritual impurity.

Bibliography: The chapters on ṭahāra in the

Bibliography: The chapters on ṭahāra in the

Djanāba shihāb al-dīn—Djanāba shihāb al-dīn
collections of traditions and the works on fiqh;

(TH. W. JUVENOL)*)

AL-DJANAWAN, ABU 'ABD ALLAH BAHAR AL-DIN
MUHAMMAD B. YA'QUB B. YUGAF, SHAIKH AL-DIN AL-HANAFI

Ibn al-Suluk fi tabakat al-umam wa l-muluk, an important biographical
dictionary of the learned men, primarily jurisconsults,
of Yemen arranged by the towns in which they were born
or lived. The work proper is preceded by a long introduction comprising a political
history of the country from the time of the Prophet to 724/1323-4,
early recognized by the later historians of Yemen to be of the greatest value so that his work
is quoted as a source by al-Khazrajdi, al-Ahda, Abu Makhrama, and others.
The biographical portion was later continued by al-Khazrajdi in his Ti'iraz
vi'dam al-zaman fi tahabit al-ydn al-umam and in the
Tu'hasi al-zaman fi a'yan al-Yaman by al-Ahda.
The Suluk of al-Djanani has not as yet been edited in its
entirety although a portion of the historical intro-
duction, that concerning the Fattimid fi'din in
Yemen, has been edited and translated from the
manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale (2117, Add. 267, foll. 308-326) by H. C. Kay in his Yaman,
it's early medieval history (London, 1892). To those
manuscripts of the Suluk listed by Brockelmann
should be added the excellent copy in the Chester Beatty Library
(no. 3110, i. & ii) and another in the
Egyptian National Library in Cairo (25 Ta'Rih);
the latter is a recent photocopy of that in the library of
the great mosque of San'a'.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, II, 184, S II, 236; Hâjdil Khallla, ed. Flügel, ii, 613; al-
Sakhawi, F'lan in Franz Rosenthal, A history of Muslim historiography, 406-7; Kay, pp. xii-xiv.

(C. L. GEDDES)

AL-DJANAWANI (also AL-DJENAWANI), ABU
UBAYDA 'ABD AL-HAMID, GOVERNOR OF THE
Djabal Nafusa for the Ibâdite imâm of Tâhart.
He was a native of the village of Ijânawun (also
Djenawen, in Berber Iqan) situated below the
town of Djâdû in the present district of Fassâto.
He already enjoyed great prestige there about 196/811
during the stay of the imâm 'Abd al-Wahhâb b. 'Abd
al-Rahbân b. Rustam in the Djabal Nafusa. On the
death of Abu 'l-Hasan Ayyûb he was elected
governor of the Djabal Nafusa by the people of the
country and afterwards received the investiture from 'Abd al-Wahhâb, probably a little before the death
of the latter which occurred in 208/823. His gover-
norship, the duration of which corresponded very
nearly with the reign of the imâm Alâb b. 'Abd
al-Wahhâb (208/823-258/871), was troubled by the
continuous war which he had to wage against the
heretic Khâlaf b. al-Samh, grandson of a previous
Ibâdite imâm of North Africa, Abu 'l-Khaatâb 'Abd
al-Alâ b. al-Wahhâb. Several episodes are known of
this war which came to an end only after the victory
which al-Djanawani achieved over Khalaf's army
in 221/835. As a result of this victory the Djabal Nafusa,
whose population were fanatical partisans of the
Rustamids, continued to be a province of the state
of Tâhart until the latter's downfall.

Al-Djanawani was pious and learned. Besides
Berber he also knew Arabic and the language of
Kanem (lugha kdnamiyya), a very strange fact. He
is counted among the twelve mustadâd ib-dû?'i
('those whose prayers are answered') who inhabited the
Djabal Nafusa towards the end of the 2nd/8th
century and the beginning of the 3rd/9th. He resided
at Ijânawun which at this period became for a time
the religious and political centre of the whole
Djabal Nafusa. The Ibâdite tradition recorded by al-
Shamâkî speaks of seventy Ibâdite scholars who
flocked there at that time from all the province
governed by al-Djanawani.

Bibliography: Chronique d'Abou Zakaria,
trans. with comm. by E. Masqueray, Paris-
Algiers 1878, 144-74; Abu 'l-'Abbâs Ahmad b.
Sa'd al-Shamâkî, Kitâb al-Siyar, Cairo 1301/1883, 179-89; A. de C. Mojtylnski, Le Djabal Nfousa,
Paris 1900, 88, n. 2; R. Basset, Les sanctuaires du Djabel Nfousa, in JA 1899, July-
August, 95-6; T. Lewicki, Études ibdites nord-
africaines, i, Warsaw 1955, 92-3, 131, and passim.
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DJANABA — DJANAZA
there were exceptions; Abū Bakr [q.v.] gave orders that he should be washed by his widow. It was a mark of piety for one at the point of death to wash himself in readiness. The body was not stripped entirely and was washed several times, always an uneven number, and for the last sādir leaves or camphor was steeped in the water. If disease made it unwholesome to touch the body, it was enough to pour quantities of water over it. Washing began with the right side and the parts washed in the ritual ablation. Martyrs who fell in battle were not washed and were buried in their tight-fitting clothes without prayers. Grave-clothes might be the every day garments, usually three, though sheets were used; white was the normal use though colours were allowed but not red. The eyes were closed, the jaw tied up and the grave-clothes tied tightly but were loosened in the tomb. The body was carried to the grave on an open bier with a cloth thrown over it, and there was an extra covering for a woman. Burial might be in the house but was more usual in a cemetery. The funeral moved quickly for, "If I am good, hurry me to God; and if I am bad, get rid of me quickly". It was better to walk in the procession than to ride and it was a work of merit to help carry the bier, it only for a few steps. A halt might be made at a mosque for prayers which differed from the salah [q.v.] because the mourners stood throughout. Prayers were said by the grave. An extreme personification might be used. A near relative officiated though the governor or a famous scholar might be asked to lead or might insist on doing so. The inam [q.v.] stood by the head of a nian or by the trunk of a woman. Prayers were said over an infant if it had cried once but not over a suicide. Those sitting in the street should stand as a funeral passes. Women were not allowed to be present; this was to avoid the lamentation customary in the Djähiliyya [q.v.] because lamentations added to the pains of the dead. The earth must not press on the body which must sit up to answer Munkar and Nakir (see 'ADHAB AL-KABR) so the grave depended on whether a "trencher" or a "nicher" came first. If this tale is true, these forms of burial existed before Islam but the details are so precise that the whole is suspect. The nearest relatives descended into the grave to put the body in position with the face towards Mecca and to loosen the grave-clothes. One man one grave is the rule; after the battle of Uhud two bodies were put in one grave but one was taken away later; if a man and a woman had to be laid in one grave, there had to be a partition between them. Burial might be on the day of death or the following day but a hurried burial at night was not approved. Some held that the earth over a grave should be level though others allowed a small mound. Covering it with flagstones and the niche shut off by a horizontal stone, it had a hole in it to let water through. Coffins were not used at first but by the 6th century they were common. There might be a meal with gifts of food to the poor. Customs changed; women followed funerals, professional mourners were employed and masonry tombs became common.


Djânâbâz. The Persian djânâbâz, 'playing with one's life; dare-devil' developed these three meanings which, mainly through Ottoman Turkish, spread into a number of languages: 1. 'acrobat', especially 'rope-dancer', which is known in the east as far as Eastern Turki (dânbaşî), in the west in the Caucasian, Turkish, and Egypt (gânbaðhaîî 'rope-dancers', gânbaûz 'gymnastics'), 2. 'soldier' [see article DJANBAZAN], 3. 'horse-dealer'; this latter word spread through Turkey (recorded in the 16th century: Glîsa Elezoviç, Is Carradehîş Türkî Arkîva Muhîmme Defterî, Belgrade 1951, 115, no. 659) north as far as Rumania and south to Syria and Lebanon, often with pejorative development of the meaning: 'one who drives a hard bargain' (Bulgaria), 'merchant who demands exorbitant prices' (Syria), 'trickster' (Rum. gânbaész). —Acrobats, known since antiquity, were always popular in the Near East, and, in particular, in the festivities given by the Ottoman sultans to the people of the capital they were never missing. 'A troupe of excellent Tumblers and Mountebanks (where of Turkey abounds above all the Regions of the Earth)...' begins the description of such a festivity (Michel Baudier, transl. by Edward Grimestone, The History of the Serrail and of the Court of the Grand Seigneur, London 1635, 88 f.). The earliest reference to djânbaç in Ottoman times seems to be found in the description of a circumcision feast for the royal princes in Edirne in 1457 (here Laonikos Chalkokondyles translates the Turkish term, spelled pehlikân [q.v.], as Eastern Turki in the west in the 16th century we have many descriptions, often accompanied by illustrations, both in Turkish sources and narratives of European travellers, of the performances of various kinds of acrobats at public festivities; particularly famous was the circumcision feast which Murâd III gave for his son Mehmed (III) in 990/1582. Ewliyâ Celebi's travel book offers interesting details about the djânbaç in the 17th century. In his account of the palace of the Istanbul guilds he mentions the guild of the acrobats (I, 625 f.), listing several names. He also mentions that the most outstanding rope-dancer, Mehemed Celebi of Uskudar, was holding an imperial letter patent (khâfi'i sherîf) by which he was appointed warden (ser-lesîme) of all acrobats (here the term is pehîvûdan) of the empire, of whom a total of 200 masters were listed in his register (defter). Mehemed Celebi is again mentioned among the participants of a memorable show at Istanbûl (now Zîr, nowadays Ankara) where—we are told by Ewliyâ Celebi (ii, 439-42, ed. Özön, iii, 10-13)—all rope-dancers (here the narrower term remsîbûz is used) assembled once every 40 years for a contest which resulted in the promotion of the apprentices to master's status. The sources for the 16th and 17th centuries can be found in Metin And, Kir Fûn, Kir Fûz, Eski donanma ve şenliklede seyirîk oyunlar, Istanbul

DJANBAZAN (Persian plural of djânbiâz, see previous article)—the name of a military corps in the Ottoman Empire. It is not known when exactly the corps was founded, although it may have been in the reign of Orkhan Ghâzî [q.v.]. The djânbažân served only in time of war, like the ta'azz [q.v.], though being more exposed to military/(political) interference (miners and sappers). Grzegorzek (Z sidsylatâv Rumelskîskîk epoхи wyprawy wiedenskiej, Löw 1912, 53 ff.) believes, however, that they were organized in 844/1440 by Murad II [q.v.] to meet the first Balkan expedition of John Hunyady and that they took part in the battle of Varna. The djânbažân served in the vanguard and were charged with dangerous tasks. This fact led Hammer (Staatsverwaltung,/index) to class them with the irregulars known as serden-gelî (lit. "mad or wild adventurers"), gommîlî ("volunteers") and delî ("madmen", [q.v.]). Grzegorzek followed by Babar (Za wirtschaftlichen Grundlage des Feldzuges der Turken gegen Wien im Jahre 1853, Vienna/Leipzig 1916, 29 ff.) held, however, that they formed the personal body-guard of Bâgzergîs [q.v.] and sandîqâ hegîs, like the djânbažân, while D'Oehsson (Tablau general, vii, 309) thought that, like the gharbînî, the djânbažân served as coastal militia in Anatolia.

The djânbažân later joined the yürüks ("nômads", [q.v.]) and Tatars as well as the yaya ("infantry") and müsellems ("sappers") in forming support forces for the Janissaries (cf. Djelâl-zâde Niğmândî, Tabâhât al-mamlûkî fi darâdât al-maslîk, Fâth Library MS 4467, f. 8; I. Hâkî Uzûncârlî, Osmanlı devleti ticâbdanında kapı kuşu ocâkları, Ankara 1943, 3). A kömün-nâmâ dating back to the middle of the 10th/16th century is in existence concerning the djânbažân of Rumelî. It states that the djânbažân formed an oğlak, that only one served at a time, the remaining nine paying 50 akâs each as "âwârî-i diwânsîye" (see 'âwârîto). The kömün-nâmâ describes the djânbažân as nomads, paying taxes (bâid-i hâsî ruşûmu) to their own officers (Su-hâkî). The relatives and dependants of the djânbažân were assimilated to the corps, which could also be joined by outsiders, related by marriage, and by converts. The djânbažân of Rumelî were considered part of the yûrûk zêvânet of Vize; they were subject to the same penal, taxation and other rules, and seem, therefore, to have come largely from the same stock. They were subject, however, to a more complicated system of anawîrî services (Kömün-nâmâ-i Djânbažân, Başvekâlet Arşivi, Târu Defterleri, no. 226). The Kömün-nâmâ-yi AÎ-i Olymnîn (v. TOEM) states that djânbažân on active service should be considered as soldiers and that the "estate duty" (resm-i kîsmet) for any killed in war should be paid to the bâid-i lâsher, if it exceeds 100 akâs, and in other cases to the bâids of wilâyets.

Later, however, all djânbažân were considered soldiers and all duties became payable to the bâid-i lâsher of Rumelî.

In 950/1543 the corps (â'ârî) of djânbažân amounted to 39 and in 964/1557 to 41 oğlak. 'Ayn-î 'Allî (Kawâmîn-i AÎ-i Olymnîn, 41) gives their strength together with that of ta'azz as 1280, of whom one tenth served at any one time. The corps was abolished towards the end of the 16th century (according to D'Oehsson under Selim II) together with those of the yaya and müsellems.

The djânbažân were cavalry troops and they also bred horses for the army. After their dissolution their name lived on in the form of "âl djânbažâl" meaning "were broken". (M. TAVRÖ GÖMBÖLLÜ)

DJANBULAT, a family of amirs, Derîzî in religion and Kurdish in origin ("soul of steel" in this language), established in the Lebanon, where they formed the Djânbulâtî party, active until the present day (common modern spellings: Djoumblatt, Jomblatt, etc.). The Djânbulât, related to the Ayyûbîds according to Lebanese tradition, appeared in the region of Killy during the 13th century (the Mamlûk Djânbulât al-Nâşîr, governor first of Aleppo and then of Damascus in 902/1497-9, sultan of Egypt for six months under the name of al-Malik al-Ashraf Abu l-Nâsr, d. 906/1501, seems to have no connexion with this family). Djânbulât b. Kâsim al-Kurdi (d. 980/1572), surnamed Ibn ʿArâbî, perhaps by taktiya, suppressed brigandry in the sandîqâl of Kilîl, where he had been placed in charge by the Ottomans, and participated in the conquest of Cyprus. His son Husayn (d. 1013/1604) evicted the wâlî Naṣîh Maḥsa from Aleppo, whom he had assisted against the rebels of Damascus, and was executed at Van for having refused to join in an expedition against Iran. 'All, his son (Djânbulatoghlu to the Ottoman historians), rebelled in Aleppo and extended his rule in Syria; he aligned himself with the amir of Mount Lebanon, Faqhr al-Dîn Ma'n, against Yûsuf al-Sayya, also a Kurd, the governor of Tripoli, defeated the latter at Hamâ, but then was reconciled to him; he established an independent amirate from Hamâ to Adana, failed to remit taxes to the Sultan, had the bîhûba recited in his own name, and raised an army of more than 30,000 men. He was conquered at Orûjî in 1016/1607, as was his ally Faqhr al-Dîn; thanks to his uncle Haydar, he received the pardon of the Sultan at Istanbul. Placed in command of Temesvar, he joined battle with the Janissaries, fled to Belgrade, and was decapitated in 1020/1611. The Djânbulât, however, kept their command over Kilîl and thereafter remained faithful to the Sultan; a nephew of 'All, Mustâfî, became bey of Rumelî. They seem to have left some remnants in the Lebanon during the latter half of the 16th/17th century.

Djânbulât b. Sa'd (d. 1050/1640), probably grandson of 'All, finally emigrated to the Lebanon in 1040/1630 with his sons Sa'd and Rabbû, settled in the Shîf, and, from 1041/1631, joined the campaign of the amîr. His son Rabbû succeeded him, and 'All, his grandson (d. 1224/1712), outlived his brothers Fâris and Şaraf al-Dîn, who were assassinated; he entered the service of the powerful Druze chieftain Kablân al-Kâldî al-Tanâkî, married his daughter, and inherited his fortune and his influence, which he increased by his generosity towards the common people. He helped the amir Haydar Shihâb to carry on the war against 'Ayn Dîn, 1218/1803, against the Yamani "party". Before his death he wished to divide his fortune between his son-in-law 'All and the amîr, but the Druzes bought back the latter's portion for 'All's benefit. This son-in-law 'All built the castle of Muğlêrâyî, finally established the local authority of his family, developed with the Djânbulât "party" an opposition movement to the amîral power, and intervened in the dissensions
of the Shihâb whom he looked upon as upstarts. In 1173-4/1760 he assured the succession of the amir Mansûr against his co-regent Ahmad, then deceased by him, brought the amir Yûsuf to power, joined with him in an unhappy struggle against Dâhir al-
'Umar, and later turned against him, won over by the intrigues of Dîjâzar. He died as an octogenarian in 1192/1778.

Başhîr Dîjandûlât, grandson of 'Ali (?), built the mosque of Muçhtâra on the model of that of Acre, and undertook important irrigation works; he helped the accession to power in 1202-1778 of the amir Bashîr II Shihâb al-Dîjandâr, to whom he was related; he set up his lieutenant 'Abbâs against him during the amir's absence in Egypt; the latter on his return defeated him at Muçhtâr and had him strangled in 1240/1825. After the downfall of the Shihâb dynasty in 1841 the Ottomans preferred the Arslân to the too rich and powerful Dîjandûlât for the Qâ'imakamate of the Shîf. Sa'd Dîjandûlât, set aside in this way, took an active part in the bloody events of 1860; condemned to death, he died in prison in 1861. His son Nasîb continued after him the struggle for authority against the Arslân, whom he eliminated, at the end of the 19th century, from the Kâ'îma-
(32,533),(966,808)

The Dîjandûlât "party" (with a scarlet flag edged with green, bearing a hand and a dark green scimitar) was formed, not in the 17th century as is often supposed, but during the first half of the 18th, when the amir Haydãr supported against 'Ali Dîjandûlât 'Abd al-Salâm Yazbak 'Amãd, who formed the Yazbakî "party". These parties do not continue, as is sometimes claimed, the classical Yamani (finally eliminated from the mountains after 'Ayn Dâra) and Kaysî (with whom the Dîjandûlât were always friendly clans), but substitute for this traditional division an analogous one, some effects of which persist in the contemporary political life of the Lebanon.
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Dîjandîr or Dîjandîr, the name given to certain guards regiments serving the great Saljûq and subsequent dynasties. Attached to the royal house-
hold, they provided the sovereign's bodyguard, and carried out his orders of execution. Their commander, the amir Dîjandîr, was a high-ranking officer; some of them are reported as being alâbâhs [q.v.]. Under the Saljûqs of Rûm, they formed an elite cavalry guard, and wore their swords on gold and the badge of the imperial coat of arms. Under the Mamlûks [q.v.], the post being held by an amir of a thousand. Later the office declined in importance, and from the middle of the 15th century to the end of the Mamlûk Sultanate the Dîjandîrs were common soldiers. From Mamlûk Egypt the term passed to North Africa, where it was used of the bodyguards of the Marinids.
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Dîjandarî, name of an Ottoman family of 'ulema-stated in the sources, in later works usually Candarli, appears in the oldest inscriptions as Dîjandarî, which has been explained as a nisba from Pers. dîjandar, 'body-
guard' (so Fr. Taeschner and P. Wittek, in 7s/. xviii, 83) or from a locality Dîjand or Cender near Sivri-
hisar (so I. H. Uzuncarşılı, in Bülent, xxiii, 457 f.).

(1) Khayr al-Dîn Khallî b. 'Ali (popularly 'Kara Khallî') is said to have been hâdî successively of Bilegikj, Iznik and Bursa. Murâd I, shortly after his accession, appointed him to the newly-created office of hâdî asker [q.v.], and later (certainly by 783/1381, perhaps earlier, see Belleten, xxii, 465-8) made him vizier; as the first Ottoman vizier to combine with the supervision of the supervising vizier of the sultans, he is reckoned the first 'Grand Vizier'. He played a prominent part in the conquest of Western Thrace, Macedonia and Thessaly, and penetrated Albania (787/1385). Left in Rumeli as vizier. The name, variously spelt in the early sources, in later works usually Candarli, appears in the oldest inscriptions as Dîjandarî, which has been explained as a nisba from Pers. dîjandar, 'body-guard' (so Fr. Taeschner and P. Wittek, in 7s/. xviii, 83) or from a locality Dîjand or Cender near Sivri-
hisar (so I. H. Uzuncarşılı, in Bülent, xxiii, 457 f.).

(2) Khayr al-Dîn Pasha [q.v.] is credited to the chroniclers with the establishment of the corps of the yaya [q.v.] and later of the yeni-serî [q.v.]. He was married to a daughter of Tâdj al-Dîn Kurdi, müderris of the medrese of Iznik. Three sons of his are known: 'Ali (2), İbrîhîm (3) and Ilyâs; the last is said to have been beglerbegi and to have died under Bâyezid I; he had a son, Dâwud Çelebi, who died in 898/1492.

(3) İbrîhîm Pasha's early career is obscure (he too seems to have been a partisan of Emir Suleymân). In 808/1406 he was hâdî of Bursa (Belleten, v, 560 f.). According to one account (Neshri, ed. Taeschner, i, 133) he was sent by Mûsam Çelebi, after Emir Suleymân's death, to Constantinople to demand tribute, and seized the opportunity to desert to Mehemmed I,
who appointed him vizier (but 'Ašḥikpashazāde [ed. Giese, 196] says he had been ḏādiʿāshārī to Meḥmed, who made him vizier on occupying Bursa). A document of 818/1415 shows that he was in that year ḏādiʿāshārī (TTTEM xvi, 379 and n. 21), and another of 823/1420 (Bellett, v, 561) that he was by then second vizier (Bayezid Pasha being Grand Vizier). When, shortly after Murād II's accession, Bayezid Pasha was killed by the pretender 'Dūzme' Muṣṭafā, Ibrāhīm succeeded him as Grand Vizier and remained in office until his death, of the plague (O. Turan, Türk skizeleri, 24, on 24 Dhu 'l-Ḩaḍra 823/25 August 1429). Ibrāhīm (full references to the influence of his family, weakened by their adherence to Meḥmed II's rivals, and followed a cautious and prudent foreign policy.

(4) Khalīl Pasha [q.v.], the eldest son of Ibrāhīm, was by 847/1443 Grand Vizier. He enjoyed Murād II's full confidence to the end of his reign, but the part he had played in recalling Murād to the throne and in guiding him was by then second vizier (Bayezid Pasha being Grand Vizier). A document of 823/1420 (Bellett, v, 561) that he was by then second vizier (Bayezid Pasha being Grand Vizier). When, shortly after Murād II's accession, Bayezid Pasha was killed by the pretender 'Dūzme' Muṣṭafā, Ibrāhīm succeeded him as Grand Vizier and remained in office until his death, of the plague (O. Turan, Türk skizeleri, 24, on 24 Dhu 'l-Ḩaḍra 823/25 August 1429). Ibrāhīm (full references to the influence of his family, weakened by their adherence to Meḥmed II's rivals, and followed a cautious and prudent foreign policy.

The second phase of the Djangall movement was marked by open Bolshevik support, which changed its whole character. On 18 May 1920 the Red fleet bombarded Enzeli, and Soviet troops occupied Rasht, and by October 1921 the rebellion was over. Mīrza Kucik Khan, styling himself the 'representative of the Persian Socialist Soviet Republic proclaimed in the city of Rasht', announced the establishment of the Persian Socialist Soviet Republic. The Glīn Soviet, which remained in power until the autumn of 1921, confiscated the estates of the big landowners and distributed them among the peasants, but met with no success in its attempts to organize the Persian peasants into independent local Communist groups.

By the terms of the Soviet-Iranian treaty of 20 February 1921, the Soviet Government renounced the imperialist policies of the former Czarist Government towards Persia, and on 8 September 1921 Soviet forces were withdrawn from Persia. Deprived of Soviet support, the Djangall movement collapsed when faced by strong Persian forces under the leadership of Rīdā Kān (later Rīdā Shāh [q.v.]), and by October 1921 the rebellion was over. Mīrza Kucik Khan was captured, and executed.
Djanganli — Djankli Haidiji 'Ali Pasha


DNÉNGS, name of the dynasty which ruled Bukhârâ (q.v.) from 1007/1599 to 1199/1785. It was descended from Djânî b. Ya'âr Muhammad, a prince of the house of the Khân of Astârkhan (Tâhir Ahdârkhân and Ahsârkhân) who had fled from his homeland before the advancing Russians to Bukhârâ around 963/1556. It was from this homeland of his that the dynasty was also called Ahsârkhânids (for genealogy cf. Čorangids).

Djân married Zahra Khanîn, a sister of the Shaybânîid ruler Ābd Allâh b. Iskandar (q.v.). On the latter's death in 1006/1698 the empire that he had founded rapidly crumbled, and it was then that the son of this marriage, Bâkî Muhammad, was able to establish himself in the territory at the core of the state around Bukhârâ in 1007/1599 (for more detailed information see Bukhârâ); he died in 1014/1605-6. The state was strengthened by Imâm Kûl Khan (1027-53/1611-43), who secured internal order by the cruellest of methods and, thanks to his religious leanings, he enjoyed the archivs of the favours. He finally retired to undertake the hadîjdî (1060/1650).

The most significant ruler of the dynasty was Ābd al-Âzîz (1055-91/1645-80), who was also outstanding as a Muftî. After his death the authority of the dynasty sank rapidly. The local princes (Bîy) became almost independent, and the Farghânâ valley was separated off as a Khôkand (q.v.) Khânate on its own. Abu l-Fayd (1123-60/1711-47) became a plaything in the hands of the amiral family of Mangît (q.v.), whose members often held the position of an Atâlik. From 1167/1753-4 it was the Mangîts who exercised the actual power within the state. The last Djan married Abu l-' Ghâzlî Khan (1171-99/1757-85) was only nominally Khân, rather like the Čingizids in the case of Timûr. Yet the first completely independent Mangît ruler (since 1199/1785) continued to be related in marriage to the Djanîs.

Under the Djanîs Bukhârâ was one of the centres of Sunni orthodoxy; its leading rôle in defensive struggles against Şî'î Persia was politically significant also. Furthermore, the state constantly had to withstand attempts on the part of the Mughal ruler Shâhjahân (q.v.) in the first half of the 17th/18th century to regain the homeland of his ancestors. Through the rivalries of the Biys and the growing pressure of taxation, however, the agriculture of the state deteriorated more and more, and commerce took other paths. Literary expression was in Persian rather than in Özbek, and it consisted essentially of works of a traditional stamp; yet these works, as also the historical writings of this period (in spite of much Russian pioneer work) have not yet been fully investigated. The architecture is greatly inferior to that of the Timûrids.


Djakîn (Canîk), an area along the Black Sea between Bafra and Fatsa, including the mouths of the rivers Kızîl and Yeşil İrmak, as well as the mountainous regions to the east. It is called after the Tsan (Georg. ćan, compare Macdonald Kinneir, Journey, 282)—a tribe of the Laz—and it has a mild climate and fertile soil; consequently, it is relatively densely populated (between 50 and 100 people per sq. km.). Until recently it was related in marriage to the sandjak of Samsun (q.v.), and is applied even today to the beautiful mountain forests of Djänik Dağlar along the Black Sea coast from Samsun to Ordu.

Djänîk once belonged to the Turkish provinciality of the Djândar-oghlu of Kâstamûnî, and together with this, it was incorporated into the Ottoman Empire by Sultan Bâyazîd I. After Bâyazîd's defeat at Ankara in 1402, Djänik was re-established by Timûr, but it was later conquered by Mehêmed I, becoming a lâwâ of the eydiyet of Siwas with Samsun (which—next to Trabzon—is the most important port on the Black Sea) for capital. In more recent times, it was a sandjak of the vilâyet of Trabzon, with the sandjak of Samsun, Fatsa, Ünye, Termel, Çarşamba, and Bafra. Under the Turkish Republic, the greater part of Canik forms the vilâyet of Samsun.


Djakîklî Hâdîdji 'Ali Pasha, Ottoman soldier and founder of a Derbeyî (q.v.) family. He was born in Istanbul in 1153/1740-21, the son of Ahmed Ağa, a kapâdî-bâshî at the Imperial palace. As a youth he accompanied his elder brother Suleyman Pasha to Djänik, where he eventually succeeded him as ruler with the title, customary among the autonîmous deerebeyes, of mukassil (q.v.). During the Russo-Turkish war of 1182/1768-1188/1774, he held a number of military commands. Serving first in Georgia, he was appointed in Destiny II 1185/ September-October 1769 to the staff of the Se'âlker of Moldavia, where he distinguished himself in the fighting against the Russians and took part in the battle of Khotîn, narrowly escaping capture. As a reward he was given the rank of vizier. In 1188/1774 he led an expedition to the Crimea and in 1190/1776 was appointed Se'âlker of Kars. In the meantime he had been able to consolidate his authority in
Djanlk, overcoming or winning over such opposition as existed, and to extend his dominions eastwards. In 1185/1777 he was recognized as Wali of Trebizond, where his brother Sulayman Pasha had preceded him. The province was assigned to him as a mdlikdne [q.v.]. Within the next few years his holdings were extended to include Sivas and Erzurum.

On 3 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1191/2 January 1778 he was again appointed Serasker of the Crimea and given the command of an expeditionary force which, with naval support, was to threaten the peninsula. This plan came to nothing. All Pasha now had to deal with his Anatolian rival the Çapanoğlu (see Ömer), who, at the instigation of his enemies in Istanbul, launched an attack against him. Deprived of his offices and of his vizirial rank, he fled in 1193/1779 to the Crimea, where he sought refuge with the Khan, Shahīn Giray. In Şahbân 1195/August-September 1778, thanks to the mediation of the Khan, he was pardoned and reinstated, recovering the rank of vizier and the control of his dominions. In 1190/1776 he presented a memorandum to the government on the reasons for the Turkish defeat in the Russian war and, more generally, on the reforms that were needed in the Empire. The work of a man of action, it deals with practical problems in simple, direct, and sometimes forceful language, and is a remarkable document of its time.

An edition is in preparation. All Pasha died in Şahbân 1196/June-July 1785.

Bibliography: Djewdet, Ta'rikkh, iii, 144-6; Sîddîqî, Oğlu Sîddîqî, iii, 548-9; Ismail Hakkî Uzan-çarî, Osmanlı tasvirleri, iv/v, Istanbul, 1956, 447-51, 509-11, iv/vi, 1959, 32-3. All Pasha's memorandum is mentioned by Djewdet (loc. cit.) and is preserved in Üpsala (a rather free paraphrase of parts of it will be found in M. Norberg, Türkiska Rikets Annaler, v, Hernösand 1822, 1425-43).

(B. Lewis)

DJANNA, "Garden", is the term which, used autonomastically, usually describes, in the Kur'ân and in Muslim literature, the regions of the Beyond prepared for the elect, the "Companions of the right"? E.g.: "These will be the Dwellers in the Garden where they will remain immortal as a reward for their deeds on earth" (Kur'ân, XLVI, 14). Other Kur'ânic terms will be considered later either as synonyms or as particular aspects of the "Garden": al-Ma'mûd, li-Firdaws ("Paradise", sg. farîdû, cf. paraklesis XXIII, 11), the Dwelling of Salvation or of Peace (dâr al-Salâm, VI, 127; X, 25), of Sojourner (al-Muhammâ, XXXV, 35), of the true Life (al-Hayawan, XXIX, 64), Garden of Retreat or of Refuge (gânnat al-Ma'âwâ, LIII, 15), of Eternity or Immortality (al-Âhad, XXV, 15), Gardens of Delight (gânnat al-Nâmîm, X, 9), etc. Following current usage, we shall translate Djanna as "Paradise", and cite Firdaws in its transliterated form.

(A) Evidence from the Kur'ân

The description of Paradise, the presentation of the relationship between its delights and the "good deeds" (şâliâhî) performed on earth by the believer, together with the description of Hell (nâr, dijâkannam) and the terrors awaiting the damned, form one of the major themes of Kur'ânic preaching. These passages constitute a form of târîka bîhâlîbiyya ("way of eloquence") with frequent and urgent evocations of the blessed life. The schools were to differ on the interpretation of these verses.

It would take too long to classify and enumerate here the descriptive details of the Kur'ân. The essentials may be found in Şübiî al-Sâlih, Les Délices et les Tournants de l'Au-Delà dans le Coran, doctoral thesis (Sorbonne 1954), typescript, 18 ff. The following summary is derived from it:—Location: "the garden of Retreat" is in heaven, near the "Lotstree of the Boundary (al-Muntahâ)" (LI, 22, LIII, 14-5). Two texts which suggest a prosopopoeia (fasî'ir) foretell that Paradise "shall be brought near" to the righteous (LXXXI, 13), "close unto them" (LXXV, 22). There is mention of the gates of Paradise, of their guards and of the greetings with which they met the elect (XXXIX, 73). The size of Paradise is equal to that of earth and heaven together (e.g., I, 133, LVII, 21). There will be pleasant dwellings for the chosen (XIX, 72) and pavilions where Houris are kept (LV, 72). Lofty gardens (LXXVIII, 10), leaping fountains (fasî'ir), streams of living water (id.), of milk, wine and honey (XLVII, 15), fountains scented with camphor (LXXVI, 5) or ginger (id., 17), shady valleys, all sorts of delicious fruits (fasî'ir), of all seasons and without a thorn. . . .

The life of Paradise is described in concrete details, especially in the Suras of the first Meccan period (the Suras of the other periods also refer to it): regal pomp (LXXIII, 24), costly robes, scents, bracelets; the texts lay emphasis on the "good works" performed on earth by the believers, and their fruits on earth will bear fruit in Paradise. The garden of Paradise is like a banquet, served in priceless vessels (e.g., LII, 24) by immortal youths "like separate pearls", with meats and fruits to the heart's desire (LI, 22, LV, 54, etc.), where scented wines, never-failing goblets of a limpid liquid (LXXVIII, 47), "delight for those who drink" (XLVII, 15), bring neither drunkenness (XXXVII, 46-9) nor rouse folly or quarrelling (LXXVIII, 35). "Eat and drink in peace, as a reward for your deeds, reposing on rows of couches!" (LII, 19-20),—couches inlaid with gold or with precious stones (LXVI, 15), etc.

The elect will rejoice in the company of their parents, their wives and children who were faithful (XIII, 23, XXXVI, 56, XL, 8, XLIII, 70). They will praise their Lord (XXXV, 34), bending towards each other in love, conversing in joy and recalling the past (e.g., LXXVI, 47, LII, 25, etc.) with "sacred wine" (id., 15, 11, 15, 14),""—couches inlaid with gold or with precious stones (LXVI, 15), etc.

A happy life, without hurt or weariness, neither sorrow, fear nor shame (Şübiî al-Sâlih 24) where every desire and every wish is fulfilled (XVI, 31, 39). "The Pious will there enjoy what they desire and We will grant yet more (mâzâl)" (L, 35). This "more", like the "addition" (zîydda) of, X, 26, is usually associated with the "approval" (ridwan) of God foretold to the elect (thus, I, 15, 35 in fine). Now, "to believers, God has promised Gardens where rivers of water flow, where they will rest immortal. He has promised them goodly dwellings in the gardens of Eden. (But) the approval of God is greater. That will be the great Victory' (IX, 72). The fruits of it will be nearness to God, God will bring the elect near to his Throne (passim), and "on that Day some faces will shine in contemplating their Lord" (LXXV, 22-23). This last text, understood in the sense given in our translation, was to serve as the accepted scriptural foundation.
for the dominating thesis of the “vision of God” (ruyât Allîh) in Paradise (see below).

Subhî al-Sâlih, 12 ff., emphasizes a certain progress in the Kuranic annunciation of Paradise: the Sûras of the first Meccan period describe it with numerous brief, concrete details “in an ardent, brief and elliptical style, with the symmetry of antithesis”. During the second and third Meccan periods “the descriptive elements become (...) more summary”. Later we find “a more abstract means of evocation”. Well-known is verse XIII, 35, Musnad al-Tabari, the picture of the Garden promised to the Pious; the later allegorical interpretations were to base themselves on it, making the concrete descriptions of Paradise the representation of an inexpressible reality. And it was during the Medina period that stress was laid on the divine “approval”, joy above all others.

Does the Kur'ân refer to different sorts of Gardens organized hierarchically, or should we understand the term ëdâh (authentic)? Others are called da'll (unique), by one only. The hypothesis can be accepted, according to the commentators. Let us simply consider two verses: “For those who fear (the Judgment) seat of their Lord, there will be two Gardens” (LV, 46), and “this side of the two, two Gardens” (id., 62); certain tasâfsir render dîn not by “this side of” like M. Blachère (en deçà), but by “above”. Should we assume four distinct Gardens? A single description applies to each pair, and the descriptions of both groups are identical except for infinitesimal differences.

Relationships may be established between the Muslim Paradise and some earlier eschatological traditions, particularly Persian and Judeo-Christian, cf. as an example the comparison proposed by Grimm and Tor Andræ between the Kur'ânic descriptions and certain Syriac hymns by the Deacon Ephrem (cf. Tor Andræ, Der Ursprung des Islams und das Christentum, Fr. tr., Les origines de l'islam et le Christiantum, Paris 1955, 151 ff.).

(B) Principal elaborations

How has Muslim thought interpreted the data of the Kur'ân? Laying aside the copious Shîlâ'exegeses, we shall consider:—(i) hadîth and so-called traditional commentaries; (2) developments of the “science of hadîm” (jâînîs); (3) falsa'fa and tasawwui; (4) efforts at synthesis; (5) reformers and contemporary modernists.

1. Traditions and traditional exegesis

The hadîths devoted to Paradise and the life therein are very numerous. Their dominating tendency is a literalness which emphasizes the reality and the detail of sensual pleasure. The value attributed to them is variable. Many are considered hadîth (authentic); others are called da'll (doubtful). Certain of them derive not from the Prophet, but from a Companion or a Follower (hadîth mauhî or mâhî). Among the many sahîk, if some are mutaqaddûr (ensured by many lines of transmission), many are ‘asiz (rare), little known and vouched for by only two authorities; or even akhîd (unique), by one only. The Musnad of Ibn Hanbal abounds with descriptions of the joys of the Beyond. The Kur'ân and Musnad Al-Bukhârî and Muslim and the four Sunan reproduce numerous traditions on the same subject; see in particular Al-Bukhârî, K. Badr al-Khaïb, c. 8, K. Al-Rikàb, c. 51, and especially K. Al-Tasîfîr. Muslim’s commentators are in the habit of grouping eleven principal hadîths reproduced by him, on the subject of Paradise. For

a restatement and discussion of these sources, see Subhî al-Sâlih, op. cit., 43 ff. A typical example of traditional exegesis is given in the tasâfsir of Al-Tabari. It may be considered together with the abundant contribution from the “story-tellers”; themselves inspired by the old “story-tellers” (kassâsî) and “weepers” (bacha’âns), who in their concern to catch the popular imagination multiplied all kinds of extravagant concrete details. On the basis of these diverse sources, there were extensive and varied developments. It is impossible to give an exhaustive survey. Here are some points of reference, borrowed from authoritative compilations of hadîth, or from Al-Tabari, or Al-Shârânî (Mukhtâsar), who himself gives a summary of Al-Kuraitî, etc.

Location:—most commonly Paradise is placed under the Throne of God, above the highest heaven. It is usually distinguished from the Eden of Adam. Traditional accounts of the “ascension” (mi‘râj, [40]) of the Prophet describe in detail his progress across the various planes and degrees. The Entrance:—the different levels of Paradise are reached through eight principal gates, the respective dimensions and distances of which are described (the figures are intended to give an impression of limitless space). Each level is in turn generally divided into a hundred degrees. The highest level, which is either in the seventh heaven or, better (see below), beyond, is sometimes called Eden, sometimes Firâdns, etc. According to an often-quoted hadîth (e.g., Al-Bukhârî, Dianâ’is, 7), the key to open these doors has three webs: the proclamation of the divine Unity (tawhid); obedience to God; and abstention from all unlawful deeds. Others add “the swords of battle on the path of God”. The Prophet Muhammad will enter first. The poor believers will precede the rich. Angels will welcome the elect to the strains of an exquisite Arab melody—Arabic being the only language in Paradise. A banquet of welcome awaits them and each dish is described at length. They will be led to dwellings made ready for them, “accomppanied by their wives, their children, by hourîs and by youths” (Subhî al-Sâlih, 121). Note: though Paradise already exists, the descriptions of a happy Beyond are always related to the resurrection of the body. It is not until after the resurrection, the “gathering” (hasîr) and the Judgment, that the “Halls Eternal” will receive their guests.

The representation of Paradise. An eternal Spring will spread an everlasting light. One day in Paradise is equal to a thousand days on earth. The stuff of which it is made is of musk, gold and silver. The palaces are of gold, silver, pearls, rubies, topazes, etc.: descriptions which may be taken metaphorically, but which the commentators may see as concrete realities. The stream Al-Kawâthar (cf. Kur’ân, CVIII, 1), with a scent more subtle than musk, flows over pearls and rubies between banks of gold. Four rivers, whose names are given, spring from mountains of musk, flow between banks of pearls and rubies, and carry to the elect milk “of an unvarying flavour”, wine “a delight to those who drink”, “clearest” honey (cf. Al-Tabari, Ibn Hanbal, etc.). There are references to four mountains (Ubdud, Sinai, Lebanon, Hasîb) to a large valley, innumerable plains, wonderful fruit-trees. It would take a horse a hundred years at the gallop to emerge from the shade of the banana-tree (Al-Bukhârî, Rîkah, 114; Musnad, passim). A single leaf from the “Lote-Tree of the Boundary” could shade the whole Community
of the Faithful. In Paradise there are horses and camels “of dazzling whiteness”, perhaps goats and sheep, and winged Ravens made of red rubies will serve as the mounts of the elect (al-Tirmidhi, Dzawna, etc.).

The pleasures of Paradise. Here too there is the same concern for extravagant and concrete descriptions. Each of the elect will have the same stature as Adam (60 cubits by 7), and the same age, 33 years, as Jesus. Their robes and adornments will be marvellous. The delights of eating and drinking are the occasion for a surfeit of endless detail, as are also the hours of rest which follow them. The Kur’ânic evocation of the Houris calls forth endless commentaries (cf. Subûb al-Šâlibi, 133-40) which celebrate the carnal joys, “a hundred times greater than earthly pleasure”, that the elect will derive from their perpetual virginity. But the female Believers who have been admitted to Paradise through the merit of their good deeds will rank 70,000 times greater than the Houris in the eyes of God.—The whole of Paradise will be drenched in glorious music: the angels, the elect, the creatures of Paradise, the hills, trees and birds all joining in the universal melody.

The Vision of God. The most wonderful melody of all is the voice of God greeting the elect. Several traditions (e.g., al-Shârâni, Mukhlissar, 128; Ibn Khudhayl, Hâdâl al-arwa’dh, 225m) speak of the visit that the elect will pay “each Friday” to the Most High, at his invitation, and after they have chosen “a fine face” at the “suk of Recognition”. The men following the Prophet, the women in the train of his daughter Fâtimah, will cross the heavens, pass by the celestial Kâ’bah surrounded by praying angels, draw near to the “Guarded Table” (al-lawh al-mahfûz “Guarded Table”) where the Pen writes the divine decrees, and finally emerge on to the “terrace of the Throne”, which is of musk. “The veil of light lifts” and God appears to his guests “like the moon at the full”. In his Isâma, Cairo ed. 15, al-Asâr’âr calls this last the “highest bliss”: a “spectacular”, not a transforming, vision (Massjion). Paradise, which will be eternal, already exists. But the emphasis is laid on the incomparable and ineffable nature of the conditions of the future life. In conformity with one of the great Ash’ârî principles, all that is said of it must be taken literally but bîdâ kayl, “without asking how”. Not only have the pleasures of Paradise no common measure with earthly joys, but they bear no analogy to them; they are of a different nature.

c) The later Ash’ârîs (called “modern” by Ibn Khaldûn), in whom there is often a mixture of Ash’ârîmism properly so called and Mâturidis, adopt a ta’wil (interpretation) which is perhaps more influenced by the Falâsîfîa than by the Mu’tazila. The most notable example is Falâhr al-Dîn al-Râzî (12th-13th centuries). The principles of his exegesis are stated in his Kûbâ’ asâs al-ta’wilîs (Cairo ed. 1327), and he supplied an associated with them “spiritual” delights (râhânîyyât). All the Mu’tazila, on the other hand, deny the vision of God and, by an appropriate grammatical exegesis, give a different interpretation to the Kur’ânic verses which mention it. In the same way they reject the present existence of Paradise which, according to them, will only be created at the Resurrection.


Among the mutakallimûn, three fundamental attitudes may be distinguished: a) Mu’tazîlî schools (which influence the tasîf of al-Zamakhsharî). Their principle of “reason as the criterion of the Law” does not favour an allegorical or spiritual interpretation, but in the sense of a more restrained literal exposition, which treats as figurative any statement or description deemed rationally unacceptable.
3. Falsafa and taṣāwuf.

Between al-Asghar, who follows Ibn Ḥanbal, and the ṭasir of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, the Hellenistic falsafa, exerted some influence on the course of these controversies, confining himself to declaring his respect for the prophetic teaching. But everything is determined by the conception of prophecy in question. In his "esoteric" Risāla adhawiyya fl amr al-madhhab (ed. S. Duniyā, Cairo 1949), Ibn Snā in his exoteric works is careful not to deny the Resurrection; the same is true of Ibn Rushd, who, at the conclusion of the Tahdīfiṭ al-tahdīfiṭ, confines himself to declaring his respect for the transcendent God. A text attributed to Ibn Snā, in its deepest reality, the life of Paradise will be that of intelligible substances united with the Active Intellect and the Universal Intellect in which, as in a clear mirror, will shine the supreme Divine Lights.

Is then the apparent meaning of the Kur'ānic descriptions totally ignored? No. They are of value, in their literalness, for the "weak-minded" (bahī) who, although they have observed God's commands on earth, will be incapable of rising to the life of pure intelligence. They will be experienced, in the strict sense, not as sensual delights, but as pleasures of the imagination, thanks to the heavenly Bodies (cf. Naḍīj, 2, and Cairo ed. 1419/1357, 298; see also Isḥāq, ed. Forget, Leiden 1892, 196 § 2; Ibn Snā, in order to put forward this opinion, takes shelter behind the authority of "certain teachers").

Avicenna's influence marks a break in the history of taṣāwuf. The first Sufīs took Kur'ānic teaching literally, but focussed their hopes on the supreme bliss and reward, the vision of God. Well-known is the allegorical act of Rābi'as, who wanted "to burn Paradise" (and "drown Hell") so that God might be loved for Himself alone and not for His rewards (and feared for Himself alone and not for His punishments). In some famous texts, al-Īṣāfāl objects to the "market of images" (the sāk of the traditional exegesis where the elect choose "a fine face" for "the visit on Friday"), and proclaims: "If in Paradise I were prevented from meeting Him, were it only for an instant, I would make life intolerable for the elect of Paradise" (cf. L. Massignon, Lexique technique, Paris 1954, 253). For al-Hallāj everything is turned towards the ru'yāt Allāh, dazzling but intermittent, in which the elect find happiness only by the "experience"—Characteristic is the attitude of al-Muḥāsibī, of whom texts transpose the promised bliss into spiritual values, whilst his Kitāb al-tawakkhum, in order to encourage popular piety, emphasizes the sensual and carnal descriptions.

The later Sūfīs took care not to remove the sensual character of the joys of Paradise, but they developed, often extensively, the "superior" spiritual sense, revealing the "kā'f" (the only the Stool ('arsh) of Delights.—But in other texts the Fatḥ al-Dīn, 190, and the commentator the others again Eden. Certain opinions, less popular, define only four "dwellings" or gardens, and place Eden on the level of the fourth heaven. But it is generally accepted that, beyond the seventh heaven (or simply the highest heaven), and thus not cosmi-
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earthly garden, distinct from the heavenly Paradise. The commentaries which distinguish the two Edens in this way usually place Paradise above the seventh heaven.

One last detail. Some hierarchical plans ("stages") of Paradise are often allowed; but there was no consensus on the order of enumeration. A khādīj of Ibn ʿAbbās proposes: (1) (the highest circle) the dwelling of Majesty, (2) of Peace, (3) the garden of Eden, (4) of Refuge (or "Retreat"), (5) of Immortality, (6) of the Firdaws, (7) of Delights.—But in other texts the Firdaws is put as a "monster"; the others again Eden. Certain opinions, less popular, define only four "dwellings" or gardens, and place Eden on the level of the fourth heaven. But it is generally accepted that, beyond the seventh heaven (or simply the highest heaven), and thus not cosmically located, Paradise, whether or not divided into plans or hierarchical divisions, has above it only the Stool (kursi) and the Throne (ʿarsh) of the Most High God. (See below the summary by al-Bāḍjārī).

...
4. Two essays in synthesis.

The jalāṣaṣa on one side and the many Şûfīs on the other were regarded with mistrust and often opposed by the official teaching. Nevertheless their influence was effective. The expansion of Tarţaṣad ("brotherhoods") spread throughout the masses many Şûfī interpretations, sometimes but not always mixed with "philosophical" glosses. This resulted in some attempts at synthesis, clearly concerned to maintain the values of the faith. We will consider two of them.

Al-Ghazzālī. — The most important synthesis is that by Abū Ḥamīd al-Ghazzālī (earlier therefore than Ibn Ἠrābī), in which are united the traditional currents, kalām, jalāṣaṣa and ṣāṣaṣaṣuṣuṭ. In the Iḫyāṣāṣad and the Iḫyāṣ, al-Ghazzālī defends the Ashʿarī thesis of the vision of God. The Kitāb al-maṣaṣṣaṣa wa-mā baʿdahu of the last quarter of the Iḫyāṣ (Cairo ed. 1352/1933, iv, 381-468) reproduces extensively hadīṭh and traditional texts which describe the sensual pleasures and joys of Paradise. But the Māṣṣad al-ṣomāṣ (Cairo ed., n.d.), without rejecting them, insists on the superiority of spiritual bliss. Paradise is a "medium of bliss" of which only images are revealed to us. There is the same doctrine in Mīṣān al-ʿamaṣ (cf. tr. Hikmāt Ḥaṣṣānī 5-6): it is because the pleasures of Paradise "are incomprehensible to the understanding of the commonality of men" that they "assimilate them to the sensual pleasures which they know". Here they are very close to the theses of Ibn Sinā. Al-Ghazzālī, however, differs radically from the "philosopher" in his teaching of the reality of the resurrection of the body. His own personal ideas seem to take shape as follows: the believers who can only conceive of sensual and material happiness will enjoy the pleasures of Paradise in the flesh; others will delight in imaginative pleasures; and others again, "the holy and the initiated (ʿirfān)" will enjoy superior delights, intellectual and spiritual, which alone can satisfy them and of which the sensual delights described in the Law are only the image. Elsewhere the possibility is not ruled out that some of the elect may share in the three kinds of joy at the same time (cf. Ārūṣān, 40, and Şûbīḥ al-Ṣāḥīḥ, 286), as M. Subhi al-Salīḥ "the philological exegesis" (texts) of the traditions, that is the teaching of the Book. The vision of God is possible, but is not of the same nature as an ocular vision on earth; it is by transforming their visual faculty that God will reveal himself to His elect. The literal, descriptive sense (localization and pleasures of Paradise) is upheld but soberly explained. The principle of bīlā ḵayṣ is reaffirmed, especially on the subject of the joys dispensed by the Houris. Let us note finally that a critique of traditional sources is adumbrated. For Muhammad ʿAbdūb, the hadīṭh, even if ṣābīḥ, may only be retained if they are mutawaddīt, warranted by many lines of transmission. This principle leads him to reject the hyperboles of many literalist descriptions.

Rāṣīḥ Rīḍā and his great Taṣṣīṣ al-Maṣāṣṭā. — This important differentiation between the hadīṭh is taken up again and elaborated, even to the point of an internal criticism of certain maṣāṣītexts) of the traditions. Thus Rāṣīḥ Rīḍā rejects as inauthentic those which promise to the elect Houris in abundance, and he refers to a hadīṭh reproduced by al-Bukhārī and Muslim, which awards to everyone in Paradise his earthly wife and a single Houri. The descriptions abounding in hyperbolical literalism are, he says, mistaken in not considering the spirit of the Arabic language, which requires that all anthropomorphisms be interpreted metaphorically. We should strive to understand the inner spirit of the Kurʾān which teaches both sensual and spiritual delights, but which places the second far above the former. For Rāṣīḥ Rīḍā, the authentic hadīṭh par excellence is that which defines the blessed life as "that which no eye has seen, nor ear has heard, nor hand has felt..." (texts) of the traditions. Thus the parallelism between the hadīḥs of the authentic Afterlife, the excessively rationalist principle of the Muṭaṣāzla, the allegorism of the Şûfīs, and he attacks by name Ibn Ἠrābī. Only the attempt to understand the actual text of the Kurʾān counts. If the spiritual life prevails over the life of the flesh, if the delights of Paradise are both sensual and intelligible, it is because that is the teaching of the Book. The vision of God is possible (contrary to the Muṭaṣāzla) but "it is not a fundamental basis of the Islamic faith" (texts) of the Şûbīḥ al-Ṣāḥīḥ, 325-35, and ref. Taṣṣīṣ al-Maṣāṣṭā.

In conclusion it may be useful to mention with M. Şûbīḥ al-Ṣāḥīḥ "the philological exegesis" presented by ʿAbd al-Kaḍār al-Maghrībi who, in 1920, wrote a commentary on the twenty-ninth section of the Kurʾān, which al-Ṭabarī reissued in the work Ālā hāmīṣa ḫaṣṣaṣ al-Taṣṣīṣ, Cairo n.d.). The author dismisses the literalist exegesis which presents the life of the Beyond in purely sensual terms: that would be to fail to take account of the incomparable power of expression of the text; he also dismisses the purely spiritual allegorical exegesis, for it derives only from subjective views. He requires an exegesis founded on the laws of the Arabic language, its eloquence and its use of metaphor. The terms describing the delights of Paradise aim at evoking part; and Eden comes in the second place; (2) four Gardens, according to the Kurʾān, LV, 46 and 62, which are considered as the ultimate earthly abode in the Delightful Refuge, Eden, Frīdaṣaṣ∂; (3) a single Abode to which the seven designations may be applied, each underlining one of its qualities.

5. Reformers and contemporary modernists (cf. Şûbīḥ al-Ṣāḥīḥ, Vth part.).
the grandest possible conception of joy. We should then understand these terms literally, but as designating, in the Other World, concrete realities intrinsically different from those here below. It is thus we should understand the fleshly joys promised to the elect: consequently, the feasts of Paradise are by no means intended for the satisfaction of sensuality, and the delights offered by the Houris represent a reality inaccessible to human understanding, a noble pleasure in which the female believers will share.—The author adds that his exegesis is only one of several alternative possibilities, and that a Muslim is free to prefer another.

The Egyptians Sayyid al-Kūth, Amin al-Khālí, and especially Muhammad Ahmad Khalaf Allāh, a disciple of the former, go even further than the Shaykh al-Magribī in the study of the "literary genres" of the Kurʾān. Azihari circles displayed violent opposition towards Dr. Khalaf Allāh. In conclusion: the official teaching has never confirmed the exclusively allegorical and spiritual interpretations of Kurʾānic verse and hadīth concerning Paradise. Throughout the centuries two trends have co-existed: (1) the so-called traditional exegesis, which accepts many traditions and which endlessly multiplies concrete details about the life of Paradise and its sensual pleasures; (2) the attempts of ḥaḍām, of al-Qazzāzī, of the Salafīyya reformers, etc., who retain indeed the obvious literal meaning of the Kurʾānic text, but take care not to amplify it; who insist on the intrinsic difference between the realities of the Beyond and earthly realities, emphasizing the primacy of the spiritual over the carnal order. Even without mentioning the "philological" exegesis of al-Magribī, we may say that the attempts of Muhammad ʿAbdūh and of Rashīd Riḍā to perform an internal critique of the traditions may well open new perspectives to our knowledge of the tafsīr.

Bibliography: in the article. (L. GARDET)

DJANNĀBA, (Djannābā, Djinannāba), arabized forms of Ganāfā, a town and port in the VIth ostān (Fars) of Persia. The name is a corruption of Gand-āb, 'stinking water', so called because of the bad quality of its water (see Ibn al-Balkhī, Fūṣūs al-dawāl va'l-dakhrīr, I, 129). Ganāfā, one of the most flourishing towns of the Persian coast in the 4th/10th century. An oil-pipe line from the Gač Sarān oil-field (which lies 70 km. to the north-east) to the island of Khūragā (q.v.), where tankers of the largest size will be loaded, is shortly to be constructed; it will enter 'stinking water', so called because of the bad quality of its water (see Ibn al-Balkhī, Fūṣūs al-dawāl wa'l-dakhrīr, I, 129). The town of Ganāfā was for a long time an important manufacturing centre where cloths of good quality were produced. Pearling was also carried on from there. It was the birthplace of Abū Sulaymān al-Djannābī (q.v.), the well-known Kārmātīan dāʾī. According to the Ḥadīth al-ʿi-lam (127), it was a large and flourishing town in the 16th century. An oil pipe-line from the Gač Sarān oil-field (which lies 70 km. to the north-east) to the island of Khūragā (q.v.), where tankers of the largest size will be loaded, is shortly to be constructed; it will enter the sea just to the north-west of Ganāfā. The town is connected with Būghār (q.v.) by a dry weather road 150 km. in length. Agriculture, fishing and shipping repairs are carried out at Ganāfā, the population of which in 1915 was 2,235. The modern form of the name is Ganāvā.

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text: BGA, passim: Yākūt, ii, 122; Fuch, De Nino Urbe, Lipsiae 1845, 10; Le Strange, 273-4, 296; P. Schwartz, Iran im Mittelalter n. den Arab. Geogr., ii, 61, 63, 86; iii, 125-7: Monteith, in JRG, 1857, 108: Tomaschek, Die Küstenfahrten Nordachs = SBAW.I, cxviii, 67; Razmārā and Nawtāsh, Farangī darātarfīyā-yi Irān, vii, 204. (L. LOCKHART)

AL-DJANNĀBĪ, ABū MUHARRĀM MUṢTAFĀ b. Ḥasan b. Siyan al-Husaynī al-Ḥāghmī, 20th/16th-century author of an Arabic historical work dealing with eighty-two Muslim dynasties in as many chapters, entitled al-ʿi-lam al-sāhkīr fi ḍawūl al-awwāl wa-ʿawwālīr, usually called Taʿrīkh al-Djannābī. A Turkish translation and abridgment were prepared by the author himself. Whether the accepted form of the maḥkāzūn is correct or should be rather Djannābī cannot be decided in the absence of information as to whence it was derived. Al-Djannābī came from a distinguished Amasya family, studied and taught in various cities, and was for a short time judge of Aleppo. His younger brother was the poet Suʿūdī. Both died in the same year 999/1590.

Bibliography: Brockelmann, ii, 357, S I, 411 f., III, 1281; ʿUmmâlī mêlîfî, irti, 40; F. Bahinger, 188 f. (F. ROSENTHAL)

AL-DJANNĀBI, ABū Saʿīd Ḥasan b. Bahrām, was the founder of Kārmātīan power in East Arabia. Born at Djannābā on the Fars coast, he is said to have become a flour merchant at Baṣra. He was crippled on the left side. His first mission as a Kārmātīan is said to have been as a dāʾī in southern Iran, where he had to go into hiding from the authorities. He was then sent to (mainland) Bahrayn, where he married into a prominent family and won followers rapidly, perhaps among a group formerly attached to the line of Ibn-al-Hanafiyya.

We find that in 286/899 he had subjected a large part of Bahrayn and taken Katfī. In 287 his partisans were in strength around Hadjar, the capital of Bahrayn, and were approaching Baṣra. The Caliph Muḫtaḍīd sent an army of 2,000 men against them, to which were added many volunteers. This army was cut to pieces; its general was taken prisoner, then set at liberty; the other prisoners were killed. About 290/903 Abū Saʿīd took Hadjar after a long siege, by cutting off the water supply; he then subjected Yamām and invaded ʿUmmān. In 300 his troops again invaded the district of Baṣra, but in 301/913 he was murdered by a slave, together with several of his high officers.

He left several sons, of whom Saʿīd succeeded, to be replaced later by the youngest, the famous Abū Tāhir [see art. below]. Abū Saʿīd was venerated after his death. His partisans believed that he would return; a horse was always kept saddled at the door of his tomb. The Kārmātīans of Bahrayn called themselves Abū Saʿīdās after him, and attributed to him the later constitution of their republic.


(B. CARRA DE VAUX)-[M. G. S. HOODSON]

AL-DJANNĀBĪ, Abū ʿAlī Tāhir. Abū ʿAlī Sulaymān b. Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥasan was one of the most famous chiefs of the small Kārmātīan state of Bahrayn and, for several years, the terror of the pilgrims and of the inhabitants of lower ʿIrāk. On the death of Abū Saʿīd [see art. above] in 301/913-4, or 300/912-3 according to al-Masʿūdī, his son Saʿīd succeeded him and governed
with a council of notables (al-'Ikhāniyya). For some time the Karmatians refrained from troubling the caliphate and were even on good terms with the government of the vizier 'Abd b. 'Isā, who granted them privileges such as the use of the port of Sirāf, in 304/916-7. In 307/920-9, however, there was an attack on Basra to support a Fātimid attempt against Egypt, according to Ibn Khalḍūn (Ubar, iv, 89). At this time Abū Tāhir was not personally at the head of affairs, since he was still too young, having been born in Ramdān 256/June-July 907, and he seems to have been appointed as maiṣir b. Abdullah 311/923-4 when he appears, although aged then no more than 16, in Rābī‘ II/July-August 923, as commander of the Karmatians who entered Basra by surprise at night. Escalading the walls, they established themselves in the town before any resistance could be organized, and spent seventeen days in pillage and massacre. As early as 305/917-8, however, Sa'd, whom the sources depict as lacking energy and authority, had been deposed, perhaps at the instigation of the Fātimid 'Ubayd Allāh. The latter, according to Ibn Khalḍūn, sent a letter of investiture to Abū Tāhir, whose reign is by some sources dated from this year.

The attack against Basra in 312/923-4 coincided with the removal of the vizier 'All b. Ṣa‘īd whom his enemies represented as the ally of the Karmatians. At the end of the same year Abū Tāhir attacked the pilgrim caravan returning from Mecca to al-Habīr, and took prisoner the amīr Abu 'l-Hayyādī 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥamdān, who had been charged with the protection of the caravan. Abu 'l-Hayyādī and the prisoners were released some time afterwards at the same time as an envoy from Abū Tāhir arrived at Baghdaḍ demanding the cession of Basra, Ahwāz and even other territories. This claim was rejected and, in 312/924-5, the pilgrims were again attacked and ʿUffā was sacked by Abū Tāhir. In 315/927-8, having again plundered ʿUffā, Abū Tāhir gained a great victory over the army sent against him by the caliph and commanded by Yūsuf b. Abī 'l-Sādī q.v., whom he captured and who was put to death in Dhu 'l-Ka‘a 315/January 928 in the course of the operations that followed. Advancing up the Euphrates, Abū Tāhir arrived at Anbār, crossed the river with the intention of marching on Baghdaḍ, but was stopped by the army of Mu‘nis q.v. thanks to the destruction, at the instigation of Abu 'l-Hayyādī, of the bridge on the Nahr Zubārā. He thereupon turned north and reached Raḥba, Karkhsīyā and Raḵša, holding the inhabitants to ransom. Some detachments penetrated as far as Sīndjar, Ra‘ba‘ān and Naṣībīn. Abū Tāhir did not return to Bahrayn until the beginning of 317/February-March 929, when he had built a dār al-khīṣra called al-Mu‘āniyya (it is known that the Karmatians called themselves mu‘āminīn), near al-Abāsī, its capital.

The most sensational act of Abū Tāhir was his expedition against Mecca where the pilgrims were gathered and where he arrived on 7 Dhu ‘l-Hijārā 311/December 923 (cf. also De Goeje, op. cit.) to receive official investiture for the regions which he possessed or had conquered. Abu Tāhir refused to restore the Black Stone, but agreed to cease obstructing the pilgrims and offered to have the khūfa read in the name of the caliph if he were allowed free use of the port of Bahrayn. However, in 323/935 he again attacked the pilgrimage, defeated the caliphal troops between ʿUffā and Kādiryā, and occupied ʿUffā for several days before returning to Bahrayn. Fresh negotiations were commenced in 325/937, by the amīr al-umāra‘ Ibn Rā‘īk, with Abū Tāhir who had again entered ʿUffā. In reply to the demand of the Karmatian, who wanted the caliph to give him 120,000 dinars per year in silver and supplies, Ibn Rā‘īk proposed that Abū Tāhir and his troops should consider themselves as enrolled in the service of the caliph and that this sum be considered as a salary. No agreement was signed. Finally, in 327/939, thanks to an ʿAlīd of ʿUffā, the pilgrimage was able to resume in consideration of a tribute of 25,000 (or 120,000) dinars and a protection due (khiṣra) which was regularly levied by the Karmatians on the pilgrims; this did not, however, in any way prevent incursions into the south of ʿIrāq.

Abū Tāhir died of smallpox at the age of 38 in 332/943-4, and was succeeded by his brother Abīmad.

The activity of Abū Tāhir raises questions as to what were his relations with Isma‘ilism, whether he really considered the Fātimid caliph ʿUbayd Allāh to be the awaited imām and obeyed him, and whether it was at his secret request that he carried off the Black Stone and launched attacks against ʿAbbasid territory. The question of the differences and the common ground between Karmatians and Isma‘ilis, dealt with by Ivanov, Ismaili tradition concerning the rise of the Fatimids, 65 ff., and Ismailis and Karmatians in JBIRAS, 1940, 78 ff., and B. Lewis, The origins of Isma‘ilism, Cambridge 1940, ch. iii on the Karmatians of Bahrayn and particularly the Karmatians and the Fātimids, will not be examined here; this account is restricted to a review of the facts concerning the history of Abū Tāhir. There are documents as much in favour of an adherence to the Fātimid caliphs as against (see the texts in B. Lewis, op. cit.). In their work on ʿUbayd Allāh al-Mahdī H. Ibrāhīm Ḥasan and T. Ahmad Shāraf incline to the idea of secret and close relations between Abū Tāhir and the first Fātimid caliph, and a real subordination of the former to the latter. Finally, in 327/939-40, it was said that Abū Tāhir recognized ʿUbayd Allāh as the mahdī, that he sent him the khiṣra, and that he was his agent in Bahrayn (see the declarations of the Karmatian interrogated by ‘Alī b. Ṣa‘īd and of the secretary of Yūsuf b. Abī ‘l-Sādī Ḥ. Ibrāhīm Ḥasan, 277). Abū ‘l-Mahāsin declares that he recognized ʿUbayd Allāh as mahdī.
on his return from Ṭabba in 317/929; but the letter of Ubayd Allah to Abu Ṭahir which is cited, and the letter of <Ubayd Allah to Abu Tahir which is mentioned in the text): BGA, i, 27; ii2, 40; iii, 12, 53, 69, 83, 97, 107, no; v, 78; vi, 153, 191; vii, 96, 313, 341; for modern works, other than those of Ivanow and B. Lewis mentioned in the article (there is an Arabic tr. of B. Lewis entitled Usūl ʾal-ʾIsmaʾiliyya, Baghdad 1947), see H. Bowen, The life and times ofʿAli Ibn ʾIsa, Cambridge 1928, index; Hasan Ibrahim Hasan and Taha Ahmad Sharaf, ʿUbayd Allah al-Mahdi, Cairo 1947, 94, 176, 180 ff., 217 ff., 225 ff., 220 ff., 257, 277, 270, 302. For the episode of Abu ʾL-Haydāj and Ibn Abī ʾL-Sādj, see M. Canard, Histoire de la dynastie des Ḥanḍimīdīs, i, 352 ff., 355 ff. (M. Canard)

**AL-DJAR** [see GANDJA].

AL-DJAR, once an Arabic port (furdā) on the Red Sea, 20 days' journey south of Ayla, 3 from al-Djufa. Until almost the end of the Middle Ages (when Yanbu', which is situated further north, took over this function), al-Djar was the supply port of Medina, one day's journey away (this according to Yākūt, ii, 5; according to BGA, vi, 191 it was two days' journey; according to BGA, i, 19, and ii, 31 it was three). Al-Djar was half on the mainland, and half on an island just offshore. Drinking water had to be brought from the Wādī Yalyal, two parasangs distant. It was an important entrepôt for trade with Egypt, Abyssinia, India and China. The harbour of Karāf (probably the Καραφωνος of Ptolemy), used for trade with Abyssinia, was situated on an island, a square mile in area, facing the town. There were many castles (ṣuyūr) in al-Djar. Their beginnings must date back to the time of ʿUmar, who had two castles built here for the purpose of housing 20 ship-loads of grain (Yaḥyābū, i, 177). By 1800, the name of the town no longer appears in descriptions of travel, and it was apparently replaced by Burayka (Burēka), which is the name of the bay of al-Djar. Extensive ruins found there may well be the remains of the old castles. The whole stretch of the Red Sea from Djudda to al-Kulzum was referred to as al-Djar in antiquity.

In the time of the Prophet, those who had taken part in the rebellion against the caliph (in 230/814-5) were referred to as al-Djar (Baladhuri, Futūḥ Misr, ed. G. Jacob, Die altesten Spuren des Wesskinds, in M. Slane, i, 246). The name was also applied to the region of the Red Sea and the coast. In 145/762: Tabarl, ii, 177. A name, al-Djar, first recorded in the lists of cities in Arabia in the time of the Caliphate of al-Muktadir. The trade in assignments (ṣukūk) for grain from the stores in al-Djar, the earliest recorded instance of promissory notes, is recorded in the hadīth and in the discussions of the scholars of Medina (Mālik, al-Muwatta', sections al-ʾina and ǧamīʿ bayʿ al-ʾlaḏām, with al-Zurqānī's commentary; Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, Futūḥ Misr, ed. Torrey, 166 ff.; G. Jacob, Die ältesten Spuren des Wesskinds, in M. Slane, xxviii/2, 1925, 250-1). The name also indicates the reign of ʿAlī, the khalif of ʿUmar, and the reign of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭaḍir, under whom the town was in a state of unrest on other occasions: for instance in 250/864-5 (Tabarl, iii, 1336), 266/879-80 (Tabarl, iii, 1941), under al-Muṭṭakīr (Abu ʾL-Farajār al-ʾIsfahānī, Maḥāṭī al-ʾIbāḥiyyān, 706, Cairo 1949).

**Bibliography:** (In addition to works mentioned in the text): BGA, i, 27; ii, 40; iii, 12, 55, 69, 83, 97, 107, 110; v, 78; vi, 153, 191; vii, 96, 313, 341;
Hamdān (ed. D. H. Müllner) 47, 182, 218; Yāqūt, Muṣṭaḥrī (ed. Wüstenfeld) passim; Baktī, Mu‘ājam, ii, 355-7 (ed. al-Sābkā, Cairo 1947); Ḥuṣayn al-Qal‘am (transl. Minorsky) 87, 148, 174; Abu ‘l-Fīḍā (ed. Reinaud) 82; Dimāṣji, Cosmogr. (ed. Mehren) 376; Ḥāfiz, ix, 25, Cairo 1936; Samānī, Ansāb, fol. 119 a, b; Wüstenfeld, Des Gebiet von Medina, 12 f.; Sprenger, Geographie des alten Arabien, 38; Ritter, Erdkunde, xii, 181-3. (A. DIETRICH)

Djarād, locusts. The word is a collective noun, the nom. unit. being djūrād, which is applied to the male and female forms in various climatic regions, but in its gregarious destructive form it is particularly and lamentably well-known. Invasions of locusts are a phenomenon not peculiar to the Muslim world, since they occur from China to America and from the U.S.S.R. to South Africa, but almost the entire Muslim world lies within the affected area, and in a region where invasions are especially frequent and severe. There is no need to give an account here of a well-known phenomenon which from the Bible to our own times has been described by many writers. Contemporary biologists have established that in their gregarious forms locusts are the same as in their solitary, peaceful forms: unfavourable climatic conditions simply modify the nature of their reproduction and mode of life. Young locusts then take flight in dense masses numbering millions which darken the sky like a vast cloud; the sound of the rasping of their legs and wings is intensified; when there is a drop in temperature, as for example in the evening, they suddenly settle on the ground and in a few moments every scrap of vegetation is destroyed, sometimes even when the destructive form occurs in an area where invasions are often frequent and severe.

In Arabic zoological, pharmacological and lexical works numerous kinds are mentioned, of which, according to some authors, differ in colour (green, red, tawny asfar, white). Where it is stated that the male is tawny and the female black, a specific variety is obviously spoken of. Some locusts fly and some leap. Some have a big and some a small body. They have no fixed habitat but wander about from place to place following a leader. The males have a lighter body and therefore are better able to fly. Locusts have six feet, the tips of which (or: the hind legs) are like saws. Their saliva is a deadly poison to plants.

In the opinion of the ancient Arabs, who used to eat them, locusts yield a delicious food tasting like the meat of scorpions; and Diābīṣ wondered why certain people did not like it. Yet eating it was believed to cause epilepsy (yajzāy). Locusts are eaten to this day by the Bedouin: methods of preparation in Hess, 124.

Medicinal uses of the locust and its significance when occurring in dreams are dealt with in pertinent works.

Three writings, each entitled Kitāb al-Djarād (probably little lexical treatises), none of which is extant, are attributed to the following authors (Fihrist, 56, 59, 83): 1) Abū Naṣr Abīnātu.b. Ḥātim (al-Bāhīl [q.v.]); 2) Abū Ḥātim al-Sijjīstānī [q.v.]; 3) Abū al-ʿAbd al-Yāqūt al-Albānī. (ii). The locust, more commonly known as grass-hopper, exists in various harmless forms in almost all climatic regions, but in its gregarious destructive form it is particularly and lamentably well-known. Invasions of locusts are a phenomenon not peculiar to the Muslim world, since they occur from China to America and from the U.S.S.R. to South Africa, but almost the entire Muslim world lies within the affected area, and in a region where invasions are especially frequent and severe. There is no need to give an account here of a well-known phenomenon which from the Bible to our own times has been described by many writers. Contemporary biologists have established that in their gregarious forms locusts are the same as in their solitary, peaceful forms: unfavourable climatic conditions simply modify the nature of their reproduction and mode of life. Young locusts then take flight in dense masses numbering millions which darken the sky like a vast cloud; the sound of the rasping of their legs and wings is intensified; when there is a drop in temperature, as for example in the evening, they suddenly settle on the ground and in a few moments every scrap of vegetation is destroyed, sometimes even over an area of several square kilometres. As a result the local population suffers an economic catastrophe, except only that the locusts themselves, if they can be killed, provide some food.

From time to time chronicles mention particular invasions of locusts, but generally without giving details, and the information to be gathered from these references is, it seems, too haphazard and localized to allow any deductions to be made in respect of possible modifications in the habits of the locusts, the periodicity of their invasions or the area of their migrations. Today there are several migratory species, the two that chiefly concern us being the Desert Locust (Schistocerca gregaria, mainly in East Africa and Asia) and the Migratory Locust (Locusta migratoria, all other parts of Africa). Attempts have always been made to prevent these invasions; and although modern techniques have to some extent increased the effectiveness of control, they have not in fact introduced any new methods for a long time nor, as yet, have they overcome this scourge. Naturally, the local inhabitants have destroyed the eggs whenever they have found them, as a preventative step. When an invasion takes place, they try to stop the locusts advancing, or to kill them by digging pits, spraying poison, using wheeled screens and flame-throwers etc., (poison and fire already envisaged by Ibn Wāghṣiyiya) although the destruction inflicted does not prevent terrible
damage being done. Resistance can only be successful formation to the Byzantines. The...nhabitants of the mountain districts, the... decided to put an end to this dangerous development, to put a stop to this dangerous development,... to serve the Arabs as scouts and spies, to guard the Ibn al-Zubayr but also preoccupied with the revolt... for anti-locust control see in particular the periodical Locusta, from 1954. (Cl. CAHEN)

**DJARADIIMA (Mardai'tes).** This name, the singular of which is Djarajumālī (cf. Aghani), v, 158, Aghani, v, 150, in a poem of Aššā Hamdān), according to Yākūt, ii, 55 denotes the inhabitants of the town of Djarajuma, situated in the Amanus (Lukkām), and of the marshy districts north of Antioch between Bās and Būkā. This word could also be connected with Gurgum, the old name of a legendary province in the region of Mar'ash, on which see Dussaud, Topogr. hist. de la Syrie, 283, 469. On the other hand Father Lammens recorded a village called Djarām near the road between Aleppo and Alexandretta and the springs of Hammām (Hamam) Shāykh (Shaykh?)

As inhabitants of the Arabo-Byzantine border country, the Djarādima played an important part during the early days of Islam in the wars between Arabs and Byzantines, and they were known to Byzantine historians by the name Mardai'tes (see below). Somewhat lukewarm Christians, though whether Monophysite or Monothelite is not known, and dependants of the “patriarchate of Antioch”, they enjoyed semi-independence vis-à-vis the Byzantines to whom they supplied soldiers and irregular troops. The Arabs, after taking Antioch, sent an expedition against them commanded by Ḥabīb b. Maslama al-Fihri. According to al-Baladhuri and Ibn al-Aṣḥīr, the Djarādima agreed to serve the Arabs as scouts and spies, to guard the Amanian Gates and, along with the Arabs, to garrison the small forts commanding the road into and out of Syria. Wellhausen has, however, questioned whether they ever played this rôle before the time of Walīd I, after 85/798 (see below). They were given exemption from jīzāya and had the right to a share of the booty when they took part in military operations. But their loyalty was intermittent, and they did not hesitate to betray the Arabs and pass in-f...form to the Byzantines. The instability of the frontier and the difficulty of access to their country made it impossible for the Arabs to impose their authority over them.

The Byzantine historian Theophanes, like Michael the Syrian and Bar Hebraeus, states that during the reign of Mu'awiyah, the emperor Constantine Pogonatus (641-68) sent the Mardai'tes (Djarādima) against Syria. Supported by Byzantine troops and under the command of Greek officers, their forces occupied the whole stretch of territory from the Black Mountain (the Amanus) to the Holy City (Jerusalem), and thus blocked control of all the mountains in the Lebanon. Many runaways slaves, no doubt Greek in origin, joined the Djarādima, as did a number of the inhabitants of the mountain districts. In a short time their forces numbered several thousand men. According to Father Lammens, this operation is said to have started in about 46/666. To put a stop to this dangerous development, Mu'awiyah began negotiations with the emperor and, after lengthy discussions, accepted a peace treaty (annual tribute of 3,000 gold pieces, liberation of 8,000 prisoners and handing over of 50 thorough-bred horses). This treaty was perhaps accompanied by a promise that the emperor would abandon the Mardai'tes and withdraw from them all help in the form of men, arms and money. It is not known if the emperor intervened with the Mardai'tes in the Lebanon who in any case, as Michael the Syrian testifies, suffered partial defeats at the hands of Mu'awiyah and were further discomfited in about 49 or 50 by the settlement of the Zutt [q.v.] in the Antioch region and further north in the country of the Djarādima (al-Baladhuri).

It is curious that the account given by Theophanes is not confirmed by the Arab historians who do not connect the peace treaty, probably concluded in 58 or 59/678-9 shortly before Mu'awiyah's death, with the question of the Djarādima whom they do not mention at that period. Wellhausen has accordingly raised doubts regarding the account given by Theophanes, suggesting that he had brought the Mardai'tes into Mu'awiyah's treaty as a result of confusing it with the treaty made by 'Abd al-Malik and the history of the Djarādima in his time, which we shall deal with later; while Father Lammens, thinking, on the contrary, that the Arab historians have not preserved any record of this incident because they have confused it with events at the time of 'Abd al-Malik. However al-Baladhuri, when speaking of the Djarādima at the time of 'Abd al-Malik, makes a very clear reference to a treaty concluded with them by Mu'awiyah, who gave them money and in return took hostages whom he kept at Ba'albek. But the writer places this incident at the time of Mu'awiyah's war against “the people of 'Irāk". That would mean the war against 'All, that is to say at an earlier period. The uncertainty remains.

In the time of 'Abd al-Malik, in 69-70/688-9, taking advantage of the fact that the caliph was not only engaged in a difficult war with the anti-caliph Ibn al-Zubayr but also preoccupied with the revolt of the Umayyad 'Amr b. Sa'id al-Asghārī whom he had left in command of Damascus. Justinian II sent the Djarādima to attack Syria. Al-Baladhuri reports that Greek cavalry, under the command of a Byzantine officer, came into the Amanus district and then advanced as far as the Lebanon, and that this force was joined by large numbers of Djarādima, native peasants and runaway slaves. To put an end to the attacks of
these adventurers the caliph was compelled to sign a treaty with them, guaranteeing a weekly payment of 1,000 dinars. Then he offered the emperor to make peace on the same terms as Mu'awiya when the latter had been engaged in the war with the people of Irāk. Theophanes also mentions this treaty, in connexion with two particular years, 6176 (65/684) and 6178 (67/686), the latter possibly being a renewal. The figures given by him are not the same as for the treaty with Mu'awiya (for 6176: 365,000 gold pieces, 365 slaves, 365 thoroughbred horses; for 6178: 1,000 gold pieces, 1,000 slaves and 1,000 shielders). But at the same time the emperor increased his claims, for we see in 6178 that the caliph had to surrender to the emperor half the tribute from Cyprus, Armenia and Iberia (cf. Michael the Syrian, ii, 469). For this consideration Justinian agreed to withdraw the Mardaites, and he recalled 12,000 of them; they settled on Byzantine territory. Theophanes reproves him for denuding the frontier in this way. But al-Baladhūri, who dates the treaty 70/689 is unaware of this withdrawal and, according to Nicephorus, Brevarium, 36, the recall of the Mardaites, insofar as they were recalled, took place when Justinian broke the truce, and in order to reinforce his army. Theophanes also says under 6179 (69/690) that some Mardaites from the Lebanon came to rejoin the emperor's army in Armenia. Others remained in the Amanus, and there were still some there at the time of Walid II (see below).

According to al-Baladhūri, the caliph after signing the treaty resorted to a trick to get rid of the Djaradjima. He sent one of his trusted supporters, by name Suḥaym b. al-Muḥādīr, to see the Greek officer commanding them; Suḥaym succeeded in winning his confidence by pretending to take his part against the caliph. Then, using troops that had been in hiding, he made a surprise attack, killing the officer and massacring the Greeks who were with him. As for the Djaradjima, he granted them the āmun; some went away and settled in villages in the neighbourhood of Hims and Damascus, others went back to the Amanus. The native peasants who had made common cause with them returned to their villages and did not fight against the Djaradjima. Some of these adventurers entered the caliph's service. According to al-Baladhūri, one of them named Maymūn al-Qurqūjūmāni (known by the Byzantines as Malouma), a former Greek slave of a member of the Umayyad family, was set free at the request of Abīd al-Malīk who had been told of the prowess he had shown in battle in the Lebanon, and he was put in charge of a garrison at Antiōch. In the time of Walīd, at the head of an army of 1,000 men who were no doubt Mardaites, he took part in the expedition sent by Maslama b. Abīd al-Malīk against Tyana, where he was killed. But al-Baladhūri was certainly mistaken when he said that his death was a great sorrow to Abīd al-Malīk, for the latter was already dead at that time. Another mistake about him occurs in al-Ṭabarī who, under 87/706, records a tradition from Wakīdī, according to which he was said to have been killed in the ranks of the Greeks. We see from Theophanes (under 6201 (89/709-10); cf. Nicephorus, Brevarium, 43-4) that this is certainly a reference to a former Mardaites fighting for the Arabs; it was precisely to avenge his death that these words were said to have undertaken the expedition in the course of which they laid siege to Tyana. (For the complications of this incident see Wellhausen 436-7, according to whom the Tyana expedition lasted for two years, 88 and 89).

However the Djaradjima, in their retreats in the Amanus, and with the support of Greeks who had come from the neighbourhood of Alexandria, continued to be a source of trouble for, in the same year 89, Maslama organized an expedition against their stronghold Djudjūma which was captured and destroyed. But the Djaradjima were treated exceptionally: they were allowed to keep their Christian faith whilst wearing Muslim dress, without being subject for ten years to payment of tribute, and to take for themselves and their families and to take part in Muslim expeditions with the right to despise those whom they slew; their goods and their trade were not to be subject to any discrimination from the fiscal point of view. This shows beyond doubt that their secession was feared and that they were needed. A number of them were settled in the region of Tīzin and Layḥīn in north Syria, others at Hims and at Antioch. Many emigrated however, crossing over into imperial territory. They settled in Pamphylia in the neighbourhood of Attaleia where they were known by the name of Mardaites and were commanded by a catapan. It has been observed that, even today, the population of this district still shows very clear traces of its Syrian origin (see Honigmann, Ostgrenze, 41, following Petersen and Von Luschau, Reisen in Lykien, Mīlyas und Kibyratis, ii, 1859, 208 ff.).

We find references to those who stayed on in Muslim territory under Yazīd II in the Irāk army (al-Dībāḥ, Bayān, i, 114), and under Hīṣām b. Abīd al-Malīk in a garrison in the Amanus (al-Baladhūri, 167, ed. Cairo, 174). During the 'Abbadīd period their privileges were confirmed for them by Wāghīk, but Mutawakkīl ordered that they should be subject to diqya, though continuing to give pay to those who were employed in the frontier posts.

As we have seen, the Djaradjima are the Mardaites. The Syrian historians call them Gargūmayē, with the additional epithet Līphūrī or Lī麽rē, that is to say brigands (cf. ịsịsị in Ibn al-Aṭīr, Nihāyā, under ardūma). The name Djaradjima is given in Ibn al-Fakhrī, 35, as denoting natives (wādhī) of Syria, as opposed to Djarāmīkī, natives of Djarāmīk, Nabāt, natives of Sawād and Sabābīdā, natives of Sind. But we find in Aghānī, vi, 76 (Aghānī II, xvii, 75) that Djaradjima, in Syria, denotes those of Persian origin like the Abnāī in the Yemen, the Aḥāmīrā in Kūfā, the Aṣāwīrā in Bāṣra and the Khaḍāmīrā in Djarāmīk. An allusion to the existence of the Djaradjima in the Amanus in the 4th/10th century will be found in H. Zayat, Vie du Patriarche melkite d'Antioche Christophe (d. 667) par le prosperityrā Ibrahim b. Yūhanna. Document inédit du Xe siècle, in Proche Orient Chrétien, ii, 1952, 60, where mention is made of a monastery of the Virgin called Dayr al-Djaradjima in the Diābal al-Lūkāmān.
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DJARASH, the ancient Gerassan, place in
Transjordan situated south-east of the
'Adjûlim, in a well-wooded hilly district, standing
on a bank of a small tributary of the Wâdi
'I-Zarkâ, the Wâdi 'I-Dayr or Chrysoros of the
Greeks. Founded in the Hellenistic era at a centre
of natural communications, later to be followed by
Roman roads, it was captured by the Jewish leader
Alexander Jannaeus in about 80 B.C., but freed by
Pompey; it then belonged to the towns of the
Decapolis, being incorporated successively in the
Roman province of Syria and the province of Arabia.
Known as Antioch on the Chrysoros, it enjoyed its
greatest prosperity in the time of the Antonines, and
it was then that most of the monuments whose
imposing remains we admire today were built. A
fortified city in the 4th century, it became the seat
of a bishopric, and churches and basilicas abounded.
Conquered in 13/634 by Shurahbil, it formed part
of the district of al-'Urdunn. In the 3rd/9th century,
according to al-Yâqûbî, its population was still
half Greek, half Arab. But soon the town lost all
its importance. No building of the Muslim period
survives, nor is there any trace of the castle which
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DJARBA (Djerba) is the largest island of the
Maghrib littoral, with an area of 514 sq. kms. It
lies to the south of Tunisia in the gulf of Gabes
(‘Little Syrtis in ancient times), an area noted for
its sandbars and tidal currents. The two peninsulas
of Mehabeul and Accara reach out towards it from
the Djeffara plain, but the island is separated from
the mainland by the Bou Grara Sea and Strait of
al-Kantara. The terrain is a deposit of the
quaternary age, being marine on the periphery and
continental inland.

There is no source of fresh water on the island
apart from the few gullies along the clayey cliff of
Guellala in the south, where the water merely
trickles for a few hundred yards even after the
heavy rains. The precipitation is slight and sporadic,
an average of 200 mm. (= 7.84 in.) falling in a
season of about 40 days, and even a continually
high relative humidity cannot offset this lack of rain.
The underground water-level to which wells are
sunk through a layer of sandy soil and a limestone
crust is abundant but saline except in the eastern
interior. Deep drillings have been made to find an
artesian water-level in the miocene clay of the sub-
structure, but the water is salty and virtually
unusable. The inhabitants of the island have
always had to collect water in tanks, private and
public, and except on certain small plots, cultivation
of the land has yielded a very low output. All those
who throughout the centuries have attacked the
island have had to contend with its shortage of
water.

Like the Kerkena islands, Djerba is connected
with the mainland by the wide sandbanks which
surround it less than 10 m. below the surface of the
sea. These banks often silt up completely. At Ţrik
el-Djmel, for instance, the caravans cross them on
their way to the Tarbella peninsula, and nearby a
road has recently been constructed over the remains
of the Roman causeway to al-ţanţara. There is thus
a direct link for modern traffic between the mainland
and the island. The effect of tidal currents on the
mud and fine sand has been to create a series of
channels, ‘oueds’, in the sandbanks. Indeed, the gulls
of Venice and Gabès are the only areas of the Medi-
terranean which are tidal. At Djerba there is a diffe-
rence of 1 m. between high and low tide. The dangers
of navigating the currents and sandbanks have always
served as a defence against outside intruders. In 253
B.C., during the first Punic War, a Roman fleet ran
aground at low tide off Djerba, and it was only
refloated at high tide by unloading the ships.
(Polybius, i, 39). In 1511, Pedro Navarro landed his
troops at high tide, and had sufficient foresight to
withdraw his ships with the ebb tide. But the
Spanish soldiers were thrown back by the islanders,
and had great difficulty in regaining their ships
which were lying four miles offshore (Leo Africanus,
trans. Épaulard, 401). It should be added that the
sea abounds in fish, and certain shrimps are swarmed
with sponges.

"Djerba, the isle of the shallows of Periplus, of
the Lotus-eaters of Erasthones and other Greek
writers, was called Pharis by Theophrastus, Meninx
by Polybius, and possibly Phla by Herodotus. The
land was well cultivated from the middle of the
fourth century B.C. onwards, at which time it was
certainly under the rule of Carthage" (Gisell, Hlst.,
ii, 124). As in Roman times, its economy was based
mainly on the growing of olives, although in the
fourth century B.C. the oil was still extracted from
wild trees. Not much is known about its maritime
dory during classical times, but it is said that there
were 400 oueds, and that the area was considered
fishing-grounds in the area. The for the most part shapeless remains of
ancient settlements point to its economic importance
at that time. Only Meninx can be accurately located,
its ruins standing under the Burdj al-ţanţara at the
end of the Roman causeway. It is probable that
Girba, from which the island’s name originated, was
situated near Hountm-Souk, and that Tipaza and
Haribus were in the neighbourhood of Adjim and Guellala respectively. The sack of Jerusalem in the first century A.D. resulted in a considerable influx of Jews, from whom most of the present-day Jewish population is descended. After having been part of the proconsular province, Djerba fell successively under the power of Tripolitania, the Vandals, and Byzantium. In the Byzantine age the bishop of Djerba was appointed from Tripoli. In 665, during the wars waged in Byzacene by Ma'awiya b. Hudaydj, Djerba was conquered and occupied by Ruwayf b. Tabbit. For the next centuries rule is known about the island, except that it came under the rule of Kayrawân and Mahdiyya. Its natural isolation was reinforced by the independent spirit of its inhabitants and their attachment to the Kharidjite schism, which between the 2nd/8th and 4th/10th centuries extended to places so wide apart as Djabal Nafusa (Tripolitania) and the Mzâb (Algerian Sahara). It explains perhaps why Arab writers such as al-Bakrî and al-Idrîsî have so few kind words to spare for them, finding them ill-natured and hypocritical. Al-Bakrî remarked that they 'acted piratically on both land and sea', and al-Idrîsî pointed out that they were Berbers and could speak no other tongue. Nevertheless the island was described in the eleventh century as a mass of gardens and olive-groves, and Djerba (Girba) figured as one of its small towns.

The invasions of the Banû Hilâl in the 5th/11th century, and the fall of the Zïrîd dynasty, seemed to increase the Djerbian's spirit of independence. Their piratical raids on the Tunisian coast and on the Christian fleets became more frequent. In 1113/6-6 'Ali b. Yâhyâ the Zïrîd was still their master. But George of Antioch, admiral to the Norman king of Sicily Roger II, conquered and occupied the island in 1135. The capture of Mahdiyya in 1148 strengthened Norma rule, which persisted until 1160 despite an uprising in 1153 which was rapidly suppressed. They were then driven from the Tunisian coast and islands by the great Almohad conqueror 'Abd al-Mu'îmin. In 683/1284, at the beginning of the reign of the Hafsîd prince 'Abd al-Hâfîs 'Umar, a Christian expedition easily retook the island. It was under the command of the Norman Castilian George de Dinan, and it was landed in Sicily, Peter III of Aragon. In 1289 the Christians built a fortress to guard over the Strait of al-Kantara, which date the island was brought under the direct rule of Sicily. But a fresh revolt, in which the Djerbians gained the assistance of the Hafsid king Abu Abd al-Mu'min. In 1292, when the Christian conquest was made from the sawdust of palm-trees.

The defiance and independent spirit of the Djerbians brought clashes with the Hafsîds as well as with the Christians. Not only did they turn a deaf ear to Abu Ali Fâris's peaceful propaganda in favour of orthodoxy, but in 885/1480 they suddenly broke their association with Abu Umar 'Ughmân and deliberately destroyed their only link with the mainland, the Roman causeway. Up to then it had been restored several times and kept in good condition.

Despite the plunderings, massacres and deportations resulting from Christian invasions, and the wars between the two rival sects (the Kharidjî and the 'Alawis), the island was removed from the Christians. Not only did they turn a deaf ear to Abu Ali Fâris's peaceful propaganda in favour of orthodoxy, but in 885/1480 they suddenly broke their association with Abu Umar 'Ughmân and deliberately destroyed their only link with the mainland, the Roman causeway. Up to then it had been restored several times and kept in good condition.

The rulers of Turkish Tunisia, Dey's and Beys, who were succeeded from 1177/1705 onwards by the rulers of the Hûsaynid dynasty, appointed first sha'ikhs and then kâ'idâs to represent them in the outlying possession of Djerba; these important officials were recruited hereditarily from certain families. In the 10th/16th century it was the Semu- meni family which ruled, and they were succeeded by the Bel Djellouis. One of them, Sa'id, was put to death in 1521/1732 for ordering the sinking of all
flat-bottomed boats in order to prevent them falling into the hands of the invading troops of Yunus Bey, son of Ali Pasha. Thereafter the Ben Ayed family ruled the island until the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

From the early eighteenth century onwards, Maliki orthodoxy gradually replaced the Ibadi schism, and Arabic began to establish itself as the most common language. Uprisings against the central power periodically brought war to the island, in particular from 1707/1599 to 1709/1610, and in 1864. In the eighteenth century there were also several raids by the Berbers of the nomadic Urghamma and Accara tribes from the desert, led by Ghalib Ali Pasha. Thereafter the Ben Ayed clan continued to be the dominant family in the island, and for commercial reasons they maintained a strong network of contacts with the outside world.
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octopuses and sponges which are so abundant in the waters off Djerba. The islanders also fish with rods, eel-pots and various types of nets.

The Djerbians work hard in their several occupations, and because of this good deal they remain very devoted to their island, and to their social and family ties.


**AL-DJARDJARA,** an ancient fortress in Arabia Petraea situated on the Roman road leading from Buṣrā to the Red Sea, about one mile north of Adhrūb (q.v.). Like Adhrūb, it submitted to Muham- mad, in 631, on condition of payment of tribute. The distance between Adhrūb and Al-Djarbā, estimated at “three days’ journey”, has been mentioned frequently in the hadith as an indication of the size of the basin (ḥawd [q.v.]) where the Prophet will stand on the day of Judgment. The expression “between Adhrūb and Al-Djarbā” thus has become proverbial to denote a considerable distance.

The place came into prominence for the second time during the Crusades, when Sulāh al-Dīn camped there in August 578/1183, during his ex-pedition against Damascus.

**Bibliography:** Baladī hurl, Futūḥ, 59; Tabarī, i, 1702; Yākūt, ii, 48; Bakrī, Muʿjam al-dān, ed. Wüstenfeld, 834-239; Le Strange, Palestine, index; A. S. Marmardji, *Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine*, Paris 1938, 183; Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, *La marche de Saladin au Caire à Damas*, in RB, 1906, 469-70 (following William of Tyrre, xxii, 14, 15); Ibn Ḥanbal, *Munād* ed. Cairo 1313 h., ii, 21; Muslim, *Ṣahih*, ed. 1330-4 h., ii, 209. (D. SOURDEL)

**AL-DJARBA,** patronymic deriving from the locality of Djīrbarāyā in Ṭirāk (on the Tigris, south of Baghdad), borne by several viziers of the ‘Abbāsid and Fātimid caliphs.

1. — Muhammad b. al-Fādil, former secretary of al-Fādil b. ‘Ala‘, sent to the Mamluks by the Fatimids in 1118/1707 to negotiate peace. He was sent to the Seljuk sultan El-āṣkārī in 1128/1716 to negotiate a truce, which was signed at the end of the year, but was soon discarded by reason of his negligence. Recalled to the vizierate by al-Musta‘īn in May 1129/1718, he died soon afterwards in the year 1130/1725, aged about sixty (see Saḍāfī, al-Walfī, iv, 4, ed. Dedering, no. 1796).

2. — Ahmad b. al-Qāshib, son of a governor of Egypt (Ibn al-Ṭanīm, Shādkhārat, a. 265), had been secretary-tutor to prince al-Muẓāṯār and became vizier in 1132/1719. He died in 1133/1720 (see Saḍāfī, al-Walfī, iv, 4, ed. Dedering, no. 1796).

3. — al-Ṭabarī, see above. (D. SOURDEL).

The famous “Tower of Skulls” (Burj al-ru’ūs) built by the Djārbāns with the bones of the dead, often mentioned by European travelers, was demolished in 1848 by order of Ahmad Bey, bey of Tunis.

DIARH wa 'L-TADIL, (disparaging and declaring trustworthy), a technical phrase used regarding the reliability or otherwise of traditionists and witnesses. This article deals with the former; for the latter see 'Adl. While the criticism of hadith did not, as is often said, apply solely to the tirdad, this formed a very important part of it. In the course of the 2nd/8th century when it was realized that many false traditions were being invented, interest in the transmitters developed, and statements regarding their qualities were made. In the 3rd/9th century books began to be written, generally in the form of lists of men with their dates, and statements regarding their credibility. We also find notes on the qualities of traditionists in the canonical Sunan collections of tradition, in the Sunan of al-Dārimi [g.v.], and elsewhere. In the introduction to his Šabk Muslim found it necessary to justify the investigation of traditionists' credentials because many felt it was wrong to criticize them. Such views must have continued for a long time, for al-Ḥakīm (d. 405/1014) still found it necessary to defend the practice of writing books on Qīm al-hadith which were written (4th/10th century onwards). al-Djarh wa 'L-tadil formed a recognized branch of the subject.

The Companions of the Prophet were considered reliable, so dijarh could not apply to them; but traditionists of later generations were subject to investigation. Views were held regarding the qualities of a reliable transmitter. He must (1) be a Muslim, (2) have sound intelligence, (3) be truthful, (4) never conceal defects in his transmission, (5) be trustworthy. In his K. al-djarh wa 'L-tadil, Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327/939) discusses in the introduction the various classes of transmitter, and his classification served as a standard for later times; e.g., al-Khāṭib al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) in his Kitāb, and Ibn al-Salāḥ (d. 643/1245) in his Usīm al-hadith. He mentions in order of merit four types whose traditions may be accepted. They are (1) tihā (trustworthy), or mutāhin (exact); (2) saddāb (truthful), mahālalhu al-yidq (his station is veracity), or lā ba‘ṣ bihi (there is no harm in him); (3) ṣayyīb; (4) sāliḥ al-hadith (good, or upright, in tradition). The second type is not so authoritative as the first and the third is slightly inferior to the second. The fourth contains men whose traditions may be written down for comparison with those of others. There are four classes of lower authority still: (1) layin al-hadith (easy-going in tradition); (2) layna bi-kawj (not strong); (3) daw’ al-hadith (weak in tradition); (4) matrāk al-hadith (one whose traditions are abandoned), dkhīb al-hadith (rejected), or hadīth dīb (liar). The first two deserve to have their traditions considered and compared with those of others; the third, though inferior, is not to be rejected outright, but one must find whether his traditions are supported elsewhere. The fourth is utterly rejected. A number of other terms are also applied to other writers.

But while this sounds straightforward matters were not so simple, for sometimes a transmitter called trustworthy by one authority was called weak by another. This raised a difficulty, but opinion seemed to prefer the view that when both djarh and tadil were expressed about the same man, the djarh had more authority because those who expressed this view must have possessed information not available to others. But while those who expressed tadil did not need to supply reasons for their view, those who expressed djarh must do so, for people differed in their idea of what constituted weakness, and it is only when the reasons are stated that one can know whether the judgment is valid. Opinions differ as to whether one authority is enough to express djarh and tadil. Two men were not able to attest the reliability of witnesses, but Ibn al-Salāḥ holds that the testimony of one man is sufficient to state the reliability or otherwise of a transmitter of tradition.


DIJARH [see kāyil].
DIJARID [see al-zarita].
DIJARID (BILAD AL-). The Djerid or “country of palms” is a district of the Sahara situated in south-western Tunisia which includes the oases of Nefta, Tozeur (Ṭūṣar), El-Ouidane (al-Udyyān) and al-Ḥamna (not to be confused with al-Ḥamna of Gabès). In the Middle Ages the Djerid was more often called Kashīlyā; but this name which is sometimes a synonym of Tozeur only (Ibn Hawkal, 243; al-Idrīsī, 121), frequently embraces Gafsa and the Neżfāwa (Ibn Kīlāḏān, i, 192) along...
with the modern Djerid, and sometimes even the district of Gabès (Leo Africamis, 8).

Apart from al-Hamma which is in the north, the oases are situated at the foot of the last antifinal fold (Drâa al-Djerid) of the Atlas, between 25 and 75 metres in altitude, on the edge of an immense sabkha wrongly named Chott el-Djerid on maps: it is an immense plain of salty clay, absolutely sterile, 110 by 70 km.; it produces no pastureage of salsoaceous plants except along its border, to which alone the name sabbah applies; this is the sabkha Takmart of Arab writers. According to tradition, the sea covered the district at quite a recent period; in fact, its altitude is about twenty metres, and it has been possible to show recently that the sabbaha of Djerid and its eastward extension, the sabbaha of Fej jedi, were in the Quaternary Age merely lagoons temporarily connected with the Gulf of Gabès.

The climate is essentially that of a desert: Tozeur only receives 89 mm. (3.5") ins. of rain a year, and very irregularly; mean temperatures there for January and July are 10° C. (50° F.) and 32° C. (90° F.); frosts are very rare, but the temperature often exceeds 40° C. It is the typical climate of the date-palm, provided that it is given abundant irrigation. Numerous springs appear at the foot of the Drâa al-Djerid, fed by a strong artesian water-level enclosed in the upper Cretaceous limestones and Pontien sandstones (Tertiary): with some artesian wells, which have been sunk fairly recently, they provide a total of about 1850 litres a second. Thus the oases of the Djerid have always had the reputation of being the finest in Tunisia.

Tozeur (Tasuros, or Blâd al-Ḥaḍar), Nefta (Nepte) and al-Hamma (Aquae) were points on a forward road near the Roman and Byzantine limes. It is not certain that Tokūys (El-Oudiane), referred to by al-Yaḥṣūbī in the 3rd/9th century, is of ancient origin. The Djerid was twice conquered by Arab conquerors: in 26/647 by Ibn Zuhayr and in 49/669 by al-Yaḥṣūbī in the 6th/12th century, and in the 13th century were replaced by tribes of Sulaym origin, the Kūb and Mirdās, who migrated from the Djerid to the neighbourhood of Bone. In the 14th century the Kūb levied the iktd, whilst certain Mirdās, after acquiring property at Tozeur, gradually began to settle. But the great Ḥafṣid sovereigns of the 15th century, as a result of several expeditions, succeeded in imposing their authority over the settled as well as the nomadic population, through the help of active governors.

From the 12th century Ḥarīgism was in full decline, weakened by dissensions between Wabbiyya and Nekkāra; it seems to have disappeared when it faced with the propaganda of Shāfiʿī. From the 5th/nth century. In 1053, the Kastiliya was ravaged by the Riyāḥ, the vanguard of the Banū Hilāl, commanded by Abī b. Abī l-Rayḥ; it was quickly incorporated in the independent principality carved out of southern Tunisia by the governor of Gaṣfa, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Rand; this principality, with its sometimes brilliant court, was to endure until the Mamluks took it over. But slowly after that the Djerid became one of the bases of operations of ʿAli, and then of Yahyyā b. Ghanīya, in their attempts to restore the Almoravid empire. Under the Ḥafṣids, in the 13th and 14th centuries, it was in fact in the hands of families who were seeking to preserve their hereditary power; among them were the Banū Yamlūl at Tozeur and the Banu l-Khala at Nefta, both descended from nomadic Arabs; they paid no more heed to the councils of notables than to the advice of their sovereigns, especially in the 14th century. But they were compelled to negotiate constantly with the nomads, to whom the settled population paid tribute (ghafdrā on harvests or a payment of money); the nomads guaranteed their supplies of grain and the export of dates, stored provisions in the houses and guarded the flocks of the rich oasis inhabitants; though turbulent and dangerous, it was not in the nomads' interest to abuse their strength. These nomads, the Rīyāḥ, were little by little thrust back in the course of the 6th/12th century, and in the 13th century were replaced by tribes of Sulaym origin, the Kūb and Mirdās, who migrated from the Djerid to the neighbourhood of Bone. In the 14th century the Kūb levied the iktd, whilst certain Mirdās, after acquiring property at Tozeur, gradually began to settle. But the great Ḥafṣid sovereigns of the 15th century, as a result of several expeditions, succeeded in imposing their authority over the settled as well as the nomadic population, through the help of active governors.

From the 12th century Ḥarīgism was in full decline, weakened by dissensions between Wabbiyya and Nekkāra; it seems to have disappeared when it faced with the propaganda of Shāfiʿī. From the 5th/nth century. In 1053, the Kastiliya was ravaged by the Riyāḥ, the vanguard of the Banū Hilāl, commanded by Abī b. Abī l-Rayḥ; it was quickly incorporated in the independent principality carved out of southern Tunisia by the governor of Gaṣfa, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Rand; this principality, with its sometimes brilliant court, was to endure until the Mamluks took it over. But slowly after that the Djerid became one of the bases of operations of ʿAli, and then of Yahyyā b. Ghanīya, in their attempts to restore the Almoravid empire. Under the Ḥafṣids, in the 13th and 14th centuries, it was in fact in the hands of families who were seeking to preserve their hereditary power; among them were the Banū Yamlūl at Tozeur and the Banu l-Khala at Nefta, both descended from nomadic Arabs; they paid no more heed to the councils of notables than to the advice of their sovereigns, especially in the 14th century. But they were compelled to negotiate constantly with the nomads, to whom the settled population paid tribute (ghafdrā on harvests or a payment of money); the nomads guaranteed their supplies of grain and the export of dates, stored provisions in the houses and guarded the flocks of the rich oasis inhabitants; though turbulent and dangerous, it was not in the nomads' interest to abuse their strength. These nomads, the Rīyāḥ, were little by little thrust back in the course of the 6th/12th century, and in the 13th century were replaced by tribes of Sulaym origin, the Kūb and Mirdās, who migrated from the Djerid to the neighbourhood of Bone. In the 14th century the Kūb levied the iktd, whilst certain Mirdās, after acquiring property at Tozeur, gradually began to settle. But the great Ḥafṣid sovereigns of the 15th century, as a result of several expeditions, succeeded in imposing their authority over the settled as well as the nomadic population, through the help of active governors.

From the 12th century Ḥarīgism was in full decline, weakened by dissensions between Wabbiyya and Nekkāra; it seems to have disappeared when it faced with the propaganda of Shāfiʿī. From the 5th/nth century. In 1053, the Kastiliya was ravaged by the Riyāḥ, the vanguard of the Banū Hilāl, commanded by Abī b. Abī l-Rayḥ; it was quickly incorporated in the independent principality carved out of southern Tunisia by the governor of Gaṣfa, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Rand; this principality, with its sometimes brilliant court, was to endure until the Mamluks took it over. But slowly after that the Djerid became one of the bases of operations of ʿAli, and then of Yahyyā b. Ghanīya, in their attempts to restore the Almoravid empire. Under the Ḥafṣids, in the 13th and 14th centuries, it was in fact in the hands of families who were seeking to preserve their hereditary power; among them were the Banū Yamlūl at Tozeur and the Banu l-Khala at Nefta, both descended from nomadic Arabs; they paid no more heed to the councils of notables than to the advice of their sovereigns, especially in the 14th century. But they were compelled to negotiate constantly with the nomads, to whom the settled population paid tribute (ghafdrā on harvests or a payment of money); the nomads guaranteed their supplies of grain and the export of dates, stored provisions in the houses and guarded the flocks of the rich oasis inhabitants; though turbulent and dangerous, it was not in the nomads' interest to abuse their strength. These nomads, the Rīyāḥ, were little by little thrust back in the course of the 6th/12th century, and in the 13th century were replaced by tribes of Sulaym origin, the Kūb and Mirdās, who migrated from the Djerid to the neighbourhood of Bone. In the 14th century the Kūb levied the iktd, whilst certain Mirdās, after acquiring property at Tozeur, gradually began to settle. But the great Ḥafṣid sovereigns of the 15th century, as a result of several expeditions, succeeded in imposing their authority over the settled as well as the nomadic population, through the help of active governors.

From the 12th century Ḥarīgism was in full decline, weakened by dissensions between Wabbiyya and Nekkāra; it seems to have disappeared when it faced with the propaganda of Shāfiʿī. From the 5th/nth century. In 1053, the Kastiliya was ravaged by the Riyāḥ, the vanguard of the Banū Hilāl, commanded by Abī b. Abī l-Rayḥ; it was quickly incorporated in the independent principality carved out of southern Tunisia by the governor of Gaṣfa, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Rand; this principality, with its sometimes brilliant court, was to endure until the Mamluks took it over. But slowly after that the Djerid became one of the bases of operations of ʿAli, and then of Yahyyā b. Ghanīya, in their attempts to restore the Almoravid empire. Under the Ḥafṣids, in the 13th and 14th centuries, it was in fact in the hands of families who were seeking to preserve their hereditary power; among them were the Banū Yamlūl at Tozeur and the Banu l-Khala at Nefta, both descended from nomadic Arabs; they paid no more heed to the councils of notables than to the advice of their sovereigns, especially in the 14th century. But they were compelled to negotiate constantly with the nomads, to whom the settled population paid tribute (ghafdrā on harvests or a payment of money); the nomads guaranteed their supplies of grain and the export of dates, stored provisions in the houses and guarded the flocks of the rich oasis inhabitants; though turbulent and dangerous, it was not in the nomads' interest to abuse their strength. These nomads, the Rīyāḥ, were little by little thrust back in the course of the 6th/12th century, and in the 13th century were replaced by tribes of Sulaym origin, the Kūb and Mirdās, who migrated from the Djerid to the neighbourhood of Bone. In the 14th century the Kūb levied the iktd, whilst certain Mirdās, after acquiring property at Tozeur, gradually began to settle. But the great Ḥafṣid sovereigns of the 15th century, as a result of several expeditions, succeeded in imposing their authority over the settled as well as the nomadic population, through the help of active governors.
denounced at the beginning of the 18th century by
the traveller Moula-Ahmed (Berbruger, ... francaise" took on the printing of the two periodicals,
with the direction of which the names of the mathe-
poverty-stricken and inaccessible, are for admini-
Algerian nomads, are its principal customers. El-
as connected by railway with Sfax since 1919.
its lofty houses of brick decorated with geometrical
nefta, with a larger population (14,600 inhabitants)
Tozeur, with its 12,000 inhabitants, is the chief town of the Djerid and the largest market
of estates were effected for the benefit of the Bey
The richest palm-grove, where however the greatest
in the Tunisian Sahara; it is patronized in particular
Oudiane has five villages (Degache, Zaouyat al-Arab,
since ancient times for its hot springs. The
(Leila, trans. Epaulard, 1956; M. Seghir Ben
Bibliography:
Ibn Hawkal, Description de l'Afrique, trans. de Slane, in JA, 1842; Bakri,
Idrissi, Description de l'Afrique et de l'Espagne, trans. Dozy and De Goeje, 1866; Ibn
Khalidin, Histoire des Berberes, 2nd. ed.;
matician Fourier and doctor Desgenettes, among others, were connected. The 116 numbers, each of 4 quarto pages, of the Courrier des deux continents constitute a historical source of the highest importance. In Arabic, Marcel's printing-press had mainly published proclamations, notices and communiqués, but after Kléber's assassination (16 June 1800) it also printed the first Arabic newspaper, al-Tanbih Keith, which was founded by Menou and, it seems, was only short-lived (see F. Charles-Roux, Bonaparte, gouverneur d'Egypte, Paris n.d., 135 ff.; R. Canivet, L'imprimerie de l'expédition d'Egypte, in BIE, 1909; Reinaud, in JA, 18, 1851, 249).

It was at Ceuta, at the opposite end of the Maghrib, on 1 May 1820, that the first newspaper to be published in Morocco appeared, El Liberal Africano, the weekly publication of the patriotic Society of the town; it came to an end after 6 numbers on 5 June of the same year (V. Ferrando la Hos, Apuntes para la historia de la Imprenta en el Norte de Marruecos, Tetuan 1949, 23).

In 1824 a French monthly, called Le Smyrniot, was founded in Izmir by a Frenchman, Charles Tricon. After some initial difficulties with both the Turkish and French authorities, it was reorganized under new management, and began to appear weekly, under the name of Le Spectateur oriental, with four quarto pages. It circulated mainly among foreign commercial elements. In 1827 Alexandre Blacque, a lawyer from Marsanne, a well-known figure in the Levant, became part owner and effective editor of the Spectateur, to which he was already a regular contributor. Later renamed the COURIER DE SMYRNE, it played a lively rôle in the affairs of the time, and more than once involved its editor in trouble with the Powers by its forthright comment, notably by its advocacy of the Ottoman cause against the Greek insurrection (L. Lagarde, Note sur les journaux français de Constantinople à l'époque révolutionnaire, in JA, ccxxxi, 1948, 271-6; idem, Note sur les journaux français de Smyrne à l'époque de Mahmoud II, in JA, 19, 190, 103-44; Selim Nühet, Türk Gazeteciliği 1832-1932, Istanbul 1931, 10-28—with a reproduction of a whole issue of the Gazette, dated 1 Floréal, year V = 20 April 1797, and of Le Spectateur Oriental, Decade 1, no. 11, 20 Février 1797; Ahmed Emin, Takvim-i Wekidâ-i divânî, a modern account of modern Turkey as measured by its press, New York 1914, 28-9; Charles White, Three years in Constantinople, ii, London 1843, 42-22). A Turkish account of Russian attempts to get the paper suppressed would be found in the history of Lufti (Ta'virî-i Lufti, iii, 98 ff.). Lufti quotes the Russian ambassador as saying "Indeed, in France and England journalists (gazeteci) can express themselves freely, even against their Kings; so that on several occasions, in former times, wars broke out between France and England because of these journalists. Praise be to God, the divinely-guarded realms were protected from such things, until a little while ago that man turned up in Izmir and began to publish his paper. It would be well to prevent him ... " (Lufti, ii, 100; cf. Emin 28).

It was at this point that Egypt was to re-appear on the scene. As early as 1821, Muhammed 'Ali had given instructions for the publication of a daily newspaper which was to be submitted to him each day and to contain various official, administrative and economic items of information, but it was probably (the numbers prior to 1840 have not been preserved) on 12 Djumâda I 1244/20 November 1828 that there appeared in Cairo the first number of the first real periodical in Arabic, al-Wâhid N'al-Maṣrîyya, the organ of Muhammed 'Ali's Government of Egypt; at first issued weekly in Arabic, it later appeared for several months in Turkish and then finally returned to Arabic; it then only appeared three times weekly, with a separately published French edition, and it remained the only periodical in Egypt under Muhammed 'Ali's Government; from the time of the Khedive Isma'il it was published daily, and in addition to orders, decrees and laws it also contained new local and foreign items, editorials and occasional illustrations. In 1881, with Muhammed 'Ali (Abdul âzîz) as chief editor, it was the most important and widely circulated newspaper of the time.

During the British occupation it reverted to its earlier form and merely contained notices and information on affairs of state. In 1929 it still appeared in official lists.

In this as in so many other matters, the Sultan in Istanbul responded quickly to the challenge of the pâsha in Cairo. In 1831 M. Blacque was summoned to Istanbul to publish the Moniteur ottoman, the official journal of the Ottoman government, in French. The following year, on 1 Djumâda I 1247/14 May 1832, the first issue of the Turkish Takvim-i Wekidâ appeared. A leading article presented the newspaper as a natural development of the imperial historiographies, with the function of making known the true nature of events and the real purport of the acts and imperial-Historic government, in order to prevent misunderstanding and forestall uninformed criticism. A further purpose was to provide useful knowledge on commerce, science, and the arts. Unlike the Moniteur, which gave some space to news and comment, the Takvim was limited to official statements. It was issued by an office called the Takvimâne-i 14 atımi, the first director of which was the Imperial Historiographer Fsad Elendi ten (whom see Babinger, GOW, 354-6). Five thousand copies were distributed to officials and notables, as well as to foreign embassies. The inauguration of the postal service in 1834 greatly helped its circulation. Between 1832 and 1838 about 30 issues a year were published. Thereafter it appeared about once a week, though with some interruptions. The final issue, number 4,068, was published on 4 Rabîî I 1341/24 November 1922, during the upheavals following the resignation of the first director, the official organ of the Turkish government by the Resmi Dîrîde, later renamed Resmi Gazette, of Ankara. (Lufti, iii, 156-60; Nühet, 30-5; Emin 29-32).

The first non-official newspaper published in the Turkish language was the weekly Dîrîde-i Hawdîdî, founded in 1840 by the Englishman William Churchill. After his death in 1864 it was continued by his son. In appearance rather like the Takvim-i Wekidâ, it was commercial in purpose, and carried an increasing amount of advertising. It did, however, publish many articles and features, often in serial form, thus offering an apprenticeship in journalism to a number of Turkish men of letters. (On some of the contributors to the Dîrîde-i Hawdîdî see the articles of Iznâlimnî Muhammed Kemal in Türk Tarihî-i ÿahine Mekâîlî, 96 and 97). The Crimean War brought new needs and opportunities. Churchill reported from the battlefield for English newspapers, and his reports were also published in Turkish in special supplements of the Dîrîde-i Hawdîdî, giving the Turkish reader, anxious for news of the war, a new insight into the function of the press.

A second officially sponsored Turkish periodical was the Wâhidî-i Tibbiyye, a medical monthly published for the first time in 1850, in both Turkish
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and French. Other journals also appeared in French, as well as in Italian, Greek, Armenian, and Judeo-Spanish.

In 1855, the second Arabic newspaper, the *Mir'āt al-Āmilī*, founded by Hāssan who was compelled to take refuge in London [see below, iii], appeared in Beirut; the same town also saw the start of *al-Sūltānā* in 1857 and, on 1 January 1858, of the *Hādīdat al-Afšār*, published in Arabic and French by Khalīl al-Khūrī; the main purpose of this publication, which had the backing of the Turkish Government, was to acquaint the numerous foreigners residing in Beirut with the Porte’s views.

The year 1860 brought two important innovations: the first was the establishment of an Arabic newspaper, *al-Dżārida* [q.v.], compared with which the earlier efforts seemed formless and inarticulate; started in Constantinople by the Lebanese Ahmad Fāris al-Shidyāk in July 1860, and vigorously supported by the Turkish Government, this periodical defended the cause of Islam which had been recently embraced by its founder. The latter can be regarded as the father of newspaper Arabic, having done so much to enrich the language, while *al-Dżārida* was the greatest Arabic newspaper of the 19th century, in sale in Cairo, Beirut, Damascus, 'Irāk and West Africa, its wide circulation depending on the care lavished upon its editing and presentation. It reached its apogee in about 1870, but after the death of Ahmad Fāris in 1884 his son Sālim was unable to maintain the earlier standard. From 1888 to 1898, *al-Shidyāk* printed, under the title *Kanz al-Ragā‘i‘* [q.v.], seven volumes made up of articles on literature, history etc., reproduced from his newspaper, and still of undeniable documentary interest. — The second innovation of 1860 was the weekly *al-Muktaf*, being the fortnightly review of *al-Dżārida*, the first privately owned newspaper produced by a Turk. Its founder was Çapanzade Agah Efendi, scion of a derebey [q.v.] family, and a senior official in the Translation Office of the Sublime Porte. Associated with him as editor was the writer Ibrahim Şināš [q.v.]. Churchill responded to this competition by publishing a daily version of his paper five times a week—the *Rāshām-e-i Dirāsh-e-i Hāmātā* [q.v.], and for a while there was keen rivalry between the two. In the increasingly authoritarian mood of the time the press began to encounter difficulties, and soon the *Terjīmān* was suspended for two weeks because of an article probably written by Ziya (Diyā) Pasha. This was the first time a newspaper was suppressed by the government in Turkey.

In the preceding section we have tried to give an account of the first attempts to establish a press throughout the Muslim world, necessarily devoting most attention to the publications directed by foreigners in the various Islamic countries, since they played a considerable part in the rise of journalism. From about 1860 there began a new period during which journalistic activity developed to the point at which it becomes necessary to relegate newspapers published in European languages to second place, despite their importance, and to trace the history of the press in the various Muslim countries separately, with due regard to the language in which publication was made.

i. ARABIC LANGUAGE PRESS

A. MIDDLE EAST.

*Egypt.*—The history of the Arabic press of Egypt can be divided into four periods. The first lasts until the time of the British occupation. After *al-Wakā‘i‘* *al-Mṣīriyya*, it was only in 1866 that the *Wādi‘ *‘I-Nu‘* appeared, founded in Cairo by ‘Abd Allāh Abu ‘l-Su‘dī; in 1859, the *Nuzhāt al-Afšār* was started by two Egyptians, Ibrahim al-Muwāylyhī and ‘Ulgmān Dżādlāl, but it was between 1876 and 1878, under the impulse of Syro-Lebanese journalists who were unable to follow their career in their own countries in freedom, that the great organs of the press came into being. At their head we must note *al-Aḥrām*, founded by Sālim and Bīghārā Takhāl, and making a modest start in 1876 at Alexandria in the form of a 4-page weekly, dependent upon French cultural influence but paying close attention to the policies of the caliph in Constantinople; it was later issued daily and, maintaining its high literary standards and scrupulous presentation, was to remain until our own time as the greatest newspaper in the Arabic language. In addition to *al-Iḥtīāl al-Mṣīri‘*, a bi-weekly founded in Alexandria in 1879 which lasted until 1892, we should mention the Cairo Coptic newspaper *al-Wālīt* (founded in about 1876, and still recorded in 1929), and the interesting attempt at nationalistic propaganda by Ya‘qūb Sanīfī, known as Abū Naḍārā [q.v.] who had to continue his activities in Paris.

The second period lasts from the British occupation to the first world war. It was in about 1885 that the Şarṭīf-Nimr-Maḳāryos consortium was set up for a group of publications, the most important of them being the fortnightly review *al-Muḥtāṣaf*, founded in Beirut in 1877 and moving to Cairo, and *al-Muḥāfṣām*, a daily paper with political news which was pro-British and in sympathy with reform; after 1889 it became an opponent of *al-Aḥrām* which still supported the policies of Constantinople. A third party, opposed to reforms and advocating traditional Islam, was formed and, after 1890, represented by a daily newspaper, *al-Mu‘ayyad*, under the remarkable and skilful direction of Shaykh ‘Ali Yūsuf. The Syro-Lebanese, who until then had had a monopoly of the press, were gradually replaced by Muslim Egyptians, mostly conservative and orthodox—*al-ʿAddā*, founded in 1897, took over the rôle held by *al-Mu‘ayyad* as soon as the latter began to become more moderate and, during the last decade of the 19th century, there appeared a considerable number of newspapers also belonging to the conservative party, and of varying degrees of fanaticism. The growing nationalism was defended at first by Abī Ḫishāk, one of the chief editors of the daily *Mṣīr* (1896), and later by Muṣṭafā Kāmil whose principal organ was *al-Li‘ād*. It was during this period that another large newspaper appeared in Cairo, *al-Dżārida*, which took account of the effective domination of the British. Mention must also be made of the review of *al-Hilāl*, directed in Cairo (1892) by Dżīrīj Zaydān, which has survived until our own time, and of the *Manār*, founded by Raṣḥīd Rūdā in 1897. For that same year Washington-Serruys (XVII-XIX) lists 52 different publications in Cairo, more than half of which date from 1895 at the latest, and 6 in Alexandria, including *al-Aḥrām*. In 1909 there appeared in Egypt 144 reviews and various newspapers, 90 of them in Cairo and 45 in Alexandria (see *RMM*, xii, 308).

During this second period, therefore, we see the expansion of a powerful press, still producing many non-political publications, but tending, when entering the political arena, to express the still vague aspirations of the Muslim peoples, to formulate them more precisely, and to stimulate the con-
centration of the divergent trends in an Arab and Muslim nationalism. In the third period of the Egyptian press, after the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, came a new generation for independent statehood and gathering momentum, though not without the accompaniment of violent crises. In 1922 the "Liberal-Constitutional" Party started a weekly publication, al-Siyasa, under the direction of Husayn Haykal; after 1926 it was duplicated by a daily edition, and it shows signs of an Egyptian particularism. The Walid Party in its turn owned a group of newspapers representing the opposing opinions of Sa'd Zaghlul and his successors: al-Balagh, Kawakb al-Shark and al-Misri are the most important.

During the second world war and the years following, the Egyptian press took a more active part in the political struggle which culminated in the evacuation of British troops. From October 1944 the different parties created new organs: al-Kulla (the Wafdist "Bloc"), Ballad (Sa'dist weekly), al-Lisna al-Djumadi (Nationalist Party weekly), to which was added a weekly review of news, Akhbar al-Yawm. This upsurge of newspapers does not include the rise of extensive undertakings made by the press: Societe Orientale de Publicite, Ahrab, Ddr al-Hildl, all of whose publications cannot be listed (for the state of the Arabic press of Egypt at the end of 1944, see COC, No. 1, 116-6; at the end of 1946, ibid., No. 4, 517, giving a detailed list).

The final period opens with the suspension of the political press as a result of the revolution of 25 July 1952. The political parties having been dissolved and replaced by a single party, the "National Union", in 1958, the press was reorganized in May 1960 and the ownership of newspapers was transferred from the hands of private individuals or companies to the National Union, with the result that the whole press was subject to a single official administration. Of the principal newspapers which continued to appear, mention may be made of al-Ahram, al-Djumahriyya, al-Mas'a, and al-Akhbar.

The Sudan.—The Sudanese periodical press originated during the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium (1899-1955). The earliest Arabic newspaper, al-Suddan, was first issued on 14 October 1899 by the London Sudanese editor, under the auspices of Dr. Farris Nimr. Four or five other papers appeared during the next thirty years, the most successful being Hadrat al-Suddan, which ran from 1919 to 1938. The rise of Sudanese nationalism in the 'thirties resulted in a greatly increased output of newspapers, chiefly as organs of political comment. In 1958, out of a total of 35 papers, mostly dailies or weeklies, 5 had been founded between 1935 and 1945, 20 between 1946 and 1955, and 10 under the Republic. There has also been a succession of English and Greek journals from 1903 and 1909 respectively. Since the establishment of the military régime in November 1958, the Sudanese press has not enjoyed freedom of expression.

Lebanon.—It was only in 1869 that the first real Arabic newspaper appeared in Beirut, al-Raqib, a weekly published by the Jesuits which survived until recent times. Before that, Butrus al-Bustani had founded the modest Nafir Saraya as far back as 1860, but it was from the middle of 1870 that, to interest public opinion in the cause of general education and national literature, he brought out the bi-weekly al-Djama' which his son Salim continued to publish until 7 July 1886. Its vogue was such that djama' became synonymous with newspaper in Lebanon. Al-Bustani also published al-Djumayna, which only lasted three years, and al-Djinin.

Not wishing to be left behind, the Muslims of Beirut in 1874 founded the weekly Thamarit al-Funun which carried on until the Young Turk revolution and then took the name of al-Istidhd al-Uthman, this newspaper was conspicuous for its poverty and the turgid prose of its pedantic conservative contributors. The same year saw the foundation of al-Takaddum, which declared itself the earnest champion of progress and the inveterate enemy of all reactionary elements in the country; Adib Is'hak was a notable contributor.

On 18 October 1877 Khaled Sarkis, son-in-law of Butrus al-Bustani, brought out the first number of the Lisin al-Hal, a daily and, to some extent, a rival to al-Djama'. The two newspapers hardly concerned themselves with politics and presented events in as colourless a form as possible, while paying particular regard to the government's opinion. The Lisin al-Hal mainly concerned itself with scientific and economic matters, but nevertheless it fell foul of the Ottoman Government which suspended it for some months, during which Sarkis published another newspaper, al-Mishkil; but that did not stop him from resuming publication, and he became the doyen of the Lebanese press in our day.

In 1880 a new party took shape: the Maronites, who opposed the encroachments of the Roman Curia, founded a small newspaper al-Misbih, while Protestantism was supported by the reviews Kawakb al-Suhb al-Munir and al-Nashra al-Ushairyia; the Greek Orthodox church, for its part, also had a newspaper, al-Hadiyya.

An important addition to the press came in 1885 with the weekly Bayrut which, with government support, served as a counterpoise to the Thamarit al-Funun. When in March 1888 Beirut became the chief town of the wilayet, an official governmental organ was set up under the name Bayrut al-Rasmiyya. At the end of the century (see Washington-Serruys, XIX, XX), 9 periodicals were being published in Beirut and 3 elsewhere in Lebanon; for 1912, the figures are 8 dailies, 17 weeklies and 12 reviews. Since 1941, and especially in the years following the second world war, a considerable number of newspapers and reviews were introduced; the situation of the Arabic press of Lebanon in 1946 was the subject of a survey in COC, No. 4, 809-12, which noted 29 dailies and 25 periodicals appearing in Beirut, and 16 other periodicals elsewhere in the country.

In 1956 the Lebanese press consisted of 27 dailies and 37 periodicals, figures which are explained only by the extreme complexity of the social, religious and political structure of the country, as well as by the great liberty enjoyed by the press. To these figures should be added 18 periodicals from inland districts,
2 dailies in Armenian, 2 publications in English and 10 in French, of which UOrient (1924), la Revue du Liban (1928) and Le Jour (1934) date from the time of the mandate, and reacher circulation figures that were high for this country (up to 7,000 or 8,000 copies); Le Commerce du Levant (1928), on economic and financial subjects, had a wide distribution.

Syria.—It was only in 1865 and 1866 that there appeared, in Damascus and Aleppo respectively, the first newspapers to be printed in Arabic and Turkish and founded by the Ottoman Government, Sûriya and al-Sabdh', the foundation of these publications were correlated with the reorganization of the Turkish administration; it was decided at the same time that the authorities of all vilayets should have a newspaper printed, and this fact explains the bilingual nature of these publications. Other instances which may be quoted are Dimâşq, set up by the Turkish Government in 1879, and the Mîrîdd al-Ashâb, which appeared in 1886. An independent political weekly, al-Shâm, came out in Damascus in 1896, whilst in Aleppo the weekly al-Shahâdâ was published from 1893, and al-I'tidâd from 1879, and in Tripoli Tariibulus al-Shâm, a weekly publication, from 1892.

In Syria, however, as in Lebanon, the press had a precarious existence, all the more since the government treated any independent criticism of its actions with the greatest severity. Consequently we find that a good many Syro-Lebanese journalists took refuge in Egypt. After the setting up of the French mandate, the Damascus press underwent a very extensive development and a large number of newspapers made their appearance, but for the most part circulation figures remained very low. In 1939, 9 Arabic and 2 French dailies, not counting a varying number of periodicals, appeared in Damascus alone; the number is obviously excessive since an output of this order was in no way justified by the same reasons as at Beirut; and yet this number actually increased after the second world war. In 1946, 19 dailies are recorded at Damascus, 7 at Aleppo and 1 at Hamást, as well as 3 Damascus periodicals (COC, No. 4, 812-3). From the period of the mandate the only survivors in 1956 were Alif Bâl (1920) and al-Ayyûm (1931), both moderate, al-Kabas (1928), al-Asîbâr (1929), and al-Mâwslî (1940), both organs of the Christian party; in addition those veteran dailies which appeared, representing every sort of political opinion. At the same time half a dozen periodicals also sprang up and, elsewhere in Syria, about ten other publications, the organs of the various parties. We may note that an independent Aleppo paper established in 1928 and published in French, "L'Éclair du Nord", in 1945 became the Birûn al-Shâmî.

Palestine.—The development of the Arabic press in Palestine was slower and later than in Egypt, Syria, or Lebanon. Syrian and Lebanese publications did not circulate in Ottoman Palestine, but apart from a few mission sheets and school publications, the first Palestinian Arabic newspaper was al-Karmal, founded in Haifa in 1908 by Nadîb Nasârî, an Orthodox Christian. It lasted until 1942. In 1921 another orthodox Damascus, Istiklâl al-Shanîî, started the newspaper Falasît in Jaffa. Both papers appeared at somewhat irregular intervals, and during the first world war were suppressed by the Turkish authorities. After the war, they resumed publication, and were accompanied by many new journals, expressing Arab political reactions to the British Mandate and the policy of the Jewish national home. Among these were Sûriya al-Djânâbiyya (ed. 'Arib), al-'Arîf and Muḥ. Hasan al-Budayrî and Mîrîdd al-Shârkh (ed. Bûlus Shehâdâ); both were started in 1919, and were of brief duration. Al-Sâbîh (ed. Muḥ. Râmîl al-Budayrî and Yusûf Yâsîn), founded in 1921, became the organ of the Arab executive.

The first daily newspaper in Arabic was the old Falasîtîn, which began regular publication in 1929, and has continued to the present day in the old city of Jerusalem. Other dailies were al-Sînîf al-Mudâšîkîm (founded 1925, daily from 1929, edited by Shaykh 'Abdallâh al-Kašîkhî) and al-Dîfâ'î (founded 1934, ed. İbrahim al-Shanîî). Both papers were owned and edited by Muslims; the former was markedly Islamic in tone; the latter expressed strong Arab nationalist views, at first connected with the Istîhadî party, later with the groups led by the Husâynîs. It is still published in Jordanian Jerusalem. The weekly al-Wâhida, founded in 1945, became a daily in the following year.

During the nineteen-thirties and forties there was a very rapid development of the periodical press, notably of political weeklies and fortnightlies. Modelled on the Egyptian weeklies, some of them offered their readers feature articles, film news and other lighter entertainment, sometimes with pictures, in addition to political news and comment. Two papers, the weekly al-Iltîkî (founded 1944) and the fortnightly al-Qâdâî (first published irregularly in the twenties, re-started 1945) represented communist or pro-communist views; the remainder expressed various shades of Arab nationalism and factions among the Arab leadership. The press in languages other than Arabic was mainly Jewish. The first Hebrew journal, the Havaâdîîleh, began publication in Jerusalem in 1871. Other Jewish papers, in Hebrew and other languages, followed in great numbers.

After the termination of the Palestine Mandate, the major Palestinian Arab journals continued or resumed publication in Jordan where, according to the Middle East for 1961, there were 7 daily newspapers in Jerusalem and Amman, and 14 periodicals, in Arabic and English. The same source cites one Arabic daily newspaper and 6 Arabic periodicals in Israel.

'Irâq.—The liberal Ottoman governor Midhat Pâsha in 1868 set up the first newspaper in Irâq, al-Zawarî, which appeared in Arabic and Turkish and, while supporting the government's policy, published official texts and news in general. In 1875 the government started another newspaper in Mosul, al-Mawsîî, and, in 1895, a third entitled al-Bâsra, in Basra.

Among the many newspapers which sprang up after the promulgation of the Constitution of 1908, the following may be mentioned: Baghdâd (1908), al-Ra'îfî (1909), Bayn al-Nahr-ya (1909) in Arabic and Turkish, al-Ri'ayûd (1910), al-Ru'sîfî (1910), and al-Nahkâ (1913). Under the British mandate a great number of new newspapers appeared, notably al-Wâhâdî al-Irâbiyûsî, al-Mawsîî, al-Irâq and al-Shârkh. After the second world war the many newly established political parties owned their own organs and until the revolution of 14 July 1958 practically every town in Irâq had a daily or weekly newspaper.

Arabia.—In the Arabian peninsula the oldest newspaper, Saâdîtîs, dates back to 1877 and, like so many official publications under the Ottoman régime, was printed in Arabic and Turkish. It was only in 1908 that Mecca had its first newspaper, al-Hisâ'îsî. The press is now represented by the official newspaper which appears once a week in Mecca, Umm al-Kurîs, and by al-Bûlîdî al-Swâ'dîyûsî (bi-weekly,
Mecca), al-`AdiDā (monthly, Mecca) and al-Madīna (weekly, Medina). In 1953 a more modern newspaper, al-Riyād, made its appearance at Djeddah but it was compelled to stop publication as a result of the hostilities.

The Colony of Aden has six Arabic publications, among which al-`Abūrār al-Adānīyya and Fātūl al-Dīazārīa may be noted. In Kuwait the most important newspaper is al-Kuwāyti al-Ya`um (1953), but it also produces a monthly review with coloured illustrations, al-`Āsāfī, published by the government.


B. — North Africa.

Paradoxical though it may appear, it was Algeria, at present the Maghribi country which is poorest in Arabic newspapers, which was the first of them to put into circulation a modest periodical, al-Mubāhahār, from 1847 to 3 December 1926; this was an Arabic edition of the official Moniteur founded at Algiers on 27 January 1832 (see H. Fiori, in R.Afr., ixxii (1938), 173-80; G. Sers-Gal, in Documents algériens, 8 December 1948). As well as official information, the Mubāhahār carried news, historical, architectural, and medical studies, etc. Its example was not immediately followed, and it was necessary to wait until the beginning of the 20th century for an independent press to appear, edited by Muslims indeed, but directed in many cases by Europeans who were desirous of informing and educating the Arabic-reading public; in this way al-Nāṣib (1899), al-Dīazārī (1900), then al-`Iyād (1905), Tiimsān (Tlemcen), Kawkab Ibrīhiyya (Algiers, 15 March 1907), al-Dīazārīv (Algiers, 1908), al-`Afrāb (Algiers, 1909), al-Raghādī (Djadjelii), etc., were founded. These publications, however, had only an ephemeral life and disappeared before 1914.

The inter-war period was the second in the history of the Muslim press in Algeria. This saw the birth, on the one hand, of a series of newspapers edited in French by Muslims, such as La Voix indigène, La Voix des Humbles (1923), L’Entente, La Défense, La Justice, Le Réveil de l’Islam (Bône, 1922), etc., all intended for the expression of popular aspirations and various political tendencies; and, on the other hand, of a periodical press in Arabic, of a distinct political-religious character. This period was, in fact, dominated by the struggle which opposed two active groups and caused heated polemics: the reformist Ḥumām (Oulémas), hostile to the Brotherhoods (see Tā`ifa), and to the bidda (see Bi`a), etc., relied on al-Ṣaḥāb (daily, then monthly; Constantine 1924-39), then on al-`Iyād (Biskra 1929-42), and finally al-Dājīra (Algiers, 27 December 1935-56); and the Marabout party, generally favourable to the Franco-Muslim entente, which had as its organs al-Naḍījāb (tri-, then bi-weekly, Constantine, 1919-50) and al-Balāgh al-Dīazārī (Mostaganem, 1927-47). The most notable was al-Dīzīrah (Algiers, 1906-53): it is also worthy of mention, among about ten papers which flourished during this period.

In 1945 only al-Balāgh al-Dīzīrah, al-Baṣā`ir (prohibited 5 April 1956), and al-Naḍījāb (which ceased to appear from 1 September the same year) remained. The organ of the `Ummānīya had been supplemented from 15 December 1949 to 8 February 1953, but it was weekly published at Constantine, al-Sawīl, while the Marabout party published a monthly, al-Dīzīrah, at Tlemcen from 15 December 1954 to August 1955. However, during this third period, Muslim predilections perceptibly changed, and some essentially political newspapers (al-Dīzīrah, January 1946 to 14 September 1955, communist; Sawīl al-Dīzīrah, from 21 November 1955, which became Sawīl al-Sūrī from 21 August 1954 to 5 November 1956: MLTD) made a timid appearance. All have now (1960) ceased to appear, or have been prohibited by the authorities; for its information the public depends on a highly developed French-language press. It must be noticed, moreover, that none of the Arabic dailies has ever held good in Algeria, and that the papers mentioned above have, in many cases, known only an irregular appearance. It should be said that they were published by amateurs, with precarious financial resources and rudimentary technical means.

In Morocco, the first newspaper was founded at Céuta on 1 May 1820, but was in Spanish; and in this language or in French the press developed, particularly at Tangier, in the course of the 19th century. In 1889 an Arabic paper (al-Magrib) appeared a few times, published by an Englishman in that town, where, at the beginning of the 20th century, many European journalists tried to reach the Muslim population by supplementing their papers with an entire or partial Arabic edition. Thus, thanks to European initiative and the collaboration of editors from Syria and Lebanon, the weeklies al-Sa`īda (1905), al-Ṣabh (1906), Lissān al-Magrib (1907), the Arabic supplement to El Telegrama del Rif (1907), and the Istiqlāl al-Magrib, Arabic edition of the bi-monthly L’Indépendance marocoine (1907), were able to appear at Tangier. The first Muslim newspaper was al-Tā`ādhāb ("The Plague," sic), a monthly controlled by the sharī`i al-Kittānī (March 1908). In the same year the Moroccan government had an official newspaper published, al-Fādyr, edited by a Syrian Christian, which was transferred to Fez in 1909. Other weeklies also were founded at Tangier, notably al-Halāk (1911) and al-Tarābīkh (1912).

After the inauguration of the Protectorate, al-Sa`īda was transferred to Rabat, where it became first tri-weekly, then daily; this semi-official newspaper, edited with care, beautifully printed, graced with numerous illustrations, anxious to inform its readers of events in Moroccan life, and widely circulated in all Morocco, played an undeniable educative and political rôle. In other towns the Arabic press hardly developed at all. Al-Wīdād had only a restricted number of readers; a daily, al-`Akkār al-ta’ṣīlīyya, was started at Fez, while a weekly, al-`Akkār al-Maghrībiyya, supplemented L’Information Marocoine at Casablanca; at Marrakesh al-Dīzūb had only a short life, but in the north, at Tetuan, several political newspapers met
with some success (al-Islāh, al-Istiklāl, I'hār al-
I'laẖ).

The accession of Morocco to independence (1956) saw the renewal of the Arabic press in the country, although the French-language newspapers had received authority to continue publication, at least provisionally. Three daily papers: were produced: the unofficial al-'Akhār al-Dżādād (Rabat), supplemented since 1 September 1960 by al-FAżfr, which was des- tined to replace it, al-'Alām (Rabat), and al-Talābīr (Casablanca), these two latter being organs, with some bias, of the Istiklāl party. The total circulation of these three dailies was less than 25,000. The Democratic Party of Independence (FDI), which has on occasion published a weekly in French (Démocratie), relies on a bi-weekly, al-Ra'y al-'Amīm.

The Moroccan Union Labour (UMC) and the Moroc- can Union of Commerce, Industry and Handicrafts (UMCIA) own two weeklies at Casablanca, al-/al'sal và’al-līthābād and al-Istiklāl respectively. In 1959 four other political weeklies were also published: al-diyyām (Istiklāl, Casablanca), al-Maqārūb al-'^Aralībi (Moroc- can Popular Movement, Rabat), al-'Nīdāl (independent Liberals, Rabat), and Ḥayāt al-Sha'b (com- munist). Finally, a monthly literary review at Marrakesh, Risālat al-'Adīb, must be mentioned.

It is, naturally, in Tunisia that the Arabic press has reached its greatest development; the two world wars, bringing about some flexibility, would make it possible for three periods to be distinguished, but on the whole one can consider that the end of the French Protectorate and the advent of the country's independence (1955) mark the limits of two well-differentiated periods.

As early as 1861 Tunisia possessed an official newspa- per, al-Raḍī' al-Tunūsī, and, from 1890, a daily news-sheet, al-Zuhrā, which was to survive more than 60 years; a second daily, al-Kuḥdīyya, appeared from 1904 to 1910, and a third, al-Nakhḍa, was founded in 1912. To these publications a crowd of periodicals of political, religious, commercial, etc., character, and of more or less ephemeral duration, was early added. Among the weeklies may be mentioned the unofficial al-Hādīra, from 1888 to 1910, then the liberal al-′Azmān (1930), the Pan- Arabist al-Sawdb (1904-11, 1920), the (Archaeo-DESTUR) Destourian Līsān al-Sha'b (1920-37). In the inter-war period a few weeklies appeared in the provinces; of a sharply marked political character, they were divided between Archaeo-Destourian (al-'Aṣr al-Dżādād, Sfax 1919-25, 1936; al-Dījār, Kayrawān, 1937) and, especially, Neo-Destourian tendencies (at Sfax, Ṣadd al-Ummā, 1936-7; al-Antīs, 1937; al-Inqūṣrār, 1937; al-′Aṣr al-Sha'bī, 1936-7. At Sūsa: Fātā al-Sabīl, 1936-9. At Kairouān: Sabra, 1937).

In 1937 G. Zawadowski (see Bibliography) col- lected 161 titles and presented a very striking diagram: from 1861 to 1903 the number of Arabic journals varied between one and six; it reached 23 in 1907, after the relaxation of security on 2 January 1904, fell to four during the first world war, to attain 32 in 1921; it fell again to eleven in 1928-9, following the measures taken for the suppression of criminal and political offences, and finally reached the figures of 57 in 1937. The same author indicates, moreover, 13 periodicals published in French by Tunisians, and, no less interesting, 73 titles of Judaico-Arabic publi- cations, in Arabic but in Hebrew characters, the oldest of which, al-Mukhābrāt, appeared in 1884-5. Flourishing until the first world war, this Jewish press afterwards continually declined until in 1937 there were only three miserable papers, at Tunis and at Sūsa.

The Arabic press of the capital played an important part during the years which immediately preceded the country's independence; depending on financial resources and skilled techniques, directed and partly edited by professional journalists, it became the herald of nationalism, endeavoured to bring its public round to the idea of independence, and spread the themes of anti-French propaganda in the towns and villages. Their end achieved, or on the point of being so, some papers, among the most important, went into opposition and tried to outbid the govern- ment; they had finally to cease publication, so that there remained of the former press only al-'Aṣmāl, a bi-weekly founded 1 June 1934 by the future president of the Republic, al-Hābīb Abū Ḳuraykāba (Bourguiba), and now a daily; and the communist weekly al-Talāsī, founded 1937. A new daily, al-Šabāb, has been started, while the weekly al-Īrādā, organ of the Archaeo-Destourians since 1934, has been replaced by al-Istiklāl. A few other nationalist periodicals such as al-'Alām, al-Nīdāl; and al-Dżumākhirī appear more or less regularly. The organ of the FLN, the weekly al-Mukhwāwama al-Dżādāsī- riyya, has become al-Mudājāhīdā. Finally must be noticed a monthly cultural review, since 1 October 1955, al-Fīhr, which young Tunisians of university education maintain at a respectable standard. Three French dailies, the oldest of which is Dēptīcī tunīssīn, and one Italian, now (1960) appear at Tunis.

Worthy of mention is a political weekly l'Action (now Afrique-Action) which won some renown abroad.


Libya.—In 1871 the first Arabo-Turkish newspa- per, Tarābulus al-Qāhir, was started in Tripoli; it was of an official character. It still continues to be published in Arabic and forms the chief organ of information for the Federal Kingdom. A second, of a scientific and political nature, al-Tarābbītī was published from 1897. Other news- papers were published during the period of Italian domination but are of only the slightest interest. Since the country became independent various newspa- pers have made their appearance, notably the periodicals al-Raḥīm and al-Talāsī (the organ of the Federal Union of Workers). (Ed.)

C. — Arabic-speaking Emigrants.

In the course of the last decade of the 19th and the first of the 20th centuries colonies of Arabic- speaking emigrants (dżādār, q.v.) sprang up in large cities of North and South America, Australia and West Africa. The main source of emigration was Lebanon and Syria, where the Arabic press was cradled and
Arabic journalism, in the proper sense, was born and nurtured. Prior to 1890 Ottoman authorities in the area permitted emigration nominally only to Egypt, but Lebanese and Syrian emigrants had found their way, even earlier, into numerous European capitals where a rash of Arabic papers and magazines made its appearance. The census of the historian of the Arabic press, Tarrázi (iv, 490), for the period ending 1929 makes the number in Constantinople 49, Russia 5, Switzerland 2, Germany 7, Italy 4, France 43, Great Britain 14, Malta 8, Cyprus 2, Egypt 34, to which were added papers issued in 14 other countries of origin. As a liaison agent it kept alive the ties of relationship between emigrants and old folks and meanwhile interpreted the new culture and helped adjustment to it. It contributed generously to the enrichment of modern Arabic literature—prose and poetry—in vocabulary and ideas and to the enhancement of the Westernization of the Arabic East.

Most of these papers began as and remained personal sheets with the founder, editor and publisher as one person. They were more concerned with politics and literature than with news and, with no local colonies to support them, they were destined to be short lived. None survived.

The New World papers likewise began as personal sheets. Most of these founder-editor-publisher sheets but the founder, editor and publisher as one person. They were more concerned with political and literary matters than with news and, with no local colonies to support them, they were destined to be short lived. None survived.

The New World papers likewise began as personal sheets. Most of these founder-editor-publisher sheets. Though short lived, the paper was distinguished itself in its vigorous defence of Islam and attack on the British in Egypt and India. A Beirut deputy in the Ottoman parliament of 1876, Khallî Ghânîm, incurred the anger of the British for his liberal views and fled to Paris, where he started (April 1881) al-Bâzîr, which exposed the massacre of Armenians. Like other anti-Ottoman publications al-Bâzîr was banned by Turkish authorities and thus doomed to early death. With Amlî Arslân, a Lebanese Druze, Ghânîm issued (1890), partly in French, Turkiyd al-Fatdt. Of a different character was the only known paper in West Africa, Ifritiya al-Tididriyya (commercial Africa, Dakar, 1951-5).
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The language of the press has already been studied in the art. 'Arabiyya, II, 4, but one cannot emphasize too strongly the part taken by the various newspapers, and particularly the Egyptian ones, in the evolution, development and enrichment of the so-called modern or contemporary Arabic which is indebted to them, far more than to actual literature, for its ability to express a multitude of new ideas, most of which have been imported from the West.

Basically, the Arabic press has made enormous progress; for a long time the only material that it had presented to the public, apart from news from abroad that was already stale, had been such information as would please the Ottoman Government or the notices provided by it; al-Dinawrb alone perhaps constituted a fortune exception. From the beginning of the century and especially since the first world war the main daily newspapers have explored a wider field, giving their readers information of every kind, concerning themselves with social, economic, literary and artistic questions, and shaping, orienting or arousing public opinion by means of commentaries which are not always dictated by the most praiseworthy objectivity. Side by side with this press, which in certain respects is comparable with the Western press and has at its disposal powerful technical and financial resources, a large staff and modern printing presses, there exists a swarm of minor publications whose preparation is entirely the work of craftsmen, when their frequency of publication does not depend upon the more or less acknowledged resources of their proprietors. While a larger number of illustrated magazines like al-Musawwar (Beirut) are enjoying an undeniable success.

The first printing press was set up in about 1817 in Tabriz, followed by one in Tehran; but in about 1824 lithography quickly and almost completely eclipsed printing for over half a century. From 1848 the first newspapers appeared, first in Tehran, then in Shiráz, Isfahán and Tabriz; in about 1860 portraits and illustrations were introduced; the first periodical of scientific character dates from 1863; the first daily newspaper from 1898; the first humorous and satirical newspaper from 1900. In 1875 the first of the newspapers established outside Iran appeared in Constantinople; others appeared in London, Paris, Cairo, Beirut and Bombay (Bahá'í).

In its early period the press was literary rather than political; the opposite was true after the Constitution of 1906. The development of the press was caused by the spread of printing which little by little replaced lithography. From 1910 to 1912 it underwent various changes caused by the political turmoil in the country. Nevertheless, E. G. Browne (The Press ...), completing the list drawn up in 1911 by H. L. Rabino, named 371 daily publications and periodicals in 1914 (see his summary of the development of the press, 7 ff.); many periodicals are of literary or scientific character; it is important to add that political newspapers very frequently ranked as literature: so too the numerous political poems and satirical articles in prose which, besides their literary value, also possess actual historical interest (see Rabino, op. cit., introd., xvi and the anthology, 167 ff.).

If the newspapers of the early period were often unofficial and poorly supplied with information, they provided a wealth of instructive articles, edited in excellent style: "they inspired a taste for reading and thus contributed to the progress of general instruction" (Rabino). As for the press which prepared for and followed the Constitution of 1906,
Browne, the eminent authority, states: "Several of these newspapers, in particular the Şü-r-İsrâ'îl, the Ḥabî ol-maṭâin and the Mâsdûdât were indeed of a superior sort and serve as models of a vigorous, nervous and concise style which until then was virtually unknown" (The Persian Revolution, 127); later he defined his views (Lit. History). To the bibliography which he drew up (in The Press) can be added the lists of newspapers and periodicals compiled by 'All Nî Rouze (Nawrûz) (1914-1925) and the Annuaire du monde musulman (1929). It is also worth recalling various newspapers published in French, Armenian and Chaldean.

In 1930, in his supplement to the Persian translation of Browne's Literary History, Rashid Yâsmî makes a stand against the increasing disregard for literary form in many newspapers, the result of the enforced speed of publication, and of the invasion of foreign words introduced in information and articles translated from European newspapers; he provides a list of newspapers (among which he singles out Ra's "The thunder", İran, Şafâ-kâşî-surk "The red twilight", İjtehad "Information", Nâhid and a list of periodicals (among which he notes Armaghân "Gift", Bahâr and Naqahâh "Spring", Ayanda "Future", İrân-i ğâwad "Young Iran", Şahr "East!", Mîhr "Sun"); to these periodicals should be added those published by the Ministry of Public Instruction and the Universities (Tehran and Tabriz) and, though it is not possible to mention them all, the literary review Yâgdâr "Memorial", the critical review Rûh-nâma-yi kûtûb "Guide to [new] books", and several scientific and technical reviews; finally he mentions some annual publications with a wealth of information as important as it is varied (Persî, Gûhânama). Several newspapers listed by the Annuaire du monde musulman have disappeared; to the list should be added, among others, Kayhân "The world", (Tehran), Azâdî "Liberty" (Maşqhad) and the remarkable reviews Farhang-i İrân zamin "Iranian culture", Madjdalla-yi mâstû, Sukhan" The world", Yâgdâr Ùyâni "Booîy".
Muslims against foreign (Christian) encroachment and in the face of presumed official lethargy. The proclamation of 1876 order led to the flight abroad of members of the “Society of New Ottomans” (Yeşil Othmānîlîlar Diyetîyesîti), including ‘All Su‘āwî, Nâmîl Kemâl, Ziya (Diýâ?) Paşa, Ağâh Efendi and others. With financial help from the Egyptian prince Mustâfa Fâdîl Paşa they undertook the publication of revolutionary newspapers directed against the policy of ‘Âlî Paşa. ‘All Su‘awî restarted the Mukhâbîr in 1867 in London. In 1868 it was followed in Constantinople by the short-lived newspaper İnkîldîb, designed by Ziya Paşa, Nâmîl Kemâl as a weekly organ of the New Ottomans. Nâmîl Kemâl left the paper in 1869, while in the following year Hûrrîyyet moved to Geneva, where another 11 issues were published, making 200 in all, ‘All Su‘awî had in the meantime moved to Paris, where in 1869 he published Ulûm, which was the first newspaper in Turkish to advocate Turkish nationalism. Another revolutionary sheet, İnkîlah, published in 1870 in Geneva by Husayn Wasfi Paşa and Mehmed Bey, is noteworthy for the fact that it attacked not the Sultan’s Ministers, but Sultan ‘Abd al-‘Azîz himself.

In the meantime there was an increase in Press activity in Turkey, particularly between 1868 and 1872; new publications included important organs of opinion like Terâbbî, İhsan, İbret and Hadîkha and humorous publications like Diogène and Khayyâlî, which registers the outspokenness of what the author of the proclamation of 1867 no longer applied. Terâbbî, which first appeared in 1868, had the first weekly supplement for women, while Miûmeyyis, which followed, in 1869, had the first children’s supplement in the country. Diogène started publication in Greek and in French, appearing later in Turkish. Hadîkha was started in 1869 by ‘Ashîr Efendi, as a scientific publication passing in 1871 under the control of Ebu ‘l-Izîyâ (Abu ‘l-I-diyâ?) Tewfîk [g.v.] (who had collaborated earlier with Terâbbî) and in 1873 under that of Şems al-Dîn Sâmîl. İhsan, which carried articles by the Pole Karski, by Ahmed Midhat Efendi and also by ‘All Su‘awî, can be considered as the most successful newspaper of the time, coming second in popularity after the official police sheet Version-i E[vêlî]. İbret, first edited unsuccessfully by Ahmed Midhat Efendi, passed in 1872 under the control of Nâmîl Kemâl, Ebu ‘l-Izîya Tewfîk and Reşâh Nûrî. In it Nâmîl Kemâl attacked the Grand Vizier Mahmûd Nedîm Paşa, who in consequence had him exiled to Gallipoli, suspending the newspaper for four months. Nâmîl Kemâl returned from exile and resumed editorship after his enemy’s fall from favour. The newspaper suffered one more suspension and was then permanently closed down in 1873, as a result of the excitement caused by Nâmîl Kemâl’s play Wâtan wegî Silîste, the author being exiled this time to the castle of Famagusta. In all 122 issues of İbret appeared, and this newspaper can be considered as the best propagator of liberal ideas during the period of the Tanzimât. The period saw the birth of many short-lived journalistic ventures of predominantly political character, as well as of organs of more enduring importance, like the best-selling newspaper Wâkit, which owed its popularity to the political commentaries of Sa‘îd Bey; Mehmed Tewfîk Bey’s Sabâhî, first published in 1876 and noteworthy for its courage in being the first newspaper to appear with several blank columns as a protest against the censors; and finally, the high-minded İstîkbâl which devoted much attention to educational matters. Mention must also be made of the Mehmed-i-i Ebû ‘l-Diyâ, published by the prolific journalist and author Ebû ‘l-Izîyâ Tewfîk (1860), and of the first children’s magazine, Eflîl.

The return to absolutism under ‘Abd al-Hamîd II was marked administratively by the transfer of Press affairs to the Ministry of the Interior in 1877; in 1878 newspapers came under the joint censorship of the Ministries of Education, Interior and Police; in 1881 an “Inspection and Control Commission” (Enfîjîmân-i Teftîf we Mu‘âdînî) was formed and charged with preventive censorship, an even higher authority, the “Commission for the Examination of Compositions” (Tedâhî-i Mu‘âlîfîlî Komisyonu) being formed in 1897 and supplemented for religious publications in 1903 by the “Commission for religious and legal books” (Kutubi-i Dinîyye we Şerîyye hîyetî). Public newspapers issued outside the borders of the Empire were dealt with by the Foreign Press Directorate (Ma‘bû‘û’l-Èı Eglînîyye Müftîrîlîqîlî) formed in 1885. All these measures were taken in spite of the 1876 Constitution which, in article 12, guaranteed the freedom of the Press “within the bounds of the law”, and in spite of the rejection by Parliament of the draconic Press Law of 1877. Press censorship under ‘Abd al-Hamîd II was supplemented by control of printing presses (1888) and of book sellers (1894).

All this limited the number and contents of publications, although it did not stop the development of the Turkish Press. Important dailies included Mîhrân Efendi’s Sabâhî, founded in 1876 and already mentioned, which included the young and later famous journalist Hüseyn Dîlâhî Bey among its contributors; Ahmed Dîjwêt Bey’s İdâm (1890), which had a semi-legal correspondent in Paris in the person of the later famous ‘All Kemâl Bey, and Ahmed Midhat Efendi’s (known as “the typewriter” for his prolific writings) Terîjîmânî-ı Hıkbatî, which between 1882 and 1884 had a passing literary phase thanks to Mu‘âlîmî Nâdîlî. Important periodicals included Mûrâd Bey’s political weekly Mîzân (1886-90 with interruptions), and above all ‘Ahmed Ihsân Bey’s Terîwêts-i Fîwânî, standard-bearer of a new literary school (Tewfîk Fikret, Dîjwêt Fikret, Dîjwêt Dîvân, Dîjwêt Sâmîl, Dîjiyâ, N. Sabînî, Rida Efendi and also by ‘Ali Shefîq, Ahmed Midhat Efendi’s (known as “the typewriter” for his prolific writings) Terîjîmânî-ı Hıkbatî, which between 1882 and 1884 had a passing literary phase thanks to Mu‘âlîmî Nâdîlî. The last decade of the 19th and the first years of the 20th centuries saw a host of short-lived publications in 1903 by the “Commission for the Examination of Compositions” (Tedâhî-i Mu‘âlîfîlî Komisyonu) being formed in 1897 and supplemented for religious publications in 1903 by the “Commission for religious and legal books” (Kutubi-i Dinîyye we Şerîyye hîyetî). Public newspapers issued outside the borders of the Empire were dealt with by the Foreign Press Directorate (Ma‘bû‘û’l-Èı Eglînîyye Müftîrîlîqîlî) formed in 1885. All these measures were taken in spite of the 1876 Constitution which, in article 12, guaranteed the freedom of the Press “within the bounds of the law”, and in spite of the rejection by Parliament of the draconic Press Law of 1877. Press censorship under ‘Abd al-Hamîd II was supplemented by control of printing presses (1888) and of book sellers (1894).

All this limited the number and contents of publications, although it did not stop the development of the Turkish Press. Important dailies included Mîhrân Efendi’s Sabâhî, founded in 1876 and already mentioned, which included the young and later famous journalist Hüseyn Dîlâhî Bey among its contributors; Ahmed Dîjwêt Bey’s İdâm (1890), which had a semi-legal correspondent in Paris in the person of the later famous ‘All Kemâl Bey, and Ahmed Midhat Efendi’s (known as “the typewriter” for his prolific writings) Terîjîmânî-ı Hıkbatî, which between 1882 and 1884 had a passing literary phase thanks to Mu‘âlîmî Nâdîlî. Important periodicals included Mûrâd Bey’s political weekly Mîzân (1886-90 with interruptions), and above all ‘Ahmed Ihsân Bey’s Terîwêts-i Fîwânî, standard-bearer of a new literary school (Tewfîk Fikret, Dîjwêt Fikret, Dîjwêt Dîvân, Dîjwêt Sâmîl, Dîjiyâ, N. Sabînî, Rida Efendi and also by ‘Ali Shefîq, Ahmed Midhat Efendi’s (known as “the typewriter” for his prolific writings) Terîjîmânî-ı Hıkbatî, which between 1882 and 1884 had a passing literary phase thanks to Mu‘âlîmî Nâdîlî. The last decade of the 19th and the first years of the 20th centuries saw a host of short-lived Turkish revolutionary sheets in Paris, Switzerland, London and Egypt. They included organs of the Committee of Union and Progress, such as Othmânîlî, published by İshâk Sukkârî and Abdullah Dîjwêt, Habîb ve Şairî-i İmâmî, published in Cairo with the cooperation of Ahmed Rîzî Bey. In the same year as the latter, in 1902, Prince Sabâhî al-Dîn published his newspaper Terâbbî. Another influential newspaper published abroad was Terîjîmânî, which Gasprîlîlî İsmâmîl (Gasprîlîlî) founded in the Crimea in 1883.

When the Constitution was once again put into practice on 24 July 1908, the Turkish Press attained
to unlimited freedom for a period of some eight or nine months. The three main newspapers of the Hamidian era (İydám, Şâbâh and Terciğümân-ı Hâkimât) were soon joined by a daily edition of Terciğümân-ı Funâm, by the Yenî Gazete of Abdullah Zuhdi and Mahmûd Şâdik and, most important, by Tanîn, published by Tewfîk Fikret, Hüseyin Kâzîm and Hüseyin Dîjâhid. In all more than two hundred newspaper licences were granted in the first few weeks of the constitutional régime, while the number of periodical publications in 1908-9 amounted to 355. This number decreased constantly in subsequent years: 130 in 1910, 124 in 1911, 70 in 1914. The fortunes of the Press were linked closely with the course of the political struggle between the Committee of Union and Progress and its opponents. In the months between the restoration of the Constitution and the “11th March Incident” (13 April 1909) the Committee was opposed by Əğtîmînîf, the organ of the Liberal Party of Prince Şâhâb al-Dîn, by İydám, which carried articles by Əli Kemâl, by Yenî Gazete, Terciğümân-ı Funâm and others. It was supported by Şâhâr-i Millat, Ebi l-Zîyâ Tewfîk’s Yenî Taşvîr-i Efâh, Millîyeyet, Hurrîyeyet and other publications. The religious opposition was led by Derwîsh Waḥdât’s newspaper Volkan and by the magazine Beyân al-Əbâh. After the “incident” censorship was re-imposed by the military administration. The Press was largely inoperative the 1909 liberal Press Law, which was in any case amended in 1913, the amendment granting wide powers to the authorities in cases where publications were deemed to endanger the security of the State. A Directorate-General of the Press was formed at the same time. Opposition newspapers tended in these conditions to be short-lived. Among the few which deserve mention one could include Seâlat-i Ətûmâmîye (1910) which carried articles by Abdullah Eddewât, signed “A Kurdî”,” and also Terciğümân-ı Funâm in 1912 by Ḥakkî Əbâh on behalf of the Party of Freedom and Concord (Hurrîyeyet ve Əlîlâ). The years before the First War also saw the birth of some important literary and scientific magazines, like the journal of the Ottoman Historical Society (Ta’rîhî-ı Ətûmâmî Enğîsîmî Medîmûsî) (1910), Türk Yurdû, the organ of the Turkish Hearths (Türk Oğlaklûr), and the literary avant-garde papers Ənîs Kâlamîr and Rubâb. One must also point to the existence of a numerous religious periodical Press. In 1913 Əli Kemâl founded the daily Peyâm, which was to amalgamate after the war with Mîhrân Efendî’s Şâbâh and, under the name of Peyâm-ı Şâbâh, to be in the forefront of the opposition to Mustâfa Kemâl in Istanbul during the Turkish War of Independence. The last years of the 1914-18 War witnessed the first ventures of journalists who were to become famous under the Republic. It was then that Ahmed Emin (Yalman) and Ḥakkî Əbâh (Us) started Waḥît, that Yûnus Ənî entered the field with Yenî Ənî and Seddâm Simâfî with the humorous magazine Diken; it is also to those years that the important daily Abaşâm goes back. Newspapers published in Istanbul at the end of the war included also Saîd Möllû’s İstanbul, Reîf Dîjâhid’s Əlemâr and Mehmed Əzzetîyê (Settel’s) Buşûk Gazete.

In Anatolia the nationalist movement was first defended by İrîdî-ı Millîyî, the organ of the Sivas Congress, which first appeared on 4 September 1919. A fortnight after his arrival in Ankara on 27 December 1919 Mustâfa Kemâl Əbâa founded his organ Hâkimiyet-ı Millîyî, which was renamed Ulus in 1928, Halek in 1955, reverting to Ulus in 1956. In 1920 Yûnus Nâdî transferred his Yenî Gûn to Ankara, returning to Istanbul in 1923 to found Dîmâhrîyeyet (Cümhuriyet), which then became the main Kemalist newspaper in the old capital. Note-worthy magazines founded or published in the years between the end of the war and the proclamation of the Republic included the Communist Aydınlîk, the literary Dergâh, which carried articles by Yaşkâ Kadîr (Karacoşunağa) and Ziya Gökâpî’s Külêk Međîmâ, started in Dîyarbekir (Diyâr-Bakr) in 1922.

Censorship ceased with the entry of the Turkish Army into Istanbul on 7 October 1922. The 1924 Constitution re-asserted the existing constitutional assurance that the Press was free within the bounds of the law and could not be subject to pre-publication censorship. Powers of suspension were, however, assumed by the authorities the following year under the Maintenance of Order (Tabrîr-i Suḥûn) law which remained in force for two years. Suspension and confiscation by Government decision were also allowed by the Press Law, which was later repeatedly amended, Press offences, penalties and other provisions being several times re-defined. The Directorate-General of the Press which had been disbandied in 1931 was re-formed in 1933, becoming in 1940 the “Directorate General of Press, Broadcasting and Tourism”, attached to the office of the Prime Minister, and, towards the end of the Democ-ratic Party administration (1950-56), the Ministry of Press, Broadcasting and Tourism.

The Turkish Press was faced with great difficulties in 1928 when the Arabic alphabet was replaced by the Latin alphabet. Newspapers appeared for a time printed in both alphabets. Circulations dropped and the Government had to come to the assistance of the Press with subventions which were continued for three years. The development of the Press under the Turkish Republican People’s Party administration (1923-45) saw the appearance of a number of distinguished journalists and journalistic dynasties. They include Ahmed Emin Yalman who, after leaving Vakît, founded Vatan in 1923, İnhîlbî in 1934, was associated with Tan in 1935, then restarted Vatan and remained in control of it until 1956 when he founded a new paper İnhîlbî; the Nâfî family who retained control until the present day of Cümhuriyet; the Simâvi family who own the best-selling Hürriyeyet, founded by Sedad Simâvi; the Settel family who edited Tan until 1946 when the newspaper’s left-wing views provoked official displeasure and student demonstrations, as a result of which the paper’s offices were wrecked; the Ali Nâfî family, associated with İnhîlbî, İydâm and, at present, with the successful Millîyî etc. An important part was also played by the veteran journalist Hüseyin Çabîd (Yalman) who, after having made his peace with the Republic, resumed journalistic activity in Yeni Şabab (started in 1958) and then re-started Tanîn, in whose columns he defended the Allied cause during the Second World War and the policy of the Turkish Republican People’s Party after it.

Important political and social developments in the Republican period were reflected largely in political, social and literary periodicals: the People’s
Houses (Halkevleri) organization had its organ in Ulkii; new ideas of social development which inspired the pages of Esatime, were championed in Kadro (1933); a popular conception of literature took shape in the columns of Varik (1933); the revival of racistian and Pan-Turanian ideals, particularly noticeable in the years of the Second World War, was marked by the appearance of the reviews Baskuri, Çinaraltsi etc.; the vogue for extreme left-wing views at the end of the war had its counterpart in the periodical Görişler (and the short-lived newspaper Gerekti); the influence of American news magazines led to the appearance of their Turkish equivalents, such as A网讯 (Ankara) and Kim (Istanbul); the influence of serious British political weeklies made itself felt in the fortnightly Forum (Ankara) etc.

The years after the Second World War were marked by the political struggle between the Republican People's Party and its opponents, a struggle in which the Turkish Press played a prominent part. Between 1950 and 1960 the Democratic Party administration had an organ in Ankara in the daily Zafer, while in Istanbul the Government cause was defended by Havadis and criticized by the majority of the other dailies. The Turkish Press, as a whole, played an important part in preparing the ground for the military coup d'état of 27 May 1960 as well as in the political struggle which has followed it. Just as important, however, as this political rôle has been the increasing professional competence of the Press: equipment and lay-out were much improved, circulations soared (reaching the 300,000 mark), the industry became highly capitalized with a growing tendency to produce mass-circulation, non-political newspapers, providing not only news, but also entertainment. This tendency can be expected to gather strength, with a consequent Muslims in Russia, since the severity of the Russian authorities in 1877.

The Muslim press of Russia only reached international rank with the famous Terdijdun, published at Baghce-Saray in 1883 by Isma'il Bey Gasprinski (see GASKRINSKI ISMA'IIL), in the Crimean Tatar language strongly influenced by Ottoman Turkish. The Terdijdun survived until 1918. For some forty years it was the mouth-piece of the reform movement and of pan-Turkism in Russia, and for over twenty years remained the only press organ of the Muslims in Russia, since the severity of the Russian censorship over the Muslims, until 1905, prevented the rise of the national press. The Terdijdun, in 1905, in fact, apart from the above-mentioned news-papers there were only six organs of local significance. Four were in Asharfi Turkish: Diva* (1879), Diva Kafkasizy (1880), Kegkül (1884), and Shark-l rüs (1903) at Tiflis; one in Kazak (Kirghiz): Dildi Wildiyet, published in 1899 at Omsk (Siberia); and one in Kazan Tatar at St. Petersburg: Nür, in 1904.

After the publication of the Manifesto of 17 October 1905 granting liberty of the press to all the peoples of Russia, periodicals sprang up throughout all the regions of the Empire inhabited by Muslims, representing every sort of political opinion from right-wing conservative to left-wing socialist. Thus, from 1905 until the revolution of February 1917, Muslims in the Russian Empire published 159 periodicals (newspapers and reviews) in the following languages: Kazakh, Tatar, and Azerbaijani. From the edict of the First World War, the principal centres for the editing and publication of the press were Tiflis (19) and Grozny (5), Orenburg (13), Tashkent (12), St. Petersburg (9), Astrakhan (8), Ufa (6), and Baghce-Saray (5). Periodicals and newspapers were also published at Tiflis, Ural, Tomsk, Samarkand, Ashkhabad, Bukhara, Samara, Karasu-Bazar, Omsk, Erevan, Kokand, and Petrograd.

The majority of the Muslim newspapers had only an ephemeral existence because of their very slender finances, lack of subscribers and, above all, the interference of the censorship which after 1906 again became very vigilant. Some of them, however, played
a leading part in developing a national feeling among the Turkish peoples of Russia.

Among the most remarkable which were read far beyond the frontiers of the Russian Empire, we should mention the liberal organs Wakhit and Şürah of Orenburg which, from 1906 to 1917, made themselves the disseminators of pan-Turkism in Russia; Kızân Muğhbire (1905) and Yilduz (1906) in Kızân; Hayat (1904), İrush (1905) and Fuxudull (1906) in Baku; Moğul Nasreddin (1906) in Tiflis; the last-named, a satirical weekly, had a fairly wide circulation in Caucasian Adharbaydjan. Other organs of local importance and with a more restricted circulation, also exerted a lasting influence on the cultural life of the Muslims, such as the Kâzâk of Orenburg (1913), published in Kızak by Ahmed Baytursunov. In Turkestan alone, where the Russian authorities maintained a very close watch on the cultural development of the Muslim population, there existed no real press, all the organs which made their appearance there being swiftly banned by the censorship.

The overthrow of the monarchy in February 1917 introduced a new chapter in the history of the Muslim press in Russia. The earlier, and often apolitical, periodicals were succeeded by a "committed" press reflecting the opinions of the various political groups of Muslim society which, after October 1917, whether from irritation or force of circumstances, were to be involved in the Revolution and civil war. From February 1917 to the end of 1920, 256 periodicals made their appearance on Russian territory, spread over 53 towns and large villages. Inferior in quality to its predecessors, the press of the revolutionary period attempted to reach wider circles, both by a larger circulation and also by the use of a language nearer to popular speech. Kızân Tatar enjoyed unrivalled supremacy since nearly half (139 exactly) of the periodicals published during this period were in this language, Adharî Turkish coming far behind with only 39 organs, followed by Uzbek (37), Kazak (21), and Crimean Tatar 71. In 1917 other newspapers also appeared, in Turkish (2 at Batum), Kumik (3 at Temir Khan Şürah), in Avar, Abkhaz and Lak.

In 1921, with the victory of the Red Army in the civil war, a new era began, that of the Soviet press, distinguished from earlier periodicals by its monolithic character, its very wide circulation and, lastly, by the appearance of new languages. Under the Soviet regime, six Turkic languages, two Iranian languages and nine Ibero-Caucasian Muslim languages became literary languages. Until 1924-8 they existed no real press, all the organs which made their appearance there being swiftly banned by the censorship.

Information on the history of the press in the Crimea, with more particular reference to the Tercüman, is contained in the work of Cäter Seydahmet, Gazprals Ismail Icy, Istanbul 1934, and in the study of Ahmed Ozenbashlı, Cenên devari mishene tenkitî bir bâbî, in Ösu Içleri, Bagchê-Saray June 1925.

For the press of Turkestan, we possess an excellent monograph of Zyia Safarov, Uzbek xalitî matbû'âtînî tarihsî mâtî'îyyalar, Samarkand-Tashkent 1927. For the Turkmen press, a number of comprehensive studies have been devoted to the review Molla Nasreddin, among them being A. H. M. Ahmedov, Molla Nasreddin'nin 300 Yıldırı, in Yuraktau Tercümanı, 1917-30, and for the press of Daghistan, that of Sh. Magomedov, Kumiskiyya periodikaları, Baku 1926-7.

v. — THE MUSLIM PRESS IN CHINA AND JAPAN

(a) China.—China has a Muslim population of some ten to twelve million persons according to the census of 1959. About two-thirds live in Sinkiang province where they constitute an overwhelming majority. The following table contains data on the geographical distribution of Chinese mosques in 1935 and on Muslim periodical publications during the period 1908-39. We may assume that an average Chinese mosque serves 200 to 250 people. In the absence of precise statistics, the table therefore indicates the distribution of the Muslim population in the mid-Thirties.

Biography: No comprehensive study on the Muslim press of Russia exists, but only monographs or articles for certain regions. For the Tatar press, besides the basic work of Ismail Ramiev, Wakhit Tatar Matbû'âtî, Kızân 1926, fragmentary information is contained in Elif-Bi, Ta tarskoy musul'manskoy pechati, Kızân 1908; Fedovot, Peçat' Tatarskiy, in Bulletin d'in-formation du V.O.K.S., Moscow 1927, no. 23-5; T. Nasirov, Svet slavstvennîn berenç elçirda tatar matbû'âtî, in Sovet Addbiyati Kazan, no. 9 1956; A. Saatî, Tatar âdabiyyat tarihî, Kızân 1926; A. Safarov, Z istorii tatarskoy periodicheskoy pre my 1905-25, in Shidny Svit, Kharkov 1928, no. 34 (in Ukrainian); D. Validov, Ölçeri istorii obrazovannostî i literaturî Tatar do revolyutsii 1917 goda, Moscow 1933; P. Ūze, Musul'manskaya pečat' v Rossi, St. Petersburg 1911.
### DISTRIBUTION OF MOSQUES AND MUSLIM PERIODICALS IN CHINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number of mosques (1935)</th>
<th>Number of periodicals (1908-39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anhwei</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chekiang</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinghai</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukien</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honan</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopei</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunan</td>
<td>932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hupeh</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansu</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiangsu</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwangsi</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwangtung</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kweichow</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchuria</td>
<td>6,811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shansi</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shantung</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shensi</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinkiang</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szechuan</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yünnan</td>
<td>3,971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,371</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 100 Chinese-Muslim papers have been located. One was published abroad (1908), and for 13 the dates of origin are unknown. The remaining 86 were founded between 1913 and 1939; 18 magazines were being established between 1913 and 1926. In the decade marked by the establishment of the Chinese Nationalist Government in Peking (1927) and the beginning of the Chinese-Japanese conflict (1937), the press expanded rapidly, and 63 new journals came into being—38 after the capital was moved from Peking to Nanking (1932). The outbreak of enmity between China and Japan brought repressions and most of the papers disappeared. The five new periodicals which were issued during the next two years were actually official publications of the two combatants aimed at gaining increased Muslim support of the war effort.

The frequency of issue is known for 71 magazines: 12 appeared at least weekly; 50—monthly or semi-monthly; 9—quarterly or annually. One magazine had a circulation of more than 3,000 copies; eight others ranged from 1,000 to 2,000 copies, while the remainder served local needs and ran to a few hundred copies only. Not more than six periodicals exceeded 40 pages.

Most of the publications appeared in Chinese, though a few were written partly or entirely in Japanese, Arabic, Uyghur (Eastern Turk), and English. The great majority were religious in content, while the remainder in addition dealt with historical or contemporary problems. Most of the magazines were printed and circulated in the cultural and national centres of Peiping and Nanking, and in large port cities, such as Tientsin, Shanghai, Canton, and Hongkong.

**Yüeh Hua (月華),** Peiping, was the leading Muslim national magazine with a circulation of 3,000. It was begun in 1929 under private subsidies and attempted to represent all factions fairly. In its columns were domestic and international news items pertaining to Islam.

**T'u Chieh (突崎),** Nanking, was established in 1934. It was the most substantial Muslim organ in the capital area, and advocated the "Three People's Principles", improvement of education, domestic unification, and contacts with co-religionists abroad.

**T'ien Fang Hsüeh Li Yüeh K'an (天方學理月刊),** Canton, was founded in 1929. It was distributed monthly without charge, but financial support was solicited. **T'ien Fang** dealt chiefly with contemporary issues, and the editor answered readers' queries in a special column.

The Muslim communities in the large cities during the 1930's organized protest demonstrations against **Ahungs (Muslims)** whenever Islam was slandered in the Chinese press. In some instances the offices and printing plants of the offending newspapers were wrecked. The Nationalist government, needing the good will of its Muslim subjects, took prompt action to prevent further insult.

During the first decade of the twentieth century, in addition to native papers, some liberal Arabic and Turkish journals advocating constitutional reform were imported from Constantinople. The need for them was gone after the revolution of 1911.

The Muslim press in China was late in developing because of low educational and economic standards and because of language difficulties. Arabic was known only to religious leaders and to a few theologically trained laymen. The **Ahungs,** on the other hand, had often only a rudimentary knowledge of the Chinese script. Most of the population were illiterate. The declining Manchu dynasty was suspicious of any particularistic or sectarian tendencies, especially in the Turki-speaking north-west borderland. One might say that the revolution of 1911 paved the way for the Muslim press in China, while the Communist revolution of 1949 decisively ended it. Muslim publication efforts were fragmentary. Most magazines were too small or too ephemeral to have a lasting influence. In contrast to the Protestant and Catholic missions in China, the Muslims lacked a centralized organization and adequate funds.

(b) Japan.—Japan has very few Muslims, but Japanese interest in Islam dates from the invasion of China (1937-45) when efforts were made to win over Chinese Muslim minorities. Prior to that date Japan experienced three private attempts to publish Muslim papers. **Hsing Hui (醒“Muslims Awake”)** was established as a quarterly by Chinese students of the Muslim College in Tokyo for distribution in China; it dates back to 1908. In 1925, I. T. Sakuma, a Japanese business man and convert to Islam, founded in Shanghai the progressive **Mu Kwang (穆光 “Light of Islam”)** with articles in Chinese, Japanese, and English. He desired an Islamic revival in China, Korea, and Japan and even advocated the translation of the Qur'ān into Chinese; **Mu Kwang** survived only three issues. **Hui Chiao (回教 “Islam”)**, a Peiping monthly devoted to social and historical problems, was published in Japanese between 1927 and 1929. The
issues also contained biographies of Chinese Muslim leaders.

Following the actual occupation of Chinese territory, Japanese military authorities launched new Muslim papers, or adapted existing periodicals to their own purposes. The Japanese took over the ten-year old illustrated monthly Chen Tsung Pao (震宗報) after they occupied Peiping in 1937. Thereafter it assumed a strongly anti-Soviet character. The Hsing Shih Pao (醒時報), a non-political monthly, first appeared in M Mukden, Manchuria, in 1925. It was revived by the Japanese in 1937, reporting mainly on Muslim life in Japan. Copies were distributed locally free of charge. Another monthly by the name of Hui Chiao (回教 "Islam") began to appear in April 1938 under the auspices of the Japanese-sponsored United Chinese Muslim Association, Peiping. This was a Japanese propaganda organ, but it was printed in Chinese. The Hsin Min Pao (新民報), official Chinese newspaper of the Japanese occupation authorities in Peiping, launched in October 1939 a weekly supplement, the Tsung Chiao Chow K'an (宗教週刊), which furnished historical and religious information on Islam.

Japanese research on Islam and Islamic peoples is scattered among numerous academic journals. Only two Japanese periodicals are entirely devoted to this topic. Both are published in Tokyo and date from 1959 and 1960 respectively. Chū-Kindō geppo (中近東月報 "Middle and Near East Monthly") is issued in mimeographed form by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ajia Rengo Yuko Kyokai (アジア連合友好会) publishes Arabu (阿拉伯 "Arab") reporting on Arabs and Arab countries.


RUDOLF LOEWENTHAL

vi. — THE HAUSA PRESS

There is a regular weekly newspaper in Hausa, Gaskiya ta fi kwabo, printed in Zaria, which began publication in January 1939. In addition, news sheets in the main recognized Hausa dialects are also published, while the Kano Times includes articles in the Hausa language.

It was on Saturday 14 November 1931 that there issued from the newly built printing house at Kaduna the first number of The Northern Provinces News. It consisted of sixteen pages of items in three columns, printed respectively in English, in Hausa in a roman orthography, and in Arabic, together with a page of photos of stallions and agricultural subjects. The reader is told "Mallams of the Secretariat have written the Hausa and Arabic translations, and compositor sent to the Press by the Emir of Kano have set up the Arabic type". This number was produced "as a basis for discussion as to whether Residents and Native Chiefs would desire the regular issue of a News Sheet of this or a similar type in the future".

The next issue was on 9 April 1932, and had the Hausa title added, Jaridar Nigeria Ta Arewa, together with an Arabic title. It consisted of twenty-six pages of print and three pages of pictures. The third number also included items translated into two other Northern vernaculars, Tiv and Fula (Fulawi). By July 1934, when number eight appeared, the paper was of a smaller format, and was printed only in Hausa, having no longer bore titles in English and Arabic. The tenth issue, 1 June 1935, included an article by R.M. East, of the Translation Bureau, Zaria, on the subject of Hausa books and writing. The spelling included new letters, ṅ, ƙ and ƙ. After the Translation Bureau in Zaria began publication of Gashiy at fi kwabo, it also produced a smaller news sheet jakadiya, in a simpler form of the language, as well as a news sheet in Tiv. In addition, it undertook the production of a large number of cheap pamphlets in Hausa on a wide range of educational topics, from top-digging to baby care. More literary works in Hausa were produced, as well as books in other Nigerian languages, such as Igbo. The Hausa newspaper has helped to develop the written language and has set a standard for the importation into Hausa of a large number of borrowed words—mostly from English. The printing of the news also in the chief dialects is now enriching the standard language, by enabling people from all over the Hausa-speaking area to share and enjoy the different forms, expressions and idioms of this widely used and colourful language.

vi. — INDIA AND PAKISTAN

vj. — EAST AFRICA

[see supplement].

DIJARIMA (,), also djurm, a sin, fault, offence. In Ottoman usage, in the forms djermine and djermene, it denoted fines and penalties (see ñürm). In the modern laws enacted in Muslim countries it has become a technical term for crime (ñürm in Pakistan).

For the corresponding Islamic concepts, see Hadd, and for penal law in general, Tazība. (Ed.)

DIJARIR B. 'AT'YA B. AL-KHATFA (HUDAYFA)

DIJARIR was among the most important hijdi- writers of the Umayyad period (the other two were his rivals al-Akhaltal and al-Farazdak [qq.v.], and may be considered one of the greatest Islamic-Arabic poets of all time. He belonged to the clan of the Banū Kulyab b. Yarbā' an, a branch of the Mudari Tamīn who were widespread in the eastern part of central and northern Arabia. He was born in the middle of the 1st/7th century and began by entering into verbal disputes with second class writers in his own district, ostensibly because he himself had been attacked but in fact because of his naturally argumentative disposition. In 64/683-4 or shortly afterwards he began his famous forty-year-long dispute with al-Farazdak, who was a foe worthy of his steel. It was caused indirectly by a long quarrel between the Banū Bahrām and a branch of the Banū Qayba and the Mudjashī, also Tamīnī and the tribe to which al-Farazdak belonged, over the theft of a camel. After they had abused each other from a distance for some time, Djarīr went to 'Irāk and met al-Farazdak for the first time in Baṣra. There were such scenes that the authorities had to put a stop to the meetings—although without any lasting success.

Djarīr began his public career by writing poems
in praise of al-Hakam b. Ayyub, an official of
the governor of Iraq, al-Hadjdjadj. Al-Hakam
recommended him to his master who invited him
to Wasit. After staying with al-Hadjdjadj for
some time and writing a series of kadis of praise
to him, Djariir was sent with his son Muhammad
to 'Abd al-Malik's court in Damascus. He was first
rejected, then graciously received by 'Abd al-Malik.
But in the long run their relationship was not
particularly good, for the caliph favoured the
Taghibi Christian al-Akhtal ('al-Akhtal is the poet
of the Umayyads) who took al-Farazdak's part
against Djariir. Djariir's relations with 'Abd al-
Malik's successor al-Walid were even worse; the latter
supported his favourite 'Adl b. al-Rikāf against
Djariir's attacks. In fact Djariir and his friend Ladjīra
ta Harley are still said to have been whipped and
publicly stripped on account of some satirical lines
on the court ladies. However he was on a rather
better footing with 'Umar II who, as a pious man,
took no very passionate interest in either eulogies or
satires, and remained courteously neutral. Never-
thless he does seem to have preferred Djariir to his
rivals. Djariir also attempted to win the favour of
the latter caliphs Yazīd II and Hishām by writing
poems in praise of them. Finally, in old age he
retired to the Yamama where he owned property
(in Ughayfiyya). He died there when over eighty, in
110/728-9 or a little later, shortly after the death of
his opponent al-Farazdak. Among his numerous
descendants were three sons (Bilāl, 'Ikrima and Nūh) who also produced poetry but did not, how-
ever, approach their father's importance.

In Djariir's diwān, collected by Muhammad b.
Habīb (died 245/859), the satirical poems occupy
the most space, and of them the larger number are
directed against al-Farazdak. The extent to which
contemporaries were interested in this poetic battle
is shown by a report of a quarrel which broke out
among soldiers in al-Muhallab’s camp during the
Azraki war—a quarrel eventually decided (thanks
to one of the Khāridji soldiers) in Djariir’s favour.
The total number of poems satirized by Djariir is
something over forty. After the satirical poems, the
poems of praise form the largest category in the
diwān, but it contains some fine elegies. Accord-
ing to his adversary al-Akhtal, Djariir was particularly
skilled in the nasīb and the ṭashbih. The Arabic
literary historians and critics rightly praise Djariir’s
fluent diction.

Djariir’s work does indeed show him to be a true
descendant of the old Bedouin poets, with all their
strong points and weaknesses. In his work and that
of his rivals al-Akhtal and al-Farazdak, the old
Arabic form of kāfīda—poetry underwent an ‘Indian
summer of undeniable loveliness’ (G. E. Von
Grünebaum).

There are several editions of Djariir’s diwān in which the poems are sometimes arranged according to the
rhyme-letters. Mahmūd ‘Abd al-Mu’min al-Shawārīb
is the man chiefly responsible for the first of these
editions (Cairo 1333); its sources are not given. The
editions of Muḥammad al-Sawī (Cairo 1353), and
Karam al-Mustāni (Beirut 1359/1940) are more
widely representative of criticism. The Nābūt, however,
of Djariir and Farazdak, as collected by Abū Ubayda
(d. ca. 210/825) and revised by others, have been
published in a model edition by A. A. Bevan (Leiden
1905-12), and furnished with a glossary and indexes. Finally, the Nābūt of Djariir and Akhtal have
also been published, according to the recension of Abū Tammām, by the Aljīra scholar Shalbānī (Beirut
1922). Both Nābūt also contain poems attacking
other persons and their answers.

Kutayba, al-Shihār, 283; Aghāshī, viii, 3-89;
Marnabān, Muṣnad, 112, 120 and passim, cf.
Brockelmann, II, 53-5; S I, 8-6. Cf. also Rescher,
Abris, i, 265-74 and A. Schaade, Djariir (supple-
ment to the German edition of EP).

(A. Schaade-H. Gätje)
al-Hadrami retreated with a group of 70 followers to a fortified Sasanid castle, belonging to a Tamlmi called Sunbul (or Sunbil). Dhariya besieged the castle, ordered wood to be placed around it and set the wood on fire. Ibn al-Hadrami and his followers were burnt alive. There are controversial traditions about the course of the encounter between Dhariya and Ibn al-Hadrami. According to a rather curious tradition (reputed by al-Baladhuri) Dhariya came to Basra as an emissary of Muawiya and described him as the "righteous servant" (al-'abd al-sadiq). He dispatched Dhariya with a troop of 2000 men to pursue Burd (another troop under the command of Wahib) and also despatched by 'Ali. Dhariya, following Burd, reached the Yemen (so al-Baladhuri, Ansab, fol. 318b). Dhariya arrived at Mecca and was told that 'Ali had been killed. He compelled the people of Mecca to swear allegiance to the Caliph who would be elected by those followers of 'Ali. In Medina he compelled the people to swear allegiance to Hasan b. 'Ali.

In the time of Muawiya there was a reconciliation between Dhariya and Muawiya. Anecdotal stories report about the talks between Dhariya and Muawiya (al-Nabati'd, ed. Bevan, 605; al-Baladhuri, Ansab, fol. 358b; al-Dhahabi, al-Kamil, ii, 168; al-Mubarrad, al-Umda fi sindat al-djirdha, ed. Wright, 30). According to Ibn Katir (cf. Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, iii, 165) the revolt was caused by the brutal action of burning (al-Biddya, fol. 208b). According to a fairly accurate story of the encounter between Dhariya and Ibn al-Hadrami, but forsook him however in Basra (al-Balaq, fol. 2009a). After the victory of Dhariya, Ziyad returned to the residence of the Governor of Basra.

The authority of 'Ali was thus secured in Basra. Ziyad b. Abi Jafir praised in his letter to 'Ali the action of Dhariya and described him as the "righteous servant" (al-'abd al-sadiq). Dhariya died in Basra. His funeral was attended by the followers of 'Ali. Dhariya was buried in Basra.


Djarrah 481

Djarrah, "he who heals wounds", "surgeon"; djiraba, "the art of healing wounds", "surgery", from djirdh, "injury", "wounds"—like the German "Wund", whence "Wundartz", "Wundarztei", etc. In the time of the Arabic versions of the Greek texts on medicine, another expression corresponding exactly to djiraba made its way into Arabic medical language and was adopted by the classical authors, namely: 'amal bi l-yad (Ibn Sinâ) or 'amal al-yad (al-Zahrâwî), "work, action performed with the hand" or "by hand" (which was only a literal translation of γυμνουγεία). But this last expression, perhaps for practical reasons of usage, was gradually to lose ground in the course of centuries and ultimately to be replaced by the first, which is the only one to have remained in use until today, with all its derivatives. However, it is under the title 'amal bi l-yad or 'amal al-yad, in classical texts, that we find mentioned many expressions relating to medical-surgical techniques. From general surgery we may note such terms as rabt "ligature" (of veins), katf "excision" (of soft diseased substance), batf and batr "incision" (for the removal of morbid matter), kasy "cauterization by fire (from xâfetn "to burn")", with the object of surgical excision; from specialized surgery such terms as kadh "operation for cataract", "reclination"; from minor or simple surgery, djâb "reduction" of a fracture (khatr) or luxation (gâh); from manual practices having medical purposes, like kadjin "cupping" without or after the sharj "scarification", fâsîd "bleeding", kasy itself as a revulsive or stimulating remedy, etc.

From 'amal al-yad there remain in modern Arabic only the words 'amaliyya, followed by the adjective djirishiyya, "operation", or "surgical operations" properly speaking, and 'amali, "operative" or "operational".

In old texts one very often comes across the forms 'ilidh bi l-hadid or bi l-illa, the [cura] cum ferro et cum instrumento respectively of the Latin translators of the Middle Ages, referring specifically to surgical operations which necessitated the use of cutting instruments.

Djirabi occurs for the first time in Arabic literature in translations of the 3rd/9th century, and from there the expression made its way into medical literature. As the name of a well-known family we find the word in the 4th/9th century [see Ibn al-Djarrâh]. However, in contradistinction to the custom of the Hellenistic-Roman period, in Islam, as in mediaeval Europe, the surgeon has always been regarded as a worker of an inferior order. It is probable that this point of view derives in essence from the Islamic aversion from any interference with the condition of the human body, and even with the bodies of animals (the prohibition of vivisection of animals). With regard to the most celebrated and distinguished doctors in Islam such as Ibn Sinâ and Ibn Zuhru, we know that they vigorously expressed their dislike of every sort of surgical treatment, which they left to the djirabi and muqâbhar (bone-setter and bone-healer). In spite of that, Ibn Sinâ devoted a large part of his works to the art of surgery ('ilm al-djirbi), and his precursor 'Ali b. al-Abbâs al-Madjûsi (d. 384/994) treated surgery in great detail in the ninth book of his work Kâmûn al-sinâ'î, devoting no less than 110 chapters to it, and added to the tenth book a special theory of surgical therapy.

The only specialized surgical manual of any importance in Islamic medical literature seems to be al-'Umda fi sindat al-djirba of Ibn al-Kuff.
DJARRAH — DJARRAHIDS

(Syria, 7th/13th century). The work which exerted the greatest influence on the West was the part on surgery by Abu 1-Kásim al-ZahráwI (Cordova, 4th/10th century), section XXX of his Kitáb al-Tasrlf. This part was translated into Latin at a very early date and was studied with great enthusiasm in the West, although close links between this work and Paul of Aegina's surgery can be noted. It is illustrated with drawings of instruments. In the works on hísha [q.v.] one frequently finds a section devoted to doctors, occultists and surgeons, as for example in the unpublished book of al-Shayzari. In it the surgeon is required to be familiar with the anatomy and therapy of Galen (Djallnus [q.v.]) and to possess a well-assorted set of instruments which must include methods for checking bleeding. The work of the bone-setter (mudjábbr) is given special attention by al-Shayzari: he is required to know the number and shape of all the bones as well as Paul of Aegina's chapter on bone fractures and sprains.

Throughout the Middle Ages, Arab surgery was always advanced over its corresponding European surgery, and indeed it helped the latter to make great advances (it is known that Lanfranc of Milan, a famous exponent of surgery in Paris in the 13th century, had based his theories almost exclusively on the Makhlá fi 'amal al-yad, the famous treatise De chirurgia of Abu 1-Kásim al-ZahráwI). But Arab surgery avoided every kind of destructive operation (amputation), even apart from prohibitions or scruples of a religious nature. Nor did it fail to contribute as well to the knowledge of the human body, replacing anatomical dissection, however, casually and in a limited way. Incidentally, 'ilm al-tasrlf "anatomy" was always regarded as an indispensable science even in the practice of specialized surgery. In this connexion one may recall the apecdote of al-Rází dismissing the man who was to have operated on him for cataract, but who had been unable to answer the questions on ocular anatomy previously put to him by the great doctor (Ibn Abí Usaybi'a).


AL-DJARRÁH B. 'ABD ALLÁH AL-HAKAMI, Abí 'Ukbá, an Umayyyad general, called Batal al-Islám, 'hero of Islam', and Fáris Abí al-Shám, 'cavalier of the Syrians'. He was governor of al- Başra for al-Walid (Caliph 86-96/705-15) under al-Hadíddj, then governor of Khorásan and Sidistán for ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzìz, till deposed by ʿUmar after a year and five months (99-100/718-9) for harsh treatment of the new converts to Islam in Khorásan. In 104/722-3 al-Djarráh was appointed governor of Armenia with orders to attack the Khazars, who at this time were threatening the lands south of the Caucasus. Advancing from Bárđďa, he occupied Báb, the frontier town (see BÁB AL-ABWÁB), near which he defeated a large Khazar force under 'Bárđďk, the son of the Khákán'. Continuing his advance round the eastern end of the Caucasus, al-Djarráh captured the Khazar towns of Balandjár and Wabandar, and reached the neighbourhood of Samandar, probably Xílar (Kizíyar) on the Terek, before withdrawing. Some time later he was recalled, but was reappointed in 112/729-30. Next year the Khazars appeared in force in his province and were met by al-Djarráh with an army of Syrians and local levies in the plain of Ardabal (Mardí Ardabíl). Here for several days in Ramadan 112/November-December 730, a great battle was fought, which ended in the total defeat of the Muslims and the death of al-Djarráh. In the course of time the name of the whole of Hjarbáýdóljan, their cavalry raiding as far south as Mosul. The loss of al-Djarráh caused widespread consternation and grief, especially among the soldiers. He is said to have been so tall a man that when he walked in the Great Mosque of Damascus, his head seemed to be suspended from the lamps. Bibliography: al-Dhahabi, Taβír al-Islám (Cairo, A.H. 1367-9), iv, 237-8; al-Ṭabárí, ii, 1352-6; D. M. Dunlop, History of the Jewish Khazars, Princeton 1954, index; F. Gabrieli, Il Califato di Hishâm, Alexandria 1935, 74 ff. (D. M. Dunlop)

DJARRÁHIDS OF BANU 'l-DJARRAH, a family of the Yemeni tribe of Ṭayy which settled in Palestine and in the Balkár region, in the mountains of al-Sharút as well as in the north Arabian desert where the two hills of ʿAgíd and Salmá, known also as the mountains of the Banu Ṭayy, are part of their territory. This family attained some importance at the end of the 4th/10th and 5th/11th centuries, but without ever succeeding in creating a state as the Banu ʿālib tribe did at Aleppo, or in having a capital, except for a very short time at Ramla. The Banu ʾl-Djarráh followed a policy of vacillation between the Fatimids and the Byzantines, at times supporting one side and at times the other, not hesitating to flatter abjectly either of them when danger threatened, or to betray them, and only abandoning these equivocal tactics to seize the chance of plundering towns or the countryside or caravans on pilgrimage. In general they remained essentially Bedouins, with the qualities and failings of the Arabs of the desert, and their activities were far from glorious. The first of the Banu ʾl-Djarráh to figure in the chronicles was named Daghfal b. al-Djarráh and was an ally of the Karmatians. At the time of his expedition against Egypt in 361/971-2, the Karmáthb [q.v.] left one of his officers with Daghfal at Ramla. During the second Karmatian invasion of Egypt in 363/974, a Djarráhid named ʿAbd Alláh b. al-Djarráh was in the Karmatian army, and it was thanks to his defection, in return for a bribe of money by the Califá al-Muʿizz, that the Karmatian force was routed after reaching the gates of Cairo. Daghfal and ʿAbd Alláh were possibly one and the same person.

Some years later Daghfal's son Mufarríd made his appearance, and was to remain in prominence until 404/1013-4; certain texts give his name wrongly as
Daghfal b. al-Mufarridj. At the time of the caliph al-'Aziz's expedition against Alptekin, a Turk who had seized Damascus and allied himself with the Karmatians, in the battle which took place outside the Ramla in Muharram 369/August-September 977, Alptekin took to flight and was found dying of thirst by Mufarridj with whom he was on friendly terms. He had promised 100,000 dinars to anyone who handed over Alptekin to him, Mufarridj, whose allegiance at that moment is not specified in the records, had Alptekin kept in custody at Lubnā. He then went to the caliph and received an assurance that the offer of the reward still held good, betrayed Alptekin and took him to the caliph. Two years later we find him involved in the Ḥamdānī Abū Taghlib's venture in Palestine. For the moment he was in control of Ramla, a fact recognized by the head of an Egyptian army, al-Fadl, whom the vizier Ibn Killis had sent into Syria at that time against a usurper from Damascus, Kassām, and Abū Taghlib. Mufarridj was then on bad terms with the Banū 'Ukjayl; as they appealed to Abū Taghlib, war broke out between him and Mufarridj who was supported by Faḍl. Abū Taghlib was defeated and made prisoner by a supporter of Mufarridj. Faḍl asked the Diyarūḥids to surrender Abū Taghlib to him so that he might take him to Egypt. Fearing that the caliph might use Abū Taghlib against himself, Mufarridj killed his prisoner by his own hand.

The agreement between Mufarridj and Faḍl did not last long, and Faḍl turned against him. But Mufarridj was sufficiently adroit to persuade the caliph al-'Aziz to give orders to his general to leave him in peace, so allowing Mufarridj to become master of Palestine once again and to ravage the land (370/980). His excursions led the caliph to send troops against him in the following year. Being put to flight, he went off to raid a caravan of pilgrims returning from Mecca, probably at the end of 371/June 982. He was more fortunate against a second Fātimid force which he crushed at Ayla. He returned to Syria but was defeated and, taking the desert route, sought refuge at Himṣ with Bakdiur, the governor of the Ḥamdānī Sa'd al-Dawla, probably at the end of 982; from there he went on to Antioch where he was captured by the Byzantine governor. He appears to have received nothing more than gifts and fair words. It is not certain that he returned to Syria, for after 373/983 we find him accompanying Bardas Phocas the Domesticus when he went to the rescue of Aleppo with the help of the Byzantine troops. Bakdiur took to flight.

Mufarridj then seems to have rejoined Bakdiur, for when the latter received from the caliph al-'Aziz the governorship of Damascus, entering office in Rajjab 373/December 983, the vizier Ibn Killis put the caliph on his guard against a possible revolt by Bakdiur with the warning that he had Mufarridj with him, and that he was an enemy. He followed Bakdiur when the latter, threatened by a Fātimid army, left Damascus for Rakka in Rajab 984/October 988. In the following year we find him attacking a caravan of pilgrims in north Arabia. It is said that Ibn Killis regarded him as a dangerous individual and that on his deathbed in 380/991 he advised his master not to spare Ibn Diyarūḥād if he fell into his power. Nevertheless the caliph pardoned him, for next year he had a gift of apparel and horses sent him and invited him to take part in the expedition against Aleppo for which the Turkish general Mangūtekin was making extensive preparations. But we do not know if he took any part in the campaign of 384/992 or in subsequent campaigns. We find no other mention of him until 386/996, the year of al-Hākim's arrival.

At that period he was supporting Mangūtekin, the governor of Damascus, in his attempt to seize power from Ibn ʿAmmār and the Kutāmā, and took part in the fighting led by the Turkish general outside ʿAṣkalān against Sulaymān b. ʿAlī b. Fāṭār b. Faltāb. Following his usual tactics, however, he did not hesitate to desert Mangūtekin and to cross over to Sulaymān's camp. It was one of his sons, ʿAlī, who pursued and captured Mangūtekin when he took to flight.

In 387/997 he tried to take Ramla and laid waste the district. The new governor of Damascus, Djiysh b. Sāmsāma, having crushed ʿAlībābā's revolt at Tyre, attacked and gave chase to Mufarridj who took refuge in the mountains of the Banū ʿUjkāl. When on the point of being captured he took part in a little comedy, sending the old women of his tribe to ask for amān and pardon, which were granted. And thus in 396/1005-6 we find Mufarridj sending his three sons ʿAlī, Hassān and Māhāmūd with a large number of Bedouins to assist al-Hākim's troops against the rebel Abū ʿUjkāl. But in the following year he held up a pilgrimage from Bagdād north of Mecca, whilst al-Maghribī fled to ʿAṣkalān and Sulaymān's fortress and took refuge in the mountains of ʿAḍājā and Salmāt, that is to say in Tayyīl territory, and compelled them to pay tribute; as the enforced halt had made them lose time, they were obliged to turn back and to call off their pilgrimage.

Some years later, an opportunity occurred for Mufarridj to play a part of genuinely political significance. In about 402/1011-2 the Fātimid vizier Abu ʿl-Ḳāsim al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-Maghribī fled and took refuge in Palestine at the encampment of Mufarridj's son Hassān who gave him his protection. The caliph having given the governorship of Damascus and the command of troops in Syria to Yārūkh, a Turk, Mufarridj's sons were unwilling to submit to his authority, representing to their father the danger to which they would be exposed from this all-powerful governor and advising him to attack Yārūkh before he arrived at Ramla. The vizier al-Maghribī took up this suggestion with the result that the Diyarūḥids laid an ambush for him on the Ghazza road, took him prisoner and, at al-Maghribī's instigation, occupied Ramla. Hassān, fearing that his father would yield to the pleas of the caliph to have Yārūkh set free, had him beheaded. Urged on by this same al-Maghribī, Mufarridj took a further step towards rebellion against al-Hākim at the beginning of 403/July 1012 when, at Ramla, he proclaimed an anti-caliph in the person of the ʿAlīd ʿAlīrīf of Mecca. But al-Hākim knew that it was always possible to suborn the members of this family. He had already arranged for Hassān, who had been entrusted with the care of Djiwarāh's grandsons, to betray them to one of the caliph's officers who had them executed. He also succeeded in persuading Hassān and his father to abandon the anti-caliph who returned crestfallen to Mecca, whilst al-Maghribī fled to ʿTrāk.

The Diyarūḥids remained masters of Palestine for only two years and five months. During this period Mufarridj tried to win the favour of the Christians in Jerusalem, and perhaps of the Emperor also, by giving orders for, and helping with, the restoration of the Church of the Resurrection which had earlier been destroyed on al-Hākim's instructions.

At the beginning of 404/July-August 1013 al-
Hakim, changing his tactics, decided to treat the Djarrahids with severity and sent an army against them. All and Mamduh surrendered; at that moment Mufarrij died, possibly poisoned by order of al-Hakim; Hassans had who had taken to flight succeeded in obtaining a pardon from the caliph by sending his mother to beg the caliph's sister, Sitt al-Mulk, to intercede for him. The caliph pardoned him and allowed him to return to Palestine where he recovered his father's lands. Thereafter he refrained from stirring up trouble until the disappearance of al-Hakim. He even took part in the expedition against Aleppo. When Anushtekin al-Duzbari (Ibn al-Arwa'd), the former governor of Afamiya, at the same time as the Kalbids of Sinan b. Sulayman (Ibn al-Arwa'd), the two of them were twice attacked by Anushtekin al-Duzbari. The Tayyis pitched their camps in the neighbourhood of the Rodji, south-east of Antioch. They were twice attacked by Anushtekin al-Duzbari. The names of the places mentioned in this connexion (Kastyn, al-Arwa'd, Inab; for the identification of the last-named place, see Ibn al-Shihna, al-Durr al-munawakkab, 117; Dussaud, Top. historique . . ., 168; Guide bleu, 280) show that they were not in Byzantine territory. Hassan gave active support to the Byzantines, not only making a successful raid on Afamiya but also, according to the Byzantine historians, helping Theoctistus, Domesticus of the Scholae, to take the borders of Menikes (Mcunda) in the Diabul al-Rawdifi then held by Na'sh b. Musallar. It was on this occasion, so it is recorded in Scylitzes-Cedrenus, that his son 'Allaf (Allach to the Byzantines) was received at court and made a patrician. Hassan is called Pinzarachi (Ibn al-Djarra'h) or Apelzarach (by Kekaumenos), but Scylitzes incorrectly gives him the title of amir of Tripoli. According to these authors he was twice received at Constantinople, but Kekaumenos says that he did not always have cause to be satisfied with his visits.

Moreover we know that, at the time of the negotiations which took place between the caliph and the emperor, after the Byzantines captured the fortress of Siksar'All in the summer of 425/1032, Hassan was present in person at the discussions at Constantinople. One of the conditions laid down by the emperor for the peace settlement was that the caliph should allow Hassan to return to his country and to resume possession of the lands he held at the time of al-Hakim, except for those that he had appropriated since the coming of al-Zahir, in return for a promise of fidelity to the caliph. But the caliph refused.

When Anushtekin al-Duzbari, taking up a curious attitude, asked the emperor to send an expedition against Aleppo (which he did not enter until 429/1032-8), promising to hold it as a vassal of the empire, we note that with him was Hassan's son 'Allaf ('Allaan in Kamal al-Din). In 427/1035-6, when the Numayrid Ibn Wahib al-Mam and the Marwanid Na'sh al-Dawla attacked Edessa, a Byzantine possession since 432/1041, Hassan came to the rescue with 5,000 Greek and Arab horsemen. There is a further mention of him in 433/1041-2 (we are then in the reign of al-Mustansir, al-Zahir having died in 422/1031). It is said that at that moment he regained possession of Palestine, after al-Duzbari had been driven from Damascus, but that the new governor of Damascus continued the war against him. After that date we hear nothing more of Hassan. Much later he comes across his nephews, Humsay b. Mamduh and Hazim b. All, during the disturbances which Badr al-Djamali had to face in Damascus in about 458/1065-6, in the entourage of an 'Aliid sharif, Ibn Abi 'I-Djann, who tried to seize Damascus. They must have been arrested and imprisoned in Cairo, for in 459/1066-7 the amir Nasr al-Dawla b. Hamdan asked the caliph to free them from the Flag store where they were incarcerated.

Finally, in 501/1107-8 we find a certain Abu 'I'mran Fa'dl b. Rab'ba b. Hazim b. al-Djarra'h coming from Baghdad to enter the service of the Saljukid sultan. His equivocal behaviour in Syria —at times he was on the side of the Franks, at others on the side of the Egyptians—led the atabek Tughtekin of Damascus to expel him from Syria. In Baghdad he offered to fight the Mazaydid from Hilla, Sadaja, and to bar the desert route to him. He went to Anbar and nothing more is heard of him.

That, it seems, is all that we know of this turbulent family who were not without significance as pawns on the chess-board of Syria in the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries, whom the Fattimids alternately attacked and wooed, whom the Byzantines succeeded in using, but whom who seem to have created for themselves,
in their own best interests, a rule of duplicity, treason and pillage.


**DJARUNDA** (Spanish Gerona), capital of the province of the same name, one of the four capitals of the principality of Catalonia. It stands about 25 km. from the sea, and its coastline extends along the well-known Costa Brava. Situated in the outer foothills of the Pyrenees, and surrounded by the Ter and Oñar rivers, it has at the present day about 40,000 inhabitants. By reason of its strategic situation on the eastern route between France and Spain it has throughout its history been subjected to sieges and constant attacks, from which it derives its name *Ciudad de los sitios* "the town of sieges". From a village of Iberian origin the Romans raised it to the rank of a town: it figures in the *Itinerary of Antoninus* as a halting-place on the first road to cross Catalonia. Falling in turn into the hands of the Visigoths, Arabs, Franks of the Spanish march and the Catalan-Aragonese, it became a great fortress known in the Middle Ages as *Força vella*. At the beginning of their occupation the Muslims, under the command of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, son of Mūsā b. Nusayr, took possession of the whole sub-Pyrenean region, including Gerona, passing through it on their way to invade the Narbonnaise. In the 2nd/8th century there was no fixed frontier on what was later the Spanish march. For this reason the inhabitants of Gerona in 169/785 entrusted their town to the authority of the Franks, under Louis the Pious, after the Amir of Cordova ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān I had been defeated in this region. The establishment of this Frankish enclave on Spanish soil foreshadowed the conquest of more extensive territories, that is to say Barcelona, in the near future. But the Muslims were not long in reacting, and in 177/793 ʿAbd al-Malik b. Mughīth, Hīshām I's general, laid siege to Gerona and, according to the Arab chroniclers, decimated the Frankish garrison and destroyed a large part of the towers and ramparts, but was unable to capture the town by assault and went on to raid Narbonne. In 178/798 the Franks occupied the mountain region between Gerona and the upper valley of the Segre, and surrounded Barcelona which they succeeded in capturing after a long siege. Among the feudal overlords taking part in this siege was Rostaing, Count of Gerona, at the head of one of the three corps which comprised the besieging army. In 212/828, a new *mandār* of the Franks having been consolidated, the Muslims were unable to reach Gerona, even when the *ḥājiḥ* of al-Manṣūr captured Barcelona. On the other hand, during the final period of the caliphate in Dhu ʿl-Kaʿda 400/ June 1010, a band of Catalans fought on the side of caliph Muḥammad al-Mahdī against the Berbers in the valley of the Guadairo, not far from Ronda; they were routed and suffered casualties, among them Otón, Bishop of Gerona, at the head of his contingent from Gerona. The county of Gerona, as a dependency of the principality of Catalonia, was the scene of a meeting on 1 November 1143 at which the Order of Templars of Catalonia was admitted. In 1205 Philip Augustus of France seized it. Thereafter, as the result both of civil wars provoked by the prince of Viana and also of struggles against France, the town had to endure numerous sieges and assaults; after being razed to the ground during the war of the Spanish Succession for declaring itself in favour of the Archduke, its tribulations reached their culminating point with the heroic resistance directed by General Alvarez de Castro when, for seven months, the town stood out against Napoleon's Marshals.

**Bibliography:** Codera, *Narbona y Barcelona*, in *Estudios crit. hist. ar. esp.*, viii, 339-41; L.
Auzias, "Aquitaine carolingienne, 43-53 and 59-66; Soldeville, "Hist. de Catalunya, i, 32; Chronicle de Moissac, ad. ann. 785; Madoz, Dictionnaire geographique of the famous (A. Hucu) MIRANDA.)

**Djassak** (Djasek or Djasik), an island in the Persian Gulf mentioned only by Yskshit, i, 9) and Kazwini (Kosmographie, ed. Wüstenfeld, 115) among Arab geographers. From their statements, it is probably to be identified with the island of Lārak in the straits of Hormuz 35 km. S.S.E. of Bandar 'Abbās [q.v.], and not with the large island of Kīsh as was done by Le Strange (266). In the time of these two authors Djasak belonged to the prince of Kīsh (Kish, the modern Kays), a small island in Lat. 26° 33' N., Long. 54° 09' E.

At the present time the name Djasak (now pronounced Djask) is borne by the flat, low-lying promontory on the Persian side of the Gulf of 'Umān in Lat. 25° 31' N., 57° 36' E. by the adjoining village. Early in the 10th/11th century Djasak is mentioned in a text translated from the Portuguese and in the following century the English East India Company established a factory there. There is a landing strip for aircraft south-west of the village. The population in 1951 was 3,115.

to obtain information about their subjects, their ministers and officials, their entourage and even their own family (see the Kitāb al-dāʿī of the Ps. al-
Dīnārī. On this point, cf. also al-Kalkashandi, Subh, i, 116, 167, tr. 184 ff.; al-Adīr al-wāḳal, of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAbbāsī, in the margin of Taʿrīkh al-ḥululās of al-Suyūṭī, 97 ff.; the Siyāsāt-nāma of Niṣām al-Mulk, tr. Schefer, 88, 99, 103 ff.; R. Levy, A mirror of Princes, tr. of Ibn Kābūs, 133). We know that the Postal Service (barīd) was made responsible for this surveillance. Thus the office of espionage was reflected in the rules relating to the dùng of al-Ghazzali, in which the five senses are the spies (djūwāsī) who bring to the imagination which is, so to speak, the sāḥīb al-barīd (Iḥyāʾ, iii, 5 and 8; cf. Kimiyāʾ al-sāʿāda, ed. 1343, 10 and tr. H. Ritter, Das Eissir der Gleichsetzling, 30). There are numerous accounts relating to the use of spies of this sort, for example al-Tanbih, 98, ii, 157–63, tr. 253–5 (al-Muṣafadād having his vizier spied on), Abū Shujāʿ al-Rūḍhāwārī, 59 (ʿAbd al-Dawla asking schoolmasters to seek information from the children about their fathers’ activities, and to pass it on to the sāḥīb al-barīd). For the spies in the Buwayhid period, sent out to search for fortunes to be con-
mended having them beheaded. If the spy is a Muslim the criterium is the harm caused in the event of a spy being a dhimmī, he is thus breaking the contract which binds him to the Muslims and he can be put to death; Abū Yūsuf, tr. 294, takes the same line. But al-Ṣaḥḥāf believes that he is only subject to an exemplary punishment since there is no breach of contract. Abū Ḥanīfa also maintains that there is no breach of contract and the dhimmī is only liable to corporal punishment and imprisonment. According to the Mālikis (Ibn al-ʿĀṣim), there is a breach of contract and the dhimmī is put to death (al-Khalil, tr. Guidi, i, 418). The Ḥanbalis (see, e.g., Ibn ʿAbdālāma’s commentary on al-Mukūnī in al-Rawd al-mubīrī of al-Manṣūr al-Bahītī, ii, 71) consider that there is a breach of contract: the criterion is the harm caused to the Muslims (for the whole question cf. Fattal, op. cit., 81 ff.).

When the spy is a foreigner who has entered Muslim territory without a safe-conduct he is put to death, and if he came with a safe-conduct without a formal objective he is simply expelled; if travelling for purposes of commerce, he is sentenced to corporal punishment and is expelled (Abū Ḥanīfa; cf. also al-Ṣaḥḥāf, Kitāb al-dimmī, iv, 167). According to the Mālikis, (Khallī, i, 392), it is permitted to kill enemy spies even though they have come unarmed with a safe-conduct, and Abū Yūsuf (tr. 294) also recom-
mends having them beheaded. If the spy is a Muslim guilty of corresponding with the Greeks and passing them information about the Muslims, according to al-Awāzī he is liable to corporal punishment, banishment and prison, unless he shows repentence; the same is true of Abū Ḥanīfa (cf. also Abū Yūsuf, tr. 294). In al-Ṣaḥḥāf’s view, since the action is not a characteristic act of khurṣ, punishment is therefore not inevitable and it rests with the ʿimām to decide. Mālik also states that the case is left to the free
decision of the imam (al-Tabari, Ikhhtldf, 172). It is probable that, in practice, and according to circumstances, greater severity was shown.

In 94/712, during the invasion of Muhammad b. al-Kasim when he marched upon Daybul (q.v.), some years prior to the invasion of Muhammad b. al-Kasim, and killed him, and again encountered the forces of Muhammad b. al-Kasim when he marched upon Daybul in 947/1212. A very large number of them was captured by the Muslims, and Muhammad b. al-Kasim sent ship-loads of them to al-Hadjldjf b. Yusuf (q.v.). Thereafter they seem to have taken to a settled and peaceful life both in Sind and abroad, as they figure in no further events until the time of Mahomed of Ghazni (q.v.) who had to fight a naval engagement with them on the Indus, where they troubled the victorious Sultan by attacking his rear and several times looting the baggage (see Gard6t, Zayn al-abddin, ed. M. Nazim, Berlin 1928, 87-9). The Dijfs, thereafter, suffered a long eclipse until the reign of the Mughal emperor Shdhlidjau (q.v.), when in 1647/1657 they broke out into a revolt and killed the fudldj (q.v.) of Mathur, Murshid Kuli Khan. During the reign of Awrangzib (q.v.), taking advantage of his preoccupation with the Deccan wars, the Dijfs of northern India, under their leaders Ruljd R6m and Rulm Cbrd, terrorized the population and even attempted to despoil the tomb of the emperor Akbar at Sikandra. They were, however, met with stout opposition from the local commandir, Mir Abu '1-Fadl (Jadunath Sarkar, History of Awrangzib, v. 297-9). In 1657/1658 Awrangzib, in a bid to crush them, deputed his general Khain-i Dihlw b. Kokaftsh, who was, however, defeated by the Dijfs in several engagements; this compelled the emperor to change the command, and entrust it to his grandson, Bid6r Bakht b. Muhammad A'zam. After the death of Awrangzib, when the Mughal empire had begun to disintegrate, the Dijfs of Bharatpur (q.v.) and the surrounding territory, under their leader Sirdd Mall, terrorized the entire country lying between Agra and Dihli. The atrocities perpetrated by them on the ill-starred inhabitants of Dihli have been vividly described by Shdhl Wall Alldh al-Dihlw (q.v.) in his Persian letters. The depredations of the Dijfs provoked Ahmad Shd Albd, when he attacked India, to say "Move into the territories of the accursed Jat, and in every town and district held by him slay and plunder .... Up to Agra leave not a single place standing" (cf. Indian Antiquary, . . . 58-9 and J. N. Sarkar, Fall of the Mughul empire, Calcutta 1950, ii, 61, 85). In 1171/1275, during his fourth invasion of India, Abdil marched against them but could not subdue them completely, and the Dijf chieftain refused to pay allegiance to the emperor, and so was utterly defeated by the Mar6has at his hands in 1757/ 1762 at the third Battle of Panipat practically broke the back of the Dijfs. Almost at the same time, a petty Dijf chieftain of the Pandjdb, Al6 Singh, received a number of villages from the retiring Shd as a grant, in return for military services rendered. Later these villages formed the nucleus of the former Indian princely state of Patil. Early in the 13th/18th century Randjit Singh Dijf succeeded in establishing a small and shortlived Sikh kingdom in the Pandjdb. Elsewhere the Dijfs kept quiet till the Mutiny of 1857 when, taking advantage of the general chaos at Dihli, they indulged in loot and massacre and became a terror to the neighbouring population and the refugees. The subsequent British occupation of India subdued them. During the disturbances of 1947 they were again active in and around Agra and Bharatpur (q.v.), taking a leading part in the loot and massacre that followed the partition of India. They are still politically active in the Indian Pandjdb and Uttar Pradesh. For their political organization, see Pradhan (in Bibliography).

In India some Dijfs appear to have embraced Islam during or soon after the Muslim conquest of Sind; in the Pandjdb most of the Dijf tribes were
converted either by Djalal al-Dīn Husayn Bukhari or by Farid al-Dīn Gandj-vShakar [qq.v.] of Pak-pattan (see Gazetteers of Muslim district and Bahawalpur); many further conversions are reported from the time of Awarangzīb.

Contrary to the popular belief that the Dījāts are deplorably lacking in common sense and are illiterate and uncultured, they have produced a number of people who have made a name for themselves in the field of learning. A Dījāt (Zutī) physician, who was apparently well-versed in witchcraft also, had embraced Islam at the following of the Prophet, and had been assigned in to treat ʿAṣāha, when she fell severely ill. The Indian Muslim writer and biographer of the Prophet, Shibli Nuʿmani, pertaining to Abu Hanifa. A Dījāt (Muhammad Zafar Allah Khan) till recently (1961) served as a judge of the International Court of Justice at the Hague.


Dījāwād Pasha, Ahmad (T. Ahmed, Cevat Pasa), 1842-1900, Ottoman Grand Vizier. Born in Syria, the son of the mirālāy Muṣṭafā ʿAšīn (whose family originated from Afyonkarahisar), he was educated at the Military College and completed the Staff College course in 1871. He served in the Russo-Turkish war as A.D.C. to the Commander-in-Chief Süleyman Pasha and as chief of staff of Naṣīr Pasha’s division. Rapidly promoted, he was appointed successively ambassador to Montenegro, with the rank of mirīāsī (1901/1884), chief of staff to the governor and military commander of Crete, Šāhār Pasha, with the rank of ferīk (1905/1889), and soon afterwards vice-governor of Crete and extraordinary commissioner. His services in Crete having commended him to ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, he was appointed Grand Vizier on 29 Muharram 1309/20 February 1891 and held office for over three years.

During this period, when the Ottoman Empire was disturbed particularly by the Armenian question, Dījāwād Pasha tried to act justly, but he lost the favour of ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, who was dissatisfied with his conduct of affairs. In memorials addressed to the Palace Dījāwād Pasha attributed the various revolts in different parts of the Empire to the ineffectiveness of the system of government, and proposed that the influence of the Palace in the government should be reduced and the authority of the Bab-i Aʿūl increased: these recommendations led to his dismissal on 9 June 1895. After a period in disgrace, he was again appointed military commander of Crete (14 July 1897) and soon after, when he was already a sick man, commander of the Fifth Army in Syria. His health worsened in Syria and he was recalled to Istanbul, where he died shortly afterwards (14 Rabī I 1318/11 August 1900).

Dījāwād Pasha, who had from his early days devoted himself to study, was a man of learning, and knew Arabic, Persian, French, Italian and Greek. Among his works are: Mawṣūmī-i hāfiyeye fi memālīk-i ʿOthmānīeye, Istanbul 1289 (a textbook for military iʿdādî schools); Taʿrīkh-i saskeri-i ʿOthmānī, Istanbul 1297, = Elat militaire ottoman ... , 1882, (on the history of the Janissaries); Riyādīyeyeyen mebābīgī dâbīq; Kimyeyeyen şakbīyeyeyen taftīb; Semd; Telefón.
He published a review entitled Yddigdr and founded a rich library.

Bibliography: Memduh Pasha, Aswdt-i s-dar, Istanbul 1327; ʻOthmân Nürt, ʻAbdulhâmid II ve dever-i saltanatî, Istanbul 1327; İbnülemên Mahmud Kemal, Osmanlî devrinde on s-darsalar, Istanbul 1949, x; Bursâl Tâhir, ʻOthmânî Muıtdilleri, iii, 43; İA, art. Cevad Paşa (M. Tayyib Gökbilgin); Babinger, 382-3.

(DAVID BAYSUN)

DAJAWALI, double plural of diwâli (through the intermediate form dišiîya which is also found, particularly in old papyrus), literally "émigrés", a term which very soon served to denote the dişîya [q.v.]. Ancient writers believed that the word had originally been applied to the poll-tax on the dhimmis who were émigrés (driven out) from Arabia; some modern writers have thought that it could have taken on its meaning, by extension, from a term used of the tax on the Jewish community in "Exile" dişiî: there is no trace of any such specific use. It would seem that, in order to understand the semantic development of the word, account should be taken of the distinction, going back to the Roman Empire, made between colonists attached to the soil, and consequently to an immutable fiscal community, and those men whom the efforts of the administration did not succeed in preventing from changing their place of residence and occupation, inşüîîn, quyâdsic. Muslim fiscal practice distinguishes, more sharply between, on the one hand, the tax due upon the land, which was immovable, from the community collectively responsible, irrespective of the actual whereabouts of each individual on the date of the assessment or payment, and, on the other, the tax due upon the person, which could only be paid by the individual in the place where he was. In the tax registers therefore an entry was made, among the theoretical inhabitants of each district, of the names of those who were "émigrés", together with their place of emigration, for the purpose of informing the authorities concerned. Since this procedure related more particularly to the dişîya, it might in consequence have led to the name dijâwâlî being given to this tax, meaning the individual tax paid also by the émigrés, or, to express it better, by all individuals irrespective of their place of residence. However, no text confirms the truth of this explanatory hypothesis.

Bibliography: see dijâya; more particularly Lokkegaard (index), and Fattal, 265.

(CL. CAHEN)

AL-DJAWALIKI or IBN AL-DJAWALIKI, ABU MANŞUR MAHÜB B. AHMAD B. MÜH. B. AL-KHADIL, so named according to Brockelmann, I, 332 and S 1, 492. Born in Bagdad in 466/1073, he died there on 15 Muhaarrâm 539/17 July 1144. According to Brockelmann, he belonged to an ancient family, but the nişâh al-djâwalîki "maker, seller of sacks", Persian gowdlâ(e) "sack", arabicized djâwalîk, pl. djâwalîkî, recorded in the Muṣarrab (48 end 49), pl. djâwalîka (Sibawayhi, ii (Paris), 205, allows us to suppose a humble origin.

He was the second successor of his master al-Tibrizî in the chair of philology at Nishâpayyá. A jealous Sunnî (Hanâbilî, according to Shaⴽhârat al-Ďhâbah, iv, 127 and al-Tanûkkî, in RAAD, iv, 164), he was appointed in place of ʻAli b. Abī Zayd (d. 516/1122), a too notorious Şiʻî who was compelled to resign.

The man was a conscientious teacher, prudent in his answers to questions and with a much admired calligraphy. His works deservedly take their place along with those of al-Tibrizî in raising the cultural level in the Arabic language from the depths to which it had fallen in the Saljûqí period: a) the K. al-Muṣarrab min al-ḵalâm al-šâṣîm al-Ďurāl al-muṣâdîm, to preserve the faith of collecting together words of foreign origin and recording them as such. This explanatory lexicon, which was highly thought of in its time, has proved to be very useful and made Ibn al-Djâwalîki's reputation. In fact, as was said by one of his pupils (Abu l-Barakât Ibn an-Ďanârî, Nushâ, 475), "the ghybîh was a better lexicographer than grammarian".

But it remained to determine the place of his predecessors' work: published by Ed. Sachau, from the Leiden MS, Leipzig 1867, x + 70 (notes) + 158 (Arabic text) + 23 (Index) pp. in 8°. W. Spitta filled the gaps from the two Cairo MSS (ĒDMMG, xiiii, 208-24); an edition in Cairo (Dar al-ḵutub al-Ḵiṣyâyâ), 1361 A. H. by Ahmad Muḥ. Şâikîr. Glosses originated by Ibn Barri (d. 582/1186) occur in an Escurial MS (H. Derenbourg, Les Manu̇skript arabes de l'Escurial, ii, 772, 5). b) K. al-Takmilî jâ ma yâlaθân jîk-amâma, the aim of this work on incorrect expressions is evident: published by H. Derenbourg, Morgenland. Forsch. (Fest-schrift Fleischer), Leipzig 1875, 107-66 (from a Paris MS, entitled: K. ḫâta al-Ďamâmî), published again in Damascus by īzī al-Ďin al-Ṭanûkî (RAAD, xiv, 1936, 163-226) from the Zâhiriyâ MS (with glosses by Ibn Barri), under the title Takhmil an-şâkh ma taghîth jîk-amâma. This complements the works of this sort, apart from the Durrat al-Ďawâwîd by al-Ḫârîf (al-Ṭanûkî, ibid., 167-168).

c) The Šâkh of the adab al-Ďâtî by Ibn Ḫubayyâ, a guide for the practice of the pure Arabic language, in fact an average work; printed, Cairo, Maktabat al-Ďudsl, 1350 A.H.

In manuscript (Kôp. 1501, Mux. xi, 16, 50), the K. al-MMuk̇dâdasl jîk-anâwî. Ibn an-Ďanârî (Nushâ, 474) attributes to him a K. al-Ďarūd written for the caliph al-Ďukâtî. Brockelmann lists as his work a Sharîk Muṣârâtîn Ibn Durayd (S 1, 492) and al-Ṭanûkî (loc. cit. 166) a K. ḡalâl al-Ďuwaʿîj min al-faḥîdis. The K. Āsma ʻakhîr al-Ďarūd wa-fursânîkâd is to be deleted from his works.

Bibliography: J. Flick, ʻArabiya, S 1, 499; E. Fleischer, al-Ďudsl, 79; Ibn al-Ďanârî, Nushâl-al-Ďudsl, 473-8; Yâkût, Udbâ, xix, 205-7; Ibn Khallîkân, iv, 424-6 (no. 722); Suyûṭî, Bughîyâ, 401; Ibn al-ʻI藠d, ShaKelâdat al-Ďhâbah, iv, 127; Kifî, Inbâf al-ruwât ʻalâ anbâ al-Ďudsl, iii, 335-7; see 335 note for other references. (H. FLEISCH)

DJAWÂN, MIREZ KAŞM ʻAllî, one of the pioneers of ʻUrdû prose literature and a munkâf at Fort William College (Calcutta), originally a resident of Dihlî, migrated to Lucknow following the break-up of the cultural and social life of the Imperial capital following the invasion of Ahmad Shâh Abdâlî in 1747/1750, and was living in Lucknow in 1760 when Ibrâhîm Khân Khâtîlî was busy compiling his tadkhîr (see Gulser-i Ibrâhîm, ʻAli-gâr 1352/1934, 93). A writer of simple, chaste and unornamented ʻUrdû prose and a scholar of Persian and Arabic (he revised the ʻUrdû translation of the Kurân, undertaken partially by Amnât Allâh and others), he was also conversant with Brâdî-bhâṣâ. He joined Fort William College on its establishment in 1800 as a teacher and settled permanently in Calcutta. He was alive in 1815 when he revised, in part, the second edition of ʻHaft al-Ďin's Kihrd Aftâs, an ʻUrdû translation of Abu l-ʻFâdîl's ʻSyrd-i Dânsîc.
In 1216/1801 he translated from a Bradj-bhasha version Kālidāsa's Sanskrit drama *Shakuntala* into Urdu at the instance of Dr. G. Gilchrist, head of the Hindustani Department of Fort William College and one of the early patrons of Urdu literature (ed. Calcutta 1804, London 1826, Bombay 1848 and Lucknow 1875). His second literary achievement is the *bārah-mīsa Dastār-i Hind*, a long poem in Urdu, arranged according to the Hindu calendar months, describing in detail the Hindu and Muslim festivals falling in those months, composed 1802 and published at Calcutta 1812. He also translated a shorter version of the *Ta'rikh-i Firuzgra*, comprising the chapters on the Bahmans [q.v.], and collaborated in the preparation of an anthology of the poems of Wall, Mr. Sawdā and Sōz [q.v.]. He also helped Munshi Lalluḍī Lāl, his colleague at Fort William College, in the translation of the *Simhāsana Dvārtimśika*, a collection of tales of Vikramāditya, from the Bradj-bhasha version (*Singhdsana Battisi*) of Sundar, a *kavi-raj* of Diwdhāj's court. He died some time after 1815.


**Djawan Mardi** [see futuwwa].

**Djawānrud** (local Kurdish *diwanrō*), a district of Persian Kurdistan lying to the west of Mt. Shāhū, between Avroman (Hawermān [q.v.] in the north, Shahzhūr in the west, and Zūhāb and Raw访谈 in the south and east. The country is generally mountainous and thickly wooded. The valleys are well watered and very fertile, being in effect the granary of the Avroman area.

There is no river now known by this name, but Minorsky derives it from *Djawanrud*, influenced by Persian *diwan* 'young'. A Kurdish tribe *Djawān*, listed by Masʿūdī (*Murādī*, iii, 253; Tāhū, 88), appears to be the same as the *Dīḏ*[q.v.]. Those sections of the *Dīf* still living in Persia are known collectively as *Dīf* *Djawānrd*. The Kurd-I *Djawānrd* proper occupy villages as far north as the river Sirwan, where this becomes the frontier of Iran, and thus surround the Hawramān villages of Pāwa.

There have been a number of poets of *Djawānrd*, the most famous being *Mawlawī* [q.v.].


**Al-Djawbarī** [see supplement].

**Djawdhār**, a *eunuch*—as is indicated by the epithet *ustād* generally appended to his name—and slave who played an important part under the first Fatimid caliphs. Even in the time of the last Aghlabid ruler he was already working in his service and, while still young, was marked out as al-Mahdī when he came of age. A Kurdish tribe *Diwanrū* proper occupy villages as far north as the river Sirwan, where this becomes the frontier of Iran, and thus surround the Hawramān villages of Pāwa.

There have been a number of poets of *Djawānrd*, the most famous being Mawlawī [q.v.].


**Al-Djawbarī** [see supplement].

**Djawdhār**, a *eunuch*—as is indicated by the epithet *ustād* generally appended to his name—and slave who played an important part under the first Fatimid caliphs. Even in the time of the last Aghlabid ruler he was already working in his service and, while still young, was marked out as al-Mahdī when he came of age. A Kurdish tribe *Diwanrū* proper occupy villages as far north as the river Sirwan, where this becomes the frontier of Iran, and thus surround the Hawramān villages of Pāwa.

There have been a number of poets of *Djawānrd*, the most famous being Mawlawī [q.v.].
Bakrī), Djawf al-Yaman, al-Djawf, and the two
Djawfs—Diawf Hamdan and Diawf Murād of the
lexicographers). Djawf Ibn Nāṣir of north-west al-
Yaman is a broad plain, roughly triangularly
bounded on the north by Djābals al-Lawḥū, Barāt,
and Shaʿāf; on the west by Djābals Maḥdāb, Khārid
Khabash, and al-ʿIṣḥāq; on the south by Diābal
Yām; and on the east by the sands of Ramlāt Dāh;m
of the south-western Rubʿ al-Ḥālī. Djawf Ibn Nāṣir,
which lies north-west of Maʾrib [q.v.], was the centre of the
Minaean Dynasty and abounds with archaeological
sites located notably Khārid al-Khabash, the plural
form of (Karibā) which were first described by Hamdānī
and later by Ḥāleʿy, Ḥābeṣhā, Glaser, Philby,
Fakhry, Tawfīq, and von Wissman, and which
include Maʿṣīn, al-Hazm, Bārakī, Ḥamnā (Kumān
in the local dialect), al-Sawdā, and al-Baydā. Among
the wādīs originating in the mountains to the west
and flowing into Wādī al-Djawf and thence to the
sands in the east, are Wādī al-ʿUla, Wādī al-Khārid,
and Wādī Maḥdāb. Two canals of ancient con-
bstruction, Bāḥī al-Kharida (which parallels Wādī al-
Khārid) and Bāḥī al-Sāliyā, are still in use to
irrigate the agricultural lands of al-Hazm and al-
Ghayl respectively, while al-Matimma is irrigated by
the seasonal waters of Wādī Maḥdāb. Al-Hazm, the
chief village of Djawf Ibn Nāṣir, is the markaz of
the nāḥiyā of Al-Djawf and seat of the ʿāmil, who
reports to the governor of the province in San.
Rūwala. Wādī Ibn Nāṣir produces wheat, barley, and
olives. Local industry is limited to
handicrafts and olive pressing. In the mid-nineteenth
century, the district was taken by Al Rashīd of Haʾil
who held it, in the face of internal rebellion and
threats from the Turks, until 1909. In that year,
Nūrī b. Shālān, the Rūwala chief, took al-Djawf.
There followed 13 years of struggle between the
Rūwala and Al-Sammar for mastery of the area,
with the town changing hands several times. The
āmilī levies of Ibn Saʿīd took al-Djawf in 1922
with the aid of local leaders who had adopted
Wahhābī tenets. The area has since remained a part
of the Saʿīdī state. Al-Djawf, now declining in
importance because of the rise of the new admini-
strative centre at Sakaka, has been a trading town
of the Shammar, Ruwala, and Shararat. It is still
threatened by the Turks, until 1909.

Hamdānī speaks of the bellicosity of the tribes of al-Djawf
and mentions two opposing groups, Hamdānī and Maḥdī, whence Djawf Hamdān and Djawf
Murād ibn Maḥdī according to Schleifer) of the
lexicographers.

Bibliography: "Ukhbān b. Bishyr, ʿUmūn al-maḏjīd, Cairo 1373, 110-11; Hāfīz Waḥba,
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520-5, 533-5 (a valuable key reference with many
additional references); H. St. J. Philby, Al-
Arabia, London 1930; Saʿīdī, London 1955;
Ritté, Erdkunde, xii, 717, 713, 842; xiii, 343,
362, 377 ff., 389-95, 467; Yākūt, i, 825,
ii, 157-89; iii, 160, 277; iv, 12, 32, 76, 389,
index; C. A. Nallino, L'Arabia Saʿūdiana, Rome
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Saʿūdak, Map 1-201 B, scale 1: 500,000 (1961).

DJAWF KUFRA is the chief oasis of the Kufra
oasis complex in the Libyan Desert and is located
about 575 miles SE of Benghazi. The 220 (1950
estimate) inhabitants of Djawf raise dates, grapes,
barley, and olives. Local industry is limited to
handicrafts and olive pressing. In the mid-nineteenth
century, the founder of the Sanūṣī Order, al-Sayyid
Muhammad b. ʿAlī al-Sanūṣī, established Zāwiyat
al-ʿUṣṭādī at Djawf at the request of the local tribe,
Zwyyya (Ziadeh 49, cf. EP), iv, 1106 which gives the
tribe's name as Zāwyya) and opened the Sahara and
the central Sudan to Sanūṣī penetration. Djawf
Amirate of the Northern Frontiers. The area is
relatively well watered, has many palm groves, and
is considered to have agricultural potential. The two
most important settlements of al-Djawf are the
towns of Sakkākā, now the administrative centre,
and al-Djawf. Kāra, al-Tuwāyr, and Djawā are smaller
villages. The total population of the district was
roughly estimated at 25,000 in 1961.

The town of al-Djawf, or Djawf ʿĀmir (29° 48′.5" N.,
39° 52′.1" E., elev. c. 650 m.), has historically been
the centre of the centre of al-Djūba and has been identified with
the Sāmata of Ptolemy. It was known to the early
Arab geographers as Dumat al-Dianda, [q.v.]. The
d name Djawf ʿĀmir (also Djawf Al-ʿĀmir, Djawf Ibn
ʿĀmir) is often used to differentiate the town from
the southern Djawf, Djawf Ibn Nāṣir, south-east of
Wādī Naḍīrān.

Muḥammad b. Muʿayyīl added al-Djawf to the
Wahhābī realm of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Muḥammad b.
Saʿīd in 1908-94, when the people of the area
surrendered to his combined forces from Najdī. In
c. 1853 the district was taken by Al Rashīd of Haʾil
who held it, in the face of internal rebellion and
threats from the Turks, until 1909. In that year,
Nūrī b. Shālān, the Ruwala chief, took al-Djawf.
There followed 13 years of struggle between the
Ruwala and Al-Sammar for mastery of the area,
with the town changing hands several times. The
āmilī levies of Ibn Saʿīd took al-Djawf in 1922
with the aid of local leaders who had adopted
Wahhābī tenets. The area has since remained a part
of the Saʿīdī state. Al-Djawf, now declining in
importance because of the rise of the new admini-
strative centre at Sakaka, has been a trading town
of the Shammar, Ruwala, and Shararat. It is still
known for its date market and crafts, while a
planned (1961) road system and development scheme
may make it an important agricultural centre.
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(J. MANDAVILLE)
experienced a short period of prominence in 1895 when al-SanusI's son and successor, Muhammad al-Mahdi, transferred the capital of the Sanusi to Kufra. However, the capital was soon moved to the newly constructed Zawiya al-Taddji, also in the Kufra Oasis, and finally in 1899 was moved to the Central Sudan.


**DJAWHAR** "substance" (the Arabic word is derived from Persian *gawhar*, Fahlawi *göhr*, which has already the meaning of substance, although both in Fahlawi and in Arabic, it can mean also jewel) is the common translation of *wujud*, one of the fundamental terms of Aristotelian philosophy. "Substance" in a general sense may be said to signify the reality. Matter in its pregnant sense is prime matter, which has never exist by themselves, for only particular beings on which all other substances depend. The philosophers, indeed, tried to combine two contradictory theories: the super-naturalistic theory of a divine, eternally acting cause for all existence and the naturalistic theory of an eternal and independent matter in which lie the potentialities of all becoming. The theory of the Aššâri theologians, on the contrary, is frankly supernaturalistic. For them *gawhar* means simply the underlying substratum of accidents; one may regard it as matter—not of matter in the Aristotelian sense of an entity possessing potentialities, but only as that which
bears or carries accidents—or even as body for the substratum consists of atoms which by their aggregation compose the body. The term, however, is somewhat ambiguous, since often in Aghārī's terminology ḍjawhar means atom, although the full designation for atom is al-ṇajwahr al-jard or al-�ئًجعئر al-waḥīd. The atoms out of which the world consists have no independent existence; they rest only on the power of God who, continually, in every time-atom, creates and recreates his atomic world. And since ḍjawhar has in theology a purely material meaning it is forbidden to apply the term to God. On the other hand some deviates from Aristotle, should be still mentioned. Although Aristotle calls the soul a substance, since it is the formal cause of the living organism, he does not regard it as having an existence separate from the body, that is independent of the body and surviving it. The Muslim philosophers regard the soul as a substance subsistent by itself, ǧawhar kī'īm binafsihi, that is independent of the body, and they teach personal immortality. It is however somewhat difficult for them as Aristotelians to uphold this, since, according to Aristotle, matter is the principium individuationis—Avicenna gives this as an argument against the pre-existence of the soul—perception and representation are localized in the body and all thinking, according to Aristotle, presupposes preliminary perception and representation and is activated by the active intellect which is one for all human beings. Their theories are therefore not always consistent or easily understood.

**Bibliography:** al-Ghazālī, Tahfīz al-falāsifa (ed. Bouyges), Beirut 1927, where the philosophers' theories are exposed and critically examined; Ibn Rushd, Tahfīz al-tahfīz (ed. Bouyges), Beirut 1929.

(DJAWHAR — DJAWHAR AL-SIKILLI)

Near Tahart ḏjawhar had to measure arms against the possibility of the pre-existence of the soul—perception and representation are localized in the body and all thinking, according to Aristotle, presupposes preliminary perception and representation and is activated by the active intellect which is one for all human beings. Their theories are therefore not always consistent or easily understood.

**Bibliography:** Tahfīz al-waḥīdī (Urdu tr. Mu'ān al-Ḥakī, Karachi n.d.), index s.v. ḏjawhar; Storey, i, 536-7; Rieu, i, 246; Elliot and Dowson, History of India . . ., v, 136-60.

(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

(DJAWHAR AL-SIKILLI, general and administrator, one of the founders of the Fāṭimid Empire in North Africa and Egypt.)

His name was ḏjawhar b. 'Abd Allāh, also ḏjāhar together with the epithets of al-Sakhāli (the Slav), al-Sīkīli (the Sicilian) or al-Rūmī (the Greek) and al-Kātib (the State Chancellor) or al-Kādī (the General). The first two epithets cast some light on his obscure origin, the other two denote the two highest posts he occupied. His birth date is unknown, but judging by the date of his death (20 Dhū 'l-Ka‘da 321/28 April 991) we may guess that he was born sometime during the first decade of the 4th/10th century; he was in the prime of his activity between 340/950 and 366/975. From the parallel career of ḏjawhar, well known to us, thanks to his recently published biography, we may infer that ḏjawhar was a freedman of the Fāṭimid house, of Slav origin. (Leo Africanus, tr. Épaulard, 19, 503 = Esclavon; on this question see I. Hrbek, Die Slaven im Dienste der Fāṭimididen, in ArO, xxi (1953), 560-71. His father 'Abd Allāh was probably a slave, but ḏjawhar appears as a freedman from the very beginning.

The first time we hear of ḏjawhar he was a qulāmīm, perhaps also the secretary of the third Fāṭimid Caliph al-Mu‘āṣir. In 347/958 al-Mu‘āṣir decided to put all the power he possessed in a military venture to dominate the whole of North Africa, and chose for the leadership of this important campaign his secretary ḏjawhar, giving him in this way the opportunity to prove that he was the most talented soldier the Fāṭimidīs ever had.

Ḏjawhar's campaign in the Central and Far Magrib was perhaps the most resounding achieved by a Muslim army since that of 'Ukba b. Nāfi' some 284 years before, but in spite of the victories ḏjawhar gained, it was neither decisive nor of any lasting effect. This was due not to any fault of ḏjawhar, but to the difficulty of the terrain and to the greatly superior strength of the enemy. Near Taḥart ḏjawhar had to measure arms with a large army of Zanāṭīs, supporters of the Umayyads, under Yā‘lā b. Muhammad al-Yāfrānī, governor of Taḥart and Ifkan; according only to Ibn Abī Za‘rī, also of Taḥtā (Tanger). He won the day and killed Yā‘lā (347/958). Instead of marching on Fez and the other Umayyad strongholds in the region, he chose to use his small forces to realize easier gains. He turned south-east, invaded

(DJAWHAR — DJAWHAR AL-SIKILLI)

His claim to fame rests chiefly on his only work, the Taḥḥīṣ al-waḥīdī, whose value as a very useful source-book for the reign of Humāyūn has been fully recognized. The original Persian text is still in MS. although English and Urdu translations have since appeared; (C. Stewart, The Teskereh al-Vahad . . ., London 1832 Calcutta 1904; Mu‘ān al-Ḥakī, Tadhākirat al-waḥīdī, Karachi n.d.). At the request of ḏjawhar a reproduction in ornate prose was made by Ilāh-dād Fāydī Sirhindī the author of the Persian lexicon Madār al-afdilī for presentation to Akbar (cf. Rieu, iii, 927a and Etēh 222).

**Bibliography:** Tadhākirat al-waḥīdī (Urdu tr. Mu‘ān al-Ḥakī, Karachi n.d., index s.v. ḏjawhar; Storey, i, 536-7; Rieu, i, 246; Elliot and Dowson, History of India . . ., v, 136-60.)
the small principality of Sidjilmasa and put its prince Muhammad b. al-Fath b. Midrār to flight. Some days later this last of the Midrāris fell into the hands of Djawhar who killed him merci-
lessly. He spent more than a year in this region waiting for a suitable opportunity to move north-
wards. In the last days of Sha'bān 349/October 960 he headed towards Fez and laid siege to it. On 20 Ramadān 349/13 November 960 he stormed the city, thanks to the bravery of Zīr b. Manād al-Ṣanāḥīl who was under his command. Its Umayyad governor Ahmad b. Abi Bakr al-Djudhaml was taken prisoner and died in prison. This great victory brought all the Maghrib al-Aksā (except Tāŋžīja and Sabta) under Fāṭimid authority for a short time. Even the last of the Ḥabštids, al-Ḥaṣān b. Djānnān, who contended himself with a small principality around the city of al-Baṣrā under Umayyad vassal-
age, paid homage. To give al-Mu'izz a tangible proof of his victory he sent to him some live fish, taken from the Atlantic Ocean, in huge jars full of water. Some months later he returned victorious to al-Kayrawān with prisoners and rich booty.

These victories of Djawhar's opened the eyes of his master al-Mu'izz to his talents, and convinced him that with his aid he could realize the dearest Fāṭimid dream since the rise of their power: the conquest of Egypt.

Between 350/962 and 358/968-9 we have no information whatsoever about Djawhar. But in 358/968-9 he came to the fore once more as the general chosen by al-Mu'izz to lead the campaign in Egypt. Al-Mu'izz had such confidence in him that he is re-
ferred to have said: "By God, if this Djawhar were to go alone, he would conquer Egypt and we would be able to enter this land clad only in our simple clothes (i.e., without armour or shield) without war and we could dwell in the ruined abodes of Ibn Ṭūṭūn and build a city which would dominate the world." (Khitat, i, 378). As a sign of honour al-Mu'izz bestowed on Djawhar before his departure all his royal garments and apparel except his seal and his royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal and royal garments and apparel except his seal. He spent more than a year in this region waiting for a suitable opportunity to move north-
wards. In the last days of Sha'bān 349/October 960 he headed towards Fez and laid siege to it. On 20 Ramadān 349/13 November 960 he stormed the city, thanks to the bravery of Zīr b. Manād al-Ṣanāḥīl who was under his command. Its Umayyad governor Ahmad b. Abi Bakr al-Djudhaml was taken prisoner and died in prison. This great victory brought all the Maghrib al-Aksā (except Tāŋžīja and Sabta) under Fāṭimid authority for a short time. Even the last of the Ḥabštids, al-Ḥaṣān b. Djānnān, who contended himself with a small principality around the city of al-Baṣrā under Umayyad vassal-
age, paid homage. To give al-Mu'izz a tangible proof of his victory he sent to him some live fish, taken from the Atlantic Ocean, in huge jars full of water. Some months later he returned victorious to al-Kayrawān with prisoners and rich booty.

These victories of Djawhar's opened the eyes of his master al-Mu'izz to his talents, and convinced him that with his aid he could realize the dearest Fāṭimid dream since the rise of their power: the conquest of Egypt.

Between 350/962 and 358/968-9 we have no information whatsoever about Djawhar. But in 358/968-9 he came to the fore once more as the general chosen by al-Mu'izz to lead the campaign in Egypt. Al-Mu'izz had such confidence in him that he is re-
ferred to have said: "By God, if this Djawhar were to go alone, he would conquer Egypt and we would be able to enter this land clad only in our simple clothes (i.e., without armour or shield) without war and we could dwell in the ruined abodes of Ibn Ṭūṭūn and build a city which would dominate the world." (Khitat, i, 378). As a sign of honour al-Mu'izz bestowed on Djawhar before his departure all his royal garments and apparel except his seal and

During these four years Djawhar showed noteworthy capacity and foresight as administrator. Besides the sympathies of the people, which he later gained, he succeeded in putting order in the finances of the country which were in complete chaos during the last years of the Ḥshshidīs. It is known that Egypt had yielded since the time of Mu'āwiya an annual revenue of about 4 million dinars when well administered. Djawhar raised 3,400,000 dinars during the first year of his admin-
istration, almost the largest revenue of Egypt in the Fāṭimid period. Some 85 years later, the able-
vizier al-Yazūfī could raise only 800,000. Djawhar had more confidence in the Maghribi whom came with him than in Egyptians, and gave them almost all the important posts. He may have been following in this respect the instructions of al-Mu'izz.

Besides his work in the administration of the new province, Djawhar had to face the menacing peril of the ʿArnāts (q.v.), who in Dhu 'l-Hijjādja 358/September 960 defeated and took prisoner at Damascus his lieutenant Dja-far b. Fālḥāh, who had been placed in charge of the occupation of Palestine and Syria. During this conflict with the ʿArnāts and their allies, Djawhar was able to annex al-
Hidjaz to Fāṭimid rule. By 366/976 the khutba was read in their name in Mecca and Medina.

After 366/976 we hear no more of Djawhar till his death in 20 Dhu 'l-Ḥaadhja 381/30 April 992. He is said have passed those idle years of his life between 368 and 381 in works of piety and welfare. His son al-Husayn, commander-in-chief to the caliph al-
Ḥākim, was killed as a result of intrigues in which he took part against the Caliph.

Bibliography: Nu'mān (Abū Hanīfa b. Muh. al-Maghribīl), al-Madhīlis wa l-musīyārat (Ms. Nat. Library, Cairo No. 26060); Ibn Himmād (Muh. b. 'Alī, Aḥḥār makātib Kunn b. 'Ubayd (ed. M. Vonderheyden, Algiers-Paris 1927, 40-49); Ibn Khallikān, Cairo ed. 1948, biog. no. 130, 141, 698; Ibn Abī Za'f, Kīrisī, ed. Tornberg, Upsala-
Paris 1843, 27-63, (tr. Beaumier, 49 122); Ibn al-Aṭhir, viii, passim, ix, 64 (tr. Faguan, passim); Bakrī, Description de l'Afrique septentrionale s.v. Sidjilmasa; Kūlīb naṣīfīr al-Barbar, ed. Levi-
Provincial, Rabat, 1943, 4-5; Yahya b. Sa'd al-
Shayyūlīsī, Cairo 1941, 64-87; Nāṣīrī, Istīkā, Casa-
mu'izz li-dīn Allîh, Cairo 1947.48

Al-DJAWHARI, Ābu Nāṣr Ismā'īl (b. Naṣr?) b. Ḥammād, celebrated Arabic lexicographer of Turkish origin, born in the town (or: in the province) of Fārāb [q.v.] (whence his nisba al-Fārābī), situated east of the Sir-Daryā. In later times, Fārāb was called Otrār or Otrār.
The date of his birth is unknown. For the year of his death most sources give either 393/1002-3 or 398/1007-8, while others mention 397/1006-7 or about 400/1009-10. The first date (or even earlier ones; see Rosenthal) is made doubtful by the statement of Yakût that he had seen an autograph copy of Al-Djawhari's Sihäuser dated 396.

Al-Djawhari commenced his studies at home under his maternal uncle Abu Ibrahim Ishaq b. Ibrahim al-Fârâbî (Brockelmann I, 133; S I, 195 f.). The author of the *Dîwân al-adab*, an Arabic lexicon which greatly influenced Al-Djawhari's own dictionary al-Sihdh. In order to complete his education he went to Baghdad where he attended the lectures of Abu Sa'id al-Sirâfî [q.v.] and Abu 'Ali al-Fârisî (Brockelmann I, 116; S I, 175) and later travelled to the abodes of the Bedouin tribes of M murderer and Rabi'a (probably in Syria and 'Irak) and even to the Hijaz and Nadîd (see, e.g., Sihdh, s.v. 'Ahâ). He thus followed the habit of earlier lexicographers who attended to make linguistic investigations among the Arabs of the desert, and he seems to have been the last lexicographer of fame to maintain that tradition. After having spent a large part of his life on travel he returned to the east, stayed some time in Damâghân [q.v.] with the Kâtib Abu 'Ali al-Hasan (variant: al-Husayn) b. 'Ali and then settled in Nisâbûr, where he made a living by teaching and copying books, especially the Qur'an, and also devoted himself to literary activity. His beautiful handwriting was so much admired that it was put on the same level as that of the celebrated Ibn Mukla. He died in Nisâbûr either as the result of an accidental fall from the top of his house or of the old mosque, or else, in a fit of madness, while trying to fly with two wooden wings (or: with the two wings of a door) fastened to his body.

Besides some verses, part of which are preserved in a Berlin MS. (Ahwardt 759g) or quoted by later authors (e.g., al-'Hallibî and Yâkût), he wrote an introduction to syntax, *Mubaddima fi 'l-nahw*, and a treatise on metre, *Arûd al-varakhâ*, both of which appear to be lost. His distinction in the field of metrics, where he deviated in some respects from the system laid down by al-Khallî [q.v.], is pointed out by Ibn Ragîlî, the Egyptian scholar, in his dictionary *Tâdî al-bugha wa-sihdh al-'Arabiyya*, commonly known as al-Sihdh (al-Sabîh is also correct), which represents a milestone in the development of Arabic lexicography. For centuries it was the most widely used Arabic dictionary until, in more recent times, the *Kâmîs al-Firuzâbâdî* [q.v.] took its place. In addition to the important standing of Al-Djawhari's lexicography is attested to by the fact that, in the centuries following its appearance, it gave rise to a huge mass of lexicographical literature, part of which has been described and characterized by Goldzider. The Sihäuser was abridged, rearranged, supplemented, commented upon, and translated into Turkish and Persian; its contents, together with those of other dictionaries, were merged into new lexicographical works; the verses and hadîjs quoted in it as 'hashîd were assembled in special treatises; a versification of it was begun by Zayn al-Dîn al-Maghribî (Yâkût, ed. Margoliouth, viii, 292); and a considerable number of writings were devoted to criticism of its shortcomings. On the other hand, several authors made it a point to defend Al-Djawhari from the attacks of his critics.

As the title suggests, the Sihäuser was intended to contain only authentic lexicographical data, their authenticity, according to the notions of indigenous Arabic lexicography, being dependent upon their transmission through a continuous chain of reliable tradition (cf. *Suyûtî*, *Mubîrî*, I, 58). Hence, the same degree of authority was attributed to the Sihäuser in lexicography as to the two *Sabîh* of Buhârî and Muslim in the science of *hadîj*. In both cases, however, the formal principles adopted did not make for absolute correctness, and numerous errors were detected in the Sihäuser although the work as a whole was held to be highly reliable.

In his short introduction, Al-Djawhari claims that he arranged his subject matter according to an entirely new scheme. His innovations, however, are mainly a combination of various principles followed by his predecessors. The arrangement of the roots under the last radical, adopted, after the model of the Sihäuser, by the best known of later lexicographers, had already been introduced by Al-Djawhari's teacher and uncle, al-Fârâbî, in the *Dîwân al-adab*. The use of the common order of the Arabic alphabet, in contrast to the phonetical arrangement of al-Khallî which was followed by several of Al-Djawhari's forerunners and successors, had also been in vogue before the Sihäuser. As to the principle of authenticity, as understood by Arabic lexicographers, Al-Djawhari's older contemporary, Ibn Fâris [q.v.], had set the example in his *Mudjzal*.

The use of the last radical as the primary basis for the arrangement of the Sihäuser has been interpreted as being due to the author's intention to help poets find rhyme words. However, Sanskrit lexicography, which seems to have influenced Arabic lexicography in some respects, occasionally used the same principle, although Sanskrit poetry has no rhyme.

At Al-Djawhari's time, independent lexicological research had already come to a close. So the Sihäuser contains mainly an abstract from earlier lexicographical works, in the first place the *Dîwân al-Adab* (see Krenkow), while Al-Djawhari's own contributions are minimal. Being replete with grammatical discussions, the Sihäuser earned its author the reputation of being the outstanding expert in grammar among lexicographers. It is reported that Al-Djawhari compiled his dictionary for the *Usâ'îd* Abu Mansûr and Al-Rahîm, who had set his pupil Muhammad al-Bishâkî, with whom he became closely associated in Nisâbûr (cf. Yâkût, *Bulddân*, s.v. *Bishâk*). In the circulation of the work an important part was taken by the author's pupil Ismâ'îl b. Muhammad b. 'Abdus al-Dahhàn al-Nisâbûrî, the Egyptian philologist Abu Sahîl Muhammad b. 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Hârawî and, later on, the well known calligrapher Yâkût al-Mawâsîl. Variant readings in different MSS of the Sihäuser are frequently pointed out by later lexicographers.

According to a tradition which has never been doubted by Western scholars, Al-Djawhari did not live to finish a fair copy of his work, reaching only the middle of the letter *Dâd*, while the rest was completed from his rough draft by his pupil Ibrâhîm b. Sahîl (variant: Sahîl) al-Warrâk. This fact, according to tradition, is held responsible for the numerous errors and later scholars detected in the Sihäuser. The account, however, may have been a mere invention, probably designed to maintain Al-Djawhari's reputation as an unfailing authority. Doubts with regard to its correctness were already voiced by Yâkût and, more outspokenly, by *Râdjhî* Khalîta, since the existence of autograph copies of the complete work had come to their knowledge or
else since, according to some traditions, the entire lexicon had been handed down from al-Djawhari but also in the first which, as agreed by all, had been edited by the author himself. A similar account, probably resulting from the same tendency, exists with regard to the authorship of al-Khallī’s Kitāb al-‘Ayn.

The Ẓibāḥ is available in a Persian lithographed edition (1270) and two Būlāk prints (1282 and 1292), which, as agreed by all, had been edited by the authorship of al-Khātūsī, Leipzig 1846, 5). The Turkish version of Van Kulu [q.v.] was the first book issued from the Müteferri̇ka press in Istanbul, in 1141/1729.


(D. L. Kope)

DJĀWĪ, plur. Djāwā, Muslims from the Būlāk al-Djāwā. Bilād al-Djāwā was the collective name for the South-East Asian area used by the inhabitants of Mecca when C. Snouck Hurgronje visited it in 1845, and probably much earlier; it has remained in use. Djāwā means not only the Javanese, but also the linguistically related people from the other islands, the Philippines, and even the linguistically non-related peoples from the South-East Asian mainland. Generally well-to-do and pious, the Djāwā were welcome guests in Mecca, especially since they were less parsimonious than the pilgrims from various other countries and therefore more apt to provide the skayjās concerned with pilgrims with an easy income. Snouck Hurgronje took a particular interest in those Djāwā who came from the Netherlands Indies; to this circumstance we owe the valuable sociological treatise on the Djāwā group in Mecca in Mekha, ii, Aus dem heutigen Leben, The Hague 1889, ch. iv. The whole pattern of Djāwā life, e.g., their behaviour in their unfamiliar surroundings, how they spent their time in case of a prolonged sejourn, how they reacted upon international and pan-Islamic influences, is discussed here brilliantly and in a very illuminating way. This picture, however, needs to be completed by Snouck Hurgronje’s later studies of Islam in Indonesia [q.v.], and it is now of historical interest only owing to the considerable change in conditions both in Mecca and in South-East Asia. (C. C. Berg)

DJĀWĪD, Young Turk economist and statesman. Mehmed Djāwīd was born in 1875 in Salonika, where his father was a merchant, and received his early education both there and in Istanbul. He graduated from the Müktiyye in 1896, where he formed a lasting friendship with his classmate Hüseyin Edib [q.v.], the journalist. After a brief tour of duty with the Agricultural Bank, he entered the service of the Ministry of Education, resigning in 1902 as secretary of the bureau of primary education. Back in Salonika he became director of a private elementary school, Mekteb-i Teleyyüz, and joined the ‘Othmanī İttihat ve Terakki Ḍeṿṛi̇ȳyēṣi [q.v.], the Macedonian nucleus of the Young Turk conspiracy against the despotism of Abd al-Hamīd II. In 1908 he became lecturer in economics and statistics at the Müktiyye. During this period in Salonika and Istanbul he published several textbooks on economics (‘Im-ı ihti̇sād, 4 vols., 1905, 1912; İngiliȳȳḷi̇ȳ, 1909; and Mekted-i ihti̇sādîyye mağdersî ‘Im-ı ihti̇sād, 1909, 1913) and, together with Ahmed Şu’ayb and Rıza Tewfik [Bölükbaşi], edited a learned journal called ‘Ulm-ı ihti̇sādîyye ve Tiaṭiṃîȳē Meḍi̇ṃi̇’ası (1909–11). Following the 1908 revolution he was elected a deputy for Salonika (1908-12) and Bigya (Canakkale, 1912-8), and became minister of finance (1910, 1913–4, 1917–8), and a member of the general assembly (medddi-is ‘ummai) of the Union and Progress (İttihat ve Terakki) party (1912-6). In the Chamber of Deputies he soon distinguished himself as an eloquent orator and a competent rapporteur of the Budget Commission. During his years as finance minister he conducted delicate negotiations in Paris and other European capitals for public loans to the Ottoman Empire. Together with a number of other ministers he resigned from the cabinet after Turkey’s entry into the war, in opposition to the Germanophile policy of Enver Pasha; later he re-entered it on the plea of Ta’avat Pasha. He was the only Young Turk minister to retain his position in the İzzet Pasha cabinet (14 October to 14 November 1918). Subsequently he went into hiding and exile to escape the wave of prosecution of Union and Progress leaders; in July 1919 an Istanbul tribunal sentenced him in absentia to 15 years’ hard labour. In 1920 he married ‘Aliye, divorced wife of Burhān al-Dīn, son of the late ‘Abd al-Hamīd II.

Djāwīd returned to Istanbul in 1922, where he acted as representative of the Ottoman creditors of the Düfte públi̇que ottomane. According to Halide Edib, The Turkish Ordeal, London 1928, 74, Mustafa Kemal rejected Djāwīd’s suggestion that he be allowed to join the Anatolian movement. In 1923 he served as an adviser to the Turkish delegation to the Lausanne peace conference. He was arrested following the 1926 assassination attempt on Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk], and tried before the special Independence tribunal in İzmir (6 July) and Ankara (10 August) on charges of having conspired to resuscitate the Union and Progress movement and thereby to subvert the regime. Much of the questioning turned around a meeting of former Union and Progress leaders held in Djāwīd’s house in Instabul on 26 April 1923; yet no specific or overt acts of high
treason were alleged or proved against him. Together with three other ex-Unionist leaders he was sentenced to death and executed by hanging in the Djebelji quarter of Damascus on 26 August 1946.

**Bibliography:** Djawīd, Memoirs, Tamin, 30 August 1943 to 22 December 1946; Türk Ansklo

(Danewart A. Rustow)

**Djawan** [see supplement].

**Djawān** [see Çawān].

**al-Djīawlān**, a district in southern Syria bounded on the west by the Jordan, on the north by the spurs of Hermon, on the east by the Nahr al-Allān and on the south by the Yarmūk. The northern part lies at a certain altitude and presents the appearance of a wild, hilly region, covered with blocks of lava and oak forests which were once magnificent but are now extremely impoverished. The southern part is fairly low-lying and differs but little from the plain of Ḥawrān, with a soil of volcanic detritus, more even and of greater fertility.

The territory of Djawlan corresponds with the ancient Gaulanitis of the Hellenistic period, which probably took its name from the town of Golan mentioned in the Old Testament. But it appears to have dwindled with time. At one period, continuing into the early days of Islam, this province included the country lying to the east of Nahr al-Allān, which can be inferred from the existence of places called Djabiyat al-Djawlan and Sahm al-Djawlan beyond that boundary. It was the latter village, which still keeps the same name, that Schumacher thought to be identified with the ancient Gōlān. A distinction may have been made later, from the 7th/13th century, between Djawlan and Djaydur where Yāḵit places al-Djīabiya [q.v.].

Djawn, which during the Byzantine period belonged to Palestina Secunda and which had then been the chief centre of power of the Ghasānids (Nābigha, ed. Derenbourg, iv, 4; xxiv, 25; 29; Ḥassān b. Thābit, ed. Hirschfeld, index) was conquered by Shurahbīl when he occupied Urdunn, but with the rise of Cunar, and not until the rebellion of Shurābīl in 944/1439, which overcame his brother Barbak as sultan of Dihlī in 933/1526-7 was once more taken for his father Adil Khan installed as viceroy in Dīnwāpur. The importance of Dīnwāpur declined with the rise of Cunār, and not until the rebellion of 974/1567 led to Akbar's temporary residence there and the government of Shāh-i Khan Muhammad Mun'mīr Khan. After the foundation of Allāhabād [q.v.] the importance of Dīnwāpur waned; it passed into the possession of the Nawābāds of Awadh in the early 17th/18th century, and into British hands in 1775. Dīnwāpur was long celebrated for its learning, and today still forms the main resource of the region.


**DIHLLI [Diāwān]**, city on the Gumti in the province of Dīnwāpur, and there established himself as governor under Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluk after 721/1321. Muslim historians derive the name Dīnwāpur from Dījūnahr, Shāh Muhammad b. Tughluk's city of the same name, which was his capital and the capital of the Khurūd after his accession; but Dīnwāpur is known as a by-form of the name of the town of Djūnahr, which has been suggested as the etymology, and this origin cannot be regarded as established.

In the confused conditions at the beginning of the reign of Āṣār al-Dīn Muhammad Tughluk [see DHIHLLN SULTNAT] the disaffected Hindūs of the eastern provinces rejected all obedience to Dihlī. The knawur Malik Sarwar, Khwāja Djīhan, persuaded Mahmūd to grant him the title of Sultan al-Shark and send him to crush the rebellion in 796/1394; having overcome his brother Barbak as ruler over Dīnwāpur with permission to use the royal title and to issue coin. After Sikandar overcame his brother Bārbak as sultan of Dihlī in 894/1489 Dīnwāpur was absorbed in the Dīnhlī empire. In 933/1526-7 Dīnwāpur was taken for his father Bābur by Humāyūn, and a governor was appointed; but the growth of the power of Shīr Khān (Shīr Shāh Sūrī, [q.v.]) and the disaffection of the Afgān faction on the death of Dīnwādy Birdān, the governor, compelled Humāyūn to march again on Dīnwāpur in 943/1536, with success; but Humāyūn's long absence from Dihlī lost him his hold on the eastern provinces, and even before his great victory of 884/1477 Shir Shāh Sūrī and his able general Khwāja Dābīdīa installed himself as viceroy in Dīnwāpur.

For the history of this kingdom see MAHRĀS. In 884/1479 Bahīl, the first Lōdī sultan of Dīnhlī, defeated the last Shārkī sultan, Husayn, and established his son Bārbak as ruler over Dīnwāpur with permission to use the royal title and to issue coin. After Sikandar overcame his brother Bārbak as sultan of Dīnhlī in 894/1489 Dīnwāpur was absorbed in the Dīnhlī empire. In 933/1526-7 Dīnwāpur was taken for his father Bābur by Humāyūn, and a governor was appointed; but the growth of the power of Shīr Khān (Shīr Shāh Sūrī, [q.v.]) and the disaffection of the Afgān faction on the death of Dīnwādy Birdān, the governor, compelled Humāyūn to march again on Dīnwāpur in 943/1536, with success; but Humāyūn's long absence from Dīnhlī lost him his hold on the eastern provinces, and even before his great victory of 884/1477 Shir Shāh Sūrī and his able general Khwāja Dābīdīā installed himself as viceroy in Dīnwāpur. The importance of Dīnwāpur declined with the rise of Āṣār and not until the rebellion (970/1561 onwards) of ʿAll Kull Khān, governor since 965/1558, does it again come into prominence; ʿAlī's final defeat in Dīnawar in 974/1567 led to Akbar's temporary residence there and the governorship of Khwāja-i Khān Muhammad Mun'mīr Khān. After the foundation of Allāhabād [q.v.] the importance of Dīnwāpur waned; it passed into the possession of the Nawābāds of Awadh in the early 12th/18th century, and into British hands in 1775.

Dīnwāpur was long celebrated for its learning, "the Shīrāz of Hind", from its foundation by Firūzī; certainly until the time of Shīr Shāh; some of its rulers—notably Ibrāhīm and Husayn—were cultured connoisseurs of more than mere scholastic learning; Khwāja schools still exist within the precincts of the mosque.

**Monuments.** The fort of Firūz Shāh, an irregular quadrilateral on the north bank of the Gumti, is of high stone walls built largely from local temple spoil, with a single gateway protected by tapering semicircular bastions; other bastions were destroyed in 1859 by the British, as were some of the
The Ašālā mosque, whose foundations were prepared on the site of the Hindū temple to Ašālā Devī by Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq, was not built until 810/1408 under Ibrāhīm Shāhī; its main feature, the central bay of the west liwān covered by a large dome which is concealed from the court-yard by a tall pyramidal gateway resembling the Egyptian propylon, is the special characteristic of the Djawnpur style under the Shārṣūni sultans. The Ašālā mosque is the largest (78.7 m. square) and most ornate: the liwāni on north, east and south are composed of five pillared aisles in two storeys, the two outer aisles at ground level being formed into a range of pillared cells facing the streets; in the middle of each side is an archway, with a single propylon on the outside, and with domes over the north and south gates; a dome covers the central bay of each liwān on the north and south of the main dome, each with its propylon facing the court-yard. Within each propylon is a large arched recess, with a fringe of stylized spear-heads similar to those of the Khaḍī buildings at Dihlī [q.v.], in which are pierced arched openings in front of the domes, and the main entrances beneath. The main propylon is 22.9 m. high, the dome behind being only 19.5 m. and 16.8 m. wide at its base. The dome is supported on a sixteen-sided arched triforium, on corner brackets over an octagon with pierced windows, supported on squinch arches. The bābla wall is relieved on its exterior by square projections behind each dome, the corners of each supported by a tapering buttress; later additions supported some of the smaller angles of the wall. There are no minārs, the top storeys of the propylons serving for the muʿadhdhin.

The masdjid Khālid Muḥīr, built by two governors of Ibrāhīm, is of the same period, only the central propylon and dome and western liwān remaining, all massive and without ornament. Of the contemporary Dhanḍhārī (dhanḍhārī "perforated") mosque only the screen of the central propylon remains, filled with the finest stone tracery in Djawnpur. The Lāl darwāza ("red gate"); near the gate of a former palace) mosque in the north-west of the city, the smallest of the Djawnpur mosques, was built c. 851/1447, the sole surviving monument of the reign of Mahmūd Shārṣūni, has a single central dome and propylon with tall treble transepts, and sarmānā galleries on a mezzanine floor flanking the central bay. The foundation of the main Dhanḍhārī Plate was laid in 842/1438, but it was not finished until the reign of Husain. The mosque stands on a raised terrace 5 to 6 m. above street level, with a single propylon in the west liwān, the transepts covered by fine barrel-vaults, and the façade entirely arcuate. These are the only remains of the Shārṣūni standing at Djawnpur, the rest having been demolished by Sīkandar Lūdī; all are of stone, largely pillaged from Hindū or Buddhist temples, and cement, the work of Hindū craftsmen. Echoes of the characteristic style of the capital occur in other places within the quondam Djawnpur kingdom, in the Arha’i Kangura masdjid at Bānhrāz (Benares), and in the Dāmī masdijds at Eţāwā and Kanawā [qq.v.].

By far the most significant monument of Mughal times is the great bridge of Munīm Khān, begun 932/1526 and finished 976/1568. Built by Afghan workmen under a Kābul architect, Afdāl al-Allāh, it consists of ten spans of arches—the four central ones of wider span than those at each end—the very massive piers of which now support pavilions at road level, partly projecting over the water on brackets; a further five spans carry the road over a smaller branch of the Gomti.

In the old town of Zafarābād, 6.5 km. south-east of Djawnpur, is the mosque of one Shaykh Bāhrā, converted c. 711/1311 from Buddhist temple remains, entirely trebated though originally with a large central arch between two piers which was probably the prototype of the propylons of the Djawnpur mosques. There are also many tombs, the most noteworthy being those of Makhūdī Sāhib Cīrāgh-i Hind (281/1389) and Sayyid Muṭaddā in the dargah-i shahād, the burial ground of the martyrs who fell in the invasion of Shīhāb al-Dīn Shūrī in 590/1194.

Bibliography: Khayar al-Dīn Muhammad Ilaḥābādī, Djawnpūr-nāma, ed. Djawnpur n.d., a late 18th century work which makes much use of the Tārīḵ-i Fīrūzān and Barānū’s Tārīḵ-i Fīrūz Shāhī, but is not entirely derivative; Eng.tr. R. W. Pogson, Calcutta 1814; for the monuments: A. Cunningham, ASI xi, Calcutta 1880, 102-26; A. Führer, The Shārqi architecture of Jaunpur (architectural drawings by E. W. Smith), ASI, NIS xi, Calcutta 1889: text very turgid; J. Ferguson, History of Indian and eastern architecture, London 1876, 522 ff. Illustrations of some buildings not available elsewhere in Markham Kittoe, Illustrations of Indian architecture from the Muḥammadan conquest ..., Calcutta 1838. A new monograph on Djawnpur is badly needed.

(J. Burton-Page)

AL-DJAWNPŪRī, Sayyid Muhammad al-Kāżimī al-Husaynī b. Sayyid Khan aliṣa Ḫān Afsa wife of the pseudo-Muḥammad, was born at Djawnpūr [q.v.] on Monday, 14 Djamīdā I 847/10 September 1443. None of the contemporary sources mentions the names of his parents as ʿAbd Allāh and Āmina, as claimed by the Mahdawī sources (e.g., Sīrādī al-Abīyār, see Bibliography), in an obvious attempt to identify them with the names of the Prophet's parents so that the prediction made in the abdīḏīk al-Mahdī (cf. Ibn Tāmīyāya, Minhāḏī al-Sunnah, Cairo 1321/1903, ii, 133) might fit his case. The Tuhfat al-kirām of ʿAll Shīr Kānī and the Djamārnumā of Khayar al-Dīn Ilaḥābādī, which mention these names, are much later complications and therefore not reliable.

A precocious child, gifted with an extraordinary memory, he committed the Kurʿān to memory at the early age of seven and received the title, according to the Mahdawī sources, of Asaf al-Umār? at the age of twelve from his teacher Shaykh dāniyāl ʿIyāḥ. At the age of forty he left Djawnpūr for Mecca and, after visiting a number of places en route such as Dānāpūr, Kālpī, Čandīrī, Djamānīrī, Māndū, Burhānpūr, Dālwaytābād, Āhadnagar and Bīdur, reached there in 901/1495. During his stay at Mecca, one day while performing the ṭawwaf, [q.v.], he suddenly announced that he was the promised
Čihil Satūn (destroyed 1858).

(Markham Kittoe, *Illustrations of Indian architecture from the Muhammadan conquest...*, Calcutta 1838)
Djami' masjid.
Mahdi. He was not taken seriously by the Meccan cw/awa5, who simply ignored his claim. He returned to
sulama, who challenged his assertion that God could be seen with physical eyes. Finding the atmosphere hostile, he left Ahmadbadd and in 905/1499 reasserted his claim to being the Mahdi at a small place called Barhll near Pafan.

The same year he wrote to some of the independent rulers about his mission inviting them either to accept him as the Mahdi or condemn him to death if he were seen to be one. He never received any reply to these, according to Mahdawi sources, Ghayyah al-Din Khaldil of Malwa, Mahmd Begra of Gujrat, Ahmad NiZam Shd of Ahmadnagar, Shd Bg of Kandahar and Mr Dhu’l-Nun of Farah accepted his claim. This, however, failed to impress the *ulamd*, who challenged its validity, finding his influence overama an impostor. The majority of the people continued to regard him as the Mahdi. He was not taken seriously by the Meccan cw/awa5, who simply ignored his claim. He returned to
sulama, who challenged his assertion that God could be seen with physical eyes. Finding the atmosphere hostile, he left Ahmadbadd and in 905/1499 reasserted his claim to being the Mahdi at a small place called Barhll near Pafan.

The same year he wrote to some of the independent rulers about his mission inviting them either to accept him as the Mahdi or condemn him to death if he were seen to be one. He never received any reply to these, according to Mahdawi sources, Ghayyah al-Din Khaldil of Malwa, Mahmd Begra of Gujrat, Ahmad NiZam Shd of Ahmadnagar, Shd Bg of Kandahar and Mr Dhu’l-Nun of Farah accepted his claim. This, however, failed to impress the *ulamd*, who challenged its validity, finding his influence overama an impostor. The majority of the people continued to regard him as the Mahdi. He was not taken seriously by the Meccan cw/awa5, who simply ignored his claim. He returned to
sulama, who challenged his assertion that God could be seen with physical eyes. Finding the atmosphere hostile, he left Ahmadbadd and in 905/1499 reasserted his claim to being the Mahdi at a small place called Barhll near Pafan.
Sayyid, very rich in detail); Wall b. Yusuf, Insf ndma, Haydarabad 1367; cAbd ... orbit and the ecliptic: the ascending node or "head", ra*s, and the descending node or "tail", dhanab (soil, of the lineal ancestor of our Djawwanl. The latter was born CAH b. Abi Talib. This pedigree received by him personally from was appointed Alid Chief of Egypt, apparently by cAbd Allah b. al-Husayn d. 588/1192. The Djawwanl family claimed there as Arab genealogist and historian, b. 525/1131, (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI) (the two diametrically opposite points of the sun's trajectory, the two lunar nodes, or to wara, ii/i, Cairo n.d. (1954), 83. The editor, Mustafa Djawad, adds detailed information on other sources at present unavailable); Ibn al-Sabunl, Takmilat Ikmdl...
dragon, al-tinni). In many cases it refers only to the "head"; in some mss. a special word, navbahr, is used. At the eclipse it is said to have "placed itself in the centre of the heaven, in the shape of a serpent (mâr, 'draco')."

The word Djawzahar, though explained differently in the Ma'âlih al-ulâm, clearly derives from the Avestan gao-êthra ( = Pahlavi gôchir = mod. Persian gawzahr), an (adjectival) epithet of the Moon meaning "forming the origin of the bull" (Bartholomaeus) or rather "preserving the sperma bovis". In the Bundâshiyn, gôchir, together with the tailed (dâmbomand) mâsh-parth, on one occasion appears as an antagonist of the sun and the moon, while, on another, it is said to have "placed itself in the centre of the heaven, in the shape of a serpent (mâr, 'draco')".

The complicated semiological development of the word and its various functions in mythology and early astrology can be understood only when seen in connexion with the myth of the eclipse monster (dragon), of wide distribution all over the Eurasion continent, and in particular the Indian Râhu myth: There the demon Râhu, immortalized by the forbidden amrita drink, from which he had sipped, is beheaded by Vishnu; but his two parts, the head (Râhu) and the tail (thenceforth called Ketu), having become stellified, incessantly try to devour the Sun and the Moon so as to take revenge for their having denounced Râhu's crime to Vishnu. Thus Râhu and Ketu are both identified with the eclipse monster, but the latter also appears at irregular intervals in the shape of a comet (dhumaketu, "smoke-cetu"; see also art. KAYD, under which name the cometary aspect of the Indian Ketu has survived in Islamic astrology).

In the later, "scientific" (i.e., computing) phase of astrology, in India, Râhu was identified with the ascending, and Ketu, with the descending, node, in view of the fact that eclipses can occur only when the two luminaries stand sufficiently near the nodes. In Arabic it is undoubtedly owing above all to Indian influence that the Gr. terms οδηγηται διὰ τὸν πλούσιον and οδηγηται διὰ τὸν πλούσιον (sicl. συνδεσμος) as found in the Almagest were replaced by al-ra's and al-dhanab; in particular, the synonym of al-dhanab: nawbahr, "the new part", clearly betrays its relationship with Ketu ("the old part"). In most manuscripts, it is regarded as a giant serpent or dragon (tinni), an (adjectival) epithet of the Moon; for its representation in Near Eastern art, see Hartner, opp. cit. below; for its appearance in Western art, see also Kühnel, op. cit. below. As indicated above, the Bundâshiyn identifies the gôchir with the constellation of the Dragon, which stands in fact "in the centre of the heaven", near the pole of the ecliptic; but in the same context it is said that "it retrogrades in such a way that after 10 years the head takes the place of the tail, and the tail of the head". This applies of course not only astrological but also astronomical purposes because they are needed for the computation of solar and lunar eclipses. 2. The following two meanings, encountered mostly in texts dating from the 11th century A.D. or later, are obviously secondary: (a) al-Djawzahar = the circuitus pareclipticus [see article "ILM AL-NA'AY'A, section on "Theory of planetary motion"] of the moon, Ar. al-munaththul bi-falak al-burâdî = οδηγηται διὰ τὸν πλούσιον κύκλος (Alm.), or in Ibn al-Haytham's theory of solid spheres, the spherical shell concentric with the earth, within which the excentric sphere (al-falak al-mdâil, "sphaera deflectens") is comprised. (b) al-Djawzahar = the nodes of the orbit of any of the five planets.


**DJAYASI** [see MALIK MUHAMMAD DJAYASI].

**DJAYB-I HUMAYUN**, the privy purse of the Ottoman Sultans. Under the authority of the privy secretary (Sirr kâtibî), it provided for the immediate needs and expenses of the sovereign. Its regular revenues consisted of the tribute from Egypt (see IRSALIYYE), the income from the imperial domains (see MUSADARA), the share of war-booty, and the proceeds of confiscations (see MUSADARA).

**Bibliography:** Ismail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı'nın saray teşkilâtı*, Ankara 1947, 77-8; idem, *Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilâtı*, Ankara 1948, 363-4; Pakaln, i, 265-6; Midhat Sertoglu, *Reşîmî Osmanî tarîhi anısklopedisi*, Istanbul 1938, 55. See further KHAZINE.

**DJAYHAN, (modern Turkish Ceyhan), the name by which the Arabs denote the ancient Pyramus, one of the two rivers which cross Cilicia and flow into the Mediterranean, the other and more westerly river being the Sayhân, the ancient Saros. The names Djayhân and Sayhân appear to have been chosen by the Arabs to these rivers which separate them from Greek territory, on the analogy of the Djayhân and Sayhân in central Asia, rivers which separate them from Turkish territory, and which owe their names to a corruption of the names of biblical rivers (Genesis ii, 8, 13), unless they are arbitrary translations of the Greek names (cf. Nöldeke, in *ZDMG*, xliv, 700 and the articles AMO DARYA, SAYHAN, SIR DARYA).

The Djayhân rises a little to the north-east of Elbistan, in the mountains which divide it from the valley of the Tohma Suyu, a tributary of the Euphrates. Its upper part is the Sêgûtül Suyu. Near Elbistan it is swollen by numerous secondary streams, one of the most important being the Hurman Suyu.
Below its confluence with the Göksün Çay, south of Aşafın (the old Yarpuz-Arabis-Abbasios), it flows southwards towards Marşin and on the outskirts of this town it is joined by the Ak Sö (Nahr Hūrīth) of Subrāb which comes from the north-east and flows past al-Ḥadāth. It then turns south-west, passing to the west of the Anti-Taurus, and reaches the edge of the Cilician plain after receiving tributaries from the region of Sīs (now Koçan). It makes its way to Missāl (al-Maṣṣila) where the main Adana road crosses it by an ancient stone bridge. The mouth of the Djayhān River in Cilicia has moved several times owing to the delta formed by alluvial deposits. At the present time, after bending sharply to the east, it comes into the sea in a bay lying to the west of Yumurtalık (the old Āyāk). Ḫabūr (‘I-Fidā) compares it in importance with the Euphrates.

The region of the lower and middle Djayhān formed part of the Ṭhawār (frontier districts). The name of the river consequently occurs more than once in poems of the ʿĀbdānī period, al-Muṭṭanabbī, Abū Fīrās and al-Sarī [for its history, see CILICIA]. In the Mamlūk period this region was conquered by Malik Nāṣir Muḥammad and was known as al-Futuh ḍ al-djāhdūniyya, following the Armenian corruption Djasān from Djayhān. The name Djayhān is sometimes used to signify the region rather than the river. This is so in Yabhā b. Ḥanīf al-Āshṭālī [for its history, see AMU DARYA].

This district was of great economic importance, especially in the 10th/16th century, shows: the Muslims caught fish in it, would be paid large sums of money not to kill them in the presence of devout Djayns, or threaten them in favour of the Djayns, or visit them as rat- or snake-catchers, and would be paid large sums of money not to do these things. They were, however, tolerated by the Muslims, since they were of economic importance as the money-lending community (cf. The book of Duarte Barbosa, ed. and tr. M. Longworth Dames, Hakluyt Soc., i, 111-2). Religious contact with the Djays was made by the Mughal emperor Akbar in 990/1582, who invited first Hījavīdījī and then the great Bāḥānūrdā to the Mughal court, and whose personal beliefs and habits seem to have been much influenced by the Djayn leaders (Bādaʿūnī, Muntakhab al-tawāriḥ, tr. Lowe, ii, 331, says with disgust of Akbar’s orders prohibiting the slaughter of animals on certain days—adding that disobedience was visited upon the entire state by being denounced as a heretic). Antagonists in favour of the Djays were confirmed by his successor Djasānī, on whom however the personal influence was never profound and who ended by condemning their character and morals (cf. Ṭāṣūkī Djasāngīrī, ed. trans. Rogers and Beveridge, i, 437-8).


Religious contact with the Djays was made by the Mughal emperor Akbar in 990/1582, who invited first Hījavīdījī and then the great Bāḥānūrdā to the Mughal court, and whose personal beliefs and habits seem to have been much influenced by the Djayn leaders (Bādaʿūnī, Muntakhab al-tawāriḥ, tr. Lowe, ii, 331, says with disgust of Akbar’s orders prohibiting the slaughter of animals on certain days—adding that disobedience was visited upon the entire state by being denounced as a heretic). Antagonists in favour of the Djays were confirmed by his successor Djasānī, on whom however the personal influence was never profound and who ended by condemning their character and morals (cf. Ṭāṣūkī Djasāngīrī, ed. trans. Rogers and Beveridge, i, 437-8).


(John Burton-Página)
his government. The city was planned on the model of Ahmadabād [q.v.] with broad boulevards and spacious bazaars. Even craftsmen skilled in various trades were sent for from that place, but the founder of Djaypur did not succeed in making the new city as prosperous as its model (‘Abd al-Hāyy Lakhnawī, ʿAlīgaḥ Ṣanḍah, ʿAlīgaḥ 1337, 30-1, in which the city is called Diya-nagar). The title Sandah, conferred on him by the Mughal emperor, and meaning ūhu, is not only indicative of the respect that he enjoyed at the Mughal Court but is also a tribute to his personal qualities as the scion of an illustrious ruling family. This ruler who ascended the qadiḥ of Amber in 1111/1699 and died in 1156/1743 was a remarkable and accomplished person. He made good use of his scientific knowledge and skill in constructing observatories at Djaypur, Dihīl, Banārās, Mathurā and Udīyān (see G. R. Kaye, A guide to the old observatories at Dihli, Jaipur, Ujjain and Benares, Calcutta 1920). The sun-clock, mounted on a triangular tower in the Dihīl observatory, gives accurate time even to this day. He also reconstructed the astronomical tables known after the reigning Mughal emperor of Dihīl, Muḥammad Shāh, as the Zīdī Muḥammad Shāhī. More illustrious and better known to history is, however, Djay Singh I who enjoyed a mansab of 6,000 and the imperial title of Mīrzā Rādīja, conferred on him by Awrangzib. Soon after Djay Singh’s death in 1156/1743 the Dhīks of Bharatpur [q.v.] succeeded in wresting, following a number of sharp encounters, a part of the state; the defection of the chief of Māčēri (now Alwar) about 1205/1790 further reduced the area of the State. By the end of the century Djaypur was in confusion, torn by internal strife and the extortions of the depredatory Marāthās. A treaty concluded in 1218/1803 with the East India Company, was dissolved only two years later. Another treaty was concluded in 1234/1818 putting a stop to the molestation of the Marāthās.

On the outbreak of a rebellion in 1820, during the infancy of Djay Singh III, a British Officer was posted in the state. In 1835 another rising took place resulting in the murder of a British political officer and injuries to the Agent to the Governor-General. Repression naturally followed resulting in the tightening of the administration and reduction in the state troops.


(A. S. Bazmee Ansari)

Djaysh, one of the common Arabic terms (with ḍund and ‘akshar) for the army.
owners to keep them against payment of taxes, which in turn served to provide the money for regular army pay (see ‘Arif, ‘AfAٌ, and biwán). In Syria, and later in the Islamic west, the coordinated provincial-military organization of the diwán [q.v.] was brought into being, an organization no precise equivalent of which ever appeared in the vast area of expansion in the east (ṣīrāq-Ṭrān).

Needless to say, this first, primitive army was entirely Arab-Muslim; in the former Byzantine provinces at any rate, this was all the easier to ensure, as the native populations were already accustomed to the habit of following the profession of arms. Nevertheless, soon enough, the Arab chiefs began to bring their masdil [q.v.] with them in a subordinate rank, while on the other hand, certain warlike border peoples (in Central Asia, northern Trān and Armenia, and in the Syrian Amanus), without embracing Islam, were associated with the military operations of the Muslims as auxiliaries exempt from taxes; only a little later the Berbers, superficially converted to the new religion, were to form the greater part of the army that set out to conquer Spain.

Fairly soon, a special corps under the name of ghuría [q.v.] was constituted which, more closely linked to the Caliph or the Governor, was basically concerned less with war than with the maintenance of internal order, and little by little became a kind of police force (see also amālik). From the time of the Umayyads onward, the conditions of military organization were very considerably modified. War, because of growing resistance and lengthening lines of communication, ceased to be as profitable as before. The result was that pay, which was not very high, now became the main source of income of the troops, if not of their commanders, and they therefore became all the more demanding. On the other hand, a new cleavage appeared between the reserve troops stationed at Baṣra, Kūfa, etc., living an increasingly civilian life, and the frontier elements who no longer came back but continued to live on the borders of Asia Minor, Central Asia, the Mağrib or Spain. Finally, the nature of military operations changed and demanded war-materials and methods adapted from those of their enemies. The adaptation from the Arab way of life to the esseцию of oil, which the Arab occupation had not succeeded in entirely effacing. In archery, in siege warfare, in the use of “naphtha” (Greek fire), they possessed skills with which the Arabs could not compete, and thus brought to the ‘Abbāsid an element of technical reform which had been missing in the Umayyad army. On the other hand, the Arabs divided their lives between civilian life and that of the camps, still closely linked to the quarrels of the tribes and the clans; the Kūrasānīs, however, formed a more clearly defined corps of professional mercenaries linked to the person of the sovereign. Actually, despite some brilliant exceptions, it was less in external warfare than in the repression of internal revolts that they were mainly employed. The Arabs themselves henceforth belonged to two categories: there were those who lived far away from the zones of military activity, who were above all the cause of disorders, and whom in Egypt the Caliph al-Mu’taṣīm was for this reason determined to delete from the registers of the adept; there were the frontiersmen who could not be demilitarized in the same way, but who organized themselves according to the autonomous new world of the ghāzās and murchubūtān, cutting themselves off from the regular army proper. The result socially was that the Arabs for the most part no longer formed the breeding-ground of the aristocracy and were lucky indeed if they did not relapse into a miserable Bedouin way of life.

Whoever its members were, the regular army was distinguished from other more ephemeral bodies of combatants, in that they alone appeared on the registers of the diwān as having a right to a permanent wage and a status which made a kind of state corporation out of them. The others, who were various kinds of free corps of “volunteers” (muqaf- wa’s), not only received less pay but, what is more important, only received it for the duration of the campaign for which their presence was required, and were not considered as professionals. As for the ghāzās, they lived on the combined profits of their non-military activities in the intervals between campaigns, on booty during them, and on pious foundations which the Muslims of the interior created in increasing numbers in their favour as a substitute for waging the ghāzd. They also did not appear in the ordinary registers of the ājāṣ and were clearly not professionals.

In its turn, the Kūrasānī army did not survive the first ‘Abbāsid century. When the Caliph al-Ma’mūn bestowed the autonomous government of Kūrasān on the family of the Tahirids, these tended to keep for themselves a large part of the Kūrasānī recruitment. Furthermore, if the ‘Abbāsid dynasty had owed its survival to the Kūrasānīs, more recently, in particular, al-Ma’mūn had owed his victory over his brother, al-ʿAmin, to them, they themselves were fully aware of this, and in Bagdād itself, where the Tahirids were responsible for keeping order, they came in the end to be resented as somewhat burdensome protectors. Al-Mu’taṣim, the same who had suppressed the regular Arab army in Egypt, also took the initiative in replacing the Kūrasānīs by Turks. Actually, it was at first mainly the Turks established within the frontiers of Islam who were referred to as such, above all the people of Farghāna whose social conditions resembled those of the Kūrasānīs; but soon young people born outside Islam and brought there as slaves (mamlūk) in this case rather than ’abād from Central Asia or what are now the Russian steppes by warriors or merchants, were to be recruited as Turks. The Turks, who above all excellent horsemen, not only had an apparently justified reputation for military, physical and moral courage, as is witnessed by a well-known short treatise of al-Dhāḥīz, but it was thought that they, linked to the person of their master by ties of slavery, acquired young enough to be formed in character by him, and being strangers to the aspirations and rivalries of the indigenous peoples,
would form a still more reliable army for the sovereign than had the first Khurasanis. In fact, experience was to prove that, having the sovereign in their power, they were to be far less tolerable and far more devoted to their own generals than to the Caliph (who, after al-Mu'tasim, never again commanded them directly). Nevertheless, because of their technical qualifications, because of the care bestowed by the Turkish chieftains on maintaining recruitment, and even because the acquisition of new slaves was the easiest remedy against the lack of discipline of the old ones (although in the long run, of course, it merely perpetuated the evil). It seemed no longer possible, right up to modern times, for oriental Muslim states to do without a Turkish army, and all of them, one after another, were to adopt one. At best, in the orient, they were counter-balanced by the calling in of other elements, rough, indigenous mountain people, skilled in fighting on foot in the mountains, such as the Daylams, or horsemen like the Kurds, or locally negroes (in Arabia) or Hindús (army of the Ghaznavids). In Egypt, the Fātimids, who conquered it with Berber contingents, reinforced as in Ifrikiya with negroes, Slavs and Rūmīs, themselves later tried to neutralize these by introducing Turks, whom in turn they sought to replace by Armenians under chiefs who could hardly be claimed as Muslims, and finally gave back some part in army affairs to the Arabs. The breaking up of the ʿAbbāsid empire also gave the opportunity of a military career to the Arabs of Mesopotamia and Syria, who gave support to the Hamdānīs [q.v.], Murdāsis [q.v.], ʿUkaylīd [q.v.] and other principalities. The Būyids in western Irān owed their specific strength to the Daylams, but the need for cavalry compelled them nevertheless to reinforce them from the start with Turks. But the racial differences of the contingents, which language and technical differences hindered from mixing easily together, were the cause of disorders, because they were jealous of each other, quarrelled over their share of the state revenues, and espoused the disagreements of their leaders; they made the streets of Baghādād and Cairo run with blood when they were not occupied in promoting their respective generals to power. Even when, later on under the Ayyubid dynasty, some Kurds, from whom the Arabs, assured them victory; but the new masters of the Muslim east re-organized their army in the traditional manner with Turco-Muslim forces recruited from slaves, and the Turkmans were only able to use their warlike qualities as ghāzīs in the outer battlefields of Asia Minor, which they had the relative proportions of the various arms, and technical progress, albeit of a secondary kind, could exercise some influence on the art of combat and the fortunes of war. The struggle against the Crusaders before the time of the Mongols possibly played a locally stimulating part in this respect.

Amongst the ancient Arabs the principal arms were the sword (sayf) and the javelin (rumh), as well as the lance (kaws), used by the Turco-Muslim infantry; the bow was not unknown, but little used on horseback; it served more as a weapon in hunting than in warfare, where it did not lend itself well to single combats of the traditional type. Here lay a difference between the Arabs on the one hand, and the Persians and Turks on the other: among the Persians the exercise of drawing a bow, which might be of any shape or size, was a living tradition among the whole population; the Turks excelled in the rapid shooting from horseback of a hail of arrows (nārah) in all directions, thus sowing disorder in the ranks of their enemies. The cross-bow (djīrkāh), often included also with the ordinary bow under the same name (baus), followed by a qualifying expression, seems to have been known in the orient since the 3rd/4th century. ʿAbbāsid and later cavalry made much use of the bow, but still also of the javelin, and the lance, too, now became a cavalry weapon; the infantry used the cross-bow while remaining faithful also to the sword which was was much improved by the quality of the so-called "Damascus" steel—in reality an Indian technique; amongst other weapons, the club (ʿamīd, Persian gurs) was still employed as well as the knife (sīkkhī). In defence, Arabs used the shield (darākah), the cuirass (īrs), various types of coats of mail (dsūr, zarrād, dīwāghan), and the helmet; they nevertheless
avoided armour that was too heavy, and the large shield does not seem to have been in current usage before the Crusades, the period when this size in shields became fashionable. The cavalryman was almost always mounted on a horse which was also protected by armour; in the armies of eastern Iran, the Indian elephant was used in some heavy corps; the camel, however, was only used for transport. The fully equipped horseman was given various names, one of which among the Ayyubid was taşdhi, a meaning which should be carefully distinguished from its other use as a synonym of "panhard".

The soldiers had to maintain their arms as well as their animals but, except in very early times, they were given to them in the first place and renewed in case of need; most of them came from state workshops which, in Egypt, held an almost complete monopoly in their manufacture. *A fortiori*, the state workshops alone dealt in engines worked by teams, that is to say, above all, siege artillery whose use developed increasingly: the heavy-beamed mangonels (*mandianik*), light ballistas, (*sarāda*, *q.v.*), battering-rams (*dabbāba*), etc. The Muslims did not take very long to pierce the secret of *tawdshi*, a meaning which should be carefully distinguished from its other use as a synonym of "panhard".
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The fully equipped horseman was given various names, one of which among the Ayyubid was taşdhi, a meaning which should be carefully distinguished from its other use as a synonym of "panhard". The cavalryman was almost always mounted on a horse which was also protected by armour; in the armies of eastern Iran, the Indian elephant was used in some heavy corps; the camel, however, was only used for transport. The fully equipped horseman was given various names, one of which among the Ayyubid was taşdhi, a meaning which should be carefully distinguished from its other use as a synonym of "panhard".
arms, the upkeep of armouries, fortresses, roads of military importance, transports, animals, etc. At 141/s, dirhams to the dinār, the legal rate of exchange in 'Abbāsīd times, the manufacture of arms, etc., may be estimated to have cost some five million dinārs, quite apart from the expense of an army of 50,000 men, whose overall budget at the zenith of the empire we know to have been in the neighbourhood of fourteen million dinārs. The two together presumably accounted for half the income of the state; a heavy burden, bringing with it heavy taxation, discontent and, in a vicious circle, revolts provoked by this discontent which lessened the chances of a decrease in taxes since military effort had then to be intensified and an ever-growing proportion of the budget be taken up by the demands of the army. Moreover, even when it had sufficient available funds on account, the Treasury did not always possess the liquid assets needed for the payment of the army at the time promised, and when this happened another vicious circle appeared, and the complaints of those concerned over the delays could only be appeased by means of increases which compromised the future even more. More and more often, the caliphs had to cede the government of provinces to generals on condition that henceforward they and not the state would pay their own army. It is hardly necessary to recall the way in which this development led to the formation of autonomous principalities, but all the same it did not solve the problem of finding by one means or another the resources needed for the upkeep of the whole army.

This was why very soon it was necessary to reorganize the system of payment completely by means of the spread and transformation of the system of ikṭā (q.v.; see also Ḍayās/)' which, to express it briefly, allowed the army to tax a village or a district and thus take directly from the source the sums which were due to them. It is not possible to dwell here on the alterations in the administrative order which resulted from this development, but it is worth remarking that the value of the ikṭā seems to have been considerably greater than that of their former pay (300-1,000 dinārs). This indicates clearly the growing social and political importance of the armament, taxation, discontent and, in a vicious circle, revolts that a cavalryman had to provide for some few retainers as well as to maintain an increasingly large amount of gear and secure the whole of his supplies in kind. It must be kept in mind, too, that in the district allocated to him, the muḥāḍā had now to take over the expenses which had formerly been the business of the state, so that the income of the ikṭā was not solely given up to covering the simple pay of earlier times. Such very varied applications of ikṭā were tried out under different states and in different periods, that only a brief enumeration of them is possible here. The system of ikṭā could be used for the whole army or for only a part of it; it could free the muḥāḍā or not from the obligation of paying the tithe, zakāt; it could be temporary and exchangeable or definitive and hereditary; it could be individual, that is to say formulated to assure the upkeep of each cavalryman or general and his fee generally, that is to say very much broader and put into the charge of an officer on condition of his being responsible for the supplies and upkeep of a whole contingent, a situation which, due allowances being made, amounts more or less to the grant of a whole district (for which see above). Finally, the ikṭā could to all intents and purposes free the muḥāḍā of all narrow governmental control within the extent of the jurisdiction assigned to him or, on the contrary, leave him under detailed supervision and subject to the intervention of an state administration. This was the situation in Egypt, and from it developed the organization of the Mamluks [q.v.]. It is possible that in Syria certain mutual influences occurred between the Muslim ikṭā and the fief of the Latins installed there following the Crusades.

Leaving aside differences of time and place, it can be seen that in almost every country of the Muslim east (rather less so in the west), the army has played an important and special political role of great real power and of growing fortunes based on landed property, it constituted more and more the true aristocracy superimposed upon the ancient native rural and urban aristocracies. By the manner of their recruitment almost foreigners to the native population, which in consequence paid little attention to their internal conflicts and changes of domination, the army imposed on this native population something of the régime of a military occupation which, nevertheless, was only upheld by the mutual support given to one another by the army and the orthodox religious framework of the régime which depended on it. This was a development whose scope, overflowing by far the domain of military matters proper, can in conclusion be no more than indicated here.

Bibliography: Most of the important information is to be found in the chronicles. However, ideas concerning certain aspects or problems of the army are to be found more explicitly discussed, from the first century of the 'Abbāsīds on, in treatises such as the Risālat al-sāhāba of Ibn al-Mu'ākkāf and the Risāla fi maktāb al-Turk wa 'dmatlu ḍawā' al-ḥīṣāf of al-Dījah (ed. Van Vloten 1903); and in some works on finance, certain chapters deal specifically with military administration, for example, the K. al-Kharājī of Abū Yūsuf and especially, the general treatise on state institutions with the same title by Kūdāma written at the beginning of the 4th/10th century; then in the 6th/12th century, the Minhājī of Makhzūmī for Egypt which enables us to complete the retrospective accounts in the Tadhkīra of Makrizī (i. 94 ff.) or the Fihrist of Ḍā'ūr, which, for instance, the Muḥīj al-Mulk (Sālīqīdīs), the Adab al-mulūk of Fakhr-i Mudabbīr Mubārak-shāh (representing the military tradition of the Ghāznawids and Ghūrids, still unpublished), the Dastūr al-khāṣīb of Hindūshāh Nakhdjāwānī (representing the military tradition of the Mongols of Persia), etc. On the other hand, according to the evidence of the Fihrist, there existed early enough a technical literature in Arabic concerned with the military arts and engines of war, which drew its inspiration from Greek and Iranān antiquity; however, no example of this has been preserved prior to the Ayyūbīd period which produced the Tadjhīra fi l-iṭiyal al-barbiyya of al-Harawī, ed. and French trans. J. Sourdel-Thomine in BEO, xvii (1962), the Tareesīt on swords attributed to Kindi, analysed by J. Heuzey in Arch. Orient. xi/3 (1854) and published by 'Abd al-Rahmān Zākī in Rev. Fac. Lettres Univ. Fuad I xlvii (1952), and especially, the Tarte de armureeput together for Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn by Mardār and Mardār Ṭarsūsī, ed. Č. Cahen in BEO, xii (1947), a type of literature which was to be developed further in the time of the Mamluks. On the Persian side should be mentioned the K. al-barb wa l-ḥīṣāf of Ghaz-
nawid), published by I. and M. Shafic in 1946. Earlier information about the Muslims’ manner of fighting has been preserved in Byzantine literature, especially in the Taktikon of Leon VI and the Strategikon of Kekaumenos, as well as in Armenian chronicles.

No general and thorough modern work exists on the Muslim army in the “classical” centuries. The account of A. v. Kremer in his Kulturgeschichte des Islam, i, remains useful; it should be complemented on several points by the corresponding chapters of R. Helly in his Social Structure of Islam, by A. Ibrahim Hasan and H. Ibr. Hasan in Al-Nassum al-Islamiyya, and by A. v. Pawlikowski-Cholewa in Die Heere des Morgenlandes, 1940; better, but more limited geographically, is the chapter, p. 485-508, of B. Spuler in his Iran in frühosmanischer Zeit; see also M. F. Ghazi, Rerum ac de Bellicos liber, 1961.

The following are monographs dealing with shorter periods: for pre-Islamic Arabia, F. W. Schwarzo, Die Waffen der alten Araber, 1886, which should be complemented by the studies on pre-Islamic Arab society of H. Lammens, B. Fares, etc.; for the period of the conquests, the considerations of Caetani in his Annali, iv, and the dissertation of L. Beckmann, Die mus. Heere der Eroberungszeit, Hamburg 1952; for the Umayyads, N. Fries, Das Heereswesen der Araber zur Zeit der Omeyyaden nach Tabari, 1921, and A. E. Kukkel, Sur certains traits du systeme militaire omayyade, in Palestinskiy Sbornik, iii, 66 (1958) (in Russian, with an analysis in French by M. Canard, in Arabisca, 1960, 219-21); for the Abbasids, W. Hoenerbach, Zur Heeresverwaltung der Abbasiden, Studie uber Qudama, in Isi., xxix (1950); and for some later states, the two important studies by C. E. Bosworth, Qasr al-Madinah military organisation, in Isi., xxxvi (1960), and H. A. R. Gibb, The armies of Saladin, in Cahiers d’Histoire Egyptienne, i. (1951); see also the chapter on military matters in B. Spuler’s Mongolen, 1955. For the political and social aspects, see Cl. Cahen, The body politic, in Unity and variety in Muslim civilization, ed. G. E. Von Grunebaum, 1955.

From a more technical point of view, K. A. C. Creswell’s Arms and Armour, 1946, gives considerable space to examples from the museums, for the most part of a later period than that which has been dealt with here; important is K. Huuri, Zur Geschicthe des mittelalterlichen Geschützweisen aus orientalischen Quellen, Helsinki 1941, which compares all the “oriental” societies; also A. Zeki Velidi, Die Schulter der Germanen (in fact, this speaks mainly of the Muslim world), in ZDMG, xc (1936), not used by A. Mazaheri, Le sabre d’Alger, 1908, 55 ff.; Augustin Bernard, Les confins algéro-marocains, Paris 1911, 95, 96; M. Bernard, Notes sur l’O. Gheris, in Bull. Soc. Géog. d’Alger, xxx, 373; Deschamps, Le Mérariste saharien, in Bull. Soc. Géog. d’Oran, xxix, 1955, and more particularly 283 ff.; A. Durand, Notes sur les Touaregs, in Bull. Soc. Géog. d’Alger, 1904, 691 ff.

1. Dījīsh, plur. Dīyūdsh means in the south of Algeria and Morocco an armed band to go out on a ghazw (ambush for purposes of plunder or of a holy war) against a caravan or a body of troops. When the dījīsh consisted of several hundred men, it was called a harka. The Dīyūdsh carried on their operation from the northern Sudán or the Niger valley throughout the Sahara and the south of Algeria and Morocco. They were composed sometimes of Tuaregs but more often of Berbers from the southern slopes of the High Atlas. The latter assembled on the Tm-Mayerd plateau in the valley of the Wèd Gheris.

When the formation of a dījīsh was decided upon, the Tuaregs who were to belong to it bound themselves together by an oath before setting out. Among the Awdād Dījīsh on the borders of Algeria and Morocco, two mounted marabouts were placed opposite one another. Between these two men of religion ran those intended for the foray, with a branch of the retém (Sahara broom) in their hands which they would throw into the air. Each dījīsh took with him some one to bring him luck, usually a marabout or a warrior who had already taken a successful part in several similar enterprises.

In the sandy plains of the Sahara or in the sand hills the members of the dījīsh walked in Indian file so that the enemy could not see their numbers from their tracks. They also made all sorts of deviations. When they came to the place chosen for the ambush, they lay in wait. The attack was usually made by night or in the grey of morning, a fierce onslaught, a hail of shot mingled with the shrill wild yells of people shrieking like demons, while the rifles poured forth bullets. All the forces of the attacking party were concentrated on the first onslaught. The terrified animals could no longer be controlled and often stampeded in all directions. Then began the second part of the fight, in which the best horsemen of the dījīsh played the principal part in driving their dismounted opponents into the desert to die. It was mainly to put down the dīyūdsh that the French military authorities instituted the corps of Méraristes Sahariens, who have succeeded in restoring order.


2. Dījīsh, or according to the pronunciation in western Morocco dījīsh, a kind of feudal organization in the Moroccan Army.

Historical. The dījīsh dates from the beginnings of the reigning dynasty. Previously the various dynasties of North Africa had succeeded to power with the help of groups of the people whose political and religious interests were their own. Revolutions not only overthrew the ruling families but forced them to maintain their power by force of arms and to spill their blood on countless battlefields. The great families, tribes and clans, who had accompanied the first ruler, became extinct. Lest they should become dependent on Berber clans, who could not be relied on to be faithful to a dynasty they had not created, the sultans had to surround themselves with foreign mercenaries, who had no connexion with the

The word dījīsh in north-west Africa has two further special meanings.
The organization of the new army was after many experiments finally entrusted to a body of French officers.

State of the Díjsh since the French Protectorate. The Díjsh still consisted of the Sheraga, Sherarda, Udáya and Bwákker with the half Díjsh-tribes of the plain of Marrákkush (Abda etc.). The tribes still had only the use of the lands occupied by them, except the Sheraga, who obtained the cession of most of their lands, and the Bwákker, almost all of whom had land around Meknès (Miknás). The Díjsh-tribes were divided into regiments of 500 men (ra). At the head of each ra was a rú'íd-asha, a kind of colonel. Below him were five •-Abd al-Bukhari, slaves of Bukhari, plur. Bwakher). The

When the Sa'dídids had become lords of the kingdom of Fás, they quartered the Arabs of their Díjsh in the garrisons of Fás, under the name of Ahí Súús; they were soon afterwards transferred to the strongholds on the coast called makhzen which had been formed by the Sa'dídids. As in the army, the Díjsh rose from their ranks. They lived on estates which formed a kind of fief in the kingdom of Fás. Mawlay Sliman was victorious but on his death his successor Mawlay Abd al-Rahmán was proclaimed sultan by the Udáya in 1822. The latter was almost overthrown by another rising of the Sherarda and had as a rule to reside in Marrákkush, the better to be able to control the tribes. But events in the north of his kingdom, a rising of the Udáya, the conquest of Algeria by the French and the wars of his representative Abd al-Kadhir against them, forced him to retire to Fás. He wished to take the field in person against the French. But after his defeat at Isly, he recognized how unequal to European armies his Díjsh was, and resolved to have an army modelled on those of Europe. His successor Muhammad carried out this plan by his edict of 22 Radjab 1277/18 July 1861. The organization of the new army was after many experiments finally entrusted to a body of French officers.
officers commanding 20 men. The private soldier of the 
*diish* was called *mkhdzni*. The members of the *djish* could... and military institutions of the Empire, and to set up a new
system, a *Nizdm-i diadid*, he issued regulations for

---

The history of Islamic armies in modern times is, in its most significant aspect, the history of their reform and westernization. The progress of the sciences in Europe enabled European Powers to wage war with increasing efficiency and their threat to the Islamic domain became progressively more difficult to contain. But it is only towards the end of the eighteenth century that Islamic rulers came to appreciate the threat in its full extent and began to take measures to cope with it. It is true that European techniques of war had been introduced here and there before that time, but the attempts were neither systematic nor long-lived. In the Crete campaign of 1644-46 the Ottoman Government employed English and Dutch instructors to train their sappers. At the end of the seventeenth century, the foundries for the manufacture of cannon were being supervised by a Venetian ex-officer of artillery named Sardi who had turned Muslim. In 1731, the French Count de Bonneval (1675-1747) who had adopted Islam and taken the name of Ahmad (see *AHMAD PASHA BONNEVAL*), was given the task of reforming the Corps of Bombardiers. He recruited and trained some 300 Bombardiers and built a foundry for cannon. He also introduced the use of the bayonet and set up a mathematical school for the navy. His work was taken the name of Ahmad (see *AHMAD PASHA BONNEVAL*).
a new model army, which itself came to be known by this very title. The advantages to be derived from a new model army may be gathered from a treatise published in translation to W. Wilkinson, *An account of the principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia ...*, London 1820. The treatise, which the author states to be a translation from a Turkish Ms., dating from 1804, when the Sultan was concerned to extend his military reforms, purports to be "An explanation of the Nizâm-y-Gedid institution", and to have been written on the Sultan's orders by "Tshelebi-Effendi", one of the Chief dignitaries of the Ottoman Empire, Counsellor, Mini-ter of State etc. [= Celebi Mustafâ Reshîd Efendi, known as Köse Kedîkhûdâ]. It is a long defence of the Sultan's policy setting out the evils of the old system and the reason for the superiority of European armies which it explains thus: "... their regular troops keep in a compact body, pressing their feet together that their order of battle may not be broken; and their cannon being polished like one of Marco- vich's watches [Markwick Markham, a London watchmaker in great esteem with the Turks] they load twelve times in a minute and make the bullets rain like musket balls". The advantages of the *Nizâm-i Gâyidid*, according to the author, are that the wearing of a distinctive uniform makes desertion more difficult, that the troops, drawn up in lines with the rear ranks parallel with the front, are easy to manoeuvre, that discipline is easier to enforce, and that defeats are not turned into routs. A British Admiralty handbook of 1920 summed up and contrasted, after a century or so of reform, the methods and aims of the old and the new model armies: "The chief features of the new methods were the systematic training of the soldiers in drill movements and in the handling of weapons; (2) their organization in symmetrical units (regiments etc.). The undrilled forces of the old armies fought to a large extent as individuals, and the military units, so far as they existed, lacked cohesion and discipline, and therefore full effectiveness in attack and defence. Under the new system the commanders exercised more control in battle and could better calculate the numbers of their troops and thus dispose them more advantageously. The recruit infantry units were not of uniform size, even approximately. Under the reformed system an army in battle order was arranged in two or three successive lines, the rear line acting in support and as reserves and each unit being of uniform depth. The ancient crescent movement of the front line was replaced by movement in straight lines". (Geographical Section of the Naval Intelligence Divison, Naval Staff, Admiralty, *A handbook of Syria*, 1920, 763). From all this it may be concluded that the objects of military reforms were threefold: the acquisition and manufacture of modern weapons, the inculcation of technical knowledge in the appropriate sections of the army such as sappers and artillerymen, and the creation of a disciplined body of troops easily manœuvreable by their commanders. The second requisite has always been, in the modern period, more difficult for the Janissaries than the first, and the third infinitely more so than the second.

Sellim III took up and amplified previous attempts at modernization. He introduced reforms in the artillery, tightened discipline, and increased the pay for privates from 20 to 40 aspers per day. The corps was put under the command of a *topçu bâshî* who was made a pasha of two tails, but administration, supplies and finances were separated from operational command and entrusted to a *nâdir*. In 1796, following earlier negotiations, the Ambassador of the French Republic Aubert-Dubayet brought with him to Istanbul a number of officers who were assigned to train the *Nizâm-i Gâyidid*. The new corps, composed of voluntary recruits, consisted of *topçi, sipâhs* and infantry. The recruits were drilled in the European fashion and taught how to manœuvre in a body on the battlefield. Seeking to avoid undue contact with the Janissaries who looked askance at these innovations, the Sultan housed the *Nîzâm* in barracks outside Istanbul. When the French, in Bonaparte's Egyptian campaign of 1798, marched on Istanbul in 1806, the new corps, which amounted by then to three or four thousand gunners and musketeers, was employed to help with the defence of Acre and gave a good account of itself. This raised its reputation particularly with the people of Istanbul and encouraged the Sultan to take a further step. He now desired to recruit troops for the *Nîzâm* by conscription both among the Janissaries and the general population. This new departure had the support of the Mufti, Welizade Mehmed Emin, and other high religious dignitaries who were convinced of the necessity of reform. It is presumably in aid of this policy that the treatise of "Tshelebi-Effendi" mentioned above was written. The Sultan promulgated a *bûhatt* on these lines in 1805, but strong opposition was soon apparent. The reading of the *bûhatt* was interrupted by a riot in Edirne, and one *kâdi* reading its text in Rodosto was actually killed. The Janissaries broke out in revolt in Rumelia and the authorities dared not have the *bûhatt* read in Istanbul. A regiment of *Nîzâm* sent from Anatolia against the rebellious Janissaries was decisively defeated. The Sultan had to appoint the *Agâ* of the Janissaries as Grand Vizier, to return the *Nîzâm* to Anatolia, and abandon for the time being the extension of reforms. But he does not seem to have given them up altogether for in 1806 an attempt was made to recruit for the *Nîzâm* in Karamân whose Wâlî, 'Abd al-Rahmân Pasha, had shown energy and loyalty in carrying out the Sultan's policy, and in 1807 auxiliary levies, Yamaks, were ordered to put on the *Nîzâm* uniform. This precipitated a revolt, the *Nîzâm* was overthrown, and the Janissaries were soon the masters there. The Sultan attempted to save his throne by decreeing the abolition of the *Nîzâm*, but he was deposed by virtue of a *fatwâ* which ruled that his actions and enactments were contrary to religion. The Janissaries burnt down the barracks of the *Nîzâm*.

Bayrådâr Mustafâ Pasha, who shortly thereafter procured the deposition of Selim's successor Mustafâ IV and the enthronement of Mahmûd II, attempted in 1808 to carry on with Selim's schemes, by recruiting troops for the new model army which he sought to disguise by giving its members the traditional title of *Saghas* [q.v.], but his ruin and death at the hands of the Janissaries ended attempts at reform for the time being. It was not until eighteen years afterwards, in 1826, that Sultan Mahmoud II (1808-39) was enabled, by a shrewd and lucky stroke, to end the power of the Janissaries. Mahmûd II left a regular army with a modern army. In 1826, having secured the support of the Mufti and the principal Janissary officers at a council held on 24-5 May 1826, the Sultan promulgated a *bûhatt* which, while speaking of restoring the traditional practices of the Empire, in effect proposed the continuation of Selim's reforms. A new force was to be formed by each Janissary battalion stationed in Constantinople providing 150
This latter exemption gives an indication of the kind of difficulty which stood in the way of uniform military administration. The heterogeneous character of the Empire, the multiplicity of its religions and sects, the survival of ancient privileges and the creation of new ones during the nineteenth century militated against uniformity. The law of 1886 which mentions the exemption of the inhabitants of Istanbul also lays down that inhabitants of the saṅghā of the Lebanon and of Samos would also be exempt. This law was not to be applied in Scutari (except for Durazzo), in the Yemen, the Hijāz, Nadīd, Tripoli and Benghzilla. These anomalies are a fair indication of the resistance which uniform European-style administration aroused.

The training and management of a conscript army and its performance in war depend on the existence of efficient health, supply and financial services, and on the orderly keeping of records. It was of course the case that such services had to be created at the same time as the army was being recruited and expanded, and it is to be expected that in time of emergency, particularly in the beginning, they would fall short of the need. In 1842, for instance, soldiers slept in their clothes and wore a heterogeneous collection of uniforms. Furthermore, the new model army depended heavily for training on a miscellany of foreign officers, French, English, Prussian, Austrian, who, as Christians, were treated with scant respect by the rank and file. Leadership at the top may have been energetic and knowledgeable, but subalterns and non-commissioned officers were scarce and inexperienced. This was the judgment of one observer in 1828 (C. Macfarlane, Constantinople in 1828 . . ., London 1829, 26). The judgement is echoed by the Marechal de St. Arnaud in 1854 who wrote that in the Turkish Army there were two things only: a commander-in-chief and soldiers and that there were no intermediary points, no officers, and even less non-commissioned officers (E. Engelhardt, La Turquie et le Tanzimat, Paris 1882, i, 116). In Helmut v. Moltke's judgment the advantages of European drill were lost by reason of the impersonality and mass character of the conscript army. The cavalry, he wrote, "... remained in masses, and did not acquire the individuality of the wild Turkish charge; and with their endurance of new customs, the old fanatical inspiration vanished. What was good in barbarian warfare was lost without gaining much benefit from the resources of civilization; popular prejudices were shaken, but the national spirit was destroyed at the same time, and the only change for the better was that the troops obeyed the orders of their leaders more than before". (The Russians in Bulgaria and Rumelia . . ., London 1854, 269.) The deficiency of officers was gradually made good. Māmādī K II sent military and naval cadets to European colleges in 1827, and in 1834 the military college at Pangalti (see Ḥarbīye) was opened. The following decades saw a steady increase in the number of Ottoman military students abroad. The Ottoman army ranks with their equivalents in the British Army is conventionally found in Captain M. C. P. Ward, R.A., Handbook of the Turkish army, London 1900. The 12,000 of Sultan Mahmūd's army were quickly reduced, but it was not until the educational reforms of Sultan 'Abd- al-Hamíd II that a notable extension of military education came about. The creation of this modern military elite, conscious of its superior knowledge and open, by virtue of its training, to European ideologies, was to have momentous consequences in the political history of the Empire and its successor states.
power in the country, Muḥammad ʿAlī determined on forming an efficient army. In 1815, after his return from his second expedient to Mecca, Muḥammad ʿAlī introduced European drill in his forces. The enterprise aroused great discontent and a mutiny broke out in Cairo; Muḥammad ʿAlī had to postpone his plans for the time being. In 1819 he obtained the services of Colonel Joseph Sève, a retired Napoleonic officer (who later embraced Islam and became known as Sulaymān Pasha [q.v.]) to direct training in a new military school which he established at Aswān, away from Cairo. The trainees were Sudanese slaves and 300 of Muḥammad ʿAlī's mamlūks. Sève encountered the same difficulties which European officers met in the Ottoman Empire: insubordination owing to contempt for the European Christian, and utter unfamiliarity with European techniques and drill. To start with, Muḥammad ʿAlī attempted to recruit Sudanese slaves for the rank-and-file, but their rate of mortality was extremely high: of the 24,000 slaves collected up to 1824 only some 3,000 were still alive by then. This method was abandoned and Muḥammad ʿAlī began recruiting from among the Egyptian peasantry. The mūḍir of the provinces were ordered each to provide a fixed quota of recruits. Press-gangs were first used to round up the recruits, an attempt was then made to substitute conscription by lot, by the method, but neither force not persuasion could overcome the peasant's repugnance for military service: resistance, flight, self-mutilation were his unavailing resort; recruitment by lot proving even more unsatisfactory, the press-gang was once again employed. After the Morea campaign, Muḥammad ʿAlī, seconded by his son Ibrāhīm, increased the facilities for the training of officers; an infantry school, a cavalry school and an artillery school, all directed by Europeans, were established, and the French military code was translated and adapted for use in the army. He entrusted the administration of the army to a naṣīr al-dīnḥādiyya, whose labours were to be guided and supervised by a council of officials, diwan al-dīnḥādiyya. By 1831 a disciplined force consisting of 20 regiments of infantry and 10 of cavalry was ready to take the field against the Ottoman Army in the Levant. At the end of the Levant campaigns in 1841 it was estimated that some 100,000 troops, including irregulars, were at the disposal of the Wāli of Egypt.

As part of the settlement between Muḥammad ʿAlī and the Ottoman Empire following his withdrawal from the Levant, the Egyptian Army was reduced to 18,000 troops, by a fermān of 13 February 1841. This figure was, however, informally increased by vizieral letters under the khidvate of ʿAbbās I and Saʿīd, the informal arrangement being confirmed by a fermān of 27 May 1866 issued to Iṣmāʿīl. This Khedive later succeeded in removing the limit on the number of Egyptian troops, a fermān to this effect being issued to him on 8 June 1873. But following his deposition, and consequently on the disturbed and enfeebled state of Egypt, the Ottoman Government was able to withdraw this concession on the accession of Tawfīk, and a fermān of 7 August 1879 once again limited the number of Egyptian troops to 18,000.

The second year of Tawfīk's khidvate saw the promulgation of a law (of 31 July 1880) which laid down that all Ottoman subjects in Egypt regardless of religion were liable, from the age of 19, to four years' active military service, followed by four years' service in the redif and a further six in the territorial reserve. The recruits were to be chosen by lot from among those liable to conscription. It seems that this law contributed to the discontent which led to the ʿUrābī movement, since ʿUrābī and his friends argued that four years active service were not enough to gain promotion from the ranks; they therefore considered this law as directed by the Turkish element in the Army against the Egyptian element. An indication of their feelings on this matter is the law of 22 September 1881, which they forced the Khedive to promulgate, and which made promotion regular and mandatory once the prescribed periods of service, and examinations, were passed.

Following the collapse of ʿUrābī's movement and the British occupation of Egypt, the Khedive, by a decree of 17 September 1882, disbanded the Egyptian Army prior to its reorganization. A Khedivial rescript of December 1882 provided for a new army to be formed limited to 10,000 men. This army was intended for internal purposes, its general officers were British and its methods of training and organization followed the British model. Khedivial decrees promulgated in 1886 reiterated the provisions of the Law of 1880 and further allowed exemption on payment of a bādal (a decree of 22 April 1895 disallowed exemption by payment of bādal after the holding of the annual recruitment ballot). At the reconquest of the Sudan in 1898, the Army was increased by the recruitment of Sudanese volunteers, and thereafter reverted to 10,000-15,000 men until the signature of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936.

The attempts to reform military institutions in Persia during the nineteenth century were neither as sustained nor as systematic as in Egypt and the Ottoman Empire. Persia was drawn into European politics during the Napoleonic period, and both France and Britain attempted to acquire exclusive influence in the country. The French sent a mission to train Persian troops in 1807-8, as did the British in 1810. Thereafter a succession of foreign officers, Russian, French and Italian, attempted to introduce European drill and techniques, but their impact was neither profound nor lasting. In 1842 a modified form of conscription was introduced. The cultivated land was reorganized into paddies and districts, each unit (the amount of land which could be tilled by one plough) being liable to provide a soldier together with a monetary contribution, part of which went to provide for the conscript's family and part to the Government, to defray the expenses of the soldiers. The division of the country into British and Russian zones of influence following the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, and the events of the First World War, prevented the Persian Government from exercising effective control over its armed forces, and it was not until after the coup d'état of 1921 that Riḍā (Rizā) Shāh, who then became commander-in-chief, was able to organize the Persian army on the European model. A Conscription Act passed in 1925 provided for universal military service for a period of 2 years. A military college was also set up in Tehran.

The successor Arab States which were set up after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire in the First World War had, under the mandatory régime, small volunteer forces organized and trained by the mandatory governments whose methods of training and organization tended to influence later practices. On attaining full independence these states speedily introduced universal conscription, the administration of which was still the object of the Government of ʿIrāq, the first to do so (by Law No. 9 of 1934), encountered armed resistance to conscription among
the Uplaphites tribes and the Yazidis of Diijal S judge.

A table of equivalent ranks in the armies of the Arab states is conveniently set out in 'Abdallâh al-
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Umar b. Hafsun broke out and the district of Jaen riha. The form Qlzan, which occurs on many maps, is spurious; it is said to be the plural of *saqar* (sand hill), whereas the plural of *faran* word is actually *al-faran*.

The name appears to have belonged originally to the wadi, which rises in Djabal Razih and the territory of Khawlan in the Yanam, flows south of Djabal al-Urr, and then turns south-westwards to empty into the Red Sea at the modern port (lat. 16° 32′ N, long. 42° 33′ E). A detailed list of tributaries is given in al-ʿUkyayl, i, 33-5, along with the names of 15 small dams (*ʿāhm, pl. ʿāḥām*). The *sayl*, with a volume of water reaching 500,000 gal, a second and waves over 10 m. high, make the lower reaches one of the most productive agricultural regions in Arabia, but without proper flood control much of the water is wasted. The principal crops are millets (*dhura* and *dakhn*) and sesame; other grains, cotton, and indigo are also grown. The soil is so rich that fertilizers are not needed, and four plantings a year can be raised. In 1360/1361 the Saudi Arabian Government, with technical and financial assistance from the United Nations, was implementing a scheme for erecting a large dam across the wadi, modernizing the irrigation system, and building good roads to link the port with its immediate hinterland.

Two channels, one of which is known as the Pearly Gates, lead from the open sea past the Farsan Bank to Dijayan port. The approach is beset with shoals, and large vessels must anchor a mile or more offshore. A haven for dhows lies inside the reefs. The town is built beside hills, the highest rising c. 60 m. Probably salt domes in origin, the hills are now capped with forts. There is no other port of this size in the Yemen. The high ground in the vicinity, and on the landward side the town is encircled by a salt flat. Round grass huts with conical roofs of African design prevail, but there are also a number of masonry houses, along with a new hotel, hospital, customs house, and school, all of modernistic aspect.

The climate is trying, with very high temperatures and humidity and fierce sand storms in summer, and the water supply is poor, the only sweet wells lying some distance out of town. Many inhabitants are stricken with malaria during the monsoon rains. Pearl fishing was once the occupation for which Dijayan enjoyed special fame. On the outskirts of the town a salt mine is exploited commercially; the open face of the salt is c. 5 m. thick.

Dijayan province, sometimes called Tihamat Ṣarīr [see Ṣarīr and the accompanying map], embraces, in addition to the lowlands, the mountains west of the continental divide on the crest of which stands Abhā. Among the mountains belonging to Dijayan are those of al-Kalur, Harūb, al-Rayth, Banū Malik, and Fayțā, all of which are 50 km. or more from the coast. The port of al-Kahma, cut off from the rest of the province by a lava field, its hinterland.

Adil, and allied good roads to link the port with its immediate hinterland.

The Almohads entered the town in 543/1149, but it was devastated the whole day since it was still in the summer of 557/1162 but failed to capture it; and Ibn Mardanish, irritated by the defection of some of these springs existed before the Arab period, i.e. before the 8th/13th and 9th/14th centuries the town was subjected to constant attacks by the Banū Marīn and the Nasīrs of Granada and, thanks to its powerfully-built castle, became the defensive bastion of Castile. Al-Idrīsi, and Ibn al-Rawd al-Mihr, noted the variety of springs, both hot and cold, within the town; but there are also a number of masonry houses, with conical roofs of African design prevail, but there are also a number of masonry houses, along with a new hotel, hospital, customs house, and school, all of modernistic aspect.

The climate is trying, with very high temperatures and humidity and fierce sand storms in summer, and the water supply is poor, the only sweet wells lying some distance out of town. Many inhabitants are stricken with malaria during the monsoon rains. Pearl fishing was once the occupation for which Dijayan enjoyed special fame. On the outskirts of the town a salt mine is exploited commercially; the open face of the salt is c. 5 m. thick.

Dijayan province, sometimes called Tihamat Ṣarīr [see Ṣarīr and the accompanying map], embraces, in addition to the lowlands, the mountains west of the continental divide on the crest of which stands Abhā. Among the mountains belonging to Dijayan are those of al-Kalur, Harūb, al-Rayth, Banū Malik, and Fayțā, all of which are 50 km. or more from the coast. The port of al-Kahma, cut off from the rest of the province by a lava field, its hinterland.

Adil, and allied good roads to link the port with its immediate hinterland.
were Kināna, al-Azd, and Ḥawlān. It has been suggested that Ghassān [q.v.] once lived in this part of Arabia.

A comprehensive list of the modern tribes is provided by al-ʿUqayli, i, 83-93, including 12 tribes in the lower wadi with Diyāzān port as their headquarters and 17 in the upper wadi centered on Abu Ārīsh [q.v.]. Among the more important ones are the Maṣārīḥa near Abū Ārīsh, the Diyāzānīra along the coast of Saḥāy, and Banū ʿṢuḥʿa with their capital at Darb (or Darb Banū ʿṢuḥʿa, incorrectly shown on the map in ĖP, i, 708 simply as Darb). The province contains a noteworthy linguistic boundary: in Diyāzān port and Abu Ārīsh and to the south the old form am for the definite article is still common, while in Ṣawā and Bayḥā and to the north it goes way to al-

The information given here on the history of the province supplements the account in the article Sābīn.

The name Diyāzān (Dījāzān) occurs in a ḥadīth attributed to the Prophet, in which it is bracketed with Damād, the name of the wadi immediately to the north. Diyāzān when mentioned in the early geographers apparently refers to the wadi only, and not to a town.

The dates 573-93/c. 983-1003 are suggested by al-ʿUqayli for the rule of Sulaymān b. Tārīf (or Tārīf, the region or the coast of Bayḥā, but these dates are not certain. Possibly al-Husayn b. Saʿlām (d. 402/1011-2), the Ziyādīd vizier who improved the pilgrim road to Mecca, was the one who broke Sulaymān's power and brought al-Mīkhāfīd Sulaymānī back under Ẓiyādī rule.

Husayn al-Iṣām, 101-3, presents new evidence to show that ʿAbd b. Muḥammad al-Sulayhī was killed in 459/1067, not in 473/1081 (cf. ĖP, iv, 516). If this is correct, ʿAll's victory in the battle of al-Zārib could not have taken place in 460/1068; Husayn al-Iṣām, 83, dates it in 450/1058.

The time of the establishment of the Sulaymānīd sharīfs in the Mīkhāfīd is undetermined. One source states that Diʿūd b. Sulaymān, great-grandson of Muḥammad al-Dījāzāni, was the first of the line to migrate from the Hijāz to the Mīkhāfīd, in the days of the Rāṣid al-Hādī Yaḥyā (d. 298/910). However, the Sulaymānīds do not appear to have transferred the core of their power to the Mīkhāfīd until after the final defeat in Mecca, c. 462/1070, of their leader Ḥamza b. Wāḥḥās at the hands of the Hashīmīd Abū Ḥaḍīm Muḥammad. Ḥamza's son Yaḥyā and grandsons Ghānīm both held authority in the Mīkhāfīd. The Sulaymānīds from Ghānīm on are often called Ghanīmids (al-Ghawānīm), a name which has the advantage of avoiding confusion with Sulaymān b. Tārīf. Wāḥḥās b. Ghānīm was the Ghānīmīd killed in battle near Ḥarād by the Māḥīd ʿAbd al-Nabī b. ʿAllī in 560/1164.

Under the Ziyādīds, the Nāḏāḥīds, and the Mahdīs, parts of the Mīkhāfīd. If not the whole region, were at times brought under the nominal or real suzerainty of Zābīdī, the capital of all these dynasties (204-569/819-1174). For example, Surūr, who as vizier was the power behind the Nāḏāḥīd throne, 529-531/c. 1135-56, secured the Mīkhāfīd as a fief for himself. From time to time the Zāydi Imām, often reigning in Saʿda in the highlands almost due east of Diyāzān, intervened in the affairs of the Mīkhāfīd.

Under the Āṣyābīds the Ghanīmīds in the Mīkhāfīd were called the Shuṭṭūt, the meaning of which sobriquet is not given. Two sons of Kāsim b. Ghānīm in succession revolted against Āṣyābīd rule but were overcome.

The Rasūlīd al-Malik al-ʿAsfar ʿUmar b. Yūsuf (d. 696/1296) in his Tahrīf al-ṣūrābīd names Hāshim b. Wāḥḥās, a great-great-grandson of Ghānīm b. Yaḥyā, as lord of Diyāzān in his time. Other Ghanīmīds were lords of Bayḥā and Bāḥra, while members of collateral branches ruled in lower and upper Damād, Ṣawā, and al-ʿLūṭaʿa (al-Ṣukaykh).

In the early 9th/10th century a new branch of Ghanīmīds appeared, the Kutbids, the issue of Kutb al-Dīn Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad, who chose as their capital Darb al-Najīd, the ruins of which are still to be seen near Abū Ārīsh. The Kutbīds were usually subject to the Rasūlīds and later to the Tāhirīds. In 882/1477 or 884 the Sharīf of Mecca, Muḥammad b. Barakāt I, raid ed the Mīkhāfīd and carried off much loot, including precious books. The connexion of Barakāt II's brother and rival, Aḥmad Diyāzān (or al-Diyāzānī, d. 905/1505), with the Mīkhāfīd is not clear. He may have lived with his Ghanīmīd relatives there for a time and secured support from them. One of his descendants was ʿAbd al-Malik al-Diyāzānī. Some of the descendants of the Sharīf al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad AbūNumayy (d. 1010/1601) were also known as Dhowā Diyāzān. Visiting Diyāzān in 909/1503, Varthema found 45 vessels from different countries in the port.

The time of the establishment of the Sulaymānīd sharīfs in the Mīkhāfīd is undetermined. One source states that Diʿūd b. Sulaymān, great-grandson of Muḥammad al-Dijāzāni, was the first of the line to migrate from the Hijāz to the Mīkhāfīd, in the days of the Rāṣid al-Hādī Yaḥyā (d. 298/910). However, the Sulaymānīds do not appear to have transferred the core of their power to the Mīkhāfīd until after the final defeat in Mecca, c. 462/1070, of their leader Ḥamza b. Wāḥḥās at the hands of the Hashīmīd Abū Ḥaḍīm Muḥammad. Ḥamza's son Yaḥyā and grandsons Ghānīm both held authority in the Mīkhāfīd. The Sulaymānīds from Ghānīm on are often called Ghanīmīds (al-Ghawānīm), a name which has the advantage of avoiding confusion with Sulaymān b. Tārīf. Wāḥḥās b. Ghānīm was the Ghānīmīd killed in battle near Ḥarād by the Māḥīd ʿAbd al-Nabī b. ʿAllī in 560/1164.

Under the Ziyādīds, the Nāḏāḥīds, and the Mahdīs, parts of the Mīkhāfīd. If not the whole region, were at times brought under the nominal or real suzerainty of Zābīdī, the capital of all these dynasties (204-569/819-1174). For example, Surūr, who as vizier was the power behind the Nāḏāḥīd throne, 529-531/c. 1135-56, secured the Mīkhāfīd as a fief for himself. From time to time the Zāydi Imām, often reigning in Saʿda in the highlands almost due east of Diyāzān, intervened in the affairs of the Mīkhāfīd.

Under the Āṣyābīds the Ghanīmīds in the Mīkhāfīd were called the Shuṭṭūt, the meaning of which sobriquet is not given. Two sons of Kāsim b.}
mental in bringing about the capture by Muhammad 'Ali Pasha's forces of the Wahhabi highland chief, Tamí b. Suł'ayb al-Rufaydi, who recited the Kur'an as he was paraded through the streets of Cairo in a scene described by al-Djabarti, IV, 219-20.

Combes and Tamisier, visiting Djayzan in 1835, observed that the commerce of the port had greatly declined as a consequence of Muhammad 'Ali's monopolistic practices. Senna and coffee were sent from the mountains to Cairo.

The most powerful of the Khayratids who came after Hámid was his grandson nawab al-Hasuyan b. 'Abd (regn. 1840-8), who held Filutha as far south as Mocha and even occupied for a time Ta'if and other places in the mountains of al-Yaman al-A'asf. Beaten in battle by the Zaydi al-Mutawakkil Muhammad b. Yahyá, al-Hasuyan abdicated. Under Ottoman rule two of al-Hasuyan's sons served short terms as Ka'limaksams in Abu 'Arish.

The last Khayratid, a nephew of al-Hasuyan b. 'Abd, revolted against the Turks and ruled independently and oppressively for a brief span. His name is given by al-UqaylI as al-Hasuyan b. Muhammad, whereas Nayl al-watar, i, 356, calls him al-Hasan.

Having supplanted the Turks in the Mihlgah in 1909, Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Idris defeated them two years later at al-Hafah, close to Djayzan port. The capital was moved by al-Idrisi from Abu 'Arish to Sabýa.

Under Saudi Arabian administration the capital has been transferred to Djayzan port. The fullest description of the port and province in recent times is given by Pibby, who was there in 1936.


**Djazá (Ar.), recompense, both in a good and in a bad sense, especially with reference to the next world; thawdb (Ar.) means the same but usually only in a good sense. Opinions differed on its nature, duration, the recipients, and how men knew of it. The Mu'tazila held that God must reward goodness and punish wickedness; reason shows this though some held that the eternal duration of recompense was known only by revelation. The opposing view was that it is not a subject for argument; if He sends all to the fire, it is His justice, and if He takes all into paradise, it is His mercy. The Mu'tazila of Básha said that God must reward goodness but may forgive all sinners. Ibn Karrám taught that revelation told that reward may be merited. Some said that reward should be eternal because it is greater than man's merit but not punishment because of God's mercy, though wilful disobedience to Him deserves an eternity of penalty. The common view was that no believer would be kept in the fire for ever; God would at last deliver him. Most Mu'tazila and the Khawáwíl said that great sins sent the sinner to the fire for ever but Djibáli said that the fate of obstinate unbelievers only and that the fire drew such to itself by its nature, God did not send them. Ka'bí said that venial sins would not be punished in the fire but that they might add up to great. Múrdrá said that even venial sins sent to the fire for ever. Some argued that, if the penalty were limited, so should the reward be, for man's acts are limited. Another view was utilitarian; if God's threats were to be efficacious, they should be as wide as possible but, if encouragement were needed, the limitation of punishment should be stressed. The general view was that all infants would go to paradise though some made their lot depend on the religion of the parents.

Bíshr b. Mu'tamír [q.v.] said that God can punish infants without being unjust. Some held that believing djinn would be in paradise in both others thought there would be no resurrection for them, either because there was no resurrection except as a reward or no reward except after responsibility and on either ground djinn were excluded. Some said that useful animals would be in paradise in both more beautiful forms to delight the blessed while noxious beasts and insects would be in the fire, helping to torment the wicked but feeling no pain themselves. Paradise is a reward for merit or bounty to those without it, infants and madmen. The nature of recompense was in dispute, whether spiritual, corporeal or both; Nazám argued that bodies were needed if the blessed were to eat and drink. He also said that there were no rewards in this world as blessings were only for encouragement; he also said that God cannot lessen the joys of paradise nor the pains of the fire. Djabáli taught that the torments in hell were not profitable to any but were the result of wisdom and justice. A saint, seen in a dream, said that friends were eating and drinking before the throne but God knew that he cared for none of these things so granted him to look on His face. It was one of the challenges against the belief that the blessed only a resurrection of the spirit. Ka'bí said that if the hand of a thief were cut off and he died an unbeliever, it was given to one who had lost a hand but died a believer or was given to some other believer. The next world is dár al-djazá.


**ii.—Ottoman Penal Law**

In Ottoman usage, djazá means punishment and kánim-i djazá (cezai) a penal code.

The oldest Ottoman penal code so far discovered forms part of the kánim-námé of Memenreddi II published by Kraeltz (MOG, i, 1921, 13-48). It deals chiefly with those criminal offences that are to be punished by strokes and fines. Soon it was enlarged by an additional chapter, a siyásétnámé [q.v.] (see Belleten, vi, 1942, 37-44), which prescribes capital or severe corporal punishment (siyásel) and regulates criminal procedure. This enlarged code constitutes the first part of the so-called Kánimnámé of Süleyman I (TOEM, 1329, suppl.) which in its major parts,
however, seems to have been compiled already under Bayezid II. A third criminal code came into existence in Suleyman I's time. This *kônûnûmdeme*, which will be the most comprehensive penal code which followed French law until 1926. After a short time, however, they introduced their own penal code, proclaiming their wish to abrogate many *bidâ* of the previous rulers and alleviate the plight of the population by reducing penalties and abolishing abuses in criminal procedure. The numerous provincial *kônûnûmdemes* contain relatively few penal regulations, since in principle the same criminal law was in force in all parts of the Ottoman Empire. In some Muslim countries conquered early 10th/16th century the Ottomans at first confirmed existing secular, including criminal, law, such as the *Dhû 'l-Kadr* codes (Barkan, *Kanunlar*, 119-29). After a short time, however, they introduced their own penal code, proclaiming their wish to abrogate many *bidâ* of the previous rulers and alleviate the plight of the population by reducing penalties and abolishing abuses in criminal procedure. In Ottoman criminal codes wide use is made of *ta* zabir (i.e., discretionary punishment by the *kâdi*). In the form of corporal chastisement, generally the bastinado, [see *Falaka*]. For many offences the penalty is a fine (*belâlîk, *gîrîme*), with or without *ta* zabir and often in addition to damages. Fines are laid down either as fixed amounts of money (mostly graded in accordance with the financial circumstances of the offender) or set in a certain ratio to the number of strokes inflicted on the criminal. In many instances slaves and non-Muslims pay half the fine of a free Muslim, but in the case of the non-Muslims this privilege is partly cancelled out by their being graded differently. The fines constituted a considerable income for the fief-holders and/or governors (or their subordinates); in later periods *kâdis* often exacted fines for themselves. Many offenders were also condemned to be beheaded, ganching, strangling, etc. Other severe penalties, the cutting off of a hand or the nose, the emasculation, are rarer penalties; sending to the galleys, banishing, gaoling, strangling, etc. Other severe penalties mentioned in *kônûnûmdemes* are emasculation, the cutting off of a hand or the nose, the branding of the forehead, etc.

The *kânûn*, though pretending merely to complete the *şarî'a*, diverges from its criminal law in a number of important points. On the one hand, it commutes certain *hadd* penalties or seems to assume that they are commonly commuted to lighter punishment. On the other hand, it extends the range of many penal regulations of the *şarî'a* and adds a great many delicts not covered by it. With a view to serving, above all, the interests of the State and ensuring public peace and order, many more crimes are made punishable by death (*suyûdâlî kâllî*); many of the penalties are evidently meant to be preventive or intimidating. The monetary fines and some of the corporal penalties laid down in the *kânûn* are unknown to religious law. The treatment of attempt, complicity, and repetition of offences in the *şarî'a*. Most important, the *kânûn* frees criminal procedure from the latter's limitation and strict regulations. Similar to the earlier *muâlîm* (*şarî'a, *kâdis*) and *muflâsîb* jurisdiction in other Muslim countries, the Ottoman *kânûn* accepts evidence that is not admissible according to the *şarî'a*. This is not regarded by it as insufficient. Admission of guilt may be obtained by torture; suspicion and the criminal past of the accused are taken into decisive consideration. In several later *kônûnûmdeme* manuscripts, marginal notes, mostly ascribed to the Nişâbûrî, abolish some regulations of the criminal code because of their inconsistency with the *şarî'a*.

The Ottomans tried to eliminate the traditional dualism of *kâdis* and *muâlîm* jurisdiction by making the *kâdis* administer both *şarî'a* and *kânûn*. Ordinary citizens were generally to be punished by the governors, *subaşı*, veyravadis, etc. only after a trial by a *kâdis*, but in reality this rule was constantly violated. The clash between the authority of the *kâdis* and the governor in the administration of criminal justice remained a major problem throughout Ottoman history. Certain classes of the population (soldiers and other *hâshi,* şîmâr-holders, *şerîfs,* *ulemâ*, foreigners, etc.) were in many cases subject to special penal regulations and tried by separate tribunals. Trade delicts and certain religious and moral misdemeanours were dealt with by the *muflâsîb* (*q.v.*).

The Ottoman penal codes were not conceived merely as laws for the protection of society from the criminals but to a large extent also as a means of protecting the people from oppressive officials and fief-holders. Sultan Süleyman I ordered that a bound copy of the penal and feudal *kônûnûmdeme* be sent to every law-court, but to what extent its criminal regulations were actually enforced is not known. From the 11th/17th century, in any case, the *kânûn* for various reasons began to lose its practical importance. Criminal justice was henceforth based exclusively on the *şarî'a* as administered by increasingly corrupt *kâdis* or the arbitrary will of oppressive governors and their subordinates. Ottoman criminal justice, praised by European observers in earlier periods for its efficiency, degenerated completely.

Modern reform of Ottoman penal law began under Mahmûd II. After the destruction of the Janissaries (1826), governors were forbidden to inflict the death penalty without the formal sentence of a *kâdis*. A new penal code, published in 1840 in the spirit of the Gülûhâne Charter, still largely aims at curbing tyrannical officials. Penalties are reduced and procedure is to become more regular; every capital punishment has to be confirmed by the Sultan. This primitive and very deficient law was somewhat improved by the code of 1851, only to be replaced in 1858 by a completely different, secular and comprehensive penal code which followed French law and, with many amendments, remained in force until 1926.


*AL-DJAZA'I* is the name given to the islets just off the north-west coast of Algiers Bay,
and which now constitute the Admiralty of the town. The Arabs applied the name of the islets to the town, which was founded in the 4th/10th century on the mainland opposite them, and which the Turks later called the capital of Algeria, and has remained so ever since. It was the French who transformed its Arab name into "Algier" (Alger). It lies at a latitude of 36° 47' N., and a longitude of 3° 4' E. (Greenwich). In the census of 1954 a municipal population of 355,000 was recorded, of whom 162,000 were Muslims; in 1959, the population of Greater Algiers (city and adjacent communes) stood at 805,000, of whom 456,000 were Muslims.

The discovery in 1940 of an important collection of Punic coins, of lead and bronze, found in the district neighbouring the port (J. Cantineau & L. Leschi, "Monnaies puniques d'Alger," in Comptes Rendus Ac. Inscr. et Belles Lettres, 1941, 263-77), is ample proof of the existence of a Phoenician warehouse, probably on the islets, with the name Icosim (the isle of owls, or thorns).

The Latin form of the name, Icosium, was given to the Roman settlement on the mainland. It is not known at which date this was founded, but it was not an important settlement, although it was the seat of a bishopric. We find no more reference to it in historical documents after the fifth century.

According to al-Bakri (Desc. de l'Afr. sept., 1941, 263-77), is ample proof of the existence of a Phoenician warehouse, probably on the islets, with the name Icosim (the isle of owls, or thorns).

The Latin form of the name, Icosium, was given to the Roman settlement on the mainland. It is not known at which date this was founded, but it was not an important settlement, although it was the seat of a bishopric. We find no more reference to it in historical documents after the fifth century.

Very little is known of the town before the Turkish period. It is probable that the original city wall extended as far as the Turkish wall, but that the density of building within it was much smaller. The Turkish wall, 3,100 m. long, was continuous, even on the coastal side, and was equipped with towers and a moat. Five gates gave access to the city: the Fishery gate and the Fleet gate on the harbour side, Bab al-Wad to the north, Bab 'Aziz to the south, and Bab Djaddid to the southern side. Various other fortifications reinforced the protection offered by the city-wall: the Kasba, which in 1816 became the residence of the Dey of Algiers, was built in 1556 to replace a Berber stronghold on the summit of the triangle which the town then formed; the Fort l'Empereur, built on the site of Charles V's camp; several forts and gun emplacements between the Bab al-Wad and Bab 'Aziz gates along the sea-front, and on the rampart which circumscribed the port.

In 1554 a Spanish levy on the city occupied the islets in order to suppress the corsairs. When it was realised that this would seriously impair their prosperity, the inhabitants and their leader, Sallim al-Tamī, sought for an ally to help rid them of the Spanish yoke. When they summoned to their aid the Turkish corsair, Ḥarād [q.v.], who at that time ruled over Djedjelli, he did not succeed in expelling the Spaniards, but seized the town himself and established it as his principal base of operations. The Spaniards attempted to recapture Algiers in 1516 and 1519, but met both times with failure. After the death of Ḥarād in 1524/1518, his brother Khayr al-Din assumed power, but was not able to maintain control over Algiers, and fell back to Djedjelli, 926/1520-5. Then in 1525 Algiers once more sent out an appeal for assistance, and on 27 May 1529 he succeeded in capturing the fortress (Penon) which the Spaniards had built on the largest of the islets. The Penon was pulled down, and the materials served to construct the breakwater which henceforth protected the islets with the mainland. Such was the origin of the port of Algiers.

Meanwhile, Khayr al-Din had bequeathed his conquest to the Ottoman Empire, which was thus in possession of an important naval base in the western Mediterranean. It is therefore in no way surprising that Charles V attempted to capture Algiers in 1541. On October 23 his forces landed on the shores of the Bay of Algiers, and after crossing the Wadī Harrāsh, they set up camp on a hill overlooking the town, now known as the Fort l'Empereur but at that time called Kudyat al-Sābūn. But during the night of 24-5 October the weather quickly deteriorated, and half the landing fleet was lost in the consequent storm. Defeated as much by the element as by the Turks, Charles V was forced to abandon much material and withdraw from Algiers, leaving it with a legend of invincibility which remained intact until 1830.

Charles V's expedition served as a warning signal to the Turks, and they proceeded to extend and perfect the fortifications, especially on the seaward side, until Algiers literally was a stronghold. Moreover, it had become the capital of a considerable Turkish province, enjoying a de facto independence of Constantinople, and was the operating base for many corsairs. All these factors contributed to its great economic and social development, beginning in the 16th century.

The city of Algiers grew in size under the Ottoman rule. In the census of 1954, the population of Greater Algiers (city and adjacent communes) stood at 805,000, of whom 456,000 were Muslims.
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long roots in the past, often of Andalusian or Moorish origin, forming the bulk of commercial and artisan classes; the numerous Kabyles, forming the labouring class; Saharanis from Biskra and the Maâb; Jews (4,000 in 1830), the richest of whom had come from Leghorn in the 18th century, and enjoyed the privileges of Europeans; some European business-men and consuls; finally, those taken prisoner from the Christians, numbering as many as 25,000 in 1834 (P. Dan). It is clear that the population was just as much Mediterranean as North African.

As far as is known, the town of Algiers was placed directly under the authority of the head of government. The judicial system was administered by two Kâds, one from the Hanafî school for the Turks, the other from the Mâlikî school for the Arabs. They worked together with a tribunal of rabbis and consuls representing the Jewish and Christian minorities. The police-force was staffed by Shaykh (Turkish cãdãh (q.v.)) under the command of a bâdoch shâhwîc. There was one force to deal with the Turks, and another to deal with the Moors. To complete the administration, there was a chief of municipal services (shaykh al-balâlu), and a mixwâr, more or less the equivalent of the mubâhâsh in Moroccan cities. The Jewish community had its own police force also and enjoyed the protection of their respective consuls.

Privatizing was the great industry of the Turkish era. After having taken the form of a holy war or of a conflict between the Ottoman Empire and the Austro-Spanish Empire of Charles V and Philip II, it became a profitable business and therefore the chief occupation of the inhabitants. All sections of the population benefited from it—the government, which received part of the takings, private individuals, who formed companies to arm the ships, and the general populace, who gained from the generosity of the privateers and wealthy ship-owners. It also led to an influx of adventurers, usually of European or Mediterranean origin, who ‘took to the turban’ to give vent to their spirit of adventure and taste for plunder, or simply to avoid falling into the hands of slave-traders. It has been estimated that there were 8,000 renegades in Algiers in 1634.

Such piracy often provoked reprisals from the European powers. They generally took the form of naval bombardments of Algiers, some of which caused serious damage. The Spaniards bombarded it in 1567, 1775 (the ensuing landing did not succeed) and 1783, the Danes in 1770. The main attacks came from France (1661, 1665, 1682, 1683, 1688) and England (1622, 1655, 1672). After having been largely suppressed by the end of the 18th century, privatizing experienced a revival during the wars of the French Revolution and the First Empire, and the British consequently carried out further shellings in 1816 and 1826.

The French invasion of 1830 had been prepared in 1808 by Major Boutin, an engineer officer sent by Napoleon to make a first-hand report of the conditions necessary to carry out such an operation successfully. The general lines of his plan were used by those who prepared the expedition of 1830; the French forces landed on the shore of the Sidi Farrãgh peninsula, to the west of the town, on 14 June, and by the 29th they had reached the defences of the Fort l'Empereur. It was captured on 4 July, and on the following day the town itself surrendered, without having suffered much damage.

For many years the French lived within the existing urban boundaries, although they did burst out at one or two points. But as the town’s population increased, it overflowed northwards (Bâb al-Wad quarter) and southwards (Bâb âAzîn quarter). Today the metropolis extends to the suburban districts of Saint-Eugène (N), Hussein Dey (S.-E.), Birmandres (Bîr Murâd Ra’îs) (S), El-Biar (S.-W.) and almost as far as Bouzareâ (W). Its growth remains uninterrupted, and is gradually spoiling the open spaces and gardens which formerly surrounded the town. The port has undergone a considerable expansion in recent years, and in 1955 it registered the movement of 9387 ships and 500,000 passengers. The airport of Maison-Blanche (25 kms. E. of the town) meets all the requirements of modern international air services.

The organization of local authorities has been modified since April 1959. The city, divided into arrondissements on the French pattern, together with the neighbouring communes, forms the single municipality of Greater Algiers.

After the Anglo-American landings of 8 November 1942, Algiers became the provisional capital of France until Paris was liberated in August 1944. Since the beginning of the Algerian revolution on 1 November 1954, Algiers itself has been the scene of political events of far-reaching importance, particularly those of 6 February 1956, 13 May 1956, 4 July, and on the following day the town itself surrendered, without having suffered much damage.
the sandjaks of Gallipoli (Gelibolu) with the khadijs of Galata and Izmid. Khayr al-Din Barbarossa, who submitted in 940/1533, and his successors were masters of three jadhig and members of the divan-i humayun. He already governed Algeria and Mahdiyya. His eyalet was extended to incorporate the sandjaks of Kodia-i, Sughla and Bigha in Asia, and Negropont (Ergibroz, Euboea), Lepanto (Aynakabdh), Karli-i, Mitylene (Midilli), and Mista (Mizistre) in Europe. Rhodes (Rodos) was added after his death and about 1027/1616 Chios (Sakli), Naxos (Naka) and Andros (Andhra). In 1052/1642 Algiers became virtually independent. Cyprus was added to the eyalet about 1080/1670 but was detached again in 1115/1703 when it became a kingdom of the Grand Vizier. It reverted to the Kapudan Pasha in 1199/1785. Mistra and Karli-i were attached to the eyalet of the Morea by Mehmet iivara Kara Mustafa Pasha, and by the time that the Tanzimat abolished the jurisdiction of the Kapudan Pasha the eyalet consisted of the six sandjaks of Bigha from which it was governed, Rhodes, Chios, Mitylene, Lemnos (Limni) and Cyprus. In 1876, after the transfer of Bigha to the eyalet of Kuhdvandirc, the centre was moved to Chios and later, in the course of further reorganizations, to Rhodes. Cyprus was occupied by Britain in 1878; Rhodes and the Dodecanese islands passed to Italy after the war of 1912-2, and were incorporated in the Greek kingdom after the second world war; the remaining islands were occupied by Greece during the Balkan war, and the ‘eyalet of the islands’ ceased to exist. The islands of Imroz (Imbros) and Bozdja-Ada (Tenedos) [qq.v.] were returned to Turkey by the treaty of Lausanne, 1923.

Bibliography: S. FrasherT, II, 342; further information will be found in the articles on the various islands, placed under their Turkish names.

AL-DJAZARI, the historian Shams al-Din Abü 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Majdi al-Din Abi Işhāq Ibrahim b. Abi Bakr b. Ibrahim b. Abd al-Rahman b. Abl al-Hasan, was born at Damascus on 10 Rabi i 658/25 February 1260. He studied with a number of teachers including al-Faîr 'Ali al-Buhārī, Ibrahim b. Almād b. Kāmil al-Takl al-Waszīṭī, Ibn al-Mugjāwīr and al-Dīnyāstī [q.v.]. Hard of hearing, he was a good conversationalist, pure of heart, sincere and upright; he liked the company of virtuous people, towards whom he showed great magnanimity. His fame chiefly rests on his historical work styled al-Ta'rihk al-musammam bi-hawdith al-samān wa-'nābdhikh wa-wafyādī al-a'ābīr wa-'l-'ayān min abnā'īh, better known by the shorter and simpler title of Ta'rihk al-Djazari. It is a large work of which only the last volume is preserved both in the library of Köprülüzade at Istanbul and in the Dār al-Kutub al-Miṣriyya. Several other copies are also to be found in European libraries; a detailed analysis of the Paris fragment was published by J. Sauvaget in 1951. The remaining portion, however, still awaits an editor. It is patterned more or less on the lines of al-Isbāhāni’s Ta’rihk al-Islām, arranged as a diary of events (annals). The latter’s work is apparently a continuation of al-Djazari’s. The Istanbul MS. has a detailed biography of the author appended to it in the hand of his friend and admirer the historian al-Kāsim b. Muhammad al-Birzālī [q.v.] who also compiled for him a Mabkha al-Mashrikha (Mashrikha) comprising the biographies of ten of his šayāḥ. The extant portion of his work is in three volumes and comprises the events of thirteen years (1052/1352) onwards until his death in 739/1338. He was rated very highly as a historian, and his work would have proved a mine of information had...
It consists of three districts (kāra), the Dayrābīra in the east, the Diyar Muṣṭar in the west, the Diyar Bākrist in the north. The Dayrābīra was the capital of the Dayrābīra. The whole of it survived. Al-Dhahabi and al-Birzall have both utilized it and extensively quoted from it. Al-Dhahabi however, is of the opinion that fathers who inhabited them in the pre-Islamic period and at the beginning of the Islamic period. But even in ancient times there were already Arabs in the Dayrābīra and one of its districts, that of Nisibis (Nāṣibīn) was called Arvastan by the Persians and Bēhq Arabābya by the Arameans. Apart from the Arabs, the Dayrābīra contained considerable Aramean elements, especially in the Tūrābīdān and a number of localities bear Aramean names, and there were Kurds in the Mosul region and Armenians to the north of the upper Tigrīs.

The Dayrābīra is of great importance historically, being astride the lines of communication between Ṭrāk and Anatolia (it is crossed by the Baghādād railway), Ṭrāk and Syria on the vast curve of the so-called Fortile Creṣcent, and between the Armeṇo-Iranian regions and Syria on the one side and Ṭrāk on the other. It contained many market-towns and cities on the banks of the two rivers and on their tributaries in the Tūr ʿAbdīn and along the Mawsil-Raḵkā road. In the Romano-Byzantine period it was divided between Persia and Rome-Byzantium. At the time of the Arab conquest, Byzantium held the region extending from the region of the Tigrīs to the plain of Iraq and the plain to the south of the Tūr ʿAbdīn. The frontier lay between Nisibib and Dāra, at the fort of Šardja (Yāḵūt, ii, 516; iii, 70; Abū Yūṣuf Yaṯākī, K. al-ṭhārdādī, ed. 1302, 22, tr. Fagan, 62). After the conquest of Syria the Byzantine garrisons were isolated, only being able to communicate with the Empire through Armenia. Ṭiyād b. Qhann therefore encountered no resistance; the western part was conquered between 18/639 and 20/641, and the eastern part in 20/641 by troops coming from Ṭrāk (al-Baladhūrī, 171 ff., ed. Cairo, 179 ff.).

In the Umayyad period the Dayrābīra was the scene of strife between the Syrians and the Ṭrākīs Sīḥīs: Sulaymān b. Ṣurād, supported by the Kaysīs Zuṭar b. Ṭaḥḥāth, was killed in 65/685 in a battle near Raʾs Ayn against a lieutenant of Ḫubayd Allāh b. Ziyād; after Mulṯṣār’s victory over the Syrians in 67/686 on a tributary of the Zāb, the victors occupied Nisibib, Dāra and Sindjar (see al-Ṭabarī and Ibn al-ʿĀṯīr under the years indicated). ʿAbd al-Malīk, before being able to go on to defeat Muṣʿab b. al-Zubayr at Dayr al-Dajjāl in Ṭrāk in 72/691, first had to conquer the Dayrābīra. It was also in the Dayrābīra that the fighting between the Kaysīs and Ṭaghlābīs took place before and after this date (cf. al-Ṭabarī and Wellhausen, Das arabische Reich, 126 ff.; Eng. tr. 202 ff.). In like manner numerous Khārdādīs revolted started in the Dayrābīra at the time of al-Ḥādhīdādī, and later in the reigns of the last Umayyads when the Khārdādīs of the Dayrābīra all but succeeded in seizing power (see Wellhausen, Oppositionsparteien, 41 ff.). It was in the Dayrābīra, at Harrān, that the last Umayyad, Marwān II, had his capital.

At the time when Muḥṣīya was governor of Syria the Dayrābīra was joined with it under a single administration. It later became a separate province comprising the three districts, responsibility for it being sometimes held by members of the Umayyad family, such as Muḥammad b. Marwān and Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malīk who were at the same time governors of the neighbouring province of Armenia. Marwān was possibly called after Marwān II that it became the capital of the Dayrābīra.

The Dayrābīra did not submit to the ʿAbbāsids without resistance, and there were even grave in-
The Djazira is the home of the Hamdanid family who, after various wanderings (their ancestor Hamdan was himself a Khāridji), extended their power over the entire province which was divided between the two Hamdanid amirates of Mosul and Aleppo which, though recognizing the nominal authority of the caliph, were almost independent. It then passed under the domination of the Buwayhids of Baghdad after the conquest by Aḥmad b. Tahir, governor of Syria and the Djazira, particularly after al-Mahdī's reign. The province was known as a Kūfīa, and in the second part of the 3rd/9th century with Musāwir, and later with Harūn al-Ḥāshīrī [see the references given in diyār rabi'ā]. The caliph al-Mu'taṣim put an end to these revolts (same references).

In the 'Abbasid period Mosul was at times separated from the administration of the Djazīra, at other times the province was included in a larger grouping. Armenia, the neighbouring province, was often linked with it or on occasion united merely with the Djālār [see diyār bakr]. Among the governors of the Djazīra worthy of note, we may mention Tāhir b. al-Husayn and, later, his son 'Abd Allāh b. Tāhir in al-Muʾmūn's reign. In the second part of the 3rd/9th century the Djazīra for a time escaped from the central authority and became a dependency of the Tūlānīd ruler of Egypt, with 'Isḥāk b. Kundāğiḥ, then Muhammad b. Abī 'l-Sadāqī, and then 'Isḥāk's son. But it was recovered by the caliph al-Mu'taṣim after 279/892.
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In the time of the Romans the present Algeciras was called Ad Portum Album, and in Christian sources there are references to two places with the name Algeciras, one on the island which was later deserted, the other on the mainland which kept its name and importance since its harbour and bay have from remotest antiquity provided a safe anchorage, even in winter, and it is the starting point for the crossing to Ceuta, a distance of only 12 miles. The Almohads almost always preferred to cross by the Tarifa-Alcazarseguir route, which is 14 miles across, and the Marinids followed their example.

The town is situated on a hill dominating the sea, and its walls go right down to the sea-shore; the citadel, built of stone, rises sharply above the ravine that lies alongside the town, to the East. Through the town runs a river, the Wadi 'l-'Asal — river of honey—which has kept this name in Spanish; its banks are covered with orchards and gardens. To the south-east, not far from the gate to the sea, was the Mosque of Banners where the standard-bearers met before the invasion, whilst to the sea, was the Mosque of Banners where the standard-bearers met before the invasion, whilst to the sea, was the Mosque of Banners where the standard-bearers met before the invasion, whilst to the sea, was the Mosque of Banners where the standard-bearers met before the invasion, whilst to the sea, was the Mosque of Banners where the standard-bearers met before the invasion, whilst to the sea, was the Mosque of Banners where the standard-bearers met before the invasion, whilst to the sea, was the Mosque of Banners where the standard-bearers met before the invasion.

In 479/1086, al-Mu'izz delivered it to Yusuf b. Tashfin who went into al-Andalus to rout Abu'l-Va'il at al-Zallakka. Yusuf lost no time in fortifying the town and repairing the weak points in the walls; he had the town entirely surrounded by a moat, laid in stocks of arms and food, and installed a picked garrison of his best soldiers. On his second crossing he again disembarked at Algeciras, setting out from there to lay siege to Aledo. The Almohads occupied the place in 524/1130, but Abu'l-Va'il laid waste its territory and that of Ronda in 569/1173 and 578/1182. In 629/1231-2 Algeciras recognized Ibn Hūd. Alfonso the Learned blocked Algeciras by sea in the summer of 677/1278, and the Christian army camped there in March 1279; on 10 Rabī' 1/21 July the Castilian squadron was routed by the Marinids; Algeciras was taken by assault and its defenders put to the sword. In his four Andalusian campaigns Abū Yusuf made Algeciras the base and, after the crossing to Ceuta, a distance of only 12 miles, he disembarked there and set out to lay siege to Tarifa nearby; after being defeated on the Salado on 7 Dīnādā 1/29 October 1340, he returned to Algeciras where he had left his harem, and from there went back to Morocco. With him the Marinids' intervention in al-Andalus came to an end; two years later Alfonso XI laid siege to his seat naval base and, after twenty months of fierce fighting, succeeded in taking it. In 771/1369 the sultan of Granada recaptured it and completely destroyed it.

The territory was annexed to that of Gibraltar and it was not separated administratively from San Roque until 1755. Later, it developed rapidly in the 18th and 19th centuries and, in 1905, an international conference on the question of Morocco was held there.


Djazirat Ibn 'Umar [see Ibn 'Umar, Djazrat].

Djazirat Kays [see Kays, Djazrat].

Djazirat Sharīk, Name given by the Arabs to the small peninsula thrusting from the eastern coast of Tunisia between the two gulfs of La Goulette (El Jālk al-wādī) and al-Ḥammāmāt. As a physical continuation of the Tunisian Dorsal range, its surface is rather hilly and cut by ravines, but in its east and west and particularly its northern parts are wide plains famous since Roman times for their wheat and olives. Its area is about 600 square kilometres. Its farthest point in the north (Cap Bon, or Ra's Mādār, currently called al-Dalgha) is the nearest point of Africa to Sicily. The peninsula is actually a part of the province (wilaya) of Grombalia (Kurunbhālia). Its western and northern parts form a subdivision (delegation, muḥamadiyya) of that province called Kīlibiyya (Kīlibiyya). There are some middle-sized and small towns, such as Grombalia (capital of the province), Korbes (Kurbus), Sulaymān, Manzil Bū Zalfa, and Tazeqzhān; fishing-ports, such as Kīlibiyya, Manzil Tālim, Kūrba, Bāzdī Khātās, and two fairly important ports: Naheul (Nābl) and al-Ḥammāmāt. Communications are assured by railways between Nābil, al-Ḥammāmāt, Manzil Tālim, and Tunis.

Sharīk al-'Abī, after whom the peninsula was named, was one of the officers of the Arab army which conquered Ifriqiya under 'Abd Allāh b. Sa'd b. Abī Sarh in 27/647-9. After the victory of Subayṭīya (Sbeitla, Suffitulm), 'Abd Allāh b. Sa'd sent Sharīk to occupy the peninsula and nominated him its governor. 'Abd Allāh b. Sa'd evacuated Ifriqiya before the end of 28/649 and the Byzantines were able to reconquer the peninsula from their stronghold of Carthage (Kartdjanna). Some 32 years later Abū 'l-Muhāḍhir Dīnār, leader of the Arab troops in Ifriqiya between 55/674 and 62/681, was able to conquer Carthage and consequently assure permanent Muslim domination of this important bridge-head to Sicily.

Owing to its strategic importance, Djazirat Sharīk was always a target for all those contemplating the conquest of Ifriqiya from the sea, and hence for long periods of its history it was a battlefield between Ifriqiya and its attackers. The Normans dominated it after their conquest of al-Mahdiyya in 543/1151 and held it till 555/1160, when the Almohads under 'Abd al-Mun'im b. 'Ali expelled them and annexed Ifriqiya to their Empire. Later, during the 10th/11th century, Djazirat Sharīk, like the rest of
Tunisia, was one of the battlefields in the war between the Spaniards and the Ottomans in their fierce dispute for the hegemony of the Mediterranean [see TUNISIA].

Two other aspects are characteristic of the history of Djazirat Sharik during the middle ages: the first is that its hilly terrain offered refuge for rebels against the governors of Ifrikiya, especially under the Fāṭimids, when a group of the Nakkāriyya (a branch of the Khawārīd) allies of Abū Yazīd [q.v.] caused much trouble to al-Kāfīm; later, during the second half of the 6th/12th century, the Banū Ghāniya [q.v.] invaded Djazirat Sharik and committed atrocities against its inhabitants. The second aspect is that its coasts, as well as those of the adjacent islands of Kawsara (Pantelleria), Kīrkīnna and Dījārna were from the beginning of the 8th/14th century suitable lairs for pirates (ghudt al-bahr), which brought against Ifrikiya the wrath of the Normans, the Pisans, the Venetians, the Spanish, and almost all Europe, and were the cause of disastrous attacks on their part.

Djazirat Sharik was described by at least four of the leading Muslim geographers and travellers in the middle ages, namely al-Bakrī, al-Tidjānī, al-Idrīsī and Yaḥyā. All, except al-Tidjānī, agree that the peninsula was flourishing and rich. Al-Idrīsī calls it Djazirat Bashāsh, after its then biggest town Manzil Bashāsh. Al-Tidjānī, who visited it in 706/1306-7, gives in his Ṭibāḥa the most detailed description we possess, including a sad picture of the peninsula as a result of the devastations of the Banū Hīlāl and the Banū Ghāniya [q.v.]. A branch of the Hīlāliyya, the Banū Dalāḏ, were masters of Djazirat Sharik in his days. He mentions only three towns: Manzil Bashāsh, Shīlān and al-Fallāḥān.


**DJAZIRAT SIKKR** (see NABIR). Spanish Alcira, called by the Muslims the island of the Jūcār, since it is situated between two channels of the river Jūcār, in Latin Suco, one of which is now dry. 37 km. from Valencia, it has a population of about 30,000 and stands at the foot of a natural harbor known as the Ribera which includes the lower part of the Jūcār valley, from Jāttīa to Catarroja and from the sea to the valley of Cárcar. The fertile alluvial plain is one of the richest in the Peninsula. It is watered by the royal irrigation canal of the Jūcār which was constructed by James I the Conqueror in the second half of the 13th century, built up on the site of earlier irrigation works which were not mere ditches to the Arab period but to the Visigothic and Hispano-Roman periods. Orange-trees, rice and horticulture have brought prosperity. Al-Idrīsī praised it for its fertility and the distinction of its inhabitants; he said that in his time it was possible to reach it only by boat in winter, and by a ford in summer, but in 622/1225, according to al-Muʻāḍib, it had a bridge. It must have been inhabited even in prehistoric times, to judge by excavations made on its boundaries, on the mountain of Solā. Its identity with Suco or Sicania Iberica is open to question, and in the Roman period it must have been fortified, as a stopping place on the Via Augusta, to judge by the commemorative tablets found there.

During the Arab period and until comparatively recent times, timber felled in the great pine-forests of Cuenca was transported on the river Gabriel and, after being taken across the Jūcār was brought through Alcira to Cullera, with Denia as its final destination for ship-building and Valencia for building.

Throughout the amirate and Umayyad caliphate its history was uneventful; it was a dependency of Murcia or of Valencia at the time when the first kingdoms of Taifas were created, until the Cid took possession of it when conquering Valencia and its territories. Ibn ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭaghīfīn, reconquered it and then routed and wiped out its division of the Cid's army. In 519/1125 Alfonso I the Warrior, when undertaking his celebrated expedition into Andalusia, tried to seize it; but after several days he was repulsed, and withdrew with heavy losses. In 523/1129 he once again invaded the region, and between Alcira and Cullera he routed another Almoravid army, thereby opening up the way.

When the Almoravids of al-Andalus disappeared and the second period of the kingdoms of Taifas started, Saʿd b. Mardanīsh succeeded in making himself master of Murcia and Valencia, and appointed as governor of Alcira a noble inhabitant of the town, ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Saʿd. During the amirate and Umayyad caliphate it was a dependency of Murcia and Valencia, and appointed as governor of Alcira a noble inhabitant of the town, Ṣufyān; the latter, after seeing Ibn Mardanīsh reinforce the Christian garrison of Valencia and, to make way for him, turn out a number of Muslims from their homes, and fearing that he too would be turned out in the same way, rebelled and joined the Almohads, as Ibn Hamūshk had done at Jaén and ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿd at Almeria.

Believing that he could recapture the town and so set an example, Ibn Mardanīsh laid siege to Alcira in the middle of Shawwal 566/June 1171, helped by his brother Abu ʿl-Hadhīdājī Yūsuf, amir of Valencia; the siege lasted for two months until the middle of Dhū l-Hijjah/August. The caliph, who had been in Cordova since July, and the sayyid ʿAbd Ḥafṣ ʿUmar, who was besieging Murcia, came to the help of the inhabitants of Alcira; but they saw that they were being more and more closely confined, and appealed to Abu Ayyūb Muḥammad b. Hīlāl, the friend and colleague of Ibn Baṣīt during the relief of Almeria. Ibn Mardanīsh, unable to force the town, had to withdraw.

Under the Almohads the town enjoyed a period of comparative calm, but was so threatened by the advance of the Christians; and two celebrated poets, Ibn Khafadja and Abu ʿl-Mutarrif Ibn ʿAmira, sensing that its loss was imminent, wrote with nostalgia of its charms and the beauty of its surroundings. At the end of 1242 James I the Conqueror captured the town.


**DJAZM** (see NAHW).

**AL-DJAZR WA 'L-MADD** (see MADD).

**DJAZULA**. Arabic name of a small ancient Berber tribe in south-western Morocco, doubtless related to the Šāhādja group [q.v.]. In association with the Lamja [q.v.], their kinship they led a nomadic life south of the Anti-Atlas. But, at quite
an early date, some of them began to settle in the western part of this mountain (Djabal Hankisa); their chief settlement was at Tâqhîjizât, now known as Tâkîjîjî, 80 km. south-south-east of Tiznit. It was among them that 'Abd Allâh b. Yasîn was born, the originator of the religious and political movement of the Murâbiîn [g.v.]. The Dîjâzûla took an important part in it and some of them settled in the Moroccan plains.

At the time of the first reverses of the Almoravids in the Sûs, the Dîjâzûla rallied round the Almohads (1531/1532) and joined them with contingents. But the loyalty of the latter at Tlemcen, when faced by their kinsmen the Almoravids, was so suspect that the Almohads treacherously massacred them (533/1144). As a result, they gave a welcome to several persons who had revolted against the Almohads and were severely punished.

Later, for almost a century the Dîjâzûla were subjugated by the Banû Yadâr of Sûs. The latter having introduced Arab Bedouin from the group of the Ma’kîl as allies, the Dîjâzûla in the end united with one of their tribes, the Dîwâ’ûn-Hasûn. At the beginning of the 16th century, Leo Africanus described them as impoverished and bellicose villagers; it was from among them that the first Sa’dîd princes recruited their harquebusiers.

During the decline of the Sa’dîd dynasty, the Dîjâzûla’s country was governed by the Dîjâfîardî (?), the tribe of the Samlala, with Ilîgh as capital. Their domination lasted for about fifty years until 1080/1670; it extended over the Sûs and, for the time being, over Dar’a and Sidîmânas (period of Abu Hûssûn, surnamed Abu Dumay’a). At the beginning of the 19th century a new principality appeared, still with Ilîgh as its centre, founded by a sharîf of the Samlala; it was to be maintained until towards the end of the 19th century. Under the name of the “kingdom of Sidî Hûshem, or Hûshem”, it enjoyed among European travellers |.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|

The ancient Arab historians of Morocco.

Today the name Dîjâzûla is no longer used except for one of the two ethnic-political clans (lajûf) between whom the tribes of the Anti-Atlas district were divided. The former Dîjâzûla are now the confederation of the Wâltûta (Berb. Idâ Ulîtî); the centre of this district is the Tâzawwâl.

In addition to ‘Abd Allâh b. Yasîn and the two persons who form the subject of the following articles, the Dîjâzûla have produced two other men of distinction: the great saint Ahmad b. Mûsâ al-Samlala (d. 971/1563), popularly known by the name Sidî Hûshem; or (Hûshem)”, it enjoyed among European travellers |.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|.|

The Arabic orthography Dîjâzûla (sometimes Dîjâzûla) corresponds with the Berber plurals augûzûlan (archaic) and Iguêlên. Some have tried to identify them with the ancient Getuli. Bibliography: The ancient Arab historians and geographers, in the indexes (in particular those quoted in the bibl. to the article AL-SûS AL-AKSA); Leo Africanus, trans. Épâulard, i, 94, 115; Marmol, L’Afrique, trans. d’Abâlcourt, ii, 42, 75; Justinard, Notes sur l’histoire du Sous, in Archives Marocaines, xxix (1933), 59 and passim; also in Hârûpîûs, v (1935), 269 and vi (1926), 351; Ch. de Pourcâul, Reconnaissance de la carte de Marrûs, 378. (G. S. COLIN)

Dîjâzûla, Abû ‘Abd Allâh Muhammâd b. Sulaymân b. Aqîl Bâkî Dîjâzûla al-Samlala, although both his father’s name and, still more, his grandfather’s are in dispute, according to his biographers and associates was descended from the Prophet, like all founders of religious orders. He was born and bred in the Berber tribe of Dîjâzûla in Moroccan Sûs [g.v.].

After having studied for a time in his native country he went to Fas and entered the madrasa al-şa’îrîn where one can still see the room he occupied. Hardly had he returned to his tribe when he was compelled to go back to north Morocco, after charging himself with a crime he did not commit in order to avoid bloodshed. He went to Tangier, then he sailed for the East, spending forty years (?) there partly at Mecca and Medina, partly at Jerusalem. He returned to Fas, and it was during this second stay that, with the help of books from the library of al-Karawiyûn, he wrote his Dalâ’îl al-şayrî. He was then initiated into the order of the Shâhîlyya, then he withdrew into a hâlû Announcement of the Eternal fourteen years. On leaving his retreat he went to live at Asfî (Safi) where he soon had so great a number of proselytes that the governor of the town felt obliged to expel him. Al-Djâzûla thereupon appealed the help of God against the town which, as a result, was for forty years in the hands of the Christians (Portuguese). It even appears that this Djâzûla’s country was governed by the Dja-fardî (?), or ‘Abd Allâh b. Yasm and the two saints of Marrûs where they were both finally buried side by side, in the place known as Riyâd al-Ârûs where his mausoleum stands. It seems that when the Shaykh was exhumed from his first tomb, his body had suffered no change and it would have been thought that he had just died. Popularly known by the name of Sidî Ben Slûmânn, he became one of the patron saints (tabût al-riqûl) of Marrûkûsh.

There grew up in Morocco a sort of religious brotherhood called the Aşhâb al-Dâllî, whose essential function was the recital of the celebrated collection of prayers. This book of prayers is often carried as a talisman, hanging over the shoulder in an embroidered leather or silver case (lûhîl). Apart from his immense knowledge of Shî‘îsm al-Djâzûla was also a jurisconsult and knew by heart the Mawâdûnu and al-Mîdâshar al-‘arîf of Ibn al-Hâdîjîb. Of his numerous Şûfi works only the following are
now known: 1.—DAL‘IL AL-KHAYRAT WA-DHAWIRAT AL-
ANWAR FI DIKHAR AL-SALAT WALA‘NABI AL-MUQADDIR, a
collection of prayers for the Prophet, description of his
tomb, his names, etc., published several times in
Cairo and Constantinople, and in St. Petersburg in
1842; 2.—HIB AL-FALAH, a prayer, exists in MS. in
Berlin 3886, Gotha 820, Leiden 22003; and 3.—
HIB AL-DIAZULI, now called HIB SUBHAN AL-DI‘IM LA
YASR, which is found among the SHADHILLS, is in
the vernacular.

Al-Diazuli founded a SHADHILLI sect called al-
Djebe, whose adherents are required without fail
to recite the boldsma 14,000 times and the
Dal‘il al-khayrat twice a week, the Dal‘il once
and a quarter of the Kur‘an every night.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ibn al-Kadi, DJEHBAT AL-
ISTUBAS, FAS 1309, 135; Ahmad Baha, NAJAL
AL-IIBIDAI, FAS 1317, 339; idem, KIFAYAT AL-
MUQADDIR, MS. in the Medersa at Algier, fol. 174 v°;
Muhammad al-Mahdi al-Fasi, MUXAT AL-ASMA‘ FI
DIKHAR AL-DIAZULI WA-LA‘HABAH WA-MUKAMMIN AL-
ABAB, FAS 1313, 233; Kadiir, AL-IGRA‘I ‘ALA
NASAB AL-ABAB AL-ARBA‘A AL-ASHRA‘I, FAS 1309; Abi
Hamid, MIKAF AL-MAKADIMIN MIN AKHBAR ABI L-
MUKADIMI, MS. in Bibl. nat. Algiers, 1717, fol. 141;
Wafран‘i, NIZHAT AL-HIDII (ed. Houdas), Paris 1888,
Ar. text, 18; Nafisir, AL-ISTIGHI, Cairo 1312, ii, 161,
iib, 77; Brockelmann, I, 252, S II 359; Leo
AFRICKEN, DESCRI. DE L’AFRIQUE, trans. Epaillard, i, 82;
Descartes, LES SEPT PATRONS DE MARRAKECH, in HEPHRAIS,
1924, 272.

(M. BEN CHENEY)

AL-DIAZULI, ABU MOUSA ISA B. ’ABD AL-‘AZIZ
B. YAMARAKHT B. ISA B. YAMARAKHT, a member of
the Berber tribe of Djazula, a section of the Yaz-
ul, which is found among the Shadhili, is in
Almeria where he taught grammar. It was in this
place that he was first known as a teacher of grammar
merely reproducing his teacher’s lectures on
grammatical rules, which is found among the Shadhili,
HIZB AL-DIAZULI, and some have even said that the Introduction
was a prayer, exists in MS. in
Bibl. nat. Algiers, 1717, fol. 141;
Wafران‘i, NIZHAT AL-HIDII (ed. Houdas), Paris 1888,
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Of his disciples two in particular are noteworthy,
Zayn al-Din Abu ’l-Husayn Yabya b. ’Abd al-
Mu‘ti (or more simply Ibn Mu‘ti) b. ’Abd al-Rahman
al-Zawawi, the first grammarian to compose an
AIHFAYA, and Abu ’l-Umr b. Muhammad b.
’Umar b. ’Abd Allah al-Adzi al-Shalibui who
dited his master’s KANAN, copies of which survive in
the Escurial (Cat. Seren-
bour; no. 2, 36, 190).
Al-Diazuli composed the following works: 1.—
Commentary on the preceding work; 2.—
AL-MUKADDIMA AL-QIARZIYYA; 3.—Commentary on the preceding work;
4.—AMALI FI L-AHKAM (dictations on grammar); 5.—
An abridged version of the commentary by
Abu ’l-Fath Uthman b. Dinm on the dihwar
al-Mutanabbi; 6.—Commentary on the U Dil of Ibn
al-Sarradi (grammar).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ibn al-Abbar, TAKMILA (ed.
Cedera), Madrid 1889, no. 1932; Ibn al-Kaluqan,
ed. de Slane, 486, (Cairo 1310, 19; SayyutI,
BUKHAYAT AL-WADH, Cairo 1326, 369; CHUHRIB,
‘UNSAAN AL-DARDII, Algiers 1911, 231; Ibn
KunfuS, WAFA‘YATI; Abu b. Ali al-Daalaj, al-
FALAKA WA L-MASHAIKH, Cairo 1322, 91; Brockel-
mann, I, 308, S I 341-2.

(M. BEN CHENEY)

DZAJZAR PASHA [see supplement].

DJEBELI [see supplement].

DJEHEL, also DJEHEL, in the Ottoman empire an
auxiliary soldier equipped by those to whom the
state assigned a source of income such as timar,
ilk akces, etc. were designated under the general
term of djebeli or ekgendik (q.v.). Certain wafts and
miliks also were required to send such djebeli to
the Sultan’s army (see for example, VAFSILAR DERGISI,
Istanbul 1280 H., 75). In the Ottoman army the djebeli-bashi
was the superintendent of the arms store at the
Porte, see I. H. USUNURULU, KAPTILIK OCAKLI, ii, Ankara
1944, 3-33).

In the 15th century the arms of the djebeli
decided mainly of a lance, bow and arrow, a sword,
and a shield (cf. KANANIM N SULTAN MEHMET DES EROBERER,
ed. F. Krallert-Greevenhout, MÖG, i, 28; B. de La
Broquiere, VOYAGE D’OUTREMERE, ed. Ch. Scheler, Paris
1892, 221, 269, 270). Soldiers equipped with such
arms and armor were known as djebe or djebeli, or
Ubayd Allah. While in Cairo he endured the greatest privations
and, to raise some money to meet his needs and
to be able to complete his studies, he was on several
occasions compelled to take on the duties of imam
in a mosque in the suburbs, refusing to go into a
madrasa.

On returning from the East, and still in the
grip of poverty, he stopped at Bougie for a time,
which he spent teaching grammar.

In 1543/1548-9 he was in Algiers where he taught
his KANUN to Abu ’abd Allah b. Muhammed b.
Kasim b. Mandas, a grammarian and native of
Ashur. Crossing into Spain, he stayed for some time
in Almeria where he taught grammar. It was in this
town that he was taught how to copy of the JSH by Ibn
al-Sarradji which he had studied with Ibn Barri and
which was in his own handwriting. His creditor to
whom this work was given as security disclosed his
plight to Abu l-’Abbas al-Maghribi, at that time
the greatest ascetic in the land, and he in his turn
approached the Almohad sultan on his behalf. The
latter entrusted al-Diazul1 with the khusba at
the great mosque at Marrakush. He died at Azamur
in 669 or 670 or 690, or else in 616 according to
Ibn KunfuS in his WaFAYAT.
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and inspection (cf. ʿAshikpaşazâde, Taʾrîkh, ed. ʿAli, Istanbul 1332, 135). Most of the ḍebelis in the ṭimār system were of slave origin. (Ḥāli l Nalâcîk)

**DJEEDA** [see YUDA].

**DJEK** [see SHAHDAG].

**DJELEN, son of Sultan Mehmed II, was born on 27 Şâfar 869/22 December 1459 in Edirne (cf. Wāḥîd-i Sultan Djem, 1). His mother, Čicîk Bâkûn, was one of the ḍebelis in Mehmed II's harem. She may have been connected with the Serbian royal house (cf. Thuasne, Djem, Paris 1892, 2). Her brother, ʿAll Beg, was with Djem in Rhodes in 887/1482 (Wāḥîd-i, 7).

Djem was sent to the sandjāk of Kastamonu as his governor with his two ḍalas in the first ten days (awdâl) of Radjâb 873/15-25 January 1469 (Wāḥîd-i, 1; according to Kemâl Paşâzâde, Tevdrîh-i ʿAlî Osman, ed. Ş. Turan, Ankara 1954, 316, 412, he was sent to Magnisa). There, in these early years, he showed a keen interest in Persian literature (cf. I. H. Ertaylan, Cem Sultan, Istanbul 1951, 11-4). He came back to Istanbul for his circumcision in 875/1470-1 (cf. Kemâl Paşâzâde, 316 and to Edirne (cf. Speculum, xxxv/3, 424) to safeguard Rûmâlî during Mehmed II's expedition against Uzun Hasan in 878/1473. A reliable source (Angiollo, 250-2) tells us about leaving his father for more than forty days, his two ḍalas made Djem decide to take the bayʿa (q.v.) of high officials. On his return Mehmed II, though he forgave the young prince, executed the two ḍalas, Kara-Sûkûmîn and Nasîfî (cf. his letter to Djem in Ferîdûn, Mungheʿûlî, 283). In the middle of Shaʿbân 879/20-30 December 1474 (Wāḥîd-i, 1) Djem succeeded his deceased brother Must‛afâ as governor of Karamân in Konya. Karamânî Mehmed Paşa, grand vizier from 881/1476 to 886/1481, favoured Djem (cf. Al-Šahâbî al-Nuṣâmînîyâ, tr. Mağdûl, Istanbul 1269, 285; Th. Spandouy Cantacasis, Petit traité de l'origin de Turchia, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1896, 43). But Bâyezîd, his elder brother, had become virtually the leader of all the opponents to Karamân, which had been especially ruinous for the holders of wakfs and mulkhs in the empire (cf. art. Mehmed II, in IA). Mehmed II himself had serious complaints against Bâyezîd in the last years of his reign (see the documents in Ertaylan, 51, 53).

When Mehmed II died on 4 Rabî‘ I 886/3 May 1481 Karamânî's enemies, supported by the Janissaries, eliminated him, invited Bâyezîd to the throne and took all measures to block the way for Djem (cf. documents in I. H. Ertaylan, 82, 84). When Bâyezîd was in Istanbul Djem came to capture Bursa (Rabî‘ I 886/May 1481). He had the&qf;#8216;Bâbûl read and coins struck in his name (Neghrî, Qânûnmâmî, ed. F. Taeuschner, Leipzig 1951, 220; the silver coin described by H. Edhem, Mehmâh-i ʿOlgânmînîyê, i, Istanbul 1334, No. 447). He cooperated with the Karamânîs (cf. document in I. H. Ertaylan, 97). His proposal for dividing the empire was accepted by Bâyezîd (Neghrî, 22-3). Defeated by the regular forces of the empire under Bâyezîd at Yenissehir on 22 Rabî‘ I 886/20 June 1481 (cf. Wāḥîd-i, 2; Neghrî, 221, Ferîdûn, Mungheʿûlî al-Sâlûtîn, i, Istanbul 1274, 290). Djem fled to Konya (he arrived on 27 Rabî‘ I 886/16 June 1481 and took refuge in Tarsus, a town under the Mamlûks (I. H. Ertaylan, 12 Dümâs, i, 886/9 July 1481). Djem arrived in the Mamlûk capital on 1 Šâḥân 886/26 September 1481 and was received by Sultan Kâyîtbây as a prince (Wāḥîd-i, 3; Ibn Iyās, Bâdâ’î al-sūrâ, 211, 212; Bulûk 1311, 208). When he made the pilgrimage and returned to Cairo (cf. documents in I. H. Ertaylan, 12 Dümâs, i, 886/7 February 1482), the Karamânî pretender (see KARAMÂN-OGHLI) and Mehmedem, sandjâk-beg of Ankara, urged him to return to Anatolia. Despite the objection of the Mamlûk amirs, Sultan Kâyîtbây permitted him to leave Egypt for Anatolia (Ibn Iyâs, ii, 213; Wâḥîd-i, 5; document in Ertaylan, 121). Djem was in Aleppo on 17 Rabî‘ I 887/5 May 1482; Kâsim and Mehmed joined him in Mamlûk territory. While Djem and Kâsim came to lay siege to Konya, Mehmedem Beg, who had moved towards Ankara, was defeated and killed in Çubûk-Çva. They gave up the siege of Konya and went to capture Ankara, but, at the news of the advance of an army under Bâyezîd II himself, hastily retreated. Djem, changing his original plan of going to Iran, fled to Taš-êli in Karamân (29 Rabî‘ II 887/16 July 1482). There he entered into negotiations with Bâyezîd II who always rejected his demand for the assignment to him of at least a part of the Ottoman territories. He only promised a yearly allowance of one million akçe provided that he would retire to Jerusalem (cf. Wâḥîd-i, 5 and his letters in Ferîdûn, i, 291-2; Djem's original letter in Ertaylan, 127). Kâsim, who never gave up the idea of restoring his principality of Karamân, made Djem decide to pass over to Rûm-ei lel (sea). With this in mind Djem made an agreement with P. d'Aubusson, Grand Master of the Knights of St. John in Rhodes. While governor of Karamân in his father's time Djem had had close relations with P. d'Aubusson (cf. Thuausne, 11-7). The agreement of safe-conduct (text in Thuausne, 60, cf. Wâḥîd-i, 7) dated 24 Dümâs, i 887/10 July 1482 provided that Djem could enter, stay and leave Rhodes as he pleased. He arrived on the island on 13 Dümâs, i 887/30 July 1482 (Wâḥîd-i, 7). P. d'Aubusson wrote to the Pope that Djem should be used as an instrument to destroy the Ottoman empire (Thuausne, 68) while Djem hoped that he could at least reach an agreement to partition the empire with his brother. In Sha'ban 887/September 1482 Bâyezîd agreed to a peace treaty with the Knights favourable to the Order and at the same time his ambassador to the Grand Master made a separate agreement about Djem who was to be detained by the Knights so as not to cause any concern to Bâyezîd (Thuausne, 85; document in Ertaylan, 152). In return he was to pay 45 thousand Venetian gold ducats annually to meet Djem's expenses (24 Shawwal 887/December 1482) (Thuausne, 86; for the negotiations now see the documents in Ertaylan, 156-61). It was understood that the Grand Master had Djem's mandate on this matter (cf. Thuausne, 80, 86 and Bâyezîd's letter to the French King in Ertaylan, 180). With the promise of sending him to Hungary via France (cf. Wâḥîd-i, 8) d'Aubusson interned him in the Order's places in France and at the same time his ambassador to the Grand Master went to intercept him on the sea if he should leave Rhodes (see documents in Ertaylan, 142-3, 188). Actually the Venetians must have attempted to seize him on his way to France (doc. in Ertaylan, 158-9; in Wâḥîd-i, 8, Neapolitan ships). Worried lest Djem should proceed to Hungary, Bâyezîd sent envoys and spies to the West to prevent it (see documents in Ertaylan, 186, 189, 192, 193, 203). His envoy to the French King, Hûseyîn, ought to have sent to assure Djem's detention there (Wâḥîd-i, 12; Thuausne, 110).
As DJem was a valuable hostage bringing political prestige as well as money the rulers of the time were most anxious to have him and the Knights had to be always on guard. In 892/1487 they imprisoned him in the *Grosse Tour* or *Tour de Zeisim*, a fort especially built to intern him near Bourgneuf (*Wâhi'dât*, 16; Thuasne, 157). Sultan Kaytibây who had been at war against the Ottomans since 890/1485 and Matthias Corvinus, Hungarian King, maintained active diplomatic relations with the Knights and the Pope to get DJem (for Kaytibây's ambassadors in Europe see Thuasne, 174, 179, 337). DJem's early attempt to get into contact with Matthias Corvinus had failed (cf. *Wâhi'dât*, 11, in *Muhabarr* 888/February 1483).

When DJem was interned in France Bayezid II put to death Gedik Ahmed Paşa, the strong man of the empire, and DJem's son, Oghuz-khan, who was then only three years old (Shawwâl 887/December 1482) (documents in Ertaylan, 167-8).

Finally the Knights and the Pope Innocent VIII thought it necessary "for the general good of Christendom" to transfer DJem to Rome, where he arrived on 1 Rabî' II 894/4 March 1489. He met the Pope in a royal reception ten days later (description of the reception in *Wâhi'dât*, 21-2; Thuasne, 232) and in their private talk DJem complained that the Knights had lured him and imprisoned him in the *Grosse Tour* and treated him as a prisoner. He wanted the Pope to send him back to his family in Egypt asserting that he would never cooperate with the Hungarians against his co-religionists (*Wâhi'dât*, 21-3).

DJem's presence in Rome increased the international prestige and activities of the Pope who now planned a Crusade against the Ottomans for which, he said in the letters to the Christian rulers, the conditions were most propitious (Thuasne, 241, 260, 265).

Bayezid was most worried by DJem's transference to Rome and he protested against it as a breach of the pact on the part of the Knights. Actually Matthias Corvinus was now pressing the Pope and the Egyptian Sultan was offering 150-200 thousand ducats to have DJem. On 17 Muharram 896/30 December 1489 Bayezid's ambassador Kâtipzâde Mustafa Beg, came to Rome with a letter assuring the Pope of his friendship and asking him to stand by the agreement made with the Knights. He had brought with him 120 thousand ducats representing three years' pension for DJem which was to be delivered after Mustafa's seeing him alive. Mustafa saw him and delivered him a letter and presents from Bayezid. (*Wâhi'dât*, 234). On 23 Shawâb 896/9 June 1493 another ambassador of Bayezid came to Rome to renew the agreement about DJem with Alexander VI, successor of Innocent VIII, and delivered 150 thousand ducats as DJem's pension (Thuasne, 314). The Pope gave guarantees about DJem, and, on the other hand he assured the Christian powers that with DJem in his hands he could neutralize the Ottomans in their plans against Christendom. Soon afterwards he could even expect support from Bayezid II against Charles VIII of France who was about to invade Italy. The French King came to Rome in 898/1494 and compelled the Pope to hand DJem over to him for his plans of crusade (1 Diümâldâ I 900/27 January 1495) (*Wâhi'dât*, 30). He was taken by the king in his expedition against Naples. On the way he fell ill and died in Naples on the night of 29 Diümâldâ I 900/25 February 1495. Rumours spread that the Pope had poisoned him (Thuasne, 365-76; Sa'd al-Dîn, *tâdi al-tawârîkh*, ii, 37; but in *Wâhi'dât*, 30-5, the latter's source, there is no hint at DJem being poisoned; Sa'd al-Dîn must have taken this from Idris Bidal's *Islam i-Charbâyân*). The place of the Pope in the story in some Ottoman chronicles, see 'Ali, *Kunh al-akhbâr*, MS.). DJem left a testament (*Wâhi'dât*, 32) in which he expressed the wish that his death be made public so that the "infidels" could not use his name in their plans of crusade, that Bayezid should have his corpse taken to the Ottoman land, that all his debts be paid, and that his widow, daughter and other kin and servants receive proper care from the Sultan Bayezid.

Bayezid learned of DJem's death through the Venetians on 24 Radjab 900/20 April 1495. He made it known throughout the empire by public prayers for DJem's soul (Ferîdûn, 1, 294), and brought back his corpse, which was embalmed and put in a lead coffin (*Wâhi'dât*, 32), from Naples only in Ramadân 904/April 1499. Buried at last in the mausoleum of Mustafa, his elder brother, in Bursa (cf. I. Baykal, *Bursa ve Amillar*, Bursa 1950, 40), DJem's corpse, too, had been subject of high politics (cf. Thuasne, 378-87).

DJem's will was fulfilled by Bayezid II (an official record shows that his daughter Gawhar Malik Sultan was honored by the Sultan with presents in Ramdân 909/February 1504, cf. T. Gökbilgin, *Ednne ne Ede Lima*, Istanbul 1951, 474). His son Murâd, however, who took refuge in Rhodes, was captured during the conquest of the Island and executed with his son on 8 Safar 927/December 1522. Murâd's wife and two daughters were sent to Istanbul (Ferîdûn, i, 539; Thuasne, 389).

DJem, whose poems were collected in two *dwayne*, one in Persian (ed. in part by I. H. Ertaylan, *Cem Sultan*) the other in Turkish (ed. by I. H. Ertaylan, *Cem Sultan*) was considered as a distinguished poet (cf. Latifi, *Tedhkire*, Istanbul 1314, 64). He is also the author of a *Fâsi reyhdn-i Sultan* DJem (ed. by I. H. Ertaylan, *Fânâmne*, Istanbul 1951).

**Bibliography:** Documents connected with DJem and his own letters that are preserved in the archives of Tokapî Sarayî Müzeesi, Istanbul, have recently been published in facsimile by I. H. Ertaylan (Sultan Cem, Istanbul 1951). These original documents as well as the correspondence of DJem in Ferîdûn (*Muneg'eïl* al-Salâfîn, i, Istanbul 1274, 290-) have not yet been studied properly. They are mostly undated. The *lahir delters* of Konya and Karamans contain a number of documents given in the name of DJem (Bayvekâlet Arşivi, Istanbul, tapu def. No. 119, 392, 393, 32, 40, 58, 809). The *Wâhi'd-i Sultan* DJem (ed. M. 'Arîf, Istanbul 1330 H.) was written or dictated by one of the closest men to DJem, Haydar (cf. M. 'Arîf's introduction) Ayâs or Sinân, who had been with him from his childhood until his death. Sa'd al-Dîn (*tâdi al-tawârîkh*, i, Istanbul 1260, 8-40) reproduced it with a few additions from other sources. *Ghûrânâmne* (Ist. Universite Kutuphanesi, Hülas Etenli Kitapları) is an incomplete copy of the *Wâhi'dât*. The collections of poems of *Ayyun-i Tîrmdhî* (Konya Müzeesi Kutuphanesi 2420/16), of Hamîdî (ed. I. H. Ertaylan) and of Kabûlî (ed. I. H. Ertaylan) contain contemporary information on DJem's life in Anatolia. Donato Da Lezze, *Historia turchesca*, ed. I. Ursu, Bucarest 1917; I. Thuasne, *Djem-Sultan*, *Bcnde sur la question de l'esclavage à la fin du XV*-siècle*, Paris 1892; Hasan b. Mahmûd Bayâtî, *Dîmî-i Diem-dîyîn*, Istanbul 1313 H.; Ahmad Sayyid al-Darradî,

Djemal Pasha (Cemal Pas¸), Young Turk soldier and statesman. Ahmed Djemal was born in Istanbul in 1872. He graduated from the erkîn-ı barîsyey mektebi in 1895, was commissioned as a captain in the general staff, and posted to the Third Army in Salonika. There he joined the Macedonian nucleus of the Young Turk conspiracy, the Oldânmîl Ihtidas ve Terakkl Djemîyyeti (Fourth in Europe as the Committee of Union and Progress), using his assignment as inspector of railways in Macedonia to help spread and consolidate the Committee's organization. Following the 1908 revolution he became a member of the Ihtidas ve Terakkl's executive committee (merkez-i 'umami). He participated energetically in the suppression of the 1909 counter-revolution (the Othmdnli IttiJtdd we Terakkl Djem'iyyeti, [known in the West as the Sublime Porte Incident or Bab-i 'Ali Wab'âst]), Djemal Pasha became military governor and wddî of Istanbul. He strongly supported the Unionists' plans for recapturing Edirne in the Second Balkan campaign and, by his forceful measures in rounding up and deporting opposition leaders in the capital, contributed decisively to the consolidation of the new regime; he could not, however, prevent the assassination, in June 1913, of the sadr-ı umâm, Mahmûd Şhewket Paşâ. From this period onward and until the end of the World War, Djemal was widely considered, together with Enver and Talat Paşås, to be part of the informal dictatorial triumvirate ruling the Ottoman Empire. He was promoted to Lieutenant-General, in December 1913 entered the cabinet as minister of foreign affairs, for his mission of modernizing the Ottoman army. In 1917 he was commander of the Fourth Army; for the Arab point of view, see the memoirs of his chief of staff AH Fuad Erden, Birinci Dunya Harbinde Suriye hdtiralan, i, Istanbul 1954. The most detailed and reliable work on Djemal was the memoirs of his chief of staff AH Fuad Erden, Istanbul [1946], 82; Millî Newslî 132, 314 f.; Djemal's memoirs (Khdîrîd 1913-1922, Derne'dedet 1922, and modernized and annotated edition, Hatidar, ed. Behect Cemal (his son), Istanbul 1959; translations: Erinnerungen eines türkischen Staatsmannes, Munich 1952, and Memories of a Turkish Statesman 1913-1929, London, n.d.) are largely an apologia for his conduct in Syria, as is the "red book" La vérité sur la question syrienne, Istanbul 1916, issued by the Fourth Army; for the Arab point of view, see especially George Antonius, The Arab Awakening, London 1938, 150-52, 185-90, 202-2. On the war years in Syria much information will be found in the memoirs of his chief of staff Ali Fuad Erden, Birinci Dûnya Harbinbî Suriye hdtîralar, i, Istanbul 1954. The most detailed and reliable

works in the Syrian provinces and took an active interest in the archaeology of the region. But there were indications of political disaffection among the local Arab leaders, and to these Djemal reacted with characteristic severity. Eleven prominent Arabs were hanged after a summary trial in August 1915, and 21 more, including a member of the Ottoman senate (mejdîsis-ı 'âydn), in May 1916—this time without formal trial. A month later, the revolt in the Hijjaz under the Sharîf Husayn (with which some of the executed Syrians had been connected) was greatly weakened the Fourth Army's position. Early in 1917 the British began their attack on Palestine, and when Djemal was recalled from the Syrian front at the end of the year, his forces were retreating before Allenby's advance.

Djemal resigned as minister of navy along with the rest of the Talâf Pasha cabinet. On 2 November 1918 he fled with Enver and Talat, going first to Berlin and then to Switzerland. (In the meantime his case was tried before an Istanbul court-martial, and he was ordered to be expelled from the army and was later sentenced to death in absentia). While in Europe, Djemal took service with Amir Amân Allah of Afghanistan and upon the mediation of Karl Radek, travelled to Russia, where he secured the support of Chicherin, Soviet commissar of foreign affairs, for his mission of modernizing the Afghan army. While in Moscow, he offered his support to the Turkish nationalist movement under Mustafa Kemal (Atatiirk), with whom he carried on an intermittent correspondence by letter and telegram beginning in June 1920; together with Enver's uncle Khalil Pasha (Halil Kut), he facilitated the diplomatic contacts between the Bolsheviks and Kemalists, which culminated in the Treaty of Moscow of 1921. In the summer of 1920 Djemal stopped in Tashkent, where he recruited a group of interned Ottoman officers for his mission, and proceeded to Afghanistan to assume his post as inspector-general of the army. He returned to Moscow in September 1921 for further negotiations with the Bolsheviks, with Kemal, and with Enver Pasha (who tried to dissuade Djemal from his mission against Kemal and from his adventurous plans in Uzbekistan). On his way back to Afghanistan, Djemal was shot to death in Tbilisi (Tiflis) on 21 July 1922 by two Armenians, Kerekin Lalayan and Sergio Vartayan—his death apparently being part of the same assassination campaign to which Talat and Sa'id Hallim Paša had earlier fallen victim. He was buried in Tbilisî and later reburied in Erzurum.

Bibliography: Türk Ansiklopedisi, x, 141 f.; Ibrahim Alâettin Gövs, Türk meşhûrars ansiklopedisi, Istanbul [1946], 82; Millî Newslî 132, 314 f.; Djemal's memoirs (Khdîrîd 1913-1922, Derne'dedet 1922, and modernized and annotated edition, Hatidar, ed. Behect Cemal (his son), Istanbul 1959; translations: Erinnerungen eines türkischen Staatsmannes, Munich 1952, and Memories of a Turkish Statesman 1913-1929, London, n.d.) are largely an apologia for his conduct in Syria, as is the "red book" La vérité sur la question syrienne, Istanbul 1916, issued by the Fourth Army; for the Arab point of view, see especially George Antonius, The Arab Awakening, London 1938, 150-52, 185-90, 202-2. On the war years in Syria much information will be found in the memoirs of his chief of staff Ali Fuad Erden, Birinci Dûnya Harbinbî Suriye hdtîralar, i, Istanbul 1954. The most detailed and reliable

**DJEMAL EFENDI** [see DJEMAL EFENDI].

**DJEMTYET-I-ILMIYYE-I-OTTOMANIYYE**, the Ottoman Scientific Society, was founded in Istanbul in 1851 by Munif Pasha [q.v.]. Modelled on the Royal Society of England, and perhaps inspired by the reopening of the *Institut d'Égypte* [q.v.] in Alexandria in 1859, it consisted of a group of Turkish officials, dignitaries and scholars, some of them educated in Europe. It was the third such learned society to appear in 19th century Turkey, having been preceded by the *Endümen-i Deryş* in 1851 [see ANQURAH], and by the "learned society of Beşhtik" in the time of Mahmûd II (see DÜJEDET, Ta'rihî, xii, 182; Lutfi, 168-9; Diewâd, 69, n. 1.; Mardin, 229 ft.). The Ottoman Scientific Society arranged public lectures and courses on premises assigned to it by the government, where there was also a reading-room with a small library. Its most important achievement, however, was the publication of the *Medîniyye-i Fânîn*, the first scientific periodical in Turkey, published monthly and dedicated with official support. Besides the natural sciences, history and geography, politics, economics and philosophy figured largely in the pages of the journal, which introduced its readers to classical and European achievements and writings in these fields, and to the scientific, non-dogmatic study of scientific and philosophical problems. Its rôle in Turkey has been likened by Ahmed Hamdi Tanpınar to that of the *Grande Encyclopédie* in 18th century France. It was of brief duration. During the cholera epidemic of 1865 the journal was compelled to cease publication, and after a brief resumption some years later was finally suppressed in 1882 by Sultan 'Abd al-Hamîd II. *Bibliography:* Mahmûd Dëwâd, *Madrî-n-i Ummîyye-Nâşirî-l-i'ilmîyî-yi-ta'rikhî* [see IDJAR]), Istanbul 1832, 369-72; Schelde, *Ueber den neuerschlossenen türkischen Gelehrten-Verein*, in ZDMG, xvi (1863), 682-4; cf. ibid. 711-4; Ali Fuad, *Mûnîî Paşa, în Türk tarik encümenî mecmaus, n.s.*, 1, 1930, 5-6; H. A. Tannapar, *XIX asır Türk edebiyatî tarîhî*, Istanbul 1956, 151-4; A. Adnan-Adivar, *Interaction of Islamic and western thought in Turkey*, apud T. Cuyler Young, *Near eastern culture and society*, Princeton 1951, 124-5; B. Lewis, *The emergence of modern Turkey*, London 1961, 431-2; V. A. Gordlevsky, *Izbrannol Solenîmenî, ii, Moscow 1961, 366-8; Ş. Mardin, *The genesis of Young Ottoman political thought*, Princeton 1962, 238-40. (B. Lewis)

**DJEMSHID** [see DJEMSHI].

**DJENDERELI** [see DJANDAR].

**DJENNE** [see DJENNE].

**DJERBA** [see DJARBA].

**DJERID**, the wooden dart or javelin used in the game of Djerd, i.e., Djerd Oyunu in Turkish and, in the Arabic of Egypt, La'b al-Djerid—a game which was popular and widespread in the Ottoman empire of the 10th/16th-13th/19th centuries. The actual form of the djerd or wooden javelin varied somewhat in the different parts of the empire; its length, moreover, seems to have ranged in general between one and two meters (von Oppenheim, 598-9). The Djerd, in Egypt, consisted of a palm branch stripped bare of its leaves, such being indeed the original sense of the Arabic word *djird*. At the court of the Ottoman Sultan in Istanbul the game of Djerd was much in evidence and never more so than in the second half of the 18th century. It afforded to the pages of the Sultan and to the other personnel of the court an admirable opportunity to show their physical prowess and dexterity. The Djerd Oyunu was in fact a mock battle in the course of which horsemen threw darts at one another, each participant in the game being now the pursuer and now the pursued. Some of the sources declare that the Djerd horsemen sought, during their mounted evolutions, to gain possession of the darts thrown earlier in the game and carried for this purpose thin canes curved at one end (Hobhouse, 634). At Istanbul large numbers of the court personnel often engaged in the *Djerid Oyunu*—indeed rival "factions" existed under the names of Lahanadîl (cabbage men) and Bamyadîl (gumbo men). The game of Djerd demanded a high degree of skill in horsemanship and in the throwing of the javelin or dart (Guer, *Mœurs et usages des Turcs*, ii, 252 gives an interesting account of the methods followed in order to acquire proficiency in this latter art). It meant also for the participants a considerable risk of serious wounds and even of death, since the head was a common target of attack. The Djerd Oyunu was abolished, however, by Sultan Mahmud II (1223-55/1808-39) after the suppression of the Janissaries in 1821/1836, but it survived long after in the provinces as a game popular among the mass of the people. *Bibliography:* Hafiz Khidr El å, *Ta'rikh-i enderîn*, Istanbul A.H. 1276, 6, 111 ff.; 389 ff.; 'Aâtâ, *Tawîk*, Istanbul A.H. 1291, 31 ff.; 127 ff.; E. W. Lane, *Tage-buch*, Frankfurt am Main 1864, 312 (according to von Oppenheim, 599, the westernmost account of the Djerd Oyunu); La Boulaye Le Gouz, *Voyages et observations*, Paris 1657, 291; J.-B. Tavernier, *Nouvelle relation de l'intérieur du Sérail du Grand Seigneur*, Paris 1675, 69-71; G. Bremond, *Descriptions essaye de l'Egitto... tradotta dal Francese dal Sig. Angelo Riccardi Ceti*, Roma 1669, 318; ibid., *Voyage et observations*, Paris 1717, i, 160-2; G. A. Olivier, *Voyage dans l'Empire Othoman*, *L'Égypte et la Perse*, Paris 1801-7, i, 52-3; W. Wittman, *Travels in Turkey*, Asia Minor, Syria and... *Egypt* during the years 1799, 1800, and 1802, London 1803, 35, 125, 208-9; J. C. Hobhouse, *A journey through Albania and other provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia*, to Constantinople, during the years 1829 and 1830, London 1831, 635-3; J. B. Schels, *Militär = Verfassung des türkischen Reiches. Im Jahre 1810... dargestellt (= Österreichische militärische Zeitschrift, Zweyte Auflage der Jahrgänge 1811 und 1812, Zweyter Band, Vienna 1820, 207-350, 279-81*; J. J. Morier, *Ayesha, The Maid of Kars* (Standard Authors, no. 100), 133 ff. (a detailed account of the Djerd Oyunu); *Journal et correspondance de Gédouy* "Le Turc," ed. A. Bobpe, Paris 1909, 126; E. W. Lane, *Manners and customs of the modern Egyptians*, London 1859, 362-3 (an account of the Djerd game as played amongst the peasants of the eastern part of the empire); von Oppenheim, *Der Djerid und das Djerid-Spiel*, in *Islamica*, ii, Leipzig 1927, 590-617; B. Miller, *The curriculum*

(D. JERRY LEWIS)

DJEYED — DJEZAIRLI GHAZI HASAN PASHA

In July 1909, after the Sultan's abdication, Idjihād ceased publication in Cairo, reappearing in June 1911 in Istanbul, where Djewdet had taken up residence. But his troubles did not end with the abdication. In February 1910 the Young Turk cabinet of İbrahim Ḥakki Paşa banned 'the History of Islam' by 'Abd Allah Djewdet Bey, which is directed against the Muslim faith', though it was Dozy's original and not Djewdet's preface to his translation of it which most offended the authorities. He was imprisoned for a month in the winter of 1912, after the Turkish defeats in the Balkan War. His attacks on the official theologians in the pages of Idjihād led to its temporary suspension in 1913 and to a compulsory change in its title on three occasions in 1914. Djewdet's opposition to Turkish participation in the First World War caused the periodical to be suppressed again, from 13 February 1915 to 1 November 1918. Meanwhile he published several non-political works, among them his edition and translation of the Ruhāyyīdī Khayām.

During the grand-vizierate of Dāmmar Fatid Paşa he twice served as director-general of public health. But he again brought himself into conflict with the authorities by an article which he wrote in favour of Bahā'īsm; in April 1922 he was sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment for blasphemy (emhīyya fa'im), but the legal argument dragged on till December 1926. In the result he was discharged and the crime itself was dropped from the new Turkish code. He died on 29 November 1932, working to the end.

His published works, original and translated, number over 60. Among his translations are six of Shakespeare's plays: although all but Antūn ve Kle'opolīt suffer through being made from French versions, they are by no means without merit. He deserves great credit also for making the modern study of psychology known to his compatriots. The long article on Djewdet by K. Siissheim in Ein Suppl., on which the present article is based, gives a complete list of his works and a bibliography, to which may be added: Enver Behnan Şapolyo, Ziya Gökhal, Itibat ve Terakki ve Meşruyet tarikhi, Istanbul 1943, 30, 49-50, 70; Ahmed Bedevi Kuran, Inkillip tarikimız ve Йон Turkler, Istanbul 1945; idem, Inkillip tarikimiz ve Itibat ve Terakki, Istanbul 1948; E. E. Ramsaur, Jr., The young Turks, Princeton 1957; B. Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, London 1961.

(D. JERRY LEWIS)

DJEYED PASHA [see AHMAD DJEYED PASHA], one of the most famous kapudan paşas (Grand Admirals) of the Turkish navy. He was born in Tekfurdaği (Rodosto) on the Sea of Marmora, where he is said to have been a slave in the service of a Muslim merchant; on being set free, he took part as a janissary in the campaign against Austria in 1737-39. At the end of the war he went to Algiers where he was received by the Dey and in the end was appointed beg of Tlemcen. Some time afterwards, to escape from the persecution of the Dey of Algiers, he took refuge in Spain. In 1760 he returned to Constantinople and was put in command of a warship by Sultan Mustafa III. In 1766 and 1767 he obtained command of the kapudan (admiral's flag-ship) and in 1770 took part in the naval war against Russia in the Mediterranean. At the vaga
battle of Cæsme [q.v.] the kapudanpaşa of which he was in command caught fire while an attempt was being made to board the Russian flag-ship, and both ships blew up; Hasan Beg, although wounded, stood against Russia; a short time later the battle of the Dardanelles and from there embarked on a daring manœuvre, as a result of which he succeeded in capturing from the Russians the island of Lemnos which they had previously occupied (10 October 1770). For this brilliant feat he was awarded the title of Ġhazi and the position of kapudanpaşa. In 1773 and 1774 he took part, as serasker of Rustuç, in the continental war against Russia; on all counts he at least had the merit of rebordering the fleet which had been destroyed at the battle of Cæsme and of inaugurating the work of reorganizing the Turkish navy with the help of European technicians, a task which was to be continued by Kütük Hüseyin Paşa [q.v.]. His complicity in the fall and death of Khâlîm Paşa, though a proof of his own fidelity to his master, was nevertheless a dangerous action which delayed the revival of the Empire.

Bibliography: Ahmed Djawid, Hadîkât al-whâzârî, App. II, 41 ff.; Aywânşârâî Hüseyìn, Hadîkât al-джîvâlîwâdî, ii, 28 ff.; Djewed, Tariîqâ, i-v; Ghazawât-i Ġhazi Hasan Paşa, MS. Süleymanîye Kütüph. Esfàf Ef. no. 2149 (for other MSS.: Ağâh Saîrî Levent, Gōzânu-nâmêler, Ankara 1956, 153 ff.) see also Ismail Kuvê, Gazavât-i Cezâyirî Gâzan Hasan Paşa'ya dair in TD, xi, 1960, 95 ff.; Hammer-Purgstall, viii; idem, Staatstruppis... v, 350 ff.; Zinkeisen, vi; W. Eton, A Survey of the Turkish Empire, London 1801, 79 ff.; I. H. Uzunçarsîh, Cezâyirî Gâzan Hasan Paşa'ya dair, TM, 1940-42, 41 ff.; idem, Osmanlı Tarihi, Ankara 1959, iv/2, 446 ff.; I. A., s.v. (by Uzunçarsîh). DÎJÎBÎL, plural of the Arabic djibal (mountain or hill), a name given by the Arabs to the region formerly known as Mâk (Mâda, Media), which they also called Irâk 'Adâmî, to distinguish it from Arabian Irâk, i.e., Lower Mesopotamia. The province came by its name of Dîjâbîl because it is, except in its north-eastern portion, extremely mountainous; it was bounded in the east by the great desert of Khûrâsân, on the south-east by Fârs, on the south by Khûzîstân, on the west and south-west by Arabian Irâk, on the north-west by Âdîbâyâyân and on the north by the Albuurz range. The boundaries were never well defined and therefore underwent frequent changes. According to Işâhêrî (203) and Ibn Hawkal (267) there were antimony mines at Isfâhân. Owing to the altitude, the climate is in general cold and there is much snow in winter.

Bibliography: Yakûtî, ii (= Barbier de Meynard, Dict. de l'Esperance, 153); A. F. Mehren, Manuel de la cosmographie, 248; Mu'âkkâsî, 384; General Sir A. Houtum-Schindler, Eastern Persian Irâk (Royal Geographical Society publication, London 1896); Le Strange, 185 ff.
border of the steppe desert, in a region where the Transjordan plateau perceptibly rises. Its tortuous relief, which makes it appear almost like a wall coloured with granites and porphyries on the east of Palestine, opens however by deep gashes on to the basin of the Dead Sea which receives most of the water of its streams, and for long supported by exports of bitumen the traffic of its commercial routes. It was always a region of communication, the strategic importance of which was plain at the time of the defence of the Roman times against the invasions of the nomads, and at the time of the struggles between the Franks of Palestine (fortress of Montreal or al-Shawbak built by Baldwin I in 1125) and the Muslim principalities of Egypt and Syria. But it was also, until the first centuries of Islam, a cultivated region where the relatively abundant springs permitted the development of small centres of settled population, still attested by numerous ruins although these have been little studied.

In the Hellenic period this ancient land of eastern Edom, separated from the country of Moab by the traditional frontier of the Wâdî al-Hasâ already mentioned, had seen the growth of Nabataean power, the apogee of which must have marked the first period of Arab penetration to the borders of Palestine. We know that entrepôts of Gebelein, like Bosra, the former Mibîsîr identified with the present-day Arandal (Arindela), provided the present-day al-Djîlani, whose school; almost the only exception are some Zaydi saints of either foreign or local origin are venerated almost everywhere; in the Afar country the (false) tomb of a certain shaykh Abu Yazîd, who is said to have however been conquered without a struggle by Yazîd b. Abî Sufîyân and would have been able to continue to live on its former prosperity. Even al-Makdisî (145) knows only al-Sharat, to which he attributes Zughar as its capital and cites Ma‘ân and Adhruh as its principal towns, and Yâkît does likewise, i.e. locating the village of ‘Arandal there. The term al-Djîlûd has then fallen into desuetude, and in the Mamlûk period writers, such as al-Kalkashandi and al-Umarî, only mention, in the niya‘a of al-Karak, the vilâyats of al-Shawbak, Zughâr and Ma‘ân, extending over all the southern part of the province of Syria.

be Abū Yazīd al-Bistāmī [q.v.] dominates the Goda mountain. Besides the veneration of local inhabitants, pilgrims from the Arab and Somali regions sometimes visit it. In Djibouti there are eight large mosques (djidīs) of masonry, and several other smaller ones of lighter construction. Several Somali tribes or tribal groups (Ise, Izaāk, Darōd) have dedicated small mosques or oratories in the town to their eponymous ancestors.

Since 1957, through the application of the law of 23 June 1956, Djibouti, an overseas territory of the French Republic, is administered, under the tutelage of a Governor representing metropolitan France, by a Council of Government, and possesses a Territorial Assembly elected by universal suffrage.


Conscious of the nobility and dignity of his thoughts and actions, of the beauty and the great usefulness of his art, and of the fact that he must be essentially serious and must reject any conduct incompatible with the impassivity which hilm requires, above all laughter and jocularity. This feeling, based upon a narrow interpretation of Kur'ānic provisions against laughter and jocularity, and on the needlessly stiff attitude of some of his contemporaries, and from the start he set out to justify laughter, and to show how it is the very opposite of this attitude. 

Laughing, according to the Koran, for the sake of the enjoyment of God (cf. XXIII, 112/11; XLIII, 46/47; LIII, 60; LXXXIII, 29), however, the Believers will be rewarded in the hereafter, they will laugh and their faces will be bright and joyous (LXXX, 38-9).

Conscious of the nobility and dignity of his religion, of the gravity of his most ordinary actions and the moderation which he must observe in all things the Muslim, when he does not consider himself compelled to shed countless tears [see bakrī], accordingly feels that he must be essentially serious and and should not fail to quote the favourable traditions at greater length and to repeat a certain number of droll anecdotes.

Indeed, the defenders of the joke are not short of arguments; the basic idea which would serve to justify complete condemnation are in fact contradicted by certain hadiths and reflections of wise Muslims, and it is easy to invoke the help of the Prophet himself who joked in various circumstances, as well as the pious forebears who hardly seem to have observed literally the Kur'ānic provisions against laughter and jocularity. The instance of the great imām of Medina is readily taken as a precedent, and one cannot forget the curious but explicable fact, from the 1st/8th century in the Holy Cities, especially Medina, of the rise of an actual school of humourists whose profession it was to bring laughter and who helped to raise the amusing anecdote, the nādira [q.v.], to the rank of a literary form. Irak was not unaffected by this movement, and it is only necessary to glance through the Fihrist (Caire ed., 201 ff., 435) to get an idea of the wealth of collections of anecdotes, either signed or anonymous, in circulation as early as the time of Ibn al-Nadīm; it is very probable that, insofar as they have a historical existence—and it is known that some of them did indeed exist—these entertainers and their aristocratic clients were scarcely embarrassed by prohibitions which others considered absolute. Collections of this kind, which certainly enjoyed a great vogue, have for the most part disappeared—like the imaginative writings, the richness of which is shown by the Fihrist—probably as the result of puritanical reaction, but they have been partly absorbed in more recent collections, and the literature of adab has preserved extracts from them which testify to the enduring though unacknowledged taste of Arab readers for the anecdote that is piquant, not to say obscene and indecent.

Situated on its moral aspect properly speaking, the comic element in fact raises a literary problem which al-Dījāzī appears, once again, to have been the first to define clearly. Inheriting a religious and literary tradition of long standing, he was shocked by the needlessly stiff attitude of some of his contemporaries, and from the start he set out to justify laughter, which he associated with life, and jocularity, stressing its advantages so long as it was not exaggerated, and showing that Islam was a liberal religion which in no way enforced reserve and severity; from there he went on to attack the boredom bred by most writings which, in his opinion, were too serious, and he suggested a levening of a little hāzī in even the most severe speculations; at times he did not hesitate to interrupt a learned argument to quote some anecdotes, at the risk of discrediting the rest of his work, but he succeeded in harmoniously blending together the serious and the comic in
several of his writings, among which the *Kitdb al-Tarbi* wa'l-tadwir is unquestionably the most perfect example; in a word, he wished the literary form of *adab* to instruct while it amused. On this policy of living in a peaceful harmony, as he has many imitators in both West and East, Going still further he put into practice, although unknowingly, the motto castigat ridendo mores, and wrote the *Kitdb al-Bukhald* in which he used laughter as an element in a moralizing design; in this case, however, his success is more questionable, and Ibn al-Djawz appears to be more or less the only other writer who tried to use laughter freely for a similar purpose (*Akbbr al-\hambd wa 'l-mughal-fjl\in*, Damascus 1345, 2-3). In general, comic writings and even contemporary theatrical comedies (a comedy is called *has\iy\ya*) are never looked on as more than an agreeable diversion, without any moral significance.  

(Ch. Pellat)

**Djidjelli** (see [Djoude]).

Djidjelli (so-called in Leo Africanus; Ziceri, Zigeri-Gigerry, Gigeri in western writers) was a coastal town in Algeria, 70 km. west of Bougie and 50 km. east of Collo. Geographical position 36° 49’ 54” N., 5° 44’ 38” E. Population 21,200 inhabitants (1955).

The ancient town of Djidjelli stood high up, where the citadel still stands, on a rocky peninsula which juts out between two bays, one to the west, small and very sheltered, the other lying to the east in a deep basin divided from the open sea by a line of reefs. The present town was built after the destruction of the Turkish town by an earthquake in 1856, and lies along the sea near to the large easterly bay. The port gains a certain importance from the export of cork which comes from the forests of the Little Kabylia.

Djidjelli is of very ancient origin. The Phoenicians in fact established a trading post at this spot, named Idgil, which later passed into the hands of the Carthaginians. During the Roman period the colony of Idigilii was included in Mauretania Caesariensis, eventually being restored to Setifian Mauretania in the time of Diocletian. It was the seat of a bishopric. It passed successively under the domination of the Vandals and Byzantines. When the Arabs became masters of the Maghrib, Djidjelli no doubt retained its independence. Ibn Khalidn tells us, in effect, that for the early centuries of the Hijira it was in the hands of the Berber tribe of the Kut\ama, who inhabited the nearby mountains (Ibn Khalidn, *Hist. des Berb\eres*, tr. de Slane, i, 198). It seems, however, to have been ravaged and in some measure depopulated, since al-Dakri describes it as a town "now inhabited" (*Description de l’Afrique septen- trionale*, tr. de Slane, 193). According to this geographer, some remains of ancient monuments still survived. The inhabitants exported copper ore from the surrounding mountains to Ifrikiya and to other even remoter regions (al-Idris, III* climat, tr. De Goeje, 214). The Hamm\amids who had incorporated it in their kingdom had a castle built there.

Like various other places on the coast of Africa, Djidjelli passed into the hands of the Christians in the 6th/7th century. In 537/H43 George of Antioch, an admiral of Roger II of Sicily, seized the town and juts out between two bays, one to the west, small and very sheltered, the other lying to the east in a deep basin divided from the open sea by a line of reefs.

The present town was built after the destruction of the Turkish town by an earthquake in 1856, and lies along the sea near to the large easterly bay. The port gains a certain importance from the export of cork which comes from the forests of the Little Kabylia.

Djidjelli is of very ancient origin. The Phoenicians in fact established a trading post at this spot, named Idgil, which later passed into the hands of the Carthaginians. During the Roman period the colony of Idigilii was included in Mauretania Caesariensis, eventually being restored to Setifian Mauretania in the time of Diocletian. It was the seat of a bishopric. It passed successively under the domination of the Vandals and Byzantines. When the Arabs became masters of the Maghrib, Djidjelli no doubt retained its independence. Ibn Khalidn tells us, in effect, that for the early centuries of the Hijira it was in the hands of the Berber tribe of the Kut\ama, who inhabited the nearby mountains (Ibn Khalidn, *Hist. des Berb\eres*, tr. de Slane, i, 198). It seems, however, to have been ravaged and in some measure depopulated, since al-Dakri describes it as a town "now inhabited" (*Description de l’Afrique septen- trionale*, tr. de Slane, 193). According to this geographer, some remains of ancient monuments still survived. The inhabitants exported copper ore from the surrounding mountains to Ifrikiya and to other even remoter regions (al-Idris, III* climat, tr. De Goeje, 214). The Hamm\amids who had incorporated it in their kingdom had a castle built there.

Like various other places on the coast of Africa, Djidjelli passed into the hands of the Christians in the 6th/7th century. In 537/H43 George of Antioch, an admiral of Roger II of Sicily, seized the town and
Dali (al-Hadidj Muhammad b. al-Harsh) attacked the town, and the Turkish garrison fled. Bu Dali proclaimed himself sultan and entrusted the government of the pedjelli—one of his supporters—with the title of agha. Sent with a squadron to punish the rebels, the Franks bombarded the town, without result (1805). But shortly afterwards, having been maltreated by the Kabyles, the inhabitants made their submission to the dey who set up a new garrison in the town.

The fall of the Turkish Government in 1830 gave the people of Djidjelli their independence which they kept until 1839, when the sack of a French trading-post made Marshal Vaëde, the Governor-General of Algeria, decide to have the town occupied, on 13 May 1839. But the garrison, having no communications with the hinterland, remained besieged by the Kabyles until the moment when an expedition led by general Saïd-Armand brought the tribes of the Little Kabylia to submission (1851).


**DJIHAD** etymologically signifies an effort directed towards a determined objective. (Cf. *idjihadh*: the work of the scholar-jurists in seeking the solution of legal problems; *mudjihada* or, again, *djihadh*: an effort directed upon oneself for the attainment of moral and religious perfection. Certain writers, particularly among those of Shi‘ite persuasion, qualify this *djihadh* as “spiritual *djihadh*” and as “the greater *djihadh*”, in opposition to the *djihadh* which is our present concern and which is called “physical *djihadh*” or “the lesser *djihadh*”. It is, however, very much more usual for the term *djihadh* to denote this latter form of “effort”).

In law, according to general doctrine and in historical tradition, the *djihadh* consists of military action with the object of the expansion of Islam and, if need be, of its defence.

The notion stems from the fundamental principle of the universality of Islam: this religion, along with the temporal power which it implies, ought to embrace to whole universe, if necessary by force. The principle, however, must be partially combined with another which tolerates the existence, within the Islamic community itself, of the adherents of “the religions with holy books”, i.e., Christians, Jews and *Madjus* [q.v.]. As far as these latter are concerned the *djihadh* ceases as soon as they agree to submit to the political authority of Islam and to pay the poll tax (*diyya* [q.v.]) and the land tax (*sharadj* [q.v.]). As long as the question could still, in fact, be posed, a controversy existed—generally resolved by a negative answer—on the question as to whether the Christians and Jews of the Arabian peninsula were entitled to such treatment as of right. To the non-scripturaries, in particular the idolaters, this half measure has no application according to the opinion of the majority: their conversion to Islam is obligatory under pain of being put to death or reduced into slavery.

In principle, the *djihadh* is the one form of war which is permissible in Islam, for, in theory, Islam must constitute a single community organized under a single authority and any armed conflict between Muslims is prohibited.

Following, however, the disintegration of Muslim unity and the appearance, beginning in the middle of the 19th century, of an ever increasing number of independent States, the question arose as to how the wars which sprang up between them were to be classified. They were never included within the strict notion of *djihadh*—even in the case of wars between states of different religious persuasion—at least according to the general Sunni doctrine; and it is only by an abuse of language that this term is sometimes applied to them, while those authors who seek for a precise terminology label them only as *kitāb* or *mukātāla* (conflict, war). There is even hesitation in referring to the struggle against the renegade groups in Islam as *djihadh*. The viewpoint of Shi‘ite doctrine is not the same, for, according to the *Shāfs*, a refusal to subscribe to their teaching is equivalent to unbelief (*kafr*). The same holds good, a fortiori, for the Khāridjite doctrine (see further *TAHKIR*).

The *djihadh* is a duty. This precept is laid down in all the sources. It is true that there are to be found in the Kur‘ān divergent, and even contradictory, texts. These are classified by the doctrine, apart from certain variations of detail, into four successive categories: those which enjoin pardon for offences and encourage the invitation to Islam by peaceful persuasion; those which enjoin fighting to ward off aggression; those which enjoin the initiative in attack, provided it is not within the four sacred months; and those which enjoin the initiative in attack absolutely, at all times and in all places. In sum, these differences correspond to the stages in the development of Muhammad’s thought and to the modifications of policy resulting from particular circumstances; the Meccan period during which Muhammad, in general, confines himself to moral and religious teaching, and the Medina period when, having become the leader of a politico-religious community, he is able to undertake, spontaneously, the struggle against those who do not wish to join this community or submit to his authority. The doctrine holds that the later texts may replace the former contradictory texts (the theory of *naskh* [q.v.]), to such effect that only those of the last category remain indubitably valid; and, accordingly, the rule on the subject may be formulated in these absolute terms: “the fight (*djihadh*) is obligatory even when they (the unbelievers) have not themselves started it”.

In two isolated opinions, however, attempts were made to temper the rule in some respects. According to one of these views, attributed to ‘Ata‘i (d. 114/732-3), the ancient prohibition against fighting during the sacred months remains valid; while according to the other, attributed to Sufyān al-Thawrl (born 97/715), the *djihadh* is obligatory only in defence; it is simply recommended (*li-'l-nadāb*) in attack. According to a view held by modern orientalist scholarship, Muhammad’s conception of the *djihadh* as attack applied only in relation to the peoples of Arabia; its general application was the result of the *idjamā‘* (general consensus of opinion) of the immediately succeeding generations. At root, of course, this involves the problem as to whether Muhammad had conceived of Islam as universal or not.

The opinion of al-Thawrl appears to have been adopted by al-Dhahī. The heterodox movement of the Ahmadiyya [q.v.], beginning towards the end of the 19th century, would go further than al-
Thawri inasmuch as it refuses to recognize the legitimacy of the *dżihād* even as a recommended activity. Cf., in the same sense, the doctrine of Bābism (see BAB).

According to the general doctrine of the Shīʿa, due account taken of their dogma concerning the absence of the Imam, who alone has the necessary competence to order war, the practice of the *dżihād* is necessarily suspended until the reappearance of the Imam or the *ad hoc* appointment of a vicar designated by him for this task. The Zaydī sect, however, which does not recognize this dogma, follows the same teaching as that of the Sunnī doctrine.

**Characteristics of the duty of *dżihād***. The *dżihād* is not an end in itself but a means which, in itself, is an evil (*jasād*), but which becomes legitimate and necessary by reason of the objective towards which it is directed: to rid the world of a greater evil; it is "good" from the fact that its purpose is "good" (ḥasan li-husn bayḥšīk).

A religious duty. The *dżihād* has the effect of extending the sway of the faith; it is prescribed by God and his Prophet; the Muslim dedicates himself to the *dżihād* in the same way that, in Christianity, the monk dedicates himself to the service of God; in the same vein it is said in different ḥadīths that "the *dżihād* is the first of the characteristics of Islam"; the *dżihād* is "an act of pure devotion"; it is "one of the gates to Paradise"; rich heavenly rewards are guaranteed for those who devote themselves to it; those who fall in the *dżihād* are the martyrs of the faith, etc. A substantial part of the doctrine reckons the *dżihād* among the very "pillars" (*arkan*) of the religion, along with prayer and fasting etc. It is a duty which falls upon every Muslim who is male, free and able-bodied. It is generally considered that non-Muslims may be called upon to assist the Muslims in the *dżihād*.

A "collective" obligation (*fard kifāya*) in contrast to *fard* (*ayn*). The *fard* (*kiṣyā*) is that duty which is imposed upon the community considered as a whole and which only becomes obligatory for each individual in particular to the extent that his intervention is necessary for the realization of the purpose envisaged by the law. Thus, as soon as there exists a group of Muslims whose number is sufficient to fulfill the needs of a particular conflict, the obligation of the *dżihād* no longer rests on the others. The general teaching is that the duty of *dżihād* falls, in the first place, individually as a *fard* (*ayn*), upon those who live in the territory nearest to the enemy, and that the same holds good in the case of the inhabitants of a town which is besieged. In the organized State, however, the appreciation of the precise moment at which the *dżihād* is transformed into an *ayn* obligation is a matter for the discretion of the sovereign; so that, in the case of general mobilization, the *dżihād* loses, for all the members of the community, its character of *fard* (*kiṣyā*), and becomes, instead, *fard* (*ayn*).

All this implies, however, that for those who hold the reins of authority and, in particular, the sovereign, the *dżihād* is always an individual duty, since their own personal action is necessary in every case. Where there are several independent Muslim states, the duty will fall upon the ruler of the state which is nearest to the enemy.

Further, the duty of the *dżihād* is relative and contingent in this dual sense that, on the one hand, it only comes into being when the circumstances are favourable and of such a nature as to offer some hope of a victorious outcome, and, on the other hand, the fulfilment of the duty may be renounced in consideration of the payment by the enemy of goods reaching a certain value, if such policy appears to be in conformity with the interests of the moment.

**Its subsidiary character**. Since the *dżihād* is nothing more than a means to effect conversion to Islam or submission to its authority, there is only occasion to undertake it in circumstances where the people against whom it is directed have first been invited to join Islam. Discussion turned on the question as to whether it was necessary, on this ground, to address a formal invitation to the enemy. The general doctrine holds that since Islam is sufficiently widespread in the world, all peoples are presumed to know that they have been invited to join it. It is observed, however, that it would be desirable to repeat the invitation, except in cases where there is ground for apprehension that the enemy, thus forewarned, would profit from such a delay by better organizing his defences and, in this way, compromising the successful outcome of the *dżihād*.

**Its perpetual character**. The duty of the *dżihād* exists as long as the universal domination of Islam has not been attained. "Until the day of the resurrection", and "until the end of the world", say the maxims. Peace with non-Muslim nations is, therefore, a provisional state of affairs only; the chance of circumstances alone can justify it temporarily. Furthermore there can be no question of genuine peace treaties with these nations; only truces, whose duration ought not, in principle, to exceed ten years, are authorized. But even such truces are precarious, inasmuch as they can, before they expire, be repudiated unilaterally should it appear more profitable for Islam to resume the conflict. It is, however, recognized that such repudiation should be brought to the notice of the infidel party, and that he should be afforded sufficient opportunity to be able to disseminate the news of it throughout the whole of his territory [see *ṣulh*].

A "defensive as well as offensive character". The *dżihād* has principally an offensive character; but it is equally a *dżihād* when it is a case of defending Islam against aggression. This indeed, is the essential purpose of the *ribāt* [q.v.] undertaken by isolated groups or individuals settled on the frontiers of Islam. The *ribāt* is a particularly meritorious act.

Finally, there is at the present time a thesis, of a wholly apologetic character, according to which Islam relies for its expansion exclusively upon persuasion and other peaceful means, and the *dżihād* is only authorized in cases of "self defence" and of "support owed to a defenceless ally or brother". Disregarding entirely the previous doctrine and historical tradition, as well as the texts of the Koran and the *sunna* on the basis of which it was formulated, but claiming, even so, to remain within the bounds of strict orthodoxy, this thesis takes into account only those early texts which state the contrary (v. supra).

A letter on leather, addressed in Arabic by the Sogdian ruler Diwatisht to the governor Djarrar b. 'Abd Allah about 1010/19, was discovered in 1932 in Zarafshan, Iran. A. Sprenger, 'Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed', iii, 240 ff. (E. Tyan)
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most precisely the limits and divisions of the Djíl-
likyya at his own time, that is to say when the
kingdom of the Taifas was at its height. In the
name from the river Ashtru, an unknown name which
cannot be identified phonetically with the Nalón,
the principal river in Asturias; the third zone is
south-west Galicia, and its inhabitants, owning only
the small enclave between Braga and Oporto, took
from the latter town the name "Portuguese"; the
fourth zone, situated in the south-east, was called
Castile corresponding with the kingdom of Leon
and Lower Castile, at that time with fortresses at
Grañón in the province of Logroño, 25 km. from
Najera, Alcocero on the Oca 30 km. from the same
town, and lastly Burgos caput Castellae. Al-Bakrí
was familiar with Constantine's division of the
Peninsula into six zones; in the second of these
zones, the centre of which was Braga and Britain, he
includet the kingdom of the Taifas; in the Célèsta
names Oporto, Tuy, Orense, Lugo, Britania—now
Santa Maria de Bretonia, in the partido judicial
of Mondoñedo—Astorga, in the province of Leon, St.
James of Compostella—which can only be the town
of the Golden Church (Kanisat al-dhāhab), although
Al-Bakrí makes them two distinct towns—and
lastly Iria—now Padrón in the province of La
Coruña—Batea, an unnecessary name; and Sarria,
35 km. south of Lugo. Ibn ʿAbd al-Mun'im, following
al-Bakrí, describes Galicia as a country with flat,
sandy ground while the inhabitants are depicted as unscrupulous warriors, highly primitive in their
customs. On the other hand al-Maḳḳari praises them
for their beauty and remarks upon the good qualities
of captives; but all are agreed in thinking their
reckless courage equal or even superior to that of
the Franks, and in striking contrast to the character
of the Visigoths and Hispano-Romans before the
Muslim invasion.
Under the one name Djjlikyya Arab historians
include the kingdoms of Asturias and Leon; in their
view, the kings of both are Galician, and the towns
Galician also, Oviedo and Leon like Zamora and
Astorga. Military expeditions by the Caliphate did
not succeed in reestablishing a firm hold upon the
territories south of the Duero which had been lost;
and although ʿAbd al-Rahmān III and al-hāḏiq al-
Mansūr were successful in imposing their authority
over the kings of Asturias and Leon and making them their vassals, the victorious campaigns of the
latter, which reached their apogee with the capture
and sack of St. James of Compostella, completed the
wide ring of devastating raids into the territories of
the Great Djjlikyya; and very soon afterwards,
when the Umayyad caliphate crumbled, it was these
kingdoms, springing from the nucleus of Galicia,
which carried the war into the Muslim territories and,
under Alfonso VI, even captured Toledo.

Bibliography: Ibn ʿAbd al-Mun'im al-Himyari, Al-Rawd al-miṣrār, ed. in part Lévi-
Provençal, 26, 66 and 185 in text, 35, 83, 233 and
248 in the trans.; Ibn ʿTahāri, ed. ibid.; al-Maḳḳari, passim; Maḳḳari, Analektes, i, passim; Dozy, Recerches, i, 89 ff.

(A. HUCI MIRANDA)}
Sefarî-Ḥişâr. Mehmed Gûlghen Efendi (Kulliyât-i Ḥudrat-i Ḥuda‘î, 1338-40 A.H.) varies this to Sivri-Ḥişâr and gives the date of birth as 950/1543-4, but to Bursa where he was appointed madrası at the Kök-Ḥişâr of Konya, the latter bringing the date of birth forward to 948/1542-3. Ḥuda‘î studied in Istanbul before becoming an instructor (mu‘âlid) at the madrasa of Sultan Selim in Edirne, from where he went to Syria and Egypt as assistant kâdi (nd‘ib). He went next to Bursa where he was appointed mudarris at the Farhâdiyya madrasa and nd‘ûb at the Court of the Old Mosque (Djâmî-i ‘Attîk). Tradition has it that at this time that he saw in a dream a vision of some people whom he considered righteous tormented in hell, and others in heaven whom he had thought sinners. He thereupon made his submission to Shékîh Uftâde. The Ṭabîyân and the Kulliyât give the date of the conversion as 985/1577, the latter giving another version of the story, according to which Ḥuda‘î first served Uftâde for some three years and was then sent as the latter’s haľîfa to Sivri-Ḥişâr (op. cit., 4 ff.). Going later to Istanbul, Ḥuda‘î first settled in two rooms which he had built of stone next to the masdjid of Mustâlla in Camliçâ, moving on to a room near the mosque of Rûm (the Greek Mehmed Paşa), an area then occupied by the present Djilwatiyya mosque and tekke which was built between 997/1589 and 1003/1595. He also preached and taught in other mosques, chief among them the Conqueror’s mosque (Fatih Djâmi‘î, where, according to Pecevî (Tarîhî, 1283 AH, ii, 36, 357) he was appointed preacher at the instigation of Sunnî Allâh, the hadâ‘îker of Rumeli. This, Pecevî says, was the beginning of his fame. He enjoyed the favour and the respect of the Sultan Ahmed I, owing these, according to the Sişsilâmânâme, to a miraculous interpretation of the Sultan’s dream. This royal favour is corroborated by the respectful references to Ḥuda‘î in both Pecevî and Na‘îmî (Raedât al-Ḥusayn fi ḥukûdat ahbâb al-ḥâsîebîn, 1280 AH, i, 112 ff., 357; ii, 154, 158). Na‘îmî reports, for example, that he was asked to wash the dead Sultan’s body, but that by this time he had excused himself on the grounds of old age, entrusting the duty to his haľîfa Shâbân Dede (ii, 154). Ḥuda‘î per-formed the pilgrimage three times. He died in 1038/1628.

Na‘îmî describes Ḥuda‘î as an eloquent and soft-spoken man. The ḥâşî (continuation) of the Shâhâkî (i, 64) reports that he let his hair grow long, a habit which was imitated by his followers. Ḥuda‘î wrote 18 works in Arabic and 12 in Turkish. These are to be found in the Selim Âğh Library in Üskûdâr (for titles of lost works see Kulliyâtî, 607 note). Most of them are short treatises, including an unfinished Arabic commentary on the Kur‘ân entitled Mâjdûsî. His printed Kulliyât includes a dihâm, as well as an Arabic treatise entitled Risâla fi Tarikhî al-Muham- madîyya, a Turkish Tarikhâmâne and a Turkish rhymed treatise, entitled Nâşîlî al-qârik (Salvation of the Drowned). His most important work is undoubtedly the Wilîyât or collected sayings (in Arabic rendering) of Shékîh Uftâde (MS in the author’s hand, No. 574 in the Selim Âğh Library). Apart from its mystical interest, this contains many important historical references to contemporary men and events. Mehmed Gûlghen Efendi in his edition of the Kulliyât dates many of the devotional poems, one of which commemorates the death of Murâd III (p. 79), adding that many of them were set to music, some by Ḥuda‘î himself. Some of the poems are syllabic in metre and are strongly influenced by Yûnûs Emre. They show Ḥuda‘î as an orthodox箩ayekî, an ascetic (i‘âdî) within the limits of the shirk‘î, hostile to exalted and more-or-less free-thinking şâfs. He even petitioned the Sultan against Badr al-Dîn, the son of the kâdi of Simavna, and his followers, among whom he seems to have been numbered for a time (M. Şaraf al-Dîn (Serefeddin), Simavânlâlî-oghlu Shékîh Badr Badr, Istanbul 1927, 72 ff.).

The Djilwatiyya had an off-shoot in the Hâşîmîyya, founded by Hâşîm Baba (d. 1773), a Dijîwâtî shékîh who was simultaneously a Malâmî (even laying claim to the title of “Pole” or kûthub) and also a Bektâshî (among whom he was known as Baba or Dede and whom also he tried to split by devising an amended ritual).

Bibliography: in the article.

DJM, 5th letter of the Arabic alphabet, transcribed dj; numerical value 3, so agreeing, like dâl, with the order of the letters of the Syriac (and Canaanite) alphabet [see ABDJAD]. It represents a g (occlusive, postpalatal, voiced) in the ancient Semitic (and in common Semitic).

In Arabic, this articulation has evolved: the point of articulation has been carried forward, in an unconditioned way, to the middle and prepalatal region, as a consequence of which it readily developed elements of palatalization (g and d) and affrication (dj). A simplification of the articulation into a spirant became possible, through the dropping of the first occlusive phase in the affricated (dj > j) where j represents a voiced palatal fricative, as French j), through the weakening and disappearance of the occlusive element in the palatalized consonant (d > y). This course of evolution can be written out as follows:

\[ g > g' > d' > d > d' > j \]

It is probable that the sound g of the Semitic djîm began at a very early time to evolve in the field which we are now considering. In any event, from the traditional pronunciation of the readers of the Kur‘ân, from the basic ideas of the Arab grammarians regarding its articulation, and through the modifications in it conditioned by the proximity of other sounds which they have noted (assimilations and dissimilations), one can justifiably conclude that,

1) g is defined as: occlusive, postpalatal, voiced; but g and k (the corresponding unvoiced) are the consonants most influenced, as regards the point of articulation, by the adjacent vowel; they are brought forward to the mediodpalatal region with a palatal vowel, and carried back to the velar region with a velar vowel; postpalatal signifies a medial position: that of g, k, articulated with a vowel a.

2) It would be better to say: for reasons unknown, A. Martinet has tried precisely to discover the causes of this displacement by structural methods, in his study La palatalisation “spontanée” de g en arabe, in DDL, liv/1, 90-102; he has brought out the structural conditioning of the evolutionary processes, by starting from the concept that Arabic emphatics are derived from glottalized consonants. His analysis is original and instructive, but in its turn also is conditioned by the basic hypothesis described above.
from the dawn of the classical period, the occluded g in dilm was opened through palatalization, affrication or even complete spirantization, at least in certain dialects. Naturally, differences analogous to those existing today in spoken languages, concerning the pronunciation of dilm, must have existed between the various ancient languages; some of them had no doubt gone much further than others in evolving towards spirantization. Besides, this process of evolution is still continuing today, as we can see: in Jerusalem, for example, a European observer (Dr. Rosen) has noticed that the affricated d which, as a child he used to hear as the pronunciation of dilm has now, in the pronunciation of the present time, become a palato-alveolar j (see E. Littmann, Neurarabische Volkスポエティオ, 3 n. 1). In certain languages in which the current pronunciation of dilm is now j, dissimilations in d or g can only be explained as fixed survivals of a former condition, at a comparatively recent stage in the development of this consonant (cf. Brockelmann, Grundriss, i, 235-6).

Arab grammarians looked upon dilm as a shadida, and therefore an occlusive, which excludes an affricated d or spirant (j); and as a maghara, which means voiced (Sibawayhi, ii (Paris), 453 and 454; al-Zamakhshari, Muf., 2nd ed. Broch. § 734; etc.). As regards the maḥbraq, al-Khalil’s maḥširiyya (Muf., ibid.) is difficult to interpret, but the description given by Sibawayhi (ii, 453 l. 7-8) indicates clearly that the active organ of articulation is the middle of the tongue (that is to say, the front) and the middle of the upper palate. Elsewhere they rejected (Sibawayhi, ii, 452; etc.) the articulation of dilm like k j (usual in Bagdad and in the Yemen) and of dilm like g, that is to say like g for the first and j for the second, which is a quite justifiable interpretation (as in J. Cantineau, Cours, 72 and others); d (palatalized d) being excluded by the designation of the front (and not the tip) of the tongue, there only remains g*. Arab grammarians appear indeed to consider this to be the only correct pronunciation of dilm. This articulation fulfils the required conditions and in addition easily conforms with the passage of y to dilm practised in certain tribes (Rabin, chart 19). In the traditional reading of Arabic the pronunciation d (affricated, prepalatal, voiced) is generally adopted.

As regards the modern dialects, it is possible to draw up a table tracing the pronunciation of dilm in general lines as follows:

1. Retention of the original pronunciation g: this seems to have been known in Aden in the Middle Ages (according to al-Mukaddasi, 96 l. 14). It is found today in Muscat, in Yemeni dialects and in various Bedouin-dialects in central Arabia. In Dāthlān (south-west Arabia) it is found in the conjugation of verbs with dilm as first radical, when it forms a syllable with the prefixes (e.g.: yigaza*). In Dofār (south-east Arabia) this pronunciation no longer exists save in the recitation of poetry, that is to say it has an archaic and quasi-architectural character. This pronunciation is also the manner of articulation proper to the dialects of Lower Egypt, and of Cairo in particular. Finally, in most of the dialects of north Morocco and also in Nédroma (Algeria), g is by dissimilation the pronunciation of dilm when used in conjunction with a sibilant or palato-alveolar.

2. Pronunciation of dilm as g or d; this is the pronunciation found in the majority of Bedouin-

1) An occlusive dorsal mediopalatal with palatalization.

dialects in north, central and south Arabia. It is also the pronunciation used by the fellaheen and Bedouins of Upper Egypt. It occasionally occurs in Dofār. It is common but not regularly used in various dialects in south-west Arabia. It is attested in a certain number of north Arabian tribes (notably the Sardifye and the Sirhān) and in the Djof; for further particulars see J. Cantineau, Cours, 74; in the other Arabic dialects only a few sporadic examples can be observed.

3. Pronunciation of dilm as y: today this occurs widely in the lower Euphrates region. It is the most widely used pronunciation in Dofār. It is common but not regularly used in various dialects in south-west Arabia. It is attested in a certain number of north Arabian tribes (notably the Sardifye and the Sirhān) and in the Djof; for further particulars see J. Cantineau, Cours, 74; in the other Arabic dialects only a few sporadic examples can be observed.

4. Pronunciation of dilm as d: this pronunciation is already attested in Irāk in the golden age of classical literature (according to Brockelmann’s interpretation, in ZA, xii, 1898, 126 and Grundriss, i, 122). It is found in certain places in central Arabia, it is the form most widely used in the Yemen, it is current in Mecca, in Irāk, among the Muslims in Jerusalem, in Aleppo, and is most widely used in country districts in Palestine, Jordan and Syria; in the Syrian desert it is regularly used among the tribes of nomad-shepherds. In north Africa it is in almost general use in both rural and urban dialects in north Algeria (for more precise details see J. Cantineau, Cours, 75); it has remained in use in Tangier and perhaps in certain places in north Morocco, in cases of gemination (bijudda, "lock of hair", but p. 453)).

5. Pronunciation of dilm as j: in Syria, Palestine and Jordan this is the town-dwellers’ pronunciation: Damascus, Nablus, Jaffa, Jerusalem (Christians), etc. It is the pronunciation of the whole of the Lebanon (except to the north of the Bekaa: d), the Anti-Lebanon and the Djbal al-Drūz. In North Africa it is found in Tunisian, Tripolitanian, Moroccan and south Algerian dialects; it is found in certain places in northern Algeria. Probably it was the usual pronunciation of dilm in the Arabic dialect of Granada.

6. Pronunciation of dilm as z: it must, finally, be noted that in the towns of north Africa one can observe a tendency in certain individuals to open the palatalization of the dilm; this pronunciation appears to be limited to certain social groups (Jews) or to certain social classes (lower-class people in north Morocco), and is not sufficiently generalized to make it possible to refer to anything more than individual pronunciations.

All the pronunciations of dilm given above are voiced. Some unvoiced pronunciations are known, and are extremely local: d in Palmyra and in some villages in the Anti-Lebanon, g in Subhēne (between Palmyra and the Euphrates).

In classical Arabic dilm is subject to certain conditioned modifications (accommodations, assimilations), see J. Cantineau, Cours, 72-3; (for the various modifications in modern dialects, see ibid., 76-9). For the phonological oppositions of the phoneme dilm, see idem, Esquisse, BSLS, xxvi, 102, 18; for the incompatibilities, see ibid., 135.

Bibliography: K. Völlers, The Arabic sounds, in Proc. IXth Orient. Congress, London 1892, ii, 143 and Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alien Arabien, Strasbourg 1906, 10-11; C. Brockelmann, Grundriss, i, 122-3 and references; A. Krimsky, in Machrīq, i, 1898, 407-93; A. Schaade, Sibawayhis Lautlehre, Leiden 1911, 72-4; de Landberg, Études sur les dialectes de l’Arabe Méridionale, i, 539, ii, 3, 506 n. 1; idem, Glossaire Dathinois, i, 256-7; A. Socin, Dissau aus Centralarabien, iii, § 161; N. Rhodokanakis, Der vulgäрасarische
In Persian the letter diim represents a voiced palatal affricate, which has a voiceless counterpart ć (ćim). The voiced velar occlusive is represented always by ć, although in Arabic loanwords from Persian diim is frequently represented by ć, e.g., ćimās “buffalo”, P. ċdādi-mīch. The letter ćim is formed on the model of diim, with three nūḥas instead of one.

In Ottoman Turkish, diim and ċim are written as in Persian and with the same values, except that in some morphophonemically conditioned situations the voiced/voiceless opposition disappears. In the modern Turkish orthography diim and ċim are replaced in general by ĉ and ĉ respectively with, however, account taken of phonetic values; hence ĉ can on occasion represent original diim.

In Urdu diim and ċim are palatal affricates as in Persian, frequently but not invariably uttered with dorsal contact with the tongue-tip behind the lower teeth. Among less educated speakers, especially in areas in India away from the main centres of Muslim culture, diim is also the pronunciation of the four sounds [džl], [džd], [zld], [zwe], as well as [zwe], which results in occasional false back-formations, e.g., mauzud for mauzud. Both diim and ċim occur with aspiration, written with ćim or čim with the “butterfly” (džačačmi) form of ĥā.

In Sindhi there occurs beside diim and ċim the voiced palatal implosive affricate, written with two nūḥas arranged vertically, ć. Other modifications of diim/čim are the aspirated čim, and the palatal affricate diim and ċim, both, however, written with the sign ć.

Bibliography: see Bibliography to Dal, ii, (J. Burton-Page).

DJIMAT (Malay), an amulet, more particularly a written amulet. The word is of Arabic origin = jism, “a body.” (Ed.)

DJIMMA, known also as Djimma Kakkā, “Djimmā of the confederacy”, and Djimmā Abbā Diiffār, from the name of its most famous king. This state lies in the angle formed by the Omo and Godjeb rivers in south-west Ethiopia, and was inhabited by Sidamā (Hamites) of the same stock as the neighbouring kingdom of Kafa; the south-east corner of Djimmā, called Garo, was inhabited by the Bogha, who are mentioned in an epigraph of Yeshak of Ethiopia (1412-27) together with the neighbouring state of Enäryā, later known as Limmu and Limmu-Enäryā (I. Guidi, Le canzoni gees-amarina, in Rend. Lim., ii, 1889). The Bogha were among the pagans forcibly converted to Christianity by Sarṣa Dengel of Ethiopia about 1850. When the Galla invaded Ethiopia they reached this region about the middle of the 16th century, and began to found small monasteries in the Gibb region, the first of which was Enäryā, where a Galla dynasty was founded about 1550-70. In Djimmā six tribes of the Djimmā group formed the basis of the Galla state, whence the name Djimmā Kakkā. Nominally Christian under Ethiopian rule, which ended about 1852, and pagan under the Galla founders of the new dynasty, a Muslim element soon entered, but died out together with Christianity during the 18th century. A monarchy is repugnant to the Galla, and its development was due to the influence of Islam. In Djimmā alone of the five Galla monarchies was the kingship allowed to survive after the Ethiopian conquest between 1891 and 1900. The language spoken here is Galla and there has been a blending of Galla and Islamic institutions. The king has both a Galla war-name, e.g., Abbā Dijfār, “owner of a dappled horse”, and a Muslim name, Muḥammad b. Dā’ūd. The kingship was hereditary, passing to a brother if there was no son. Owing to the influence of the monarchy, which was inconsistent with the Galla ideal of a tribal ruler who held office for only eight years, the Galla gada-system became much curtailed, and eventually the gada-grades were reduced from five to two. Islam was re-introduced early in the 19th century, and by the last quarter of the century Djimmā had become a centre of Islamic learning in western Ethiopia, though it caused no real anxiety to the kings of Ethiopia; nevertheless this did prevent Menilek II from annexing Djimmā to his kingdom, along with the rest of the tributary states that lay round Ethiopia. For the plan of the re-introduction of Islam till the end of the century the names of eight kings are preserved, the best known being Sanna Abbā Dijfār I; the last king was also called Abbā Dijfār. The trade route from Kafa to the coast lay through Djimmā; since it was a fertile land, the presence of traders from outside encouraged the development of agriculture; wheat, coffee, cotton, and aromatics were its chief products. It was also a centre of the slave-trade. Under Ethiopian rule the kingship was allowed to remain, the king being a vassal of the king of Ethiopia.


DJINAH (Indian-Pakistani equivalent of Djanāb; English spelling: JINNAH), MUḤAMMAD 'ALI Muḥammad 'Ali Djinah, known by his fellow-countrymen as the Khād-i A'īsam, was the founder of the state of Pākistān. He organized and led the Pākistān movement and became the first Governor-General of the new state.

It is generally accepted that he was born on 25 December 1876, though some records give dates in 1875 and 1874. His father was a moderately wealthy merchant, a member of a Khād family living in Karachi. His early education took place in Bombay and later at the Sindh Madrasat al-Islām and the Missionary School High School in Karachi. After matriculation he was sent to England in 1892 where he qualified for the bar (Lincoln's Inn) in 1896.

While in London, during the final days of Gladstonian liberalism, he showed a keen interest in public life, as an admirer and supporter of Dādābhā'ī Nawōrāji, the first Indian to be elected to the House of Commons. At this stage also he assumed the outward appearance of an Englishman. Until the last year of his life he normally wore immaculate English clothes and he used a monocle. All his important speeches were delivered in English and even his

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
broadcast on 3 June 1947 on the acceptance of the partition scheme was translated into Urdu by others. In short, he had become "Mr. Jinnah".

He returned to India in 1896 and in the following year began to practise law in Bombay. After several lean years he became quite rapidly a leading member of the Bombay bar. His mind was always that of the lawyer. His speech aimed at precision rather than eloquence. He had little patience with those who used words as symbols to awaken emotions. He addressed himself to the British government or to the educated Indian minority. When he spoke to the masses it was in English and in the same terms he employed in writing a brief. If the masses responded it was to the man's intensity and uprightness, not to the warmth of his words.

Jinnah's first venture into Indian politics was as a member of the Indian National Congress. He attended the 1906 session as private secretary to Nawroji who was then Congress President. Three years later, in January 1910, he took his place as a member of the first Imperial Legislative Council. He was elected to represent the Muslims of Bombay, and he was the first non-official member to secure adoption of a legislative Act, in this case an Act validating Muslim waqfs.

In 1913, while remaining an influential figure in the Congress, Jinnah joined the Muslim League. He was to serve, said Gokhale, as the "ambassador of Hindustan-Muslim unity". He took the leading role in negotiating the "Lucknow Pact" whereby the Congress and the Muslim League agreed on a scheme of constitutional reform containing guarantees for the rights of the Muslim community. Jinnah presided over the 1916 session of the League which approved these proposals.

The years after 1918 brought a wave of radicalism and violence into Indian politics. Jinnah, with his repeated emphasis on what he called "constitutional lines" felt himself being supplanted by the extremists. In 1919 he resigned from the Legislative Council in protest against the extension of repressive police authority. The following year he parted from the Congress these proposals of non-cooperation. In addition to his break with the Congress, Jinnah found himself separated from many of his fellow Muslims who were ardent supporters of the Khilafat movement. The Muslim League declined in importance and was internally divided.

Jinnah was married for the first time as a child, before he left for England in 1892, but his wife died whilst he was away. His second marriage, to the daughter of a rich Parsi, took place in 1918. It was not a success and they had separated before her death ten years later. Throughout most of his life his sister Fatima looked after his domestic needs.

Between 1920 and 1930 Jinnah played a part in Indian public life but he cannot be said to have been a leading figure and certainly not the sole or principal spokesman for the Indian Muslims. He was elected to the new Central Assembly and was a delegate to the first two Round Table Conferences (1930-1). At this stage he began to practise at the Privy Council bar and established a home in London, paying only intermittent visits to India.

His final return took place in 1935, after the enactment of the new constitutional provisions of the Government of India Act. Almost at once he began to move toward control of the Muslim League and its role as the main instrument of Muslim nationalism. In 1936 he became President of the Parliamentary Board of the League, the committee that took charge of the election campaign. Their object was a programme of mass contact but they were not markedly successful as was shown by the poor electoral record of the League in 1937. The Congress, which had done well, now assumed power in the majority of the Provinces and seemed to have established a claim to be the sole heir to British authority. Jinnah, now President of the League, moved to dispute this claim, stating that no further constitutional steps could be taken without the consent of the Muslim nation, represented by the League.

Jinnah's first line of argument was that the Muslims could not expect full justice in a political society with a Hindu majority. The League gave much attention to Muslim grievances against Congress provincial ministries. In 1939, after the outbreak of war, the Congress governments resigned. Jinnah, giving cautious support to the war effort, was able to strengthen his organization and to bring about, during the war years, League participation in the government of several provinces.

The second main argument was now launched. It consisted in the assertion that a separate state for the Muslims of India was possible and necessary. Muhammad Iqbal had suggested such a scheme in 1930 but it was not adopted as a political programme until the meeting of the Muslim League in Lahore in March, 1940. This was the Pakistan Resolution.

It was not yet clear whether Jinnah could validly claim to speak for Muslim opinion. In Bengal, the Pandit, Sindh and the North-West Frontier Province, all Muslim-majority areas, the League was unable to exercise effective and continuous control. However, in the elections of 1946 the League won almost all the Muslim seats and Iqbal was to be nominated as spokesman for the overwhelming majority could not be denied.

He participated actively in the negotiations leading to the partition scheme, insisting always that the Muslims must be allowed to choose a separate state. In June 1947 his object was accomplished and the state of Pakistan came into existence at midnight on 14-15 August. Jinnah, General and President of the Constituent Assembly, was elected Governor-General and President of the Constituent Assembly. His first efforts were directed to ending communal bloodshed and hatred. He was, by this time, seventy years old and his health was showing signs of collapse. Nevertheless he presided over the establishment of the machinery of government and was in effective control of policy. During 1948 he became progressively weaker and on 11 September he died.

He was a man who changed the course of history, for, while there was Muslim national feeling before Jinnah, he gave it self-confidence and organization. He was a man of rigid integrity, perhaps hard to love but made for admiration. He was a nationalist who seemed at times to be more English than Indian; he was a Muslim who made few references to God or the Prophet or the Koran. He was not a deeply religious man. To him the Muslim heritage was a civilization, a culture and a national identity. And he founded a state just as surely as had Babbur.
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intelligent, imperceptible to our senses, capable of appearing under different forms and of carrying out heavy labours (al-Baydawi, Comm. to Kur'an, II, 32). Ibn Khaldün, for example, reckoned all references to the djinn among the so-called mulkubik passages of the Kur'an, the knowledge of which Allah has reserved to himself (Kur'an, III, 5). These different attitudes are excellently treated in the Dict. of techm. terms, i, 261 fl.; cf. also al-Razi, Majatis, lxiii.

III. The djinn in folk-lore. The transition to this division comes most naturally through the use of the djinn in magic. Muslim theology has always admitted the fact of such a use, though judging its legality varyingly. The Fihrist traces both the approved and the disapproved kinds back to ancient times, and gives Greek, Harránían, Chaldean and Hindú sources. At the present day, books treating of the binding of djinn to talismanic service are an important part of the literature of the people. All know and read them, and the professional magician has no secrets left. In popular stories too, as opposed to the tales of the professed littérateur, the djinn play a large part. It is so thorough a feature of the Thousand and One Nights, especially in that class of popular religious novels of which Well published two in his Translation of the Nights, namely the second version of "Dijujhar the Fisherman" and the story entitled "All and Zähir of Damascus". In the Thousand and One Nights, particularly in the first part, the djinni generally turns against any human being out of spite to get the better of him; roaming the world at night (Night No. 76), the djinni or fairy, pari transports a man for immense distances, to make him lose his way; he turns him into an animal (a monkey, in No. 48, a dog, in No. 5 and 66); but on the other hand he sometimes restores his human form (No. 5 and 34); he protects the man undeservedly duped by one of his fellows (No. 47); he teaches man how to free someone from bonds; he makes the world visible, by means of exorcism (ibid.); moreover, djinni and fairies sometimes join together to do good (No. 78); on the other hand, man can defend himself and by his cunning has the djinni at his mercy (like the fisherman who imprisons him in a jar, No. 11); and sometimes a man harms djinn unintentionally (a man eating dates throws away a stone which kills one of their children, No. 1). Still newer to the ideas of the masses are the fairy stories collected orally by Artin, Östrup, Spitta, Stumme, etc. In these stories the folk-lore elements of the different races overcome the common Muslim atmosphere. The inspiration of these tales is more characteristic of the peoples of North Africa, as well as of the Egyptians, Syrians, Persians and Turks rather than of Arabia or Islam. Besides this there are the popular beliefs and usages, so far very incompletely gathered. Throughout this field also there are points of contact with the official Islamic view. Thus, in Egyptian popular belief, a man who dies by violence becomes an 'ifrit and haunts the place of his death (Willmore, Spoken Arabic of Egypt, 371, 374), while in the Islam of the schools a man who dies in deadly sin may be transformed into a djinni in the world of al-Barzakh (Dict. of techm. terms, i, 265). Willmore has given no details on the djinni in Egypt. For South Arabia see Abdullah Mansur, The land of Uz, 22, 26, 203, 316-20. See also R. C. Thomson in Proc. of Soc. of

"djinn", and only constructed different theories of their nature and their influence on the material world. The Comm. to Kur'an, LXXII, 1; al-Damiri, Hayawán, s.v. djinn. They were created of smokeless flame (Kur'an, LIV, 14) while mankind and the angels, the other two classes of intelligent beings, were created of clay and light. They are capable of salvation; Muhammad was sent to them as well as to mankind; some will enter Paradise while others will be cast into the fire of hell. Their relation to Iblis the Shaytan, and to the Mutuza, ventured to doubt the existence of
**DJINN**

In Turkish folklore. Of the words used to denote these, *cin* (djinn) is the most common; *ecini* (edjinni) is a variation of it. The word *cin*, in use only in the form *cinh* or *cinne*, has in certain instances the same sense as *djinn*; it is a corruption of *ins*, from the group *ins wa djinn* (= "men and djinn"), which occurs frequently in the Küran. In everyday speech as well as in stories of fantastic adventures and tales of the supernatural, the word *peri* is often taken as a synonym of *djinn*; the two terms are often confused even in traditions, nevertheless the former really belongs to the realm of supernatural tales where the word *djinn* is less common. In parts of eastern Anatolia (at Tokat and Akalm, *iyi saatte olsunlar* have to be taken with regard to certain places such as water-clossets, remote corners where rubbish is piled or where dirty water overflows, at the foot of trees, quiet dirty corners on river-banks, the base of walls above the gutter, enclosed dark places in houses (like lumber-rooms) etc.

*Diinn* appear to men in many different forms, most often in the guise of animals, such as; — a black cat (without any light markings), a goat (kid, or he-goat), a black sheep, a duck, a hen with chicken, a buffalo, a fox; or else in human shape; either as men of ordinary size or dwarfs, and sometimes as men of gigantic stature (many who claim to have seen them describe them as quite white, thin, and as tall as a minaret or a telegraph pole); they also appear with the features of a baby wrapped in its swaddling-clothes. In the magic arts of the negroes in Turkey, the snake is regarded as the animal in which *diinn* are incorporated. Wolves and birds are the only other living creatures to whose attacks *diinn* are vulnerable.
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Interfere in family life and wreck marriages; such incidents are due to the young man or woman having irritated a *djinn* in some way, or else because one or other of them is loved—and indeed "regarded as a spouse"—by one of these supernatural beings, either by a male or female *djinn* according to the circumstances.

Methods of avoiding *djinn* and their misdeeds can be put into two categories: precautionary measures which anyone can take of his own initiative, and measures to be taken in cases requiring recourse to a specialist. Some of the precautions to be taken in order not to irritate *djinn* are as follows:—so far as one can, to avoid the places they frequent, never to "profane" those places (by soiling, spitting, urinating etc.), always to say a besmele (bišm-illâh) or a destâr (this word means "with your permission") before each action and before moving anything, never to forget to say these words, e.g., each time any object or article of clothing is put away in a chest or where any provisions are put in store etc., so that the *djinn* may not consume them.

In serious cases of illnesses or infirmities thought to have been incurred through *djinn*, recourse is made to specialists, who are *bhdóa* or *shaykhs* or even simple people without any religious title who have never received any training in the art of medicine. They are called *huddams*, "masters—or patrons—of servants", the *djinn* being considered as servants or slaves entirely subject to them. The procedure for exorcising takes various forms, but the principle is invariable: the sorcerer (who is also given such names as *cindar* [*djindár*] or *cinî* [*djindîl*], signifying the captor of a *djinn*), invokes the *djinn* or *djinn* thought to be responsible for the trouble, or to be able to reveal it; when he succeeds in calling up the guilty *djinn*, he negotiates with him, either with apologies or with threats, to free and cure the victim. Some of these exorcisms are carried out in the absence of the victims; others require their presence—as is the case in the magic arts of the Turkish negroes (natives of Africa) who, before 1920, and especially in big towns like Istanbul and Izmir, set up corporations of exorcisors under the godgias, their spiritual leaders; the efficacy of their magic cures was acknowledged by the white population also.

(On this subject see: A. Bombaci, *Pratichè magiche africane*, in *Folklore*, iii, no. 3-4, 1949, Naples, 3-11; P. N. Boratav, *The Negro in the Turkish folklore*, in *Journal of American Folklore*, lxv (1951), no. 251, 83-8; P. N. Boratav, *Les Noirs dans le folklore turc et le folklore des Noires de Turquie*, in *Journal de la Société des Africanistes*, xxviii (1958), 7-23. Bibliography: In addition to the works quoted in the text of the article, the author has made use of materials resulting from his own research, together with the texts of tales, legends and fantastic stories in his collection of manuscripts. The lack of any single comprehensive work on this subject is a gap in Turkish folklore studies.)

India: In India one encounters three distinct concepts of *djinn*—traditional or orthodox, based on literal interpretations of the Kur'anic verses; superstitious, as revealed in the popular superstitions; and rationalistic, as attempted by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân and others of his school of thought.

In traditional or orthodox accounts the *djinn* is represented as a creature created from fire, unlike man who has been created from clay. The *djinn* are invisible and aery (*Lughât al-Kur'ân*, 'Abd al-Rashîd Nu'mânî, ii, 254-6). Almost all the Indian scholars on exegesis have held this view. lnayat 'Ali mentions four types of *djinn*: (i) aerial creatures, without any physical form, (ii) snake-like creatures, (iii) those who shall be subjected to the same process of divine dispensation on the Day of Judgment as human beings, and (iv) creatures with beast-like features (*Mishbâh al-turûk fi lughât al-Kur'ân*, Dihl 1357 A.H., 85). Some jurists have, despite their belief in the supernatural character of the *djinn*, considered them so real as to deal with hypotheti-
cal problems arising out of human marriages with *djinn*. (b) It is popularly held that the *djinn* are invisible creatures with great supernatural powers and with an organization presided over by a king. Even in the educated circles of Muslim society, this concept was common in the middle ages. During the time of Ileîmîsh, an area in the vicinity of the Hawêl-i Shamsî of Dihlî had the reputation of being the abode of *djinn* (*Mishbâh al-falahat*, Ms personal collection). Djamalî [g.] refers to a guest house which was constructed by Ileîmîsh (607-33/1210-35) and was known as Dar al-Djinn because it was thought to be frequented by the *djinn*. A Shaykh al-Islâm of Dihlî, Sayyid Na'îm al-Dîn Şuğîra, accommodated Shaykh Djalal al-Dîn Tabrizî in this house in order to test his spiritual powers. The Shaykh sent his servant to place a copy of the Kur'ân in the house in the absence of the victims; others require their presence;(*Siyar al-Arîfîn*, Dihl 1311 A.H., 165, 166). This has given birth to a superstition that before a new house is occupied, a copy of the Kur'ân should be placed therein in order to expel the *djinn*. Since it was believed that the *djinn* could do harm to human beings and also cause serious ailments, many religious writers deal with incantations and litanies to counteract their evil effects. Şâh Wall Allâh (d. 1763) suggests methods to expel *djinn* from houses (*Kawal al-Djamiî*, Kânpur 1291 A.H., 96, 97).

(c) An attempt to rationalize the concept of *djinn* by divesting it of all supernatural and superstitious elements was made by Sayyid Ahmad Khân. He held the view that by the word *djinn* the Kur'ân meant Bedouins and other uncivilized and uncultured people. To him the expression *djinn wa l-'ins* which occurs fourteen times in the Kur'ân meant 'the uncultured and the cultured people'. The different contexts in which the word *djinn* is used in the Kur'ân have been explained by him as references to different qualities and characteristics of these 'people' (*Tafsîr al-Kur'ân*, iii, 'Allgaha 1883, 79-95); this point of view was subjected to criticism by the *ulamâ*.

for hantu (evil spirit); in some languages (e.g., Gayo) it is used as a general name for all kinds of indigenous spirits.

(DINN, yévo, genus, is the first of the five predicates al-alf ‘al-khamma (generic species, difference, property, accident) as given by Porphyry in his Introduction (Isagoge) to Aristotle’s Logic—introduction which is incorporated by the Muslim philosophers in Aristotle’s Organon—and its logical sense (for also its common sense of “race”, “stock”, “kin”, is mentioned by Aristotle, Porphyry and the Arab commentators) is said to be that which is predicated of many things differing in species in answer to what a thing is, e.g., animal. These predicables are also called al-ma‘sīni al-thi‘iya, “intentiones secundae” in scholastic terminology, to distinguish them from al-ma‘sīni al-‘alā, “intentiones primae”. According to the later Greek and to the Muslim commentators the first intentions refer to the particular things, the second intentions refer to the ten categories which are themselves the highest genera of particular things and to which the Muslim philosophers give the name of the al-adīnās al-‘azhara, the ten genera.

As to the problem of the objective reality of the genera, species and, generally speaking, of universals, it is not discussed as much in Muslim philosophy as in Scholasticism, although it is one of the fundamental problems in Aristotelian philosophy and constitutes one of its fundamental difficulties (cf. for this and the following the article DJAWHAR). There are three possible views, the realist view that universals exist objectively, the conceptualist view that they are but abstractions of the mind without a corresponding reality, the nominalist view that they are but names without any reality. Now Aristotle holds at the same time the conflicting realistic and conceptualist views. On the one hand he holds the immanent realistic view that universals form a constitutive part in individuals, Socrates, e.g., is a man because the specific, the universal form in his own nature is neither universal nor individual; if “animal” by itself were universal, there could not be several animals; if it were individual, there could not be the universal “animal”, individuality and universality are therefore accidents added to it, the former in the exterior world, the latter in minds (this passage has been discussed by I. Madkour in his introduction to al-Madhkal 63, and his L’Organon d’Aristote dans le monde arabe, Paris 1934, 185 f.). Although Averroës often polemizes against the transcendent realism in Avicenna’s theory of the dator fornumarum, he holds fundamentally the same position and he says e.g.: “Just as artificial products can only be understood by him who has not made them, because they take their origin in an intellect that is in the form which is in the soul of the artisan, so the products of nature prove the existence of supermundane Forms which are the causes that the sensible substances are potentially intelligible”. And he adds: “This is the theory to which the partisans of the ideas tended, but which they could not attain” (cf. my Die Epitome der Metaphysik des Averroës, Leiden 1924, 42). The Muslim theologians, generally speaking, are nominalists. They argue against the conceptualist side of the philosophers’ view by asking: “How can knowledge give any truth, if reality is individual and knowable universal, since truth is the conformity of thought with reality?” The theologians do not admit the objective reality of forms, all reality is individual, universals exist only in minds, they are sīāt nafsīyya, spiritual qualities which, however, are not wholly real, but something intermediate between reality and unreality, or unreal, that is to say they are hādīt, modi, or ma‘sīnī (the Stoic λεκτά or συμμακρομένα, ma‘nī in this sense is the literal translation of συμμακρομένον, meaning, something meant, cf. Lane, s.v.). We find also the absolute denial of universals. Since for their sensualism thinking is nothing but the possession of representations and you cannot represent a universal e.g., “a horse”, but only a particular, e.g., a definite horse, the universals are totally denied by then, (cf. Gazzzālī, Tahāfūt al-Falāfasīla (ed. Bouyges, Beirut 1927, 330).


DJINS is the Arabic word used at the present time to denote “sex”, the adjective djinsi corresponding to “sexual” and the abstract djinsīyya to “sexuality” as well as “nationality”. The juridical aspect of sexual relations has already been examined in the article BAH, and is to be subject of further articles, NIKĀH and ZINA; the present review will be limited to general considerations on the sexual life of the Muslims and the place that it occupies in literature.

Pre-Islamic poetry, in so far as it is authentic, indicates that a certain laxity of behaviour was prevalent among the Arabs of the desert (Lammens, Le berceau de l’Islam, 276 ff.), and the “reunions galantes” of the contemporary Touaregs, described by Father de Foucauld (in his Dictionnaire touareg-français, Paris 1952, ii, 559 ff., s.v. akhd), probably are not far removed from pre-Islamic practices. The nasib of the classical kāfīda, markedly erotic in character, is no doubt an indication of the existence of temporary unions in the encampments; in any case, its position at the head of the poem is evidence of the importance which the ancient Arabs attached to love, and especially sensual love, particularly since a number of lines of verse as realistic as those of Imru’ al-Kays have probably been deleted, through puritanical reaction, from the ancient poems collected in the 2nd and 3rd/third and
9th centuries; a further indication of this interest is shown by the richness of the vocabulary relating to the sexual organs, which is no doubt mainly due to the ubiquity of slang terminology, which is confirmed at this present time by an unpublished study by Dr. Mathieu on the prostitutes of Casablanca. Incidentally we know that prostitution (bigazah), which is to be discussed in the article zina, was already in existence and that prostitutes were distinguished by a special emblem which floated over their tents (see Caussin de Perceval, Essai). It does not seem that Islam has in practice made many changes from the earlier state of affairs. Certainly the Kur'an, in several verses (IV, 30; XVII, 34; XXIII, 5-7; 35; XXIV, 31, 33; LXX, 29-31), enjoins chastity, but only outside the bonds of marriage or concubining (see S. H. al-Shamma, The ethical system underlying the Qur'an, Tübingen 1959, 95 ff. and bibliography); it condemns prostitution (XXIV, 33) and, above all, fornication (see zina), but the conditions laid down by the fuhudah for the legal proof of zina are such that it more often than not escapes punishment. Marriage, as conceived by the Kur'an, has a two-fold object: it is intended to allow the male, who is largely favoured since it is he who benefits from the privileges of polygamy and repudiation (while women are in certain cases even deprived of the right of giving their consent), to satisfy his sexual needs lawfully, and to ensure the perpetuation of the race. That is why celibacy is in no way recommended, and it is even recommended to give the celibate in marriage (XXIV, 32). The Kur'an is realistic where it deals with sexual pleasures which it authorizes and the enjoyment of which it encourages, on the sole condition that Believers should make use of one or more partners (at their disposal, marriage and concubining [see 'abd]). The celebrated verse (II, 223; see also 183, 222) "Your women are a field for you. Come to your field as you will" may be compared with some of the suiras, such as that of Joseph (XII), or verses such as those which describe the delights of paradise and, above all, the after-life (LV, 56, 70, etc.).

The Prophet himself is quoted as having made use of one of the courtesans (at his disposal, marriage and concubining [see 'abd]). The celebrated verse (II, 223; see also 183, 222) "Your women are a field for you. Come to your field as you will" may be compared with some of the suiras, such as that of Joseph (XII), or verses such as those which describe the delights of paradise and, above all, the after-life (LV, 56, 70, etc.). The Prophet himself is quoted as having made use of one of the courtesans (at his disposal, marriage and concubining [see 'abd]).

The ethical system underlying the Qur'an, Tübingen 1959, 95 ff. and bibliography; it condemns prostitution (XXIV, 33) and, above all, fornication (see zina), but the conditions laid down by the fuhudah for the legal proof of zina are such that it more often than not escapes punishment. Marriage, as conceived by the Kur'an, has a two-fold object: it is intended to allow the male, who is largely favoured since it is he who benefits from the privileges of polygamy and repudiation (while women are in certain cases even deprived of the right of giving their consent), to satisfy his sexual needs lawfully, and to ensure the perpetuation of the race. That is why celibacy is in no way recommended, and it is even recommended to give the celibate in marriage (XXIV, 32). The Kur'an is realistic where it deals with sexual pleasures which it authorizes and the enjoyment of which it encourages, on the sole condition that Believers should make use of one or more partners (at their disposal, marriage and concubining [see 'abd]). The celebrated verse (II, 223; see also 183, 222) "Your women are a field for you. Come to your field as you will" may be compared with some of the suiras, such as that of Joseph (XII), or verses such as those which describe the delights of paradise and, above all, the after-life (LV, 56, 70, etc.). The Prophet himself is quoted as having made use of one of the courtesans (at his disposal, marriage and concubining [see 'abd]).

It is impossible in this brief account to mention all the anecdotes which cast a harsh light on the preoccupations of this leisurely society, and of certain caliphs too, but it will be recalled that temporary marriage (see mut'a) which the Kur'an had not suppressed (although Sunni Islam finally rejected it) allowed transitory unions at small cost and, along with female musicians and singers, true professionals of love gained lasting reputations; for example the woman of Sheba (see the interesting anecdotes which are related to us almost all belong to the same class of libertines, whilst persons of rectitude, especially the Hanbalis, protested vigorously against public immorality. Under the 'Abbábsides we see the development of a refined society, of luxury and pleasures (on the old Persian practice of incest, see particularly al-Djahiz, K. al-Bukhádì, 3-4). We have little information about the sexual life of the lower orders of Muslims, among whom there was apparently a certain degree of laxity, but it seems clear that if the members of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie married free women who gave them children, they went elsewhere in search of sensual pleasures; this is the reign of the kiyán [see kána], so magnificently described by al-Djahiz, bringing with them an atmosphere of distinguished sensuality. Although during the pre-Islamic period and in the early days of Islam men's tastes had favoured women of ample proportions, it was now slenderness of figure that no doubt escapes punishment. Marriage, as conceived by the Kur'an, has a two-fold object: it is intended to allow the male, who is largely favoured since it is he who benefits from the privileges of polygamy and repudiation (while women are in certain cases even deprived of the right of giving their consent), to satisfy his sexual needs lawfully, and to ensure the perpetuation of the race. That is why celibacy is in no way recommended, and it is even recommended to give the celibate in marriage (XXIV, 32). The Kur'an is realistic where it deals with sexual pleasures which it authorizes and the enjoyment of which it encourages, on the sole condition that Believers should make use of one or more partners (at their disposal, marriage and concubining [see 'abd]). The celebrated verse (II, 223; see also 183, 222) "Your women are a field for you. Come to your field as you will" may be compared with some of the suiras, such as that of Joseph (XII), or verses such as those which describe the delights of paradise and, above all, the after-life (LV, 56, 70, etc.). The Prophet himself is quoted as having made use of one of the courtesans (at his disposal, marriage and concubining [see 'abd]).

A text such as the one by al-Djahiz entitled Musákhárat al-dzawár wa 'l-kháshám, despite the obscurity of certain passages, is in this respect extremely instructive. The literary sources abound with anecdotes which relate to sexual abnormalities such as bestiality (al-Djahiz, K. al-Bukhádì, 53, §73, 67, §200) and sapphism. Prostitution, controlled, existed almost everywhere (Mez, op. cit, 432). In the account of Bashshár given in the Agháni, the most striking detail is the number of successes with women that this poet achieved, but it would be wrong to generalize too hastily and to conclude that debauchery had invaded the whole of society. The heroes of the anecdotes which are related to us almost all belong to the same class of libertines, whilst persons of rectitude, especially the Hanbalis, protested vigorously against public immorality.

119, n. 47) but which is often considered as more reprehensible than sodomy and bestiality (see Bouquet, Éthique sexuelle, 57).
On this question, an anecdote attributed to al-Asma'ī [q.v.] seems to show to what an extent certain Bedouins had succeeded in keeping their sober habits; the philologist having asked a Bedouin to give him a definition of love (fīkhā), the latter replied: "a glance after a glance and, if it be possible, a kiss after a kiss; this is the entrance to Paradise". The Bedouin's reply astonished al-Asma'ī who, when asked in his turn to give his own definition, drew this remark from his interlocutor: "But you are not in love! You are merely seeking to have a child!" (al-Washšā', Muwâwāshāt, 77).

Throughout the following centuries, interest in sexual matters continued, as can be seen from the copious literature devoted to these subjects. In this connexion we should note that, if writers and poets of restraint do exist in Arabic literature, many others practise complete freedom of language; the restrictions on the circulation of unexpurgated translations of the Arabian Nights are well known, and Das Buch der wunderbaren Erzählungen und seltsamen Geschichten edited by H. Wehr, Damascus-Wiesbaden 1956, again confirms the general tendency towards indecency, towards suhûf, later successfully cultivated by the poet Ibn al-Hāǧidḏāḏā and many others.

To meet the sort of demand that requires that serious matter should be interspersed with amusing passages, works of adab literature frequently contain smutty anecdotes, and even popular encyclopaedias indulge in scabrous sections; there is no reason to be shocked by this, for the prudishness displayed by some is often no more than hypocrisy, as al-Dāhib points out, who, in his introduction to the Muḫfīkātatar al-djwādī wa l-ḥilmāmin, after making fun of the Tartuffes who are too easily offended, recalls that the virtuous ancestors were in no whit so prudish and states that the words of the Arabic language were made to be used, even though they might seem shocking. The short work just referred to is particularly scabrous, dealing plainly with one aspect of sexual life and at the same time providing a sort of anthology of love, normal and abnormal; the author verges on obscenity without any sort of restraint.

Earlier works dealing with sexual life seem to have been quite numerous already, if we can judge by the references that Dāhib makes to the Kutub al-bah, of Indian origin, saying that these works are in no sense pornographic and that the Indians regarded them as manuals of sexual education with which they taught their children (K. al-Ḥayāmān, index); no doubt he is here alluding to the Kāmmuṭāra, of which, however, no Arabic translation has survived. Other and later works also appear to have inspired the Indian tradition, in particular the K. al-Aljīyya which the Fīhrist quotes, while Hāǧidḏī Khalīfa (see index) says that it was written by a certain al-Ḥakim al-Azrāk for the master of Nisābdūr, Tughān Shāh (569-81/1174-85), and embellished with suggestive illustrations. In its development, adab literature soon spread to sexual questions also, and two authors of the 3rd/9th century seem to have specialized in this type of writing. The first, Abu l-Ānas al-Šāmārī (d. 755/1358 [see AL-ŠAYMARI]), who had, however, been a kādāḏī and to whom are attributed books on astrology still preserved in mss., is the author of some forty works which include one treatise on onanism (K. al-Ḫalāṣkāda fi ḍiālāl ḥaymān) and one on sapphism (K. al-Sābīkāda fi l-ḥaymān). The second is a certain Muḥammad b. Ḥassān al-Nāmaḏī whose Fīhrist (217) devotes a passage, reproduced in full by Yākūt (Udābā, xvii, 119), and entirely taken up with the enumeration of titles relating to sexual questions, in particular a large work K. Barǧidḏ wa-bahbāḥīb in which the author makes a special study of the best ways to fascinate women. The Fīhrist (436) lists the titles of 12 works "on the Persian, Indian, Byzantine and Arab bāḥ", none of which appear to have survived, but it is probable that some of them were serious in purpose: a study of the harmony between men and women in relation to their physical charact-ers, female physiology, the mystery of generation, sexual medicine and hygiene, etc.

Subsequently, the literature that can be described as erotologic adab developed quite considerably; to modern eyes it may appear obscene in character, though it was not so regarded by its readers, since whole chapters characteristically combine verses from the Qur'ān and ḥadīṯs of the Prophet with obscene anecdotes or poems, while others on the contrary are merely inspired by the wish to popularize certain notions about medicine and hygiene. Ş. al-Munajḏīḏī (Ḫaydī džinisīya, 107 ff.) reproduces a list of the contents of several of these works which are mostly unpublished; we will name them briefly, noting the characteristics of the authors to whom several are, rightly or wrongly, attributed: Ḥaydūḏ (436) lists the titles of 12 works "on the Persian, Indian, Byzantine and Arab bāḥ", none of which appear to have survived, but it is probable that some of them were serious in purpose: a study of the harmony between men and women in relation to their physical charact-ers, female physiology, the mystery of generation, sexual medicine and hygiene, etc.

Bibliography: In the text. Two funda-
mental studies have been devoted to the subject discussed in this article; the first, by G.-H. Bousquet, La morale de l'islam et son éthique sexuelle, Paris 1953, is the work of a jurist and sociologist who does not neglect practical reality; the second, by Šalāh al-Dīn al-Munājjudīdīdī, al-Hāyāt al-dīnissiyyā 'ind al-'Arab, Beirut 1958, is an excellent exposé based essentially on literary sources; another work by the same author, Dīmāl al-marā 'ind al-'Arab, Beirut 1957, is also rewarding. Since then two works have appeared but which remain unavailing to me: M. ʿAbd al-Wāḥīd, al-ʾĪlām wa-l-muḥkīlā al-dīnissiyyā, Cairo 1939/1961, and Y. el-Masri, Le drame sexuel de la femme dans l'orient arabe, 1962. (Ch. Pellat)

Dījrīdā (see Dirāg). Dījrīdīn (in Arabic Dīrī-dīnīt and K. r. k. n.): we know of a niṣāb of Kīrkīnti, borne by a mystic of Sicilian origin, in the 4th/10th century, Agrigentum. Far removed from its ancient splendour, the town fell into the hands of the Arabs in 214/829 and was destroyed, or more probably dismantled, in the following year for fear that the Byzantines would return. It rose again, however, under Arab rule, and was frequently involved in hostilities with Palermo, which resulted in the bloody struggles of the first half of the 4th/10th century. It was taken into the territories of the amirs of Sicily, with a city of the same name south-west of Bam and came under the rule of the Kalbid (in Arabic Saḥīrīyā, ed. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1953, 69; trans. Damascus 1957, 154), and which corresponds to a former Chaldaean church (F. Saar and E. Herzfeld, Archæologische Reise im Euphrat und Tigris Gebiet, Berlin 1911-22, ii, 236-8; A. Sioufi, Les antiques et monuments de Mossoul, Mosul 1940, 17-23; J. M. Pley, Mossoul chrétienne, Beirut 1939, 19-28). In Islamic times St. George is frequently confused with the prophets Khīḍr and Ṭāhīr (see Kīdīr and Qīdīrīlīzī).

Bibliography: [Tabari, index; Tabarih Chronicle, tr. Zönten, Paris 1869, ii, 54-66; Ibn Kubayya, Maḍārīf, ed. ʿUkāhīya, index; ʿThālābi, Kiṣās al-anbiyā, Cairo 1382, 466 ff.; ʿṢāmī, Kāmās al-ʿālīm, ii, 1377; (C. PellaR De Vaux *)

Dījrīt (see DJISM). Dījrūf, a fertile, high lying district of Kīrmān with a city of the same name south-west of Bam and separated from it by the Bārīqān Mountains. There is no record of the city in pre-Islamic times and the first mention of the city is when Dījrūf was captured by Muḍīraḥ b. Masʿidū in 356/555 (al-Balāghūrī, Fiwa, 391). Thereafter the city is mentioned many times, especially in the Arabic geographies.

The Khāridjītes were active in Dījrūf but nothing is known of the history of the city. The geographer al-Muṣaddasī (461) praises the district highly in describing the fertility of its land and its beauty. The Šafrīl Yāʿkūb and his brother Ṭāmr are said to have embellished Dījrūf with buildings (Sykes, ii, 16). The city suffered much from the anarchy of the Mongol and post-Ikhnānī periods but it continued to exist in the Timūrid period after which Dījrūf disappears from the sources, although the district or Ḡakristīn retains the name to the present day.

The site of the old city of Dījrūf is unknown but it must be near the present town of Sabzāwarān, and some nearby ruins (Le Strange, 314) may be those of the old city.

Bibliography: Le Strange, 314; Schwarz, Iran, iii, 240; P. Sykes, A history of Persia, London 1930, ii, 16. (R. N. Frye)

Dījsīm (Ar.), body. In philosophical language the body (ṣawāṣ) is distinguished from the incorporeal (daşmāṣāt), God, spirit, soul, etc. In so far as speculation among the Muslims was influenced by Neo-Platonism two features were emphasized: (1) the incorporeal is in its nature simple and indivisible, the body on the contrary has a composite and divisible nature, (2) the incorporeal is in spite of its negative character the original, the causing principle, while the body is a product of the incorporeal.
The more or less naive anthropomorphism of early Islam, i.e., the conception of God after the analogy of the human form, is to be considered here. On it one may consult I. Goldziher, Vorlesungen über den Islām, 1910, 207 f., 120 f., and A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, 1932, 66 f. But from the usual taddīsm or tābqāhī we must distinguish the teaching of certain philosophers who called God a body; this is to some extent a question of terminology. According to al-Āṣfāri (Makhlūdī, ed. Ritter, i, 31 f., 44 f., 59 f., 207 f., iii, 303 f.), the Shī‘ī theologian al-Husayn b. al-Ashʿarī (first half of the 3rd/9th century) was the most important champion of the view that God is a body. He would not however (cf. 208 and 304) compare Him with worldly bodies but only describe Him in an allegorical sense as an existing being, existing through Himself. His description of God (p. 207) is thus to be interpreted: God is in a space which is above space; the dimensions of His body are such that His breadth is not distinguished from His depth and His colour is similar to His taste and smell; He is a streaming light, a pure metal shedding light on all sides like a round pearl. If we add that the qualities of bodies are also called bodies by Highām and others, then we must conclude with S. Horovitz (Über den Einfluss der griechischen Philosophie, 1919, 38 f.) that here Stoic terminology is present but with foreign additions. The doctrine of the spirituality of the soul of the incorporeality of God was recognized by Islam. Only the doctrine of the spirituality of the soul of man, held by many theologians, notably Ghazālī, did not find general recognition [cf. NAFS]. Ibn Hazm, for example (Kiāb al-Tabīfī, 80 ff.), calls the individual nafs a dišim, because it is distinguished from the souls of other individuals, because it has knowledge about much that another does not know, and so on.

A remarkable doctrine about the body had already appeared before Āṣfāri and then developed in his school, namely a theological atomism. Regarded from the philosophical side, the atomists and their opponents have at least one hypothesis in common: the body is composed of the incorporeals. How and according to the view of the atomist theologians, the body is composed of the smallest particles (atoms) which cannot be further subdivided, incorporeal themselves and not perceptible. They then fall out over the question how many atoms are required to make a body, in a way which reminds one of the old problem of how many grains of corn make a heap. A survey of this speculative atomism, the origins of which have not yet been fully explained, is given by D. B. Macdonald, Continuous re-creation and atomic time in Muslim scholastic theology (in Isis, no. 30, 1x/2, 1927, 326 ff.).

The philosophers, on the other hand, say with Aristotle and his school that the body is composed of matter and form (hayyālād or madda and sāra). Both are in themselves incorporeal, indivisible and imperceptible, but their combination, the body, is divisible because the body is a continuous magnitude. This is really a philosophically distanced cosmogenetic conception, the birth of the body from a male active principle (form) and a female receptive principle (matter). For Aristotle, who taught the eternity of a world order coming from God, the idea had hardly any importance; still less had it for the Stoics, who taught that matter and form are in reality separate beings which are separated in imagination (Arab. ji 'l-Dājīn, ji 'l-Wahim). But for the Neo-Platonists it became a gigantic problem, to derive the material, corporeal world from the incorporeal; it became still more difficult for the Muslim philosophers to effect a reconciliation with the absolute doctrine of creation.

Aristotle gives the following definition (cf. De coelo, i, 1, 268, 7 f., and Metaph., v, 13, 1020, 7): a body is that which has three dimensions (dimension = diātāsos, diāsētma, Arab bād, imtādād) and is a continuous, therefore always divisible, quantity (μονον συνεχες, kam mutāslīl).

A wordy dispute arose over this; the question was which is the most essential, the dimension or the magnitude, and how the magnitude is to be conceived (as incorporeal form). When the Neo-Platonists wish to "explain" something they make an abstract out of the concrete: σον becomes σοντις, kam becomes kāmiyya, magnitude becomes quantity and dišim dišimīyya (corporality). The following answer is then given to the question how a body comes into being: through corporality (= corporeal idea of form) being assumed by matter (also incorporeal by definition). When the absolute body or second matter is thus brought into existence, the dimensions and other qualities of the concrete bodies come into existence; the gap between in corporeal and corporeal is thus bridged.

As regards matter, this doctrine comes from the Enneads (eneides); the formulation that corporality is the first form of the body (ουςματικὸν εἴδως) is found in the Neo-Platonist expositor Simplicius (4th century) in his commentary on Aristotle's Physics (ed. Diels, 227 ff.). Hence in Arabic the expression sāra dišimīyya and in Latin forma corporis; because the body according to Aristotle is one of the five continuous magnitudes (like line, surface, space and time) one talks of continuity (ίττισι) as the form of the body.

The Ikhwān al-Safā, Ibn Sinā and al-Ghazālī adopted these subtleties, although in different proportions. The Ikhwān al-Safā place corporeality or absolute body (dišim mutlak) last in the series of emanations [cf. Fayd].

Ibn Sinā, who also distinguishes two matters, although he knows that the dišim is the translation of the Greek υπόμονη (hayyālād) and he regularly uses it synonymously, regards as the first form of existence of the body continuous quantity, in which the power is according to the dimensions, in other words, the dimensions are added like attributes or accidents (cf. hudud in isiṣ Rasûl, 58, 60 [thereon al-Ghazālī, Miṣṣār al-Simī, 180]; Ishdrat, ed. Forget, 90 ff.).

Ibn Rushd disputes (Metaphysics, Cairo ed., 37 ff.), as so often, the teachings of his predecessor without quite clearing up the problem.

When the Neo-Platonic philosophers and theologians talk of the body, it should always be asked what they mean by it: the divine original (= idea of the body) or its purest, unalterable copies in the heavenly spheres and constellations, or lastly the sublunar elementary bodies with their qualities, changes and combinations. This is the first step to comprehension, so far as this is possible.

The distinction between the heavenly bodies and earthly bodies influenced by them was very important for the natural philosophy of the period. The latter were composed of the four relatively simple bodies (elements, in Aristotle ἄρκλη σῶματα: Arab. al-bāṣāʾin). In the higher sense the heavenly bodies were simple; to describe them the term dišim (plur. aqīrīm) was used. In another respect they are synonymous with dišim. It is to be noted that the Theory of Aristotle (ed. Dieterici, 32, 40 f.) understands by
Djimmuntary those philosophers who as followers of Pythagoras teach that the soul of man is the harmony of its body (ψυκή, ψυκή, ψυκή). This was a theory particularly common among physicians.

Generally popular also was the distinction taken from Aristotle between the physical and the mathematical body (δασκάλια and δασκάλια). The geometricians are said to regard dimensions as ideal figures, abstracted from the many qualities possessed by natural bodies, with which the physicists deal.

Djimm. badan and djasad are used as synonyms of djism; the two last are usually applied to the human body, badan often only to the torso. While badan is also used for the bodies of animals, djasad is rather reserved for the bodies of higher beings (angels etc.). Djamid is an inorganic body, but adasid is used particularly for minerals. It may also be mentioned that haykal (plur. haykal) means with the gnostics and mystics the physical word as well as whole as the planets, because the world-soul and the spirits of the stars dwell in them like the soul of man in its body (cf. al-contains; Nicholson, Studies in Islamic mysticism, 110; cf. Theology of Aristotle, 167).


DJISR, pl. djisür (Ar., cf. Frankel, Arah. Fremdwörter im Arabischen, 285), "bridge", is more particularly, though by no means exclusively, a bridge of boats in opposition to חןעטר (q.v.), an arched bridge of stone.

An incidence of the history of the conquest of Babylonia has become celebrated among the Arab historians as yawn al-dj ISR "the day of [the fight at the bridge]": in 13/634 Abū 'Ubayd al-Thakafi was defeated and slain in battle against the Persians at a bridge across the Euphrates near Hira; cf. flere Hahaaus, Saker und Vorarbeiten, vi, 66 ff.; 73, Caetani, iii, 114 ff.

DJISR BANÂT YA'KÙB, the "bridge of the daughters of Jacob", name of a bridge over the Upper Jordan, above the sea of Galilee and to the south of the former marhsy depression of the lake of al-Hila, now dry. At this point, which was that of an old ford known at the time of the Crusades under the name of the "ford of Ya'kûtib" (Yadum Jacob of William of Tyre) or "ford of lamentations" (bakkahdad al-ahsān of Ibn al-A'thir and Yahkét), the 'a maris from Damascus to Saif and 'Akkā crossed the river, following a trade route which was especially frequented in Manllik times and which coincided also with a barid route. From this time dates the improvement of the crossing by the erection of a bridge of basalt of three arches, traces of which are still visible, and the construction nearby of a caravanserai, before 848/1444, by a Damascus merchant, who marked along with his foundations the route from Syria to Egypt (al-Nu'aymî, al-Darîs, ed. D. al-Hasani, ii, Damascus 1951, 290; cf. H. Sauvain, in J. d. 1895, ii, 262). Travellers and geographers, oriental and western alike, only rarely omit mention of this stage, sometimes under the designation also frequent, of Djrwr Ya'kûb or Pons Jacob.

The strategic importance of this crossing, again emphasized in 1799 when it marked the extreme point of the advance of French troops, was especially marked in the 6th/12th century when Franks and Muslims contested it furiously: Baldwin III was defeated here by Nūr al-Dīn in 552/1157; Baldwin IV built here in 573/1178 a fortress entrusted to the Templars, the Castellet of the ford of Jacob, whose ruins still remain on a knoll on the west bank 500 m. south of the bridge; this stronghold was taken and destroyed by Salāb al-Dīn a year later, in 575/1179. The favour enjoyed by the Biblical reminiscences centred on this locality even in the middle ages, and which seem to have resulted from a transfer to the Jordan of the tradition of Jacob's crossing of the Jabbok (now Nahr al-Zārkā), according to Genesis, xxii, 22, is attested by the toponymy of the region and by the mentions in Arabic authors of the 6th/12th century of a maghar al-Ya'kub, then a place of pilgrimage, and of a "castle of Jacob" (bašar Ya'kûb) or "house of lamentations" (bayy al-ahsān); the latter name refers to the lamentations of Jacob for the death of his son Joseph (recalled not far from there, at the place called Djubb Yosuf or Khân Djubb Yosuf, by the pit in which he is said to have been cast by his brothers). At the present day there further exists the "grotto of the daughters of Jacob" (magharat banāt Ya'kûb), a sanctuary whose name explains that of the bridge: cf. H. A. Wolfson, "iron bridge", name of a bridge across the Euphrates near Hira; cf. Wellhausen, in ZDMG, lxiv, 694-700; William of Tyre, xxi, 26; Ibn al-A'thir, xi, 301; RHC Or., i, 636; iv, 104, 203 ff.; Harawi, K. al-siyārāt, ed. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1953, 20 (Fr. tr. idem, Damascus 1957, 52 and n. 57); Yakût, i, 775; Dimashqî, ed. Mehren, ii, 187; H. Grossen, in ZDPV, Paris 1934-6, index s.v. Ják Bandî Yaqûb and Gué de Jacob.

Bibliography: R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, Paris 1927, 314; F. M. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine, Paris 1933-8, i, 162, 480, 486; ii, 226; Le Strange, Palestine, 53; A. S. Marmardji, Textes géographiques, Paris 1952, 7; M. Gaudefroy-Demombynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, 246; R. Hartmann, Die Stadte von Damaskus nach Kairo, in ZDMG, lxiv, 694-700; William of Tyre, xxi, 26; Ibn al-A'thir, xi, 301; RHC Or., i, 636; iv, 104, 203 ff.; Harawi, K. al-siyārāt, ed. Sourdel-Thomine, Damascus 1953, 20 (Fr. tr. idem, Damascus 1957, 52 and n. 57); Yakût, i, 775; Dimashqî, ed. Mehren, ii, 187; H. Grossen, in ZDPV, Paris 1934-6, index s.v. Ják Bandî Yaqûb and Gué de Jacob.

JISR AL-IJADID, "iron bridge", name of a bridge over the Orontes in the lower part of its course, at the point where the river, emerging from the valleys of the calcareous plateau and widening towards the depression of al-Amk (q.v.), turns sharply westwards without being lost in that marhsy depression whose waters it partly drains to the sea. The fame of this toponym, frequently mentioned in mediaeval documents but of obscure origin (perhaps local legend), is explained by the strategic and commercial importance of this stage, through which, in antiquity and in the middle ages, has always passed the route joining Antioch to Chalcis (Kinnasrin), and then Aleppo (a route frequently taken, at the time of Antioch's prosperity, by the caravan traffic descending from the col of Baylân [q.v.]). The bridge itself, defended by strong towers and fortified on various occasions (notably in 1162 by Baldwin IV), is known to have played a part of prime importance in the wars between Arabs and Byzantines as early as the 4th/10th century, later in the history of the principality of Antioch after its storm by the Franks of the first crusade. The present bridge retains no trace of the building of this period. In the neighbourhood is a raised site
which doubtless marks the position of the ancient Gephyra.


DJISR AL-SHUGHUR or DJISR AL-SHUGHAR, the modern name of a place in north Syria, the site of a bridge over the Orontes which has always been an important centre of communications in an area that is mountainous and difficult to traverse. It was in fact at this spot that the most direct route from the Syrian coast to the steppe in the interior and the Euphrates, passing over the Qalb al-Nuṣayr and the Limestone Massif, crossed the line of communications that ran north-south and followed the Orontes between Apamea/Kal'at al-Mamluk and Antioch/Anţūkiya. Of these two routes the second is today abandoned, its traffic having gradually declined during the Middle Ages, while swamps spread over the once fertile and cultivated plain of al-Qāb [q.v.]. But the valley of the Nahr al-Kabir and the depression of al-Rūj are still partly followed by the modern road from al-Ladhikyā towards Halab, crossing the Orontes by this bridge which has been so often rebuilt and altered, and across which the old trade route used to run, linking the coastal town of Laodicea with Chalcis/Kinnarīn and Berea/Halab, in one direction, and with al-Bāra'[q.v.] and Arra/Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān in the other.

There have long been attempts to identify this spot with the Seleucia ad Belum of Ptolomy, or Nicaea (corruption of Seleucobullos) of the *Itinerarium Antonini*, which in ancient times commanded one of the routes leading from the Limestone Massif. But the identification of this bridge with the one at Kasbah, so often mentioned in the fighting at the time of the Crusades, has given rise to much discussion. In the descriptions given by Arab authors, and also the modern aspect of the present village, only a caravanserais and a mosque of the Ottoman period testify to the fact that it was once a halting-place for pilgrims of the hadjdi coming from Anatolia and crossing Syria by the ancient road along the Orontes valley, and it is difficult to place at a date earlier than the Mamluk period (defaced inscription) the bridge with its assortment of materials and the sharp elbow projecting upstream. There seems however to be a convincing case, and on this point we follow R. Dussaud in his refutation of Max van Berchem's suggestion, for distinguishing the site of the cross-roads, the Kasbah, and the Kasbah, from the site of the twin castles of al-Shughur and Bakāṣ which stood in the same valley, but 6 km. to the north-west, and constituted one of the eastern defences of the Frankish principality of Antioch.

It is this fortress, whose ruins still crown a ridge of rock of which the central part has collapsed (hence the need to build two separate fortications) and dominate the village of Shughr al-Kadim amidst its gardens, which was conquered by Salāh al-Dīn in the course of the celebrated campaign of 1187-88, during which he first halted at Tall Kasbah. Later, this fortress formed part of the domains of the Ayyūbīd al-Mālik al-Zāhir Ghażāl and, after being captured by the Mongols, it became during the Mamluk period the centre of a military district ranking as one of the nīsabūs of the province of Aleppo. Its decline, from the time when it lost all its strategic importance, finally explains the subsequent rise of the modern Djisr al-Shughur and the return of a settled population to the neighbourhood of the bridge where, in the time of Abu 'l-Fidāʾ, there had only been a weekly market (crowded, however), and where caravanserais for foreign merchants were then built (the sovereign of Aleppo promised to put up a fondaco for the Venetians).


DJISS (A), plaster.—Muslim builders have generally shown themselves unanxious to use carefully chosen and worked materials in their constructions. Frequently walls, apparently hurriedly built, are composed of rubble (undressed stones) or even of pisé (compacted earth and lime) or mud-brick. This mediocre skeleton, however, is clad by facings which disguise its poverty and give it the illusion of richness. Just as the Byzantine builders decorated church sanctuaries and rooms in princely dwellings with marble plaques and mosaics with a gold ground, those of Persia, Egypt, or the Maghrib have covered the façades and interiors of their mosques and palaces with incised facyence or with sculptured and coloured claustra, wall-panelling, and windows themselves are adorned with perforated plaster *claustra*, their voids filled with coloured panes.

Plaster and stucco (made of a mixture of lime and marble or powdered eggshell, or else of pure gypsum and dissolved glue) are both of especial interest as the facings of exteriors and interiors. The plaster is carefully smoothed and decorated with paint, or, when it has been applied more or less thickly on the wall, sculptured by an iron tool whence the name of *naksh hadida* given in North Africa to work of this genre. In his book *L'Alhambra de Grenade*, 5, Henri Saladin has provided the following technical account [here translated]: "On a wall coated with plaster the craftsman would trace the intended design with a dry-point; then, with the help of chisels and burins, he would cut in the fresh plaster the ornaments which he had outlined. This procedure necessitated the use of a slow setting plaster, which could be obtained by the addition of gum or salt to plaster, as the Tunisian craftsman do today. Later this method was replaced by moulding, but this gives less delicacy. Mouldings of the Arab period may still be seen at the Alhambra. An examination of the ornamentation of the convent at S. Francisco, an old Alhambra de Grenade, 5, Henri Saladin has provided the following technical account [here translated]: "On a wall coated with plaster the craftsman would trace the intended design with a dry-point; then, with the help of chisels and burins, he would cut in the fresh plaster the ornaments which he had outlined. This procedure necessitated the use of a slow setting plaster, which could be obtained by the addition of gum or salt to plaster, as the Tunisian craftsman do today. Later this method was replaced by moulding, but this gives less delicacy. Mouldings of the Arab period may still be seen at the Alhambra. An examination of the ornamentation of the convent at S. Francisco, an old Alhambra de Grenade, 5, Henri Saladin has provided the following technical account [here translated]: "On a wall coated with plaster the craftsman would trace the intended design with a dry-point; then, with the help of chisels and burins, he would cut..."
can be seen, pierced by nails joined one to another by a network of string. One should add that besides the sculpture obtained by cutting away the field between the decorative elements one does also find moulded or impressed reliefs—particularly border mountings—level with and adhering to the ground-work, which has been cut back for this purpose.

The important role played by decoration of this genre in the Islamic art of the 8th/14th century, which saw the erection of the most notable parts of the Alhambra, is attested by a passage of Ibn Khaldun, who considers it as a branch of architecture (Mukaddima, ii, 327; Rosenthal, ii, 360-1): he remarks that the work is executed by iron tools (bi mathdkib al-hadid) in the still wet plaster. However, it goes without saying that plaster as an element of decoration is much earlier than the blossoming of Hispano-

Arabian art. To what period should one assign its adoption by the Muslims, and to what influence can it be attributed?

Hellenistic art, one of the essential sources of the Muslim arabesque, was not ignorant of stucco relief, which was often delicately modelled. It must not be supposed, however, that Islam has inherited the art of the Roman or Byzantine workers in gypsum plaster, for Islamic moulded-plaster decoration is very different, both as a technique and as a style. It is apparently towards Sasanian art that the search for its origin must be directed. The Syrian castle of Kašr al-Hayr, founded by the Umayyad Highām in 112/728, in the ornamentation of which Sasanian motifs preponderate, presents some panels which are indicative of this origin. A compact floral decor, wholly filling the geometrical frames which divide the panels, is treated without relief but by cutting out the plaster perpendicularly or obliquely to the surface plane. This sunken two-dimensional sculpture, in which there is no projection, is already that of the Islamic works in plaster of the succeeding centuries. It flourishes in the 3rd/9th century at Sāmarrā and, mixed with Hellenistic elements, gives rise to the linear undercut decoration of the 'Abbāsid palaces. This was transmitted, with many another fashion, from ʻIrāq to the Egypt of the Tūlūnids. From Egypt it reached North Africa, where it found a favourable soil. An extension towards the Sahara among the Khārijītes, who had taken refuge at Sedrātā near Warglā, must be mentioned. The plaster there, which mixed with sand is very durable, is used, under the name of tinšgēnt, for incised decorative facings, where the African Christian inheritance appears side by side with Mesopotamian reminiscences. However, it is especially in the Maghrīb and in Spain that sculptured plaster attains its greatest beauty. The 6th/12th century saw the birth in Marrakesh, Fez, and Tlemcēn, of facings with a floral decoration where the sculptor has given to this plastic decoration at richness of forms, a firmness yet a flexibility of composition, a vigour in relief (e.g., the Almoravid domes of the midāl at Marrakesh and of the Ḥarawiyyin of Fez, the Almohad capitals of the Kutubiyya etc.) which greatly transcend the usual frontiers of the arabesque. The rôle played by sculptured plaster in Hispano-

Arabian art in the 13th and 14th centuries is well known. It was to be maintained in Spain in the mudjār monuments, and to survive in the later Tunisia and Morocco, attesting less the decorative invention of the artists than their fidelity to tradition and their manual skill. (G. Marçais)

**BITAL** [see sīkka, ważn].

**AL-DJIWA** (also Liwā, probably derived from the local pronunciation of ǧ as y, resulting in al-yiwa > liwa) a district of many tiny oases in the heavy sands of south-central al-Ẓafra, the large, almost completely sand-covered region extending southward from the Persian Gulf between Sabbāḥat Maṭṭī in the west almost to Long. 55° E. The oases nestle in the hollows and passage ways of the northernmost sand mountains of al-Baṭin, with the greatest number lying between Lat. 23° N. and Lat. 23° 15' N. The eastern third of the oases, which are smaller and less frequented than the others, bear to the southeast below Lat. 23° N.

The word al-Djiwa, which lies only a few feet below the surface, supports numerous small groves of date palms growing on the sheltered side of great dunes. In many places the owners live above their gardens on the dunes themselves, where there is a chance of catching a cooling breeze. The ruins of several forts are scattered throughout the district, but today the inhabitants live only in palm-thatch huts. All but a few of the oases are uninhabited except during the summer when the date groves require attention. During the rest of the year most of the owners are in the desert with their herds or along the coast of the Persian Gulf. Among the settlements usually inhabited the year round are al-Māriya, ʻAtūf, Shīdh al-Kalb, al-Kayya, al-Karmīda, Shūh, and Thāwāmīyya.

The people of al-Djiwa belong, in roughly descending order of numbers, to the tribes of al-Manāṣir, al-Maṣrī, al-Hawāmil, al-Maḥārība, al-Kubahāt, ʻAl Bū Falāb, al-Marar, and ʻAl Bū Muḥayr. All but al-Manāṣir belong to the conglomerations usually referred to as Bani Yās [q.v.]. Sand-dwelling tribesmen, such as members of ʻAl Ṭaḥsid and al-ʻAwānim, of some whom even a few palms, are frequent visitors. A few residents of al-Djiwa own pearling boats, and every year some of the men journey north to the Persian Gulf to seek their fortunes on the pearling banks. Their number declines, however, as more find employment with the oil companies operating in various parts of Arabia.

Al-Djiwa lies within the more than 70,000 sq. km. of territory in dispute between Saudi Arabia and Abu Zaby. During the abortive arbitration of this dispute in 1945-4 (see al-Buraymi), both sides contended that they had historical rights to sovereignty over al-Djiwa and that they had exercised jurisdiction by collecting zakūt (Saudi Arabia on the Persian Gulf banks) and by maintaining law and order. Abu Zaby claimed the traditional loyalty of all the inhabitants of al-Djiwa, while Saudi Arabia maintained that the preponderance, including all of al-Manāṣir and al-Maṣrī, were loyal Saudis.

Al-Djiwa was unknown to the Western world until 1324/1906 when the acting British Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, F. Z. Cox, learned of its existence from a former inhabitant.

concerning Buraimi and the Common Frontier between Abu Dhabi and Saudi Arabia, 1955. The only detailed material on the district in Arabic is to be found in the Arabic and English versions of the Saudi Arabian and United Kingdom arbitration memorials cited above. (W. E. MULLIGAN)


djīwar, the 'urf of Mullā Ahmad b. Abī Sa‘īd b. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abbāl-Razzāk b. Makhādum Khās-sa i Khudā al-Ḥanāfī al-Ṣāliḥī (he claimed descent from the Prophet Sāliḥ) was born at Arba‘ī, near Lucknow, in 1047/1637, as he was 21 (?) lunar years old in 1065/1645 when he completed his Al-Tafsīr al-Āhmadī (cf. Ḥadīth al-Ḥanāfīyya, 436). The same year of age, that states he was 35 years of age at the time of his death in 1130/1717. Gifted with an extraordinary memory, he was taken to the Kur‘ān by heart at the age of seven. Studying in his early years first with Muhammad Šādik al-Sītārkī, he completed his education in rational and traditional sciences at the age of sixteen with Luṭf Allāh Šūṭa-Dājahnābādī. Contrary to the historical opinions such as the ‘Ālamgir-nīmā and the Mu‘āthār-i ‘Ālamgīrī, all his biographers unanimously agree that he was appointed as one of his ‘teachers’ by Arwaẓnizībī who greatly respected and honoured him. This must have happened between 1064/1653 and 1068/ 1657, the year Arwaẓnizībī ascended the throne. Most probably, the emperor, on his accession, read certain books in a small Mullā, Šūṭa ‘Ālan I, the son and successor of Arważnizībī, like his father, also held him in great esteem. The Mulla must have attained high proficiency in fiḥk as, at the comparatively young age of 21, he compiled his Arabic Tafsīr dealing with those akhān ghar‘iyya that are deducible only from the Kur‘ān. After completing his education, he began to teach at his home-town. He left for Adīmīr and Dīhil in 1071/1660, where he stayed for a considerable time teaching and preaching. In 1102/1699 he left on a visit to Mecca and Medina for the first time and after a stay of five years there returned to India in 1107/1695. He then joined the imperial service and spent some six years with the armies of Arwaẓnizībī who was then engaged in fighting against the Deccan kingdoms. In 1112/ 1700 he returned to India the second time for Al-Dīgāz and after twice performing the Ḥadīẓ and its šiyārah returned to Arba‘ī in 1116/1704. After a short stay of two years, during which he received the Šu‘fī hikmā from the Shāhīy Yāsn. b. ‘Abbāl-Razzāk al-Kādirī, he repaired to Dīhil with a large number of pupils. He was received in audience at Adīmīr by Šu‘ī ‘Ālan I (1119-24/1707-12) who took him to Lahore. He returned to Dīhil on the death of Šu‘ī ‘Ālam and engaged himself again in his favourite profession of teaching. He had also established a madrasa in his home-town Arba‘ī. A detailed account of this institution appears in the Urdu work Tārikh hasaba-i Arba‘ī by Khāṣīm Huṣayn (ed. ? date ?). He died in his niyāra in the Dīhil masjīd of Dīhil in 1130/1717 but his dead body was later disinterred and taken to his home-town for final burial.

He is the author of: (i) Al-Tafsīr al-Āhmadīyya fi bayān al-ayāt al-ṣahr‘iyya, compiled in five years 1060-9/1650-8 while he was still a student (ed. Calcutta, 1263 A.H.); (ii) Nār al-‘umma‘r, a commentary on the Nasfa‘ī’s Manṭari al-‘ummar on the principles of jurisprudence, written at the request of certain students of Medina in a short period of two months; also frequently printed; (iii) al-Samā‘īk, on the lines of Dīhil’s ā‘āl al-Lawābī written in the Hikmat during his second visit in 1112/1700; (iv) Manātīb al-‘ulayhiyya, biographies of saints and ḥadīth which he compiled in his old age at his home-town. The work contains a supplement by his son ‘Abbāl-Kādir and a detailed autobiographical note (for an extract see Nasfa‘ī’s Tafṣīr al-Nakhrā, vi, 21); (v) Edībī-Aḥmadī, on sā‘īf and mystic stations, compiled in his younger days.

Bibliography: Āzād Bilgrāmī, Subha al-mardžān, Bombay 1238 /1885; 79; idem, Manātīb al-‘ulum, Agra 1328/1910, 216-7; Rāhman ‘All Ālī, Tārikh-i ‘ulānā-i Hind, Cawnpore 1914, 45; Fakhr Muhammad, Ḥadīth al-Ḥanāfīyya, Lucknow 1324/1906, 416; Siddīq Ḥusayn Khān, Ḥabīd al-‘ulām, Bhopal 1325 A.H., 907; Ḥabīd al-Hāvy Lakhnawī, Nashat al-khwātir, Haydarābād 1376/ 1957, vi, 19-21 (contains the most detailed and authentic notice); ‘Abbāl al-Ahwāl Dājmāpurī, Muṣīf al-Mufīr, 113; Ḥabīd Nāwāz Khān, Manātīb al-‘ummar, Bibl. Ind., iii, 794; M. G. Zubaida Ahmad, Contribution of India to Arabic literature, Allāhābad 1946, index; Brockelmann, ii, 1164-5; Muhammad b. Mu‘atamār Khān, Tārikh-i Muḥammadī (Ethe 2834), contains a short but useful notice in Arabic; Ḥabīd Huṣayn, Ṣubḥ-i Bahār (MS. in Urdu).

A. S. Bazmool Ansari, Dīhil, “protection, residence” and “neighbourhood”, nown of action of the 3rd form to which only the second meaning corresponds, as in the grammatical term dijarr al-dīhil “attraction of the indirect case” (syn. dijarr al-mudjādāra, cf. Wright, Gr. Ar. Lang., 1955, ii, 234 B). Dīhil “protection” corresponds to the 4th form adījār, and particularly to the substantive dijār “one protected, client” coinciding with the Hebrew gār “one protected by the clan or community”. Noldeke in his study of the Addād noted the identity of the institution “in the same juridical sense” (in wesentlich demselben rechtlichen Sinne, Neue Beiträge zur sem. Sprachw., Strasbourg 1910, 38). The religious suggestion of “protection of a holy place”, so frequent in Arabic, strangely recurs in the Hebrew gār and especially in the Phoenician equivalent which, in numerous proper names, denotes one protected by a sanctuary or divinity, as well as in a text of Ras Šhamra kindly brought to our attention by M. Ch. Virolleau, the eminent pioneer in this field of study: “gār already figures in the 14th century B.C. in a poem containing the expression gr t l which I translated in 1936, in my Légende de Danel, 165, as ‘hôte de la maison de Dieu’ . . .” (Cyrus H. Gordon, Ugar. Manual glossary no. 357, rendered it by ‘a person taking asylum in a temple’). The evident relationship of the term to the religious vocabulary is further emphasized by the later evolution of the Hebrew gār in the well-known sense of “converted to Judaism”. Noldeke’s remark (loc. cit.) giving precedence to the sense of “one protected” presupposes, in accordance with a well-known law, a term of socio-religious significance, owing its survival to the importance of the institution in nomadic customary law. Despite the Arab lexicographers, and also Gesenius, who wish to derive from a primitive meaning “to deviate”, the meaning “to stay in the house of a host”, it may be a question of the almost universal semantic link between “foreigner, enemy” (cf. Latin hostis) and “guest, client”, for the root gār in both languages also has the sense of hostility, injustice. Gesenius compares the Arkaian gār, which is rather “guest, enemy”, which would agree with the suggested etymology.

DJIZA [see AL-KĀHIRA].

DJIZAN [see DJAYZĀN].

AL-DJIZIL, Abū Muḥammad al-Raḥf b. Sulaymān b. Dāwūd al-Azdi al-Aṣrāfī (died in Djiza, Egypt, in Dhul-Hijjah 256 or 257/870 or 871), an eminent follower of al-Shāfī‘ī and most probably a direct disciple of his. Like a good number of early Shāfī‘īs he was originally a Mālikī and disciple of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Jahm. After his adherence to Shāfi‘īsm he devoted himself to making an accurate compilation of Kitāb al-Umm. Together with that of al-Buwayfī, his version of this master work of Shāfī‘īsm is the most trustworthy. It may be considered as representing the second phase of Shāfī‘ī jurisprudence known as the Egyptian. His compilation was rewritten at a later date with insertions of another Rābi‘ī (Abu Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Murādī, d. 720/833). It is difficult to distinguish in Kitāb al-Umm things attributed to our Rābi‘ī from those of the other. Zaki Mubārāk, in his study of Kitāb al-Umm has tried to find characteristics of both, but his reasoning is not convincing. Al-Rābi‘ī al-Dīzīl counts among his disciples Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasrī. Ibn Khallikān illustrates him as a most virtuous and modest man.

Bibliography: Al-Subkī, Tabābāī, Cairo, i, 53; Ibn Khallikān, Wālayjāf, Cairo 1948, i, 53, no. 220; Ibn al-Zayyāt, Al-Kawākbī al-sayyārā bi tartīb al-siyāra, Cairo, 155; Zaki Mubārāk, Taḥlīl nasab Kitāb al-Umm, Cairo 1932, 73; M. K. Husayn, Adab Muṣr al-Islāmīyya, Cairo, 58, 95 (note).

DJIZYA (i)—the poll-tax which, in traditional Muslim law, is levied on non-Muslims in Muslim states. The history of the origins of the djizya is extremely complex, for three different reasons: first, the writers who, in the ‘Abbāsīd period, tried to collect the available materials relating to the operation of the gīyūrā and the khardā used for taxes which in these texts were used with different meanings, at times in a wide sense, at others in a technical way and even then varying, so that in order to be able to complete a reasonable picture they tended to interpret them according to the meaning which had become current and best defined in their own time; secondly, it is a fact for which due allowance is not made that the system which sprang from the Arab conquest was not uniform, but resulted from a series of individual, and not identical, agreements or decisions; finally, this system followed after, but did not overthrive, earlier systems which themselves differed one from another and which, moreover, in the period immediately before Islam, are imperfectly understood and a subject of controversy. In these conditions, the account that follows can do no more than serve as a provisional guide.

The word gīyūrā, which is perhaps connected with an Aramaic original, occurs in the Kurān, IX, 29 where, even at that time, it is applied to the dues demanded from Christians and Jews, but probably in the somewhat loose sense, corresponding with the root, of "conversation" (for non-adoption of Islam), and in any case as collective tribute, not differentiated from other forms of taxation, and the nature of its content being left uncertain (the examples given in the works on the biography of the Prophet are very variable; tribute was adapted to the individual conditions of each group concerned). It is possible that, mutatis mutandis, precedents can be found in pre-Islamic Arabia outside the religious sphere, in the conditions of submission of inhabited oases to more powerful tribal groups, in return for protection; but as a result of their conquests the Arabs, heirs of the Byzantine and Sasanid régimes, were to be faced with new practical problems.

Naturally there was no hesitation over the fact that the dhimmīs [q.v.] had to pay the Muslim community a tax which, from the point of view of the conqueror, was material proof of their subjection, just as for the inhabitants it was a concrete continuation of the taxes paid to earlier regimes. This tax could be of three sorts, according to whether it was levied on individuals as such, or on the land, or was a collective tribute unrelated to any kind of assessment. In the ‘Abbāsīd period, the texts show us a clear theoretical distinction between taxes levied on the one hand a tax on land, the khardā, which except in particular instances could not be suppressed since the land had been conquered once for all for the benefit of the permanent Muslim community, and a tax on persons, the gīyūrā, which, for its part, came to an end if the taxpayer became Muslim. But it is far from being the case that such a distinction was always made, either in law or in fact, in the first century of Islam, and the problem is simply to determine what was the primitive practice, and how the ultimate stable system was gradually attained.

Starting from the indisputable fact that in the very early texts the words djizya and khardā are constantly taken either in the wide sense of collective tribute or in apparently narrower but inter-changeable senses (khardā on the head, gīyūrā on land, as well as vice versa), Wellhausen, and then Becker and Caetani etc., built up a system according to which the Arabs, at the time of the conquest, are alleged to have levied collective tribute on the defeated, without taking the trouble to distinguish between the different possible sources of tax, and it was only the multiplicity of conversions which, at the very end of the Umayyad rule, led, particularly in Khurāsān, to a distinction in the total revenues being made between two taxes, the one on the person, ceasing with the status of dhimmī, the other on land which remained subject to the obligations placed upon it by the conquest. This theory, apart from the prejudicial question that it contradicts the opinion of all classical jurists, in fact comes up against numerous difficulties and recently has been severely breached, especially by Løkkegaard and even more by Dannet whose conclusions, in their general lines and inspiration, no longer seem to be refutable, although even they do not answer all the problems which they in their turn raise. They have demonstrated completely that the texts often make an effective distinction between the tax on land and the tax on the person, even if the term denoting them is variable, and have stressed the improbability that a reform which covered the whole empire should have started in the remote province of Khurāsān
during the final anarchic years of the Umayyad dynasty, and (especially Dennett in a closely reasoned analysis of the situation region by region) that one could not speak of a uniform system immediately after the conquest, since neither the earlier institutions nor the conditions of occupation had been everywhere the same.

The Sāsānid empire had possessed a fiscal system which distinguished between a general tax on land and a poll-tax, at rates varying according to the degree of wealth, but from which the aristocracy were exempt. The Christian Byzantine empire had a more complex system about which we still remain uncertain on many points. A personal tax did exist, but was scarcely used, except only for colonists and non-Christians. The general tax made no distinction; in the case of a small property fiscally subject to the direct administration of the State, it was apparently levied on agricultural cultivation, on the basis of a unit of measurement or jāwām; on the other hand, in large estates enjoying a certain autonomy it appeared to be more practical to base the calculation on the number of persons working; but if the tax was in this way proportional to the size of the population, it was still in no way a specific poll-tax since it was not added to another tax which was apparently based on the land. This precise point must be kept clearly in mind if we wish to understand the subsequent developments.

Now in some instances the conquest was effected purely by force, in which case the system established was at the conqueror's discretion, at other times as the result of a treaty of capitulation, and in this case, when the native population kept its fiscal autonomy, a particular fiscal system might be merely stipulated, or else a certain sum might be fixed in advance as tribute to be paid, with allowances being made for considerations of assessment.

In Irāk, the province to which most of the ‘Abbāsid jurists refer, the conquest was in general effected by force, or at least with the abandonment of the Sāsānid administrative services; with the help of native subordinates the Arabs controlled the institution and collection of taxes which followed the traditional lines. The poll-tax was still distinct from a land tax, though its rate was probably increased (1, 2, 4 dinārs = 12, 24, 48 dirhams), but the grading of wealth was maintained. To remain exempt from this poll-tax, the members of the aristocracy declared their allegiance to the Muslim faith; one cannot say if at the same time they were freed from the land tax, though subject to it in the modified form of the tithe levied on Muslims' property.—In most of the towns of Syria and Upper Mesopotamia, the Arab occupation was carried out by means of treaties which distinguished them from the large autonomous estates of the previous regime; although temporary agreements at the very beginning had established collective tribute, the system which was set up was one of autonomous control, but with the tax defined by the conqueror and usually calculated (as at Hira in Irāk) on the basis of a fixed contribution (generally 1 dinār) per head, and thus a tax proportional to the population, as was the case before on the large estates; the same method of calculation may have continued on the large estates, but under the direct control of the conqueror, since most of the great Byzantine landowners had disappeared, and with the addition of the poll-tax on the colonists (?); incidentally the conquerors often found it advantageous at that time to accept the peasants' payments in kind. In Egypt most of the Christian communities were taxed under a system which united payments in kind, a land tax of 1 dinār per faddān (unit of cultivated land) and a specific poll-tax of 1 dinār per head, this last fast, however, being based on the calculation of the sum which the community had to pay, on the condition that the total amount would eventually be divided among the inhabitants in the most equitable proportions (as papry show); contrary to previous belief, this poll-tax must in practice have constituted for the mass of the inhabitants a burden almost as heavy as the land tax. Finally, in the greater part of Irān and central Asia, as well as in some places in Cyrenaica, the system established was of fixed tribute to be paid by the local rulers who were maintained in office, with no interference from the conquerors either in declaring or collecting the tax; in Khorāsān in particular, taxpayers continued to be charged on the basis of the Sāsānid dual system of land tax and poll-tax, apart from any questions of conversion or non-conversion to the new religion. Whatever uncertainties remain in particular systems (especially in Syria, it seems), it will be seen that, in general, the duality of land tax and poll-tax existed at the taxpayer's level, under various conditions, for the greater part of the peasant populations, while on the other hand a system of unitary contribution prevailed throughout the town population of Syrian towns and in Upper Mesopotamia; the conquerors, particularly in the East, held aloof from these distinctions so long as the tribute was paid.

However, difficulties very soon appeared. In Egypt monks were exempt from poll-tax; the Copts, who since Roman times had been past masters of tax evasion, noted that the taxpayer could escape payment of poll-tax if he left the district where he was enrolled or, better still, if he entered a monastery. It therefore became necessary to make all monks in their turn subject to poll-tax (a much more probable explanation than the alternative upon which one is driven back if one accepts that the poll-tax was a tax at the beginning of the Muslim régime: since it was later found applied to monks, the argument runs that it made its original appearance in the form of a tax on the monks). It was necessary to apply for authorization for removal, and to mark taxpayers with an indelible stamp, hence all those passports, seals etc. of which archaeologists have provided us with so many unimpeachable examples. Phenomena of the same sort must have existed in many places, and are for example recorded in Upper Mesopotamia and also in Irāk.

There, however, matters are presented to us somewhat differently. In Irāk, in fact, evasion of taxes took the form of conversion to Islam, the convert believing that his new status would free him from the whole fiscal complex levied on the non-Muslim, that is to say the land-tax and the poll-tax. In reality what happened at the beginning —and the Muslim administration did not look upon it amiss—was that the convert abandoned his land, with no thought of it ceasing to be subject to the kharājī, to a non-convert who guaranteed its cultivation and fiscal capacity. The thing was possible so long as it happened infrequently and the treasury had little to fear, for the new régime had inherited from its predecessors, both Byzantine and Sāsānid, the idea of the joint liability of each locality in regard to taxation, and those who remained therefore paid for the land which had left the owners and was now being exploited. However, by the time the terrible governor al-Hadidjadi came to Irāk the matter had
already assumed dangerous proportions as regards the development of land, and hence also threatened the treasury. He then took the draconic decision to send back the peasants to the land, to subject them to taxation again, including poll-tax, and, in practice, to forbid them to be converted to Islam.—A similar problem arose in Kfarasân; but there it was the native aristocracy who persecuted the peasantry who were guilty of conversion to Islam: since every conversion risked increasing the burden of taxes on non-Muslims and compelling the aristocracy to make good from their own pockets any short-comings in payments, they tried wherever they could to impose still heavier taxes upon the Muslims, at least the poorer ones, rather than on the non-Muslims: inequality in reverse ... It is clear that these repressions also could not last. It was somehow inadmissible, in a Muslim State, virtually to penalize entry into Islam. The pious 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz is credited with an attitude of absolute reaction to the policy, and he is said to have gone so far as to encourage conversions by the remission of the whole complex of taxes levied on non-Muslims. The most authoritative texts recently discovered or interpreted do not confirm such a Utopian outlook (H. A. R. Gibb, The fiscal rescript of 'Umar II, in Arabica, ii, (1955)). It seems that the law clearly differentiated the doctrine of fāy (q.v.), there was a move towards the idea of dissociating from the complex of taxes imposed on the non-Muslims the kharāj, which from this time on was regarded rather as being levied specifically on land and not on the person, and hence was compatible with the status of Muslim: the poll-tax, as such, was to disappear, but the treatment did have been undertaken from the time of 'Abd al-Malik (Abū Yusuf, 24; cf. Løkkegaard, 133), to give a truly personal character to it of the dhimmis, as earlier in Saljukid Asia Minor (for this point see in particular Kermitüddin Aksarayi, Musâmeret 'il-âhab, ed. O. Turan, 153, with analysis of F. Isiltan, 1943, 81), once again confers considerable importance on the dījziya, although the word often bestowed on it is kharāj (the land-tax at that time bearing other names; see below). A certain number of rules formulated during the 'Abbasid period appear to be generally valid from that time onwards. Dījziya is only levied on those who are male, adult, free, capable and able-bodied, so that children, old men, women, invalids, slaves, beggars, the sick and the mentally deranged are excluded. Foreigners are exempt from it on condition that they do not settle permanently in the country. Inhabitants of frontier districts who at certain times could be enrolled in military expeditions even if not Muslim (Mardaites, Armenians, etc.), were released from dījziya for the year in question. A personal fixed contribution, the dījziya was levied by lunar years (generally just before or just after the beginning of the year; sometimes in Ramadân under the Ma'mûls), unlike taxes connected with agriculture; it could thus be dissociated from them in tax-farming and 'idâ concessions. Money was stipulated, and normally payment had to be made in it, but payment in kind was admissible, under an officially determined scale of equivalent values. According to the Kur'ânic text, one must give al-dījziya 'an yad, which has since been interpreted, perhaps wrongly, to mean "by hand" and personally (on this point see F. Rosenthal, Some minor problems in the Qur'ân, in The Joshua Starr Memorial Volume, New York 1953, 68-72, and Cl. Cahen, Coran IX-29, ...), in Arabica, ix (1962), 76-9); administratively, this meaning suggests the need to count the non-Muslim population, hence for instance the forbidding of all village notables to accept a lump payment of dījziya from their subordinates. Furthermore it was desired to have confirmation given to every individual concerning his status as a subject of Islam or, more accurately, as a member of an inferior social class; it is apparently in this way that we must interpret the Kur'ânic formula (which
follows the one given above) wa-hum sdghirun (sometimes glossed as abār ibi ʿi-ṣaḥābir), in connection with the well-known instances of notables or Arabs refusing, although Christians, to pay the "dijiza of the 'ulūdāt", rather than as implying the necessity for a humiliating procedure, which later rigorists claimed to find in it. Actual censuses were apparently undertaken, especially at the time of the differentiation between dijiza and kharradī (by 'Abd al-Malik in Syria, Yazid II in Egypt, etc.), and, reciprocally, the evaluation at 130,000 dinārs of the total return from dijiza levied in the time of Saladin, for example, at the average rate of 2 dinārs, allows us to estimate the Christian population then in the country at about 65,000 heads of families.

In principle, the dijiza, like the sakāt, had to be used for pensions, salaries and charities. But under this pretext it was often paid into the Prince's private treasury. Malik and al-Shafīʿī admit that the rate of tax could be increased; with or without doctrinal justification, arbitrary demands appeared at times during the economically difficult and religiously strict period of the Mamluks; however, we must take count of the fact that the growing scarcity of gold and the devaluation of the dirham had often brought the dijiza to a level lower than was stipulated by doctrine; moreover the monks, or at least those in poor monasteries, found a way to reduce their returns.

In the territories directly controlled by the Mongols, before their conversion to Islam, the original fiscal system abolished the poll-tax on non-Muslims; when they adopted the Muslim religion, zealous agents sought to make the Christians pay all the arrears (forty years...) (al-Dijazārī, Chronique, ed. Sauvaget, 48, Nr 307).—In Sicily, after the original fiscal system abolished the poll-tax on non-Muslims, we find a way to reduce their returns.

The dijiza has naturally disappeared from modern Muslim States as a result of the growing equality of religions, the introduction of military service and the modernization of new fiscal systems.
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(C. L. CAHEN)
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**Dijiza**

The word kharradī was used for preference instead of dijiza by the 10th/11th century, later dijizārī or dijizārī-šerī (cf. indexes in R. Anhegger-H. Inalcik, Kanunname-i Sultān..., Ankara 1956; Tāyīb Gökbgil, Pata Livan, İstanbul 1952; F. Kraeilletz, Ör. Urvuhendes in türkischer Sprache, Vienna 1922; Ö. L. Barkan, Kanunlar, İstanbul 1943). Bahṣ-kharradī for dijiza was occasionally found in the documents (cf. T. Gökbgil, 158, and B. Lewis, in BSOAS, xiv (1952), 553, 559) to distinguish it from land-kharradī. For the collector of dijiza, khardrādī or khardrādī is used in the first period, dijizārādī later.

The payment of dijiza was sometimes dependent on the land possessed: anyone, Muslim or non-Muslim, who possessed a bāghīna, land recorded under the possession of a dāmmī (cf. Ćitlik), was to pay dijiza (cf. the regulation of Ohri dated 1022/1613 in Ö. L. Barkan, 295; that of Avlonya in Sürer-i Defter-i Sanack-i Arannd, ed. H. Inalcik, Ankara 1954, 124). The reason given for this was the treasury's concern to protect the dijiza revenues.

Following a conservative policy in the conquered lands, the Ottomans identified certain pre-Ottoman poll-taxes with dijiza. Upon the request of their new subjects in Hungary (Barkan, 304) they accepted for dijiza the old tax of one flori, gold, paid per family to the Hungarian kings before the conquest (cf. Barkan, 303, 320). Previously in the Balkans the Ottomans, under their post-conquest poll-tax, probably of the same origin as the Hungarian one flori tax, in their own taxation only as an nurī poll-tax under the name of ispendje (cf. H. Inalcik, Osmanlîlarda razıyet rüşûmî, in Belleten, xiii, 602). They ruled that anyone subject to dijiza was to pay ispendje (Belleten, xiii, 602). But the latter was ordinarily included in timār [q.v.]. It can be supposed that the Ottomans, like the first Muslim conquerors of Egypt and Syria, found in the Balkans and Hungary a poll-tax of one gold piece, probably from a common Roman origin (cf. P. Løkkegaard, Islamic taxation, Copenhagen 1950, 134-5). Sanctioned by māṣ and idiftyād as asserted in the firmans, dijiza was for the Ottomans a religious tax the collection and spending of which had to receive special care. It was collected as a rule directly for the state treasury by the Sultan's own kâds [q.v.]. It was exceptional to grant dijiza revenues as timār or mākul. Also it was farmed out only in special cases (cf. Anhegger-Inalcik, 39). As a garbi tax belonging to the bayt māl al-muslimin its administration was put under the supervision of the kâds and not infrequently its actual collection was made by them (cf. Gökbgil, 158).

The dijiza revenues were spent usually for military purposes or assigned to the regular pay of a military
unit as qiyalik. Mahmud II raised the rates of diizya and assigned it to the upkeep of his reformed army of tasdir-i mansura, claiming this as a religious use for ghazd. As a result, diizya was drawn up defter-i Ajizya-i gahrdn book called defter-i Ajizya-i gabrdn. But, as we read in the defter of Buda and Pest in L. Fekete, Die Systgat- schrif in der türkischen Finanzverwaltung, Budapest 1955, i, doc. 8, 20 pp. 176-98, 350-5; ii, facsimiles, Tables XI, XXXVI). Referred to also as asi defter, original defter, this book was made in two copies, one for the central treasury, the other for the provincial administration. The census was to be renewed. But, as we read in the nishdn of 22 Dju- mādā II 1102/23 March 1691 such censuses were not renewed for long periods and as a result of deaths and births, flights and conversions the books did not reflect the actual situation. In the reign of Mehmed II half of the diizya due from the fugitives of a village was to be made good by its timār-holder and the other half by the remaining diizya-payers (R. A. Becq, Imam al-Malik, 176). But, with the collapse of the timār system in the late 16th/17th century the whole burden fell upon the latter. Finally by the reform of 1102/1691 each diizya payer was made responsible only for his own personal diizya and a paper, kāghdī or warāk, was delivered to certify its payment. On the other hand the fugitives were pursued, (ibid.) or, sometimes, the authorities would try to bring them back by promising a reduction in the rate of diizya, as was done to repopulate the deserted villages in the province of Manastir (Monastir) in 1117/1705.

As a rule every third year, called new-yafste (Nau- Yâfiya) yilli a general inspection was made to cross out the dead, mirde (murde) and to add new-yafste (new-yafste), those who were omitted from the defter for one reason or another, among them the bāshis, kethals, kheidżis, Dīzva ʻil-i harān, in the time of Mehmed II and Helge Ingelhart, Fikh (Al-Durar, 212; Mewkufatī, 1, 351) distinguished two kinds of diizya, that fixed by suh, agreement, the amount of which could not be altered, and that levied by the prince, al- diizya ʻala ʻl-ruṣūs. The former, called in Ottoman official terminology diizya ber wehz-i makhṭūt or simply makhṭūt, was extensively applied and found two different fields of application in the Ottoman empire: (a) The submission as a vassal of a Christian prince always implied the payment of an agreed yearly tribute however small the amount might be. Then the Sultan censored the non-Muslims under the prince as the Sultan’s own khardi-paying subjects (see Boğqdan, Raguza) and the yearly tribute which was usually paid in gold pieces as a khardi-i makhṭūt (see Dār al-Šahād); (b) In some cases the qimmi under the Sultan’s direct rule were permitted to pay their diizya in a fixed sum, ber wehz-i makhṭūt, as a community. The qimmi ra‘ayā applied for it mostly to escape the abuses of the diizya-collectors and their request was accepted by the government often to insure its payment, for other- wise they often threatened to abandon their villages and run away. On the other hand the Albanian mountain tribes of Klementi living in five villages were permitted to pay a nominal fixed sum of one thousand ake for their diizya in 920/1517, and in 1103/1692 the authorities were permitted to guard the highway passing through their area. Also in Kurvelesh, Albania, seventeen villages in rebellion agreed to submit on condition that they paid their diizya ber wehz-i makhṭūt at a fixed sum of 330 esed guhrūsh in 1106/ 1695. In these examples we see the government being rather forced to come to an agreement with its qimmi subjects. Sometimes the makhṭūt was agreed upon between the diizya-collectors and the bāshis, kethals, Christian notables, who thus being able to distribute the diizya in their communities them- selves expected to have some advantages such as to alleviate their own share, as actually stated in a document. But this practice was denounced by the government.

The makhṭūt system gave the Jewish community of Safad the opportunity to save their clerics from paying diizya by paying bagnis. Note and documents from the Turkish Archives, Jerusalem 1952, 11; U. Heyd, Ottoman documents on Palestine, Oxford 1960, 121; cf. idem on the Dīzva-registers for Palestine in Jerusalem, iv (1952), 173-84 (in Hebrew, with Turkish documents).

Considering its basic character of a poll-tax, however, the government often insisted on its payment individually. On the other hand the makhṭūt, fixed sum of diizya for a group, might become too onerous when the number in such a group for one reason or another decreased. In such cases a new census was often asked for, to reduce the amount or to return the payment to individuals.

The makhṭūt system in diizya, however, came to be more and more extensively applied in the period of decline during which the central government had increasingly lost the control of tax collection in the provinces. The bagnis-bagnis, khowšs and kæne then took over, as the a'jān among the Muslim population, the collection of taxes within their communities, and this prepared their rise as a local aristocracy in the Balkans in the 12th/13th century. In the belief that the makhṭūt system was favourable for the ra‘ayā the government continued to apply the system (the circular of 25 Muḥarram 1257/17 March 1841 in Mühimmе no. 13663 Malıyе Yeni
It was the Sultan's responsibility to declare every new year the rates of diizya to be collected on the basis of a fatvad (q.v.) given by the Shaykh al-Islam who determined it according to the shar'i scale. In Ottoman terminology the grades were adNı, avsaJ and adadı corresponding to şahısr al-şhmadh muñafirin, wealthy, mutassaawat al-bal, medium status, and fahır muş'taman, working poor man, who were to pay, 48, 24 and 12 dirham-i sharfi (see DIRHAM) of the coins in circulation. In a document of 6 Dümâdâ II 896/16 April 1491 (Gökbilgin, 159) we find diizya applied according to the shar'i scale. But in a firman of 880/1475 the collector was accepted to accept payments over fixed rates (Anhegger-Inalcık, 78).

Payment could be made in silver and gold coins in circulation, and rarely the rates were also shown in current copper coins. In a firman of 1101/1690 the rate for the lowest grade was fixed as one Egyptian gold piece, shahi fru'mun, or 2 1/2 esedl (Dutch) ghurush, or 90 para or 1170 copper manghir. But payments were mostly made in silver akçe (q.v.) until the late 16th century, and in ghurush or para in later periods. The recurrent devaluations and depreciations in coinage (cf. H. Inalcık, in Belleten, lvii, 676-84) of the Ottoman Empire, mainly because of the need of the Ottoman government to declare in the firman of diizya-collection every year (cf. examples in Hadźibegić, doc. nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 14, 19, 22, 25) a schedule of the official rates of the coins in circulation. But disparities between the official and current rates often gave rise to disputes between the tax-payers and collectors, and the treasury sometimes resorted to accept only gold pieces. At other times, on their own initiative, the collectors forced the tax-payers to pay only in gold with the intention of exchanging this later for their own profit. To prevent this the Sultan often had to send special orders to the collectors to accept silver coins too (the Aĥkâm deferferler in the Bayvekâle Archives, Istanbul, are indeed full of such orders). The assessment of diizya in the Ottoman silver coinage went up from 1102/1691 to 1249/1834 as shown in the following table (Hadźibegić, in Prilozi, v, 102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>adNı</th>
<th>avsaJ</th>
<th>adadı</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1102/1691</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 1/4</td>
<td>2 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108/1696</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156/1744</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5 1/4</td>
<td>2 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218/1804</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231/1816</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239/1824</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242/1827</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244/1829</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249/1834</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahmud II emphasized in his firman that the increases, adNıvım, were not newly assessed taxes, muhdadhx, but simply the result of a necessary adjustment of the fixed shar'i quantities of silver to be paid as diizya in the currency of the day (cf. Hadźibegić, v, 69, 79). But these increases, even if they were not in real value, gave rise to widespread discontent among the dhimmis in the Ottoman empire.

It must be remembered that until the introduction of radical changes in the Ottoman finances in the 11th/17th century, diizya was levied in some large areas of the empire only at one single fixed rate (cf. the Sandjak regulations in Barkan, 83, 201, 226, 316); for the dhimmis subject to diizya of all classes 25 akçe in the province of Yeni-i in Süleyman's time, 40 akçe in 991/1583, 35 akçe in some provinces and 55 akçe in others in the province of Bitlis 30 in the island of Taşhöv, 46 in the province of Mosul in the 10th/16th century. It was 80 akçe in the lands conquered from the Mamlûks, namely in the provinces of Adana, Damascus, Safad; the rates here, except for the latter, were less than the normal lowest rate (one gold piece was 60-70 akçe during this period). The reason given for this special treatment in the provinces of Eastern Anatolia was the poverty due to the physical conditions of the area. As for the islands, similar conditions together with the special defence responsibilities imposed on the population accounted for it. The dhimmis of the island of Imbros were even exempted altogether from diizya (Barkan, 257). The single rate of 80 akçe in Syria and Palestine appears to be a survival from the last phase of the Mamlûk period during which diizya was for all classes one gold piece plus a fraction to cover collection costs (B. Lewis, Notes, 11). Being considered too low as compared to the shar'i rates, these fixed single rates of assessment were raised on the accession of a new Sultan to the throne (on Selim II's accession an increase of ten akçe was made; cf. Barkan, 318).

The assessment of diizya was made per family in Hungary, Palestine in the 10th/16th century (cf. B. Lewis, Notes, 10; idem, Studies in the Ottoman Archives, in BSOAS, xvi, 1 (1954), 484-5), in the province of Salonika, and many other places in the Balkans (cf. Gökibilgin, 155-7) before the reform nişan of 1102/1691.

Also in the early period there were certain groups exempted from diizya. It was true, in principle, that the exemption from diizya was considered as a waste of a revenue belonging to the bayt māl al-muslimin; hence it was made only exceptionally and, if done, in return for military services. Thus the dhimmî population of a crucial fortress (cf. Barkan, 204; but in 835/1431 the population of Akbaḥisâr, Albania, was exempted from all taxation but diizya, cf. Sâret-i Defer-i Sanâa, v, 620, in charge of guarding a mountain pass (cf. H. Inalcık, Fatih devri, i, Ankara 1954, doc. i), relatives of the children levied for the Janissaries, diizya supplying sulphur for the powder factories in Salonika (deiter, K. Kepeci tasmii no. 3510, Bayvekâle Archives) were exempted from diizya. The Christian soldiers who formed part of the Ottoman fighting army in the 9th/16th century, namely Christian timâr holders, voynukuş (q.v.), martsîlos (q.v.) and efikas, enjoyed total exemption from diizya (H. Inalcık, Fatih devri, i, 176-9). The sons and brothers of voynukuş were subjected only to a bedel-i diizya, substitute of diizya, at a fixed rate of 30 akçe which was about half of the lowest rate of diizya by 922/1516 (Barkan, 396, 398). When these groups lost their military use in the 10th/16th century they were mostly made dhimmî râ'dîya and subjected to diizya. Those maintained were subjected to a fixed low rate.

At all times the Ottoman government granted partial exemption from diizya to the dhimmis of a particular position. Those living in the provinces in the borderland, i.e., Serbia, Bosnia, Hercegovina, Montenegro, paid diizya only at the lowest rate, adadı, and in time of war the dhimmis living nearest to the field of operation and on the military routes paid it as half (cf. Hadźibegić, in Prilozi, iii, doc. 2, 203).
The dhimmis having to abandon their homes because of enemy invasion were exempted from diizya for a certain period. The dhimmis migrants in some regions paid it at a very low rate (only six akçe in Silistre in the mid-16th century, cf. H. Inalcik, Osmanilarda raiyet rüşûmu, in Belleten, xcii, 608, note 173). As late as 1170/1757 the dhimmis of 21 villages in Chios who were engaged in the production of mastic paid it all equally at the lowest rate.

Under the capitulations the dhimmis terdijiman, dragomans, translators to the foreign embassies, enjoyed exemption from diizya. But many dhimmis had managed to obtain berâis of terdijiman by dubious ways to escape paying diizya (see Berâtî). If a musta'min (see AMAN) prolonged his stay in the Ottoman dominions longer than one year he was treated as a dhimmî, subjected to diizya, and could not leave the country for the Dar al-harb [q.v.] (cf. Al-Durar, 207). Though we find in the records, sidîdîât, of the kâdi of Bursa cases testifying the application of this rule, some ways must have been found to allow foreign merchants to stay as musta'min for longer periods in the great commercial centres even as early as the 9th/15th century (cf. documents in Belleten, xcii, 67-96). Later on under the capitulations the Ottoman government became more strict on this matter and levies were raised in several ways (cf. the Ottoman constitution of 1153/1740 to France, article 63). The Armenians of Persia, Arâmîm-n-i Âdâm, visiting the Ottomans lands usually as merchants, were also subject to diizya (the nişâhân of 1102/1691, and Hâdzâbegic, doc. 4, 10, pp. 107, 125).

The nişâhân of 1102/1691 provided that diizya was to be levied per head by all the dhimmis subject to diizya on the basis of the ârâfî scale, thus abolishing the mahlû akçe system and exemptions (cf. Fındıklılı Mehmed Âgha, Sûlîhidâr ta'rîkhî, i, ed. A. Refik, Istanbul 1928, 559). But many old practices and exemptions survived, and only in 1255/1839 was the proclamation of equality in payment of taxes all such exemptions and privileges abolished. Diizya-payers had always to pay two additional dâtîs, one for the living expenses of the collector and resm-i kitâbet (also called resmî hesab, adârât-i kitâbet, kâhrî-i mûhdsebe or kâlamîsîye) for the services of the central department of diizya (cf. Hâdzâbegic, iii, 112). Actually these were well established dues found with all the departments of the Ottoman finances. In the firman of 880/1475 on the collection of diizya (Anhegger-Inalcik, 77-8) we find a due of two akçe per family called resm-i kitâbet and a one akçe due levied formerly by the ilkehûdâs. In the 10th/16th century the collector and the scribe accompanying him each took one akçe for themselves (Barkan, 180; in Hungary, in addition, one akçe resm-i kâhsân, Barkan, 316). In 1102/1691 ma'shat was 12, 6 and 3 para for a'dâ, âsasal and adnî respectively and one para was paid for u'darat-i kitâbet by all alike. Four years later a new due, ma'shat for the kâhidî, was added, which was 9, 4 and 1 1/2 para for a'dâ, âsasal and adnî respectively. In 1106/1694, to prevent the abuses in collection of these dues, it was made clear that the collectors were to levy these not for their own account but for the treasury, and the remunerations were to be paid to them by the treasury from the diizya-revenues at the central department of diizya (Hâdzâbegic, iii-iv, doc. 4, 5, 10, 11, pp. 107, 112, 125, 131). The total sum of these legal dues amounted to 1/3 of the diizya itself and their rates were raised following the increases in diizya. From the same firmans we learn that the collectors were illegally subjecting the diizya-payers to some extortions under the names dâhânîn, kâhsânî, qârî'at-i diizya, koldî akçeî, kâhdî-i mûhdsebe (Hâdzâbegic, iii-iv, 112, 125), mum-akçeî buyûlûdî avâm-tîdî and others. With the proclamation of the Tanzîmât in 1255/1839 collectors with a salary from the treasury were appointed and were allowed to take from the tax-payers only a minimum of provisions for themselves and their animals (Hâdzâbegic, Prîlozî, v, doc. 25, 93). But the heaviest burden on the diizya-payers was the obligation to make good the diizya of the fugitive dhimmis, gûrîkhte (in Turkish gûrîkhate) and the dead, mûrda (in Turkish mûrdâ), which sometimes caused the depopulation and ruin of a whole village. As disclosed in the nişâhân of 1102/1691, in some villages the surviving quarter of the previous population was forced to pay the diizya of the missing three quarters too. On the other hand the collectors in cooperation with the local kâhidî sometimes tried, without official permission, to collect diizya from the new-yâfe (naw-yâfsa), those not yet recorded as diizya-payers in the official defters. They also collected bedel-akcesî, a lump sum for those names in the defter under which no one could be identified. The government almost never struggled to prevent such abuse and ended by assessing a fixed new tax, called gûrîkhtî, to and beyond the nişâhân of 1102/1691. This tax appears in the diizya accounts of 1102/1693 and it was then 40 akçe per head, a sum about one-eighth of the diizya itself. Also we find a similar tax called new-yâfe akcesî even at an earlier period. These proved to be only new burdens for the ra'dîyâ since the collectors continued their exactions according to the established customs. When in 1102/1691 the method of collecting diizya by distributing personal certificates of payment was established, the collectors, in an effort to use all the certificates delivered to them by the treasury, forced people not subject to diizya to accept them, or imposed certificates of higher rates to those subject to low rates. Some of the collectors were denounced as having accepted bribery from the wealthy to save them from the exerting rate of the new tax, and forced the poor to accept them. To all this must be added the common complaint about the ra'dîyâ having to provide the needs of the collectors' large suite of hâddîs, guardians, and many other exactions which were common in the collection of taxes in the period of decline. The collectors acted apparently even more harshly towards diizya-payers, since the firmans commanded, on the basis of the gûrîkhtî, that the dhimmis were to pay diizya in complete humiliation, dhûl wa sâghîr (cf. Hâdzâbegic, doc. 5, 10, pp. 112, 126). All this was no doubt mainly responsible for the discontented ra'dîyâs cooperating with foreign invaders from the late 11th/17th century on. The reform measures taken in 1102/1691 and later did not improve the situation, and it can be safely said that the abolition of the exemptions, especially those of clerics under the new system, ended by turning some influential groups among non-Muslims against Ottoman rule.

Bibliography: The Ottoman state followed the Hanafi school in the application of diizya; Al-Durar fi sharî' al-arâyir al-akhâmî by Molla Khûsrew (Istanbul 1258, 195-216) and later Mewkûhâtî's translation of the Mustâhid al-abhur (Istanbul 1318, 340-41) became the principal authorities for the Ottoman mu'âlemâ and administrators on these matters. For a statement of the sharî' principles in an official Ottoman regulation
see Ö. L. Barkan, Kanunlar, 331. The earliest firman on the levy of djizya that has come down to us is dated 580/1475-6 in R. Anhegger-H. Inalcik, Kanunlar-i Seld'lin ve defterleri, Ankara 1956, 76-8; facsimile in F. Babinger, Sultanische Urkunden zur Geschichte der osmanischen Wirtschaft und Staatsverwaltung am Ausgang der Herrschaft Mehmed II, des Er-oberers, i, Munich 1926, 270-80; French summary in N. Beldiceanu, Les actes des premiers Sultans, Paris-The Hague 1960, 149-50; H. Had&begic in his fundamental article on djizya in the Ottoman empire Djizya i li haraç, in Prilisi, iii-iv, 55-155; v, 43-102, published twenty-seven documents from the sigiflrd of the kâdis of Bosnia and Macedonia. Two berds dated 5 Ramaçan 1111/ 24 February 1700 and 1 Şabîn 1121/6 October 1709 published by B. C. Nedko in Sammlung orientalischer Arbeiten, xi, Leipzig 1942 and reproduced in Beirut; xxxi, 641-9, are transcribed with some errors.

The cizye muhasbe defterleri, maliye ahkâm defterleri and mukadad defterleri in the collections of Mâliye, Kâmil Kepeci and Yeni Seri, the Başvekâlet archives, Istanbul, constitute an inexhaustible source on the subject. The oldest defters in these series are a defter-i muhkadâ'ît of Mehmed II’s time, Yeni seri, nos. 176, 6222 and 7357, a defter-i ta‘ziye-i djizya-i gibrânî-i wîlâyât-i Rumeli wa Anatolu, dated 953/1545. K. Kepeci, no. 3532 and a defter-i ahkâm-i maliye, dated 971/1565 Mâliye Yeni Seri, no. 2775. The collection of defter-i muhasabâ‘i djizya, the most comprehensive source on djizya, start in 1101/1690, K. Kepeci nos. 3508-3799. (HAÎL İNÂLCİK)

iii.—INDIA

The question of the levy of djizya in India has provoked more emotion than scientific study, it being assumed that practice in India was closely modelled on the teachings of fiqh, or the precepts of Indo-Muslim scholars, or the policies of the Ottomans. The view taken here that djizya was not normally levied under the Dhyli Sultanate in the sense of a discriminatory religious tax may be contested; for this see below and page 325.

The earliest extant source for the Arab conquest of Sind, Balladurî, Futuḥ, 439, speaks of Muhammad b. Kâsim levying kharâdâ‘ as tribute upon the conquered. The Cal-nâma, said to be a Persian translation (c. 613/1216-7) of an early Arabic account of the conquest, speaks (India Office Library MS 435, 268) of the Sindhis being allowed the status of dhiyâ and of a graduated poll-tax being laid upon the people of Brâhmanbâd, the three classes paying at the canonical rates of 48, 24 and 12 dirhams respectively (MS. 261-262). This account, however, would seem more a reflection of later tradition than of events in 947/1202 which antedated the differentiation between kharâdâ‘ as land-tax and djizya as poll-tax under the late Umayyads which became the basis of fiqh teaching.

Under the Dhyli sultanate [q.v.], political conditions —the continued presence of armed Hindu chieftains in rural areas, the particularism of the period 801/1398-9 to 932/1526—do not appear apt for the imposition of a novel discriminatory tax by a minority upon a majority. Kâdî Minhadî al-Sirdâr Djüdrdjanî does not refer to djizya being levied in the period to 638/1240. Amir Khursaw, Kirân al-selâ‘yin, 4’Allagîrî, lith, 1928, 35, uses djizya to mean tribute from Hindu kings. References in the Khâlidî and early Tughluk period couple djizya indiscriminately with kharâdâ‘ to mean tribute or land revenue (e.g., Diyâ al-Dîn Barani, Ta’rîkh-i Firuz Shâhî, Bib. Ind., 291, 574; Baranî states also (Futuḥ-i Sultânî, iii, 345, India Office Library MS 11, fol 379a) that Hindûs and Rânîs were levied kharâdâ‘ and djizya from their own Hindû subjects). An anecdote in Amir Hasan Sifâ’î’s Fawzî’d al-Fawzîr (707/1307-722/1322) speaks (Dhîlî lit. 1865, 76) of a Muslim darbîh being required to pay djizya, in a context showing that tax in general is meant.

There are, however, for the reign of Firuz Shâh Tughluk a number of references, principally in works of the manâshîb idiom, stating that that Sultan levied djizya. The anonymous Sirat-i Firuz Shâhî, (727/1327-3, India Office Library Roto 34 of Bankpur MS, fol. 61b), claims that Firuz Shâh Tughluk ordered that only canonical taxes should be collected, a claim repeated in the Futuḥî-i Firuz Shâhî, ed. Shâykh Abdur Rashid, ’Allagîrî, 1954, 6. Shâms al-Dîn Sirâdî A’tîf, Ta’rîkh-i Firuz Shâhî, states (Bib. Ind. ed. 382-4) that Firuz, having obtained a fatwâ that djizya should be levied from the Brâhmins, ordered it to be levied, but reduced its incidence, after protest from the Brâhmins of Dihlî and petition from other Hindûs, from the three rates of 40, 20 and 10 tankas to 10 tankas of 50 fils. The contemporary collection of or- namental epistles, Inshâ’yi Mahrû (ed. Shâykh Abdur Rashid, ’Allagîrî n.d.), also mentions (41, 53-4) the levy of djizya, although the latter context suggests it was not distinguished from land revenue.

In the Sayyid and Lodî period nothing is heard of the levy of djizya. From the manner in which the historians of Akbar’s reign report its abolition by him, even the references to it in the Tughluk period may be largely panegyrical There is indeed no agreement on the date at which the abolition took place. Abu ’l-Fadî in the Akbar-nâma (Bib. Ind., ii, 203), places it in 171/1564, Bâdâ’înî in 987/1579 (Muntakhab al-tawdrikh, Bib. Ind., ii, 276). The latter, who is otherwise quick to condemn Akbar for any deviation from orthodoxy, mentions the event without comment. Nîzâm al-Dîn Ahmad does not refer to djizya but mentions an abolition of zakât in 1798/1950.

Following a number of orthodox measures discriminating against non-Muslims, Awrangzîb imposed djizya in 1609/1679, the Mirât-i Ahmadi states (i, 296-8), after a petition by (‘ulamâ’ and fahaid). Financial stringency as well as Awrangzîb’s personal inclination doubtless helped to prompt the decision, although this would not, of course, explain the discriminatory character of the tax. Isâr Dâs, Fustuhi-i ‘Alamgîri, (British Museum Add. 23884, fol. 748-74b), states that government servants were exempted and that there were three rates of tax—owners of property worth 2,500 rupees were assessed at 16 rupees, those worth 250 rupees at 6 rupees 8 annas, and those worth 52 rupees were assessed at 3 rupees and 4 annas, the blind, the paralysed, and the indigent being exempt. Its introduction encountered popular and court opposition at Dihlî, which was, however, overcome. The Mirât-i Ahmadi states that djizya brought in 500,000 rupees in the province of Gudjarat.

Djizya did not long survive the death of Awrangzîb in 1718/1707. Bahâdur Shâh, Dihândar Shâh, Farrukhsîyar and Muhammad Shâh are all said to have abolished it, although Farrukhsîyar had at one time struck a dirham shârîf to facilitate payment of the djizya at the canonical rates (see TAR-AL-BAR,
iii. Niẓām al-Mulk Āṣaf Dījāh attempted to revive it in 1135/1723, and Muḥammad Shāh nominally restored it in 1137/1725, but this restoration was never carried into effect.
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**Djodhpur or Mansawā** was the largest of the former Indian States in the Rajputana Agency with an area of 36,120 sq.m. and a population of 2,555,904 (1941 Census). There appears to be no evidence to support the Rājpūt legend that the state of Djodhpur was founded by the Rājpūts of Kanawdī after their defeat by Muḥammad of Ghūr in 590/1194. Siyāḥjī, the founder of the Rāṯhōr dynasty of Djodhpur, was probably descended from Rāṯhōr rājās whose inscriptions were found outside Djodhpur as early as the tenth century. The city of Djodhpur dates back to 1459. Rāw Mālīd of Djodhpur, who refused to grant asulam to Humāyūn, was defeated by Shīr Shāh and by Akbar whose tributary he became. From this time the rulers of Djodhpur were closely connected with the Mughal emperors of Dīlī, giving their daughters in marriage to the imperial family and serving in the Mughal armies.

The most famous Rājpūt in the service of the Mughal emperors was Māḥārāḏā Ḍiasāwī Sinh (1048-9/1638-73). Because of Awrangzīb's orthodox religious policy war broke out in 1090/1679. Djodhpur was sacked, but guerilla warfare continued for many years. The Sayyids brothers forced the ruler of Djodhpur to give a daughter in marriage to the Emperor. Fūrūs in turn. The sovereigns bore the title of Bāb of Djodhpur. Quarrels that broke out between the various Ouolof communities led to the secession of the Lebou who crossed Cayor and went to settle on the peninsula of Cap Vert under the suzerainty of the dāmāl. In the 16th century a certain Kōumūbū Gūeīmū, with the help of the Lebou, started a revolt against Bour Bāmīr Dīm Kōumbara who crushed it, but was unable to prevent the chiefs of Cayor and Baol from seceding. In the middle of the 16th century, Lefleuf Fack was unable to withstand a further revolt, led by a certain Amanī Gōne Sohīl who was the true founder of the kingdom of Cayor, with M'Bour as its capital.

Probably as a result of the profoundly democratic temperamental of the Ouolofs, there is not a single sovereign from this period whose name is outstanding. But the linguistic and cultural mark had been set, and was later confirmed during the colonial period. Djolof, being situated inland, was affected by European colonization only at a late date. In the 16th century Islam had only superficially penetrated to this region where the pagan practices of the Ouolofs scandalized the pious Muslims. However, the progressive Islamization of the inhabitants was noted as early as 1445 by Ca da Mesto.

After settling on the coast from 1683, the French explored the interior. In 1682 Lemaire gave information about the Ouolofs, while three years later La Courbe sent his agents to make a treaty with the Bour de Guiolof. From 1749 to 1755, Djolof was visited by the French naturalist Michel Adanson. A century later it served as a place of refuge for the rebels during the campaigns conducted against Lat Dior, dāmāl of Cayor. In 1871 the Tīḏījī chief Aḥmadus Shevkhu invaded Djolof and Cayor, but was routed by an expeditionary force and killed in 1875.

In 1889, a force under the command of Colonel Dōods put the bour de Djolof to flight. The latter's brother acknowledged the French protectorate on 3 May 1890. Henceforth Djolof shared in the development of Senegal and, in 1931, a branch line of the east by Fūṭa Damga and Ferlo, on the south by Niani-Ouli and Baol, and on the west by Cayor and N'Dimbouar.
Dakar-Saint Louis railway reached Lingueré in the heart of the Djolof country. At the present time the region is almost entirely Islamized. In every village can be found a place reserved for communal prayer (djidma) and one or more marabouts. The Muslim Ouolofs are very strict in praying and fasting; the name tabashi (Touareg tafaski, from pascha) which they give to al-‘Ird al-kabir is evidence of their partial conversion by the Berbers; they are very ready to become members of a religious confraternity, usually the Čadiyya. It was from Djolof that Ahmadu Bamba, founder of the Murid sect, recruited his followers. This Muridism (in a peasant form) is regarded as a "Ouolofisation" of Islam.

Society.—According to tradition, the first villages are said to have been formed by gifts of land by the Burba Djolof to warriors who had distinguished themselves in expeditions. As in most of the Ouolof country, society is divided into endogamous groups which no-one can leave or join. The freemen (gor) are descendants of the founder of the village or marabout: artisans, cobblers (wound), blacksmiths (teugne), wood-workers (laod), sorcerers (gueule). The caste of the unfree (or diama) seems to have disappeared.

The place of habitation is the village (deub), formed of squares which house the scattered family. Although the ground-nut has noticeably improved living conditions, Djolof is one of the poorest regions of Senegal, and hence the temporary emigration of the men to the towns.


DUBAYL, a small port in Lebanon situated between Bayrut and Tripoli on the site of the ancient Byblos (or Gebal in the Old Testament), formerly a centre at once maritime, commercial and religious, closely connected with Egypt since the 4th millennium B.C., and as celebrated for the worship of Adonis, of a syncretistic nature, as for its specialization in woodwork and products from the forests on the mountains nearby. If Byblos remained truly prosperous in the Roman period and later became the seat of a bishopric, it appears to have greatly declined by the time when it was conquered by the Muslims, and when Mu‘awiya established a colony of Persians there, as in the neighbouring territories. Dubayl, which was attached to the ġund of Damascus, kept a small garrison until the 5th/11th century. At that period, when the Fātimids had extended their domination over the Syrian coast, it was under the direct dependency of the Shī‘i kādis of Tripoli, the Banū ‘Ammar. According to the traveller Nasir-i Khusrav who passed through it in 438/1047 the town, triangular in shape and surrounded by high walls, stood by the sea, whilst the surrounding plain lay to the foot of Mount Lebanon, was covered with date-palms.

Captured in 496/1056 by Raymond de Saint Gilles, Count of Tripoli, it became a feudal domain under the name Gibel, and was given to a family of Genoese origin who were known as the "lords of Gibel"; it remained in the hands of the Crusaders until reconquered by Saladin in 583/1189. Archaeological traces of the Frankish period can be seen in the castle which stands on a hill at the north-east angle of the enceinte, no doubt on the site of an earlier Muslim fortress, and in the church of St. John, most of which was later rebuilt, though the baptistery, a masterpiece of Romanesque art, has survived intact.

At one time reoccupied by the Franks, to whom the Kurdish garrison put there by Salāḥ al-Dīn had surrendered in 593/1197, the town was reconquered in 665/1266-7 by Baybars who restored the fortifications, and later made it part of the Mamlūk district of Bayrāt. Then, at the end of the 9th/10th century, it fell into the hands of the Banū Hamāda, a family of Mutawalīs dominating Upper Lebanon, and remained in their power until the 12th/13th century. The importance of its port had by then greatly diminished, its place being taken by Dūbih, a rival port from ancient times which had long been in control of the local coastal shipping.

At the present day Dubayl is merely a small village of about 1,500 inhabitants, almost all Maronite, and it is chiefly known for the ruins of the Phoenician town which have been methodically excavated since 1921 by the French mission under the direction of M. Montet and M. Dunand respectively.

Bibliography: Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. Byblos; R. Dussaud, Topographie historique de la Syrie, Paris 1927, 63-9; M. van Berchem and E. Fatio, Voyage en Syrie, Cairo 1913-5, 105-13; Guide Bleu, Syrie-Palestine, Paris 1932, 38-45; Le Strange, Palestine, 32, 664-5; M. Gaudet-Demombymes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelous, Paris 1923, 23 and 74; R. Grousset, Histoire des Croisades, index, esp. i, 141 and iii, 147; Ibn Khurdadābih, 77 and 255; Ibn al-Fakih, 105; Ya‘qūbī, Balīdun, 328; Ya‘qūbī-Wiet, 178; Nāṣir-i Khusrav, ed. Schefer, 43; Ibn Shaddād, al-‘Aṣkal al-bahrīra, 2nd part, ms. Leyden 800, f° 98b; Yākūt, ii, 32; Marājīdī, i, 240. (D. Sourdel)
and took the name 'Aynayn from its two flowing springs; it is also said to have been once occupied by the tribe of 'Abd al-Kays. In the early Islamic period 'Aynayn was noted for its plentiful date palms and for a poet, Khulayd 'Aynayn, who is chiefly remembered for exchanging lampoons with the famous Umayyad satirist Djarir b. 'Atiyaa. The site was later abandoned. The present town was populated about 1330/1912-1 by members of Al Bū 'Aynayn who emigrated from Kātar, with the permission of the Turkish authorities, as the result of a local dispute. The settlers were Mālik Sunnīs engaged in pearl fishing and other seafaring occupations. Al-Djubayl came under Sa'ūdī rule during the conquest of al-Hasā' by 'Abd al-'Azīz Al Sa'dūd in 1331/1913. The town was formally acknowledged to be Sa'ūdī territory in the treaty of 1334/1915 by which Britain recognized the independence of 'Abd al-'Azīz. During the consolidation of the Sa'ūdī kingdom, al-Djubayl became a port of entry for goods destined for Central Arabia. Its significance has since diminished as the result of the decline in the Persian Gulf pearling trade and of the development of modern communication routes through the port, rail, and road centre of al-Dammām [q.v.]. The population of al-Djubayl was estimated in 1960 at 4,200.


AL-DJUBAYLA, a small town of 30-60 dwellings located in Nadād at 24° 54' N, 46° 28' E, on the left bank of Wādī Ḥanīfah between al-'Urayyana and al-Dihriyya. Yākūt mentions a place called al-Dijubayla as the chief town of Banū 'Amir of 'Abd al-Kays, but there is no evidence definitely linking this place with the present town. According to Ibn Bulayhid and local tradition, the site of 'Akrābā [q.v.] is near the present town. Mounds on the right bank of Wādī Ḥanīfah, called locally ʿuqbūr al-ṣāḥib, are believed to be the graves of some of Banū 'Akrābā who fell in the battle of 'Akrābā, and 'Akrābā is the name of the garden area of al-Dijubayla, a small raudhah about one kilometre east of the town, which is said to be the actual site of the gardens in which the battle took place.

Ibn Bīshr relates that in 850/1446 al-Dijubayla belonged to Al Yazīd, whom Mūsā b. Rāfī's b. Mānī al-Muraydī, an ancestor of Al Sa'ūdīs, attacked and virtually exterminated shortly thereafter. Al Dughābahīr of al-Dihriyya claim descent from the survivors of Al Yazīd, who were a branch of the Banū Ḥanīfah (Hanīfī b. Lūjaym b. Wāḥīl), the supporters of Muṣaylima al-Raḍīʤābī at the battle of 'Akrābā and the tribe which gave its name to Wādī Ḥanīfah. The battle site of 'Akrābā was in ancient al-Yamāma, which is believed to have extended as far north as the present town of al-Dijubayla and its garden of 'Akrābā. However, in many cases the identification of ancient places by modern usage remains inconclusive.

Both al-Dijubayla and 'Akrābā are mentioned several times by Ibn Bīshr as the scene of clashes between the growing power of Al Sa'ūdī and the influential line of Banū 'Akrābā from al-Hasā' al-Aḥṣā' between 1331/1721 and 1172/1758-59. In 1253/1740 the young reformer, Shaykh Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, then virtually unknown outside of al-'Urayyana, destroyed the alleged tomb of Zayd b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the eldest brother of the Caliph 'Umar and one of the Companions who fell at 'Akrābā, as a step towards the obliteration of false worship in Nadjīd. Today the site of the tomb is forgotten.

Al-Dijubayla lies at the junction of two roads from al-Riyād to al-Hidjaz; one road winding across the rolling rocky country between the east bank of Wādī Ḥanīfah and al-Riyād, and a second road which is paved as far as al-Dihriyya [q.v.] and then follows the bed of Wādī Ḥanīfah to al-Dijubayla. These roads give the town access to al-Riyād for the sale of crops raised in the garden of 'Akrābā and a small steady income from trans-peninsular motor traffic. In 1961 a new road was completed which provides a paved all-weather route from al-Riyād to the Tuwayk escarpment at Sha'īb Lūhā (sometimes shown on maps as al-Ḥa) south-south-east of al-Riyād, whence it proceeds north-west, parallel to the escarpment, as far as Mārāh where it rejoins Darb al-Hidjaz, eliminating completely the difficult stretch of road between al-Dijubayla and the pass of al-Haysiyya at the head of Wādī Ḥanīfah. Bibliography: Ibn Bīshr; Ibn Bulayhid; Philby, Sa'dīd Arabia, London 1955; Yākūt. (R. L. Headley)

DJUBBA [see LIBĀS].

AL-DJUBBĀ'I, Abu 'Ali Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb, one of the most celebrated of the Mu'tazilas [q.v.]. Born at Dijubba in Khuzistān, he attended the school at Başra of Abū Ya'kūb Yūsuf al-Ṣaḥḥām who at that time occupied the chair of Abū 'l-Hūṭhāyil al-Ṣaḩlāf. He succeeded al-Ṣaḩḥām, and it can be said that he added to give a final brilliance to the tradition of the masters, while at times he refreshed it and opened the way to new solutions. He died in 303/915-6.

He thus holds a place in the line of the Başra Mu'tazilas who, especially over the question of human actions, differ from the Baghdād Mu'tazilas. In Başra itself, he was particularly at variance with al-Nāẓẓām (whom he opposed) and al-Dībijīz, but he also differed from the two lines of thought of al-Āṣamm and Abū 'l-Ḥalīfah al-ʿAhrām, and these were closer to his own. The two last-mentioned both combined the influence of Mu'āmmar with the tradition of Abū 'l-Hudhayl, and the second former added to the Başra teaching influences deriving from Baghdād (school of al-Murḍār).

Al-Dijubba'i had two pupils who later became celebrated: his son Abū Ḥāşim (cf. below), and Abū 'l-Ḥasan al-ʿAshārī [q.v.] who, after breaking away, was to devote himself to refuting Mu'tazilism and to become the "founder" of the so-called school of the ʿAshāriyya [q.v.]. The traditions of the 'ilm al-kalām take pleasure in recounting the dialogue reputed to have brought al-ʿAshārī and his teacher into conflict on the subject of the fate of the "three brothers"—one pious, one impious and one who died in infancy. In this issue was posed the problem of the rational justification of the divine Decree. Al-Dijubba'i, it is said, was unable to reply, and al-ʿAshārī left him. W. Montgomery Watt has reminded us that the wish to "justify" absolutely the divine Decree in respect of every human destiny seems to derive perhaps from the Baghdād Mu'tazila rather than from the Başra school (Free will and predestination in early Islam, 137).

However that may be, no complete work of al-Dijubba'i has survived until the present time. We know that he left a Kitāb al-usūl, to the refutation of which al-ʿAshārī devoted several treatises (cf. in
the bibliography of McCarthy, *Luma*, Appendix iii, nos. 16, 61, 65, 78), and various polemical works against Ibn al-Rawandi and al-Nazām. But one of the best available sources allowing us to evaluate tendencies is still the *Makāli al-Islāmiyyin* of al-Asgh’arī (see particularly Cairo ed., ii, 181-2, 196, 199-201, 243, etc.).

The teaching given by al-Djubba’ī followed after the reaction by caliph Mutawakkil which dates from 235/850. Muḥazilism is no longer the official doctrine. As a criterion, and he continues to affirm the identity of the divine attributes and the divine essence; on the other hand, however, he tends to introduce once again the mystery of the divine Will and its action upon the world.—Two examples: (1) those of the Baghdād Mu’tazila, followed with certain modifications by al-Shāhīm, who adopted the idea of “acquisition” (*kabh, tkfisīb*), applied it only to involuntary human actions, God being, in their view, in no way the “cause” of free human actions; for al-Djubba’ī, on the contrary, God retains Supreme Power even over the actions which man performs freely. But, unlike the later Ash’arī solution, he refuses to apply the theory of the *kabī* to free actions; and he ceases the “creator *kadar*” of his actions, in the sense that man acts, or his actions proceed from him, with a determination (*kadar*) which comes from God.—(2) ‘Abbād objected to any association of God with evil, and for example refused to speak of *garr* or *kabī* as sickness or weakness; according to al-Djubba’ī, they can be called “evils”, provided that this term is taken metaphorically; similarly, he offers personal solutions to the problem of “divine aid” (*lutf*) and “divine favour” (*lutf*), which do not destroy the voluntary character of the action. What is more, foreshadowing certain Ash’arī theories, he breaks away from the Mu’tazila tradition of allotting merit and demerit according to an exact, rational criterion, and maintains that God grants to whom He will His favour or good-will gratuitously; the problem of *safā‘a* is of the action. What is more, foreshadowing certain Ash’arī theories, he breaks away from the Mu’tazila tradition of allotting merit and demerit according to an exact, rational criterion, and maintains that God grants to whom He will His favour or good-will gratuitously; the problem of *safā‘a* is

Al-Djubbā’ī was no doubt one of the Mu’tazila whom al-Asgh’ārī took the greatest pains to refute, all the more since he knew him better; but this did not happen without his influence being felt, and we have already noted al-Djubbā’ī putting forward certain Ash’ārī arguments. This complex relationship between al-Asgh’ārī and his former teacher helps us, to explain the paradox of Ash’ārīm in its infancy: claiming kinship with the “Ancients”, particularly Ibn Ḥanbal, but rejected, no less than Mu’tazilism, by contemporary Ḥanbalites.

Abū Ḥāšim ‘Abd al-Salām, son of al-Djubbā’ī, d. 321/933. He was a contemporary of al-Shāhīm, and his son thus exerted on Muslim thought an influence which far surpassed the direct role of Bara’ Mu’tazilism, considered as an independent school.


**Djūbūr** is a large and predominantly sedentary Sunni tribe of central and northern Iraq. A considerable community so named occupies land and villages in the Khālis *ḫāṣṭ* of the Divālā *luwād* and another on canals drawing from the Hilla branch (right bank) of the Euphrates, below Hilla. Minor sections calling themselves Djūbūr are also found elsewhere in central *Irāk*. But the largest body lives in riverside villages on the Lesser Zab between Altun Köprü and the Tigris, and on the latter river between the points south of Altun Köprü and north of Takrit. The former of these branches have habitually quarrelled with the ‘Ubayd of the Ḥawdīa west of Kirkūk
and the Djazira in the plain between the two Zabs; the latter have a longstanding history of bad relations with the Shammar (Djarbā) of the Djafara. All alike are in water-filled lands of the Zab and Tigris, there mechanical pump-irrigation and some flow-irrigation have greatly developed. Many from the latter districts work for the oil company whose pipelines from Kirkuk oilfields cross or skirt their territory.

The various Djuābūr sections have little cohesion, and have produced no unifying leader for generations. They consist of many unconnected elements with little bond save their name. The usual legend of Dioci or rather Djoči (ca. 580-624/1184-1227), the eldest son of Cingiz-Khan [q.v.], and the ancestor of the Khāns of the Golden Horde, Ķrīm, Tiemen, Bukhara and Khiwa. A depalatalized, perhaps Turkish, form of his name, Toshi or Doshi, is represented by the Tosh of Djuwayni and Diūjdānī, the Tosucchan (i.e., Toshī Khān) of Cappadocia and the Dūsh of Nasawi. The historical data on this progenitor of so many dynasties are sparse and contradictory. His very paternity is uncertain. It is implied in the Secret history of the Mongols that his real father was Olgīr Bokó of the Merkit, by whose tribe his mother Bőre Fuđîn was carried off into captivity shortly after her marriage to Cingiz-Khan. On the other hand Rashīd al-Dīn, who reproduces the Altan Deber, the official chronicle of the imperial family, specifically states that Bőre was already pregnant at the time of her capture. Contrary to the Secret history she was not, according to Rashīd al-Dīn, rescued by a joint expedition of Cingiz-Khan, Djamūka and Ong-Khan but was handed over by the Merkit to the last named, with whose tribe the Kereyt, they were then at peace. Delivered up by Ong-Khan to an emissary of Cingiz-Khan Bőre gave birth to Djoči in the course of the homeward journey; and the circumstances of his birth are in some way reflected in his name, apparently the Mongol word djoči "guest". Djoči is first mentioned in the Secret history, under the year 1207, as being sent on a campaign against the Oyrat and other forest peoples along the western shores of Lake Bāykal: after conquering these peoples he advanced in a westerly direction to receive the submission of the Khirghiz tribes in the region of the Upper Yenisey. Rashīd al-Dīn, whilst recording the submission of the Khirghiz in 1207, makes no mention of Djoči in this connection, though he refers to him as having suppressed a revolt of that people in the winter of 1218-19. Djoči took part in his father's campaigns against the Chin rulers of Northern China, being active with his brothers Čaghatay and Ŭgedē in Shan-hsi (1211) and Chīh-li, Ho-nan and Shan-hsi (1213). He likewise took part, in 1216 or 1217, in a campaign against the remnants of the Merkit which resulted in their defeat and annihilation in what is today the eastern part of the Khasik Government, there being a clash with Sultan Muhammad Khāsrizm-Shāh [q.v.] as the Mongols were returning eastwards from this campaign formed the prelude to the hostilities which broke out in 1229. Upon the arrival of Cingiz-Khan's forces on the Kura, probably in September of that year, Djoči was dispatched upon an expedition down the Sr-Daryā. The details of this expedition, which is passed over in silence by the contemporary Muslim sources, are given by Djuwayni, who refers to Djoči as Ulush-Idi, a title which Rashīd al-Dīn, in reproducing Djuwayni's account, takes to be the name of a general in joint command. Advancing down the Sr-Daryā Djoči captured Ūshagkn, Öskend, Bārūn and Ašgān. It had been his intention not to attack Dijand but to rest his troops in the Kara-Kum steppe to the north-east of the Aral Sea in what is now Central Kazakhstan. However a report on the conditions prevailing in Dijand caused him to change the direction of his march and lay siege to the town, which surrendered in April or May, 1220. Djoči now proceeded to the Kara-Kum steppe and seems to have remained in this region or in the Dijand area until the end of the year, when he was ordered by Cingiz-Khan to join Čaghatay and Ŭgedē in the siege of Gurgāndī [q.v.]. The siege operations appear to have been hampered by a quarrel between Djoči and Čaghatay: upon the fall of the town in Safar 618/March-April 1220 it became part of Djoči's yuri or appanage, which now extended from the region of Kayalîgh [q.v.] to the eastern banks of the Volga, competing with its limits almost the whole of the present-day Kazakhstan. From Gurgāndī Djoči withdrew northwards into this enormous territory, there to remain till the spring of .../1223, when he joined his father and brothers in the Kulan-Bašī steppe between the present-day Cīmikent and Djamīnlī in Southern Kazakhstan, driving before him, for the purposes of a battue, great herds of wild asses: he brought also with him, as a present for Cingiz-Khan, 20,000 grey horses. After the battue the princes passed the remainder of the summer in Kulan-Bašī and Djoči then returned to his own territories, where he remained for the rest of his life, apparently on bad terms with his father, whom he predeceased by several months. Upon his death his yuri was divided between his eldest son Orda and his second son [q.v.], the founders respectively of the White Horde and the Kanat Khānate or Golden Horde.

Bibliography: As in the article Cingiz-Khan with the following additions: Barthold, Turkestān; Pelliot, Notes sur l'histoire de la Horde d'Or, Paris 1950; J. A. Boyle, On the titles given in Juvaini to certain Mongolian princes, in HJAS, ix (1956) (J. A. Boyle).

Djuuddā (see gudālā).

Djuudda, pronounced Diudda locally, a Saudi Arabian port on the Red Sea at 22° 29' N., 39° 11' E. Its climate is notoriously poor. The town, flanked by a lagoon on the north-west and salt flats on the south-east, faces a bay on the west which is so encumbered by reefs that it can only be entered through narrow channels. By paved road, Djuudda is 72 km. from Mecca and 419 km. from Medina. Most Arab geographers and scholars maintain that Djuudda, signifying a road (Lane; al-Bakrī, ii, 371) is the correct spelling of the name of the town, rather than Djuudda or Diudda (grandmother) as claimed by Gautier, Philby (Heart, i, 221) and others (cf. Yākilū, li, 47; Hitti; Wahba) on account of the existence (until 1928), of the tomb of Eve not far from the town. For description and photographs, see E. F. Gautier, Moeurs et coutumes des Musulmans, Paris 1931, 64-6). The town dates
from pre-Islamic times. Ḥīdhām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbi in al-ʿĀṣim claims that ʿAmr b. Luhayy of the Khūzāʿa introduced idols from Ḍjūdā into Mecca several centuries before Islam (cf. al-ʿĀṣim in bibliography). According to Yākūṭ, Ḍjūdā b. Ḥaẓm b. Rabbān b. Ḥulwān of the Khūzāʿa took his name from the town which was part of the territory of the Khūzāʿa (q.v.). The foundations of Ḍjūdā’s importance were laid in 26/646 by the Caliph ʿUthmān, who chose it as the port of Mecca in place of the older port of al-Šuḥū’ayba a little to the south (al-Batānunī, 61, 156). As the focus of the Muslim world, Mecca became a great importing centre, its supplies coming from Egypt and India via Ḍjūdā.

By the 4th/10th century Ḍjūdā was a prosperous commercial town and its customs were a considerable source of revenue to the rulers of al-Ḥiḍjāz (Muṣādḍasī, 79, 104). In addition, taxes were levied on pilgrims at Ḍjūdā, for it was here that those who came by sea landed on Arabian soil. Nāṣir-i ʿAlīshāwur (ed. Scherer, 65; 181-3 of the translation) describes the city in the 5th/11th century as an unwalled town, with a male population estimated at 5,000, governed by a slave of the sharif of Mecca, whose chief duty was the collection of the revenues. A century later Ibn Ḍiʿbaʿyar (ed. De Goeje, 75 ff.) gives a picture of the town with its reed huts, stone dhonis, and mosques each built by these Sahīb al-ard. or having abolished the taxes levied by the ṣarīfīs.

With the decline of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate, much of the trade formerly going to al-ʿAṣrāba was diverted to Ḍjūdā, where ships from Egypt, carrying gold, metals, and woolens from Europe, met those from India carrying spices, dyestuffs, rice, sugar, tea, grain, and precious stones. Ḍjūdā exacted about ten per cent ad valorem on these goods. After 828/1425 the Mamlūk Sultans of Egypt, whose cupidity had been aroused by Ḍjūdā’s prosperity, took the collection of customs at Ḍjūdā into their own hands (although they shared it with the ṣarīfīs from time to time), thus making Ḍjūdā politically as well as economically dependent on Egypt (Ibn Ṭaghribīrdī, iv, 21, 411 v, 79).

The coming of the Portuguese to eastern waters, and their attacks on Muslim shipping from 1502 onward, brought a new threat to Ḍjūdā, which the Mamlūks and after them the Ottomans made determined efforts to meet. Ḥusayn al-Kurdī, the Governor of Ḍjūdā, appointed by the Mamlūk Sultan Kānṣūf al-Γhdārī, built a formidable wall around the town in 917/1511 (al-Batānunī) erroneously states that it was in 915/1509) and made Ḍjūdā a base for attacks against the Portuguese fleet. Lopo Soares de Albergaria sailed to the Ḍjūdā harbour in 923/1517 in pursuit of the Mamlūk fleet commanded by Salmān Rāḥī, but declined to attack the city because of its powerful fortifications (Danvers, The Portuguese in India, 1894, 335). In 945/1538 the Ottoman naval expedition, on its way to India, called there, and collected masts and guns (Hammer- Purgstall, GOR, ii, 156-8; Uṣumcarnānī, Osm. Tar., ii, 170 ff.; 53; Fevzi Kurtoglu in Belleten, iv, 1949, 53-87; Stribling, 89-90). In 948/1541 the Portuguese made their last unsuccessful attempt to take the city, which was defended by the Sharīf Abū Numayy. The Sultan Sulaymān repaid him for his successful resistance by granting him half of the fees collected at Ḍjūdā (Ḍaḥlān, 53). The trade of the Red Sea did not, as was at one time thought, end with the Portuguese circumnavigation of Africa, but continued under Ottoman protection, right through the 16th/17th century. Ottoman sources of this period refer to the regular appearance at Ḍjūdā of ships from India, and a Venetian consul in Cairo, in May 1565, speaks of the arrival of 20,000 quintals of pepper at Ḍjūdā. It was not until the late 16th and early 17th centuries that the transit trade through the Red Sea began to come to an end (F. Braudel, La Méditeranne et le monde méditerranéen à l’époque de Philippe II, Paris 1949, 423-37; Hail Inalcik, in Belleten, xv, 1951, 662 ft.).

Little of importance occurred in the history of Ḍjūdā during the 11th/12th and 12th/13th centuries. Al-Ḥiḍjāz, under the suzerainty of the Sultan, was ruled locally by the Ḥasanīd family of the sharīfīs, who intrigued to their own advantage against the declining power of the Turks (Ḍaḥlān, al-Djabartī). The town of Ḍjūdā was a sandjak, for a while the centre of the eyālet of Ḥabesh, later part of the ʿulāiyet of Ḥiḍjāz. According to Ottoman sources, the Grand Vizier ʿAlaʾ Muṣṭafā Pasha (held office 1085/1676-1094/1685) endowed Ḍjūdā with a mosque, khān, hammām, and water supply.

During the 13th/19th century, Ḍjūdā passed through a number of vicissitudes. In 1217/1803 the Wahhābīs (q.v.) besieged the sharīfī Ḡālib in Ḍjūdā but were unable to take the town, which began to boast of itself as a Gibrailtar (Ibn Bighr, i, 122). Ḡālib later surrendered and Ḍjūdā was subject to the rule of the Wahhābīs until 1226/1811, when Muḥammad ʿAlī restored nominal Ottoman sovereignty. In 1229/1841 Burkhart described Ḍjūdā as a town with 12,000 to 15,000 inhabitants, among whom indigenous elements were scantily represented, while strangers from the Yemen and Hadramawt appeared to be numerous. Both Burton (i, 179) and al-Batānunī (6) mention the coral and mother-of-pearl taken from the Red Sea at Ḍjūdā and made into prayer beads at Mecca and crucifixes at Jerusalem. In 1256/1840 Egyptian rule was replaced by the direct rule of the Porte, represented by a wāli in Ḍjūdā.

On 3 Dhu-l-ʿKaʿda 1274/15 June 1858 Ḍjūdā was the scene of a massacre, instigated, it is thought, by a former Ḍjūdā police chief, and several dissatisfied Ḍjūdā merchants, in which about 25 Christians were killed, including the British and French Consuls and a group of wealthy Greek merchants. The British steamship Cyclops, anchored in the harbour, bombarded the city for two days and restored order without much damage (Isabel Burton, ii, 513 ff.).

Ḍjūdā was the first Hidjazī city to fall into sharīfī hands after Sharīf al-Ḥusayn’s proclamation of Arab independence in 1334/1916 (Nasif, 50). The Turks surrendered the city on 15 Shabīb 1274/17 June after a combined land attack by Sharīf al-Ḥusayn’s army and a six-day bombardment by the British navy. The port then became the major supply depot for the sharīfī forces operating behind Turkish lines during the Arab revolt.

Under the short-lived Kingdom of al-Ḥiḍjāz, Ḍjūdā was a focal point in the struggle between the Wahhābīs and the sharīfīs for control of al-Ḥiḍjāz. After the Saʿūdī occupation of Mecca in Rabīʿ I 1343/October 1924, Ḍjūdā became the capital of the government of ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn. The city was under siege by the Wahhābī forces, situated in the coastal hills ten miles from the town, for almost an entire year from Djiūmādā II 1343/January 1925 until its submission in Djiūmādā II 1344/December 1925. Defence of the city was hindered by the inadequacy of the sharīfī army, estimated by...
Phily (Forty Years, 114) at 1,000 regulars augmented by Bedouin recruits, and by the Ka'immaḳām, favoured negotiation with the Sa'ūdīs and the deposition of ʿAli (Naṣīf, 156 ff. Details of the town's history during this year are contained in the newspaper Barid al-Hadījā, ed. Muḥammad Naṣīf). In Ḍhuʾl-ʿKādā 1345/May 1927 ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Ibn Saʿūd and Gilbert Clayton met in Ḍjudda and concluded the Treaty of Ḍjudda in which Britain recognized the "complete and absolute" independence of Al Saʿūd's territories.

Nallino, describing the town in 1938, mentions the site of the tomb of Eve, quietly demolished by the Saʿūdīs in 1928, the so-called European cemetery, which is thought to date from 1235/1820 and which contains the remains of some Jews and Asians, and the villages beyond the wall. These included al-Hindawiyya to the south, al-Nuṣla to the south-west, al-Baghdādiyya and al-Rūways to the north, and Nakatū, a reed hut settlement inhabited by Ṭakārīr (sing. Ṭakrūrī) (q.v.), all of which have become part of the enlarged city.

The city now has a population variously estimated at 106,000 to 160,000; it is governed by a Ka'immaḳām (the only local governor in Saudi Arabia who still retains the Turkish title), who is under the administrative authority of the Governor of Mecca. The town has an elected Municipal Council. Since World War II, Ḍjudda has experienced a commercial boom. Its wall was demolished in 1946-7, and the town block houses with their latticed balconies have been razed in the old section of the town to make room for modern office buildings. Ḍjudda is known for the cosmopolitan character of its populace: Buḥkārīs, Yamanīs, Ḥaḍramīs, and some tribal communities, notably Ḥarb, still live in separate quarters of the town.

Ḍjudda has numerous light industries including a cement plant and several marble cutting works. A new hospital completed in 1948 supplies the town with over 2,500,000 gallons of water a day, most of which is piped in from wells in Wādī Fāṭima. A modern port at the southern end of the city, A modern port at the southern end of the city, A modern port at the southern end of the city, A modern port at the southern end of the city, with an official air and sea port of entry for pilgrims, is the town with over 2,500,000 gallons of water a day, most of which is piped in from wells in Wādī Fāṭima. A modern port at the southern end of the city, A modern port at the southern end of the city, A modern port at the southern end of the city, A modern port at the southern end of the city, equipped with a two-berth pier 1,300 feet long, is still retained the Turkish title, who is under the administrative authority of the Governor of Mecca. The town has an elected Municipal Council. Since World War II, Ḍjudda has experienced a commercial boom. Its wall was demolished in 1946-7, and the town block houses with their latticed balconies have been razed in the old section of the town to make room for modern office buildings. Ḍjudda is known for the cosmopolitan character of its populace: Buḥkārīs, Yamanīs, Ḥaḍramīs, and some tribal communities, notably Ḥarb, still live in separate quarters of the town.

In 1949, forty years after his capture, Sir Richard Burton was brought to Djudda and concluded the Treaty of Djudda in which Britain recognized the "complete and absolute" independence of Al Saʿūd's territories.

Sir Richard Burton, 1893, ii, 513 ff.; Hopper, Ḽuddah, in Lands East, Feb. 1956; H. St. J. Phily, Forty years in the wilderness, 1957; idem, Arabian studies, 1952; idem, Saʿūdī Arabia, 1952; idem, Arabian Days, 1948; Snouck Hurgrignon, Mekka, ii, 1888; idem, in Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, 5th series, ii, 381 ff., 399 ff.; idem, in Verhandel. der Gesel. für Erdkunde, xiv, 141; ʿAbd al-Κuddūs al-ʿAnsārī, Ḍjudda ʿabī l-ṭalārīk in al-Manhāl, Ḍjudda Jān/Feb. 1962.—For the Ottoman period see Perīdīn, Manṣūra al-salīmī, Istanbul 1265, ii, 6 ff.; Ewilīyā Celebi, Seryāḥīnāmē, ix, 794 ff.; Ḥādamī Khalīfā, Diḥānnīnīm, 519; i. H. Uzun-ｃarsi, Osmanlı tarihī, i/i, Ankara 1934, 44-5; G. W. F. Strilling, The Ottoman Empire and the Arabs 1517-1874, Urbana 1942, index. (R. HARTMANN-PHEBE ANN MARR)
no way connected with the Flood. Ancient Ar-
menian tradition certainly knows nothing of a
mountain on which the ark rested; and when one
is mentioned in later literary sources, this is clearly
due to the gradually increasing influence of the Bible,
which makes the ark rest on the mountains (or a moun-
tain) of Ararat. The highest and best known mountain
there is Masik (Masis), therefore Noah must have been stranded
on it; the next stage in the growth of the Armenian
tradition is due to Europeans, who transferred
Ararat (Armen. Apobaterion), the name of a district,
to the south of Lake Van (cf. the mountain name Ararti
and the life of Noah after leaving the ark. Thus
the ark first settled; cf. Hiibschmann, xvi, 333-4).

The tradition that Masik was the mountain on
which the ark rested only begins to find a place
in Armenian literature in the 11th and 12th cen-
turies. Older exegetes identified the mountain now
called Djabal Djudi, or according to Christian
authorities, the mountains of Gordyene (Syri.
Kur'an (Sura XI, 46) mentions as the landing-place
of Noah, to Mount Kardu which had, from the
earby times, been regarded as the apobaterion".

We might further mention that Layard and
subsequently (1904) L. W. King discovered rock-
sculptures and inscriptions of Sennacherib in
the Djabal Djudi; King therefore proposes to identify
this mountain with the Nipur of the Sanherib
texts. Cf. Layard, Ninissu u. Babylon, 621; King
Jewish-Babylonian tradition was adopted by the
authorities, the mountains of Gordyene (Syr.
Kurdish, |, 564, = Yaküt, i, 270, 11 = Muchfarik, 111), which was probably
considered the highest mountain of all. It is also
possible that the Kürân in its localization of the
mount on which the ark rested had taken over some
older tradition current in Arabia. For this view
we might quote a remark of the apostle Theophylus
(Ad Autolycum, lib. ii, c. 12) who says that:
even in his time the remains of the ark were to be
seen on the mountains of Arabia. The transference of
the name Djudi from Arabia to Mesopotamia by
the Arabs must have taken place fairly early, as
has been mentioned, probably as early as the
time of the Arab invasion; even in the older poets, for
example, Ibn Kays al-Rukayyat (ed. Rhodokanakis,
cf. Nödeke, WZKM, xxv, 91) and Usayya b. Abi
I-Salt (ed. Schulthess, Beitr. 2. Assyri., viii, no. 3, 5)
Djabal Djudi is no longer the Arabian, but the
Mesopotamian mountain. The transference of the
name Djudi to the Kürân chain and the rapid
acceptance of the new name may probably have
been favoured by the circumstance that the land
south of Bohtan, towards Assyria, had often in the
Assyrian period formed part of the district of
Gutium, the land of the Gutí (Kutú) nomads,
and this, the name of a people and district, had
not quite disappeared in the early years of Islam.
On the geographical term Gutium, which is known
to have existed even in the early Babylonian
period, see Scheil, Compt.-rendus de l'Academie des
Inscript. et Bell. Lettres, 1912, 328 ff., 606 ff.

If we assume, as is obvious, that the term Ararat
(Assyr. Urartu) at one time also included an area to
the south of Lake Van (cf. the mountain name Ararat
in the Gordyene cuneiform inscription; see also
Şanda, in the bibliography) then Masik (Great
Ararat) and Djabel Djudi, both traditional resting-
places of the Ark, might each be called Mount
Ararat (in conformity to the Biblical account).

Like the whole country round Ararat, the neigh-
bourhood of Djabal Djudi is to this day full of
memorials and legends which refer to the Flood
and the life of Noah after leaving the ark. Thus
for example at the foot of the mountain is the village
of Karyat Thamânn = "the village of the
80 (Syri. Thamânn; Armen. T'mán = 8; now:
Bêt’mán) in which legend says the people saved in
the ark first settled; cf. Hübschmann, xvi, 333-4.
The Arab geographers also mention a monastery on
Djudi in their time, Dayr al-Djudi; on this cf.
Shâbûshî, Kitâb al-Diyârâ (J. Heer, Quellen, 1858,
96; Sachau, Vom Klosterbuch, Berlin 1919, 20, no.
49) = Yakûtî, ii, 653. The ruined sanctuary (known
today as Safina Nabi Nâî) is venerated by
Muslims, Jews and Christians (G. L. Bell, Amur-
rahâ, 293).

The name of a mountain is mentioned in later
literary sources as the apobaterion of Noah.

If we assume, as is obvious, that the term Ararat
(Assyr. Urartu) at one time also included an area to
the south of Lake Van (cf. the mountain name Ararat
in the Gordyene cuneiform inscription; see also
Ararat, the name of a district, had hitherto
been based on the principles of the school of Başra,
particularly the book of Shabûshî, Kitâb al-
Diyârâ, the name of a district, had hitherto
been based on the principles of the school of Başra,
the name of a district, had hitherto
been based on the principles of the school of Başra,
predominance of the Basrans, the Kufans found their way and gained disciples. The two schools were
a title which suggests an agreeable sense of humour. He died in 193/810.

When the Arab conqueror 'Ukba b. Nafi imposed his authority in 47/667 upon the local prince, the
latter was called the Waddān, after the name of his
principal oasis. It was inhabited by Mazāta Berbers. It was for a time Ibadite and belonged to the
district, or when the district took the
name of Djufra. It was comparatively independent,
being partly isolated by the powerful and dreaded
population consists of about 5,000 inhabitants;
half of them claim to be

Al-Mas'ūdī (d. 345/956) explained the term
'ahd which was translated into Arabic as Surat al-ard,
translated into Arabic as Shūratul 'ūlā, 'survey of the
Earth'. However, it was used for the first time in the Rasā'il Ikhwān al-
Ṣafā in the sense of 'map of the world and the
climes'. The Arabs did not conceive of geography as a well-defined and delimited science with a specific
connotation and subject-matter in the modern sense.
The Arabic geographical literature was distributed
over a number of disciplines, and separate mono-
graphs on various aspects of geography were produced under such headings as Kitab al-Buldān, Shūrat al-ard, al-Masālīk wa 'l-mamlāk, 'Ilm al-
frat*- al-ard, 'science which dealt with fixing the geographical
position of places. Al-Mas'ūdī considered al-Masālīk as
the science which dealt with fixing the geographical
position of places. Al-Muljaddāsī came nearest to
dealing with most aspects of geography in his work
Ahsan al-tahāsim fi ma'rifat al-aḥlāhīn. The present
use of the term diwāhrajīya for geography in Arabic
is a comparatively modern practice.

(II) Pre-Islamic and Early Islamic Periods

In pre-Islamic times the Arabs' knowledge of geography was confined to certain traditional and
ancient geographical notions or to place-names of
Arabia and the adjacent lands. The three main
sources where these are preserved are: the Kur'ān,
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DIWĀHRAJĪYA, Geography.

(i) The term diwāhrajīya and the Arabs' conception of geography

The term diwāhrajīya (or diwāhrajīya, diwāhrajīya, etc.), the title of the works of Marinos of Tyre
(c. 70-130) and Claudius Ptolemy (c.A.D. 90-168) was translated into Arabic as Şūrat al-ard which was used by some Arab geographers as the title of their works. Al-Mas'ūdī (d. 345/956) explained the term as ha'f al-ard, 'survey of the Earth'. However, it was used for the first time in the Rasā'il Ikhwān al-
Ṣafā in the sense of 'map of the world and the
climes'. The Arabs did not conceive of geography as

(ii) Pre-Islamic and Early Islamic Periods

In pre-Islamic times the Arabs' knowledge of geography was confined to certain traditional and
ancient geographical notions or to place-names of
Arabia and the adjacent lands. The three main
sources where these are preserved are: the Kur'ān,
the Prophetic Tradition (hadīth) and ancient Arabic poetry. Many of these notions must have originated from Babylonia in ancient times or were based on Jewish and Christian traditions and indigenous Arab sources.

The geographical concepts or information contained in ancient Arabic poetry reflect the level of understanding of the pre-Islamic Arabs of geographical phenomena and the limits of their knowledge. The Kur'ān preserves traces of some geographical and cosmographical ideas which resemble ancient Babylonian, Iranian and Greek concepts and the Jewish and Christian Biblical traditions. Verses like ‘the heavens and the earth were joined together before we clove them asunder’ (XXI, 30); ‘God is He Who created seven Firmaments and of the earth a similar number’ (LXV, 12); ‘God is He who raised the heavens without any pillars* (XIII, 2); ‘He withholds the sky from guarding’ (XXI, 32); ‘He withholds the sky from being spread out and the mountains set thereon firm so that it may not shake, all form a picture which resembles the ancient Babylonian concept of the universe in which the Earth was a disc-shaped body surrounded by water and then by another belt of mountains upon which the Firmament rested. There was water under the Earth as well as above it’ (Agavi frescoes) were most probably of Iranian origin. Besides, certain terms in the Kur’ān, e.g., burūdi (= Gr. Πυργος, Latin burgus), baladun or baladatun (a Semitic borrowing from the Latin palatinum: Gr. Παλατίνον, karya (> Syriac kritha*, a town or village), indicate the non-Arab origin of the concepts with which these terms are associated in the Kur’ān. These terms are also attributed to ‘Abd b. Abī Tālib (d. 40/660), Ibn ‘Abbas (d. 66-9/686-8), and others, which deal with cosmography, geography and other related questions, but it seems that these traditions which reflect the ancient geographical notions of the Arabs were concocted in a later period to counteract the scientific geographical knowledge that was becoming popular among the Arabs of the period, although they were presented as authentic knowledge by some geographers in their works. Though scientific knowledge advanced, some of the traditions exercised deep influence on Arab geographical thought and cartography, e.g., the tradition according to which the shape of the land-mass was compared to a big bird whose head was China, right wing India, left wing al-Khazar, chest Mecca, Hidjaz, Syria, Ibrāhīm and Egypt and tail North Africa (Ibn al-Fakih, 3-4) became the basis of the geographical writings of the Balghī School. It is not unlikely that this concept had its origin in some ancient Iranian maps observed by the Arabs.

The political expansion of the Arabs, after the rise of Islam, into Africa and Asia, afforded them opportunities to collect information and to observe and record their experiences of the various countries that had come under their sway or were adjacent to the Arab Empire. Whether such information was gathered for military expeditions or for other purposes, it is very likely that it was also utilized in the topographical works that were produced during the early ‘Abbāsid period.

(III) The Transmission of Indian, Iranian and Greek Geographical Knowledge to the Arabs

It was not until the beginning of the ‘Abbāsid rule and the establishment of Baghdād as the capital of the empire that the Arabs began acquainting themselves with scientific geography in the true sense. The conquest of Trān, Egypt and Sind gave the Arabs the opportunity to gain first hand knowledge of the scientific and cultural achievements of the peoples of these ancient cradles of civilization, as well as giving them ownership of, or easy access to their centres of learning, laboratories and observatories. But the process of acquiring and assimilating foreign knowledge did not begin until the time of the Caliph Abū Dā‘far al-Maṣṣūr (135-58/ 753-75), the founder of Baghdād. He took a keen interest in the translation of scientific works into Arabic, which activity lasted for nearly two hundred years in the Islamic world. The Barmakids (= Gr. Ευγέρσης) also played an important role in the promotion of scientific activity at the court. Quite often the translators were themselves eminent scientists whose efforts enriched the Arab language with Indian, Iranian and Greek geographical, astronomical and philosophical knowledge.

Indian Influences. Indian geographical and astronomical knowledge passed on to the Arabs through the first translation into Arabic of the Sanskrit treatise Sūrya-siddhānta (not Brahma-phulasaridhānta as believed by some scholars) during the reign of al-Maṣṣūr. The work showed some earlier Greek influences (see A. B. Keith, History of Sanskrit literature, 517-21), but once translated into Arabic it became the main source of the Arabs’ knowledge of Indian astronomy and geography, and formed the basis of many works that were produced during this period, e.g., Kūdū al-Ẓīdī by Ibrāhīm b. Ḥabīb al-Fāsūrī (wrote after 170/390), al-Dār al-Burūj and al-Sayfī (wrote after 170/390) by Muḥammad b. Muṣa al-Ṭārārī (d. after 232/847), al-Sind Hind by Ḥabāsh b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Marwāzī, al-Baghdādī (second half of the 3rd/9th century) and others.

Among other Sanskrit works translated into Arabic during this period were: Āryabhātīya (Ar.: Aṛāgbhad) by Āryabhata of Kusumapura (b.A.D. 476) who wrote in A.D. 499; then, Khandakādīryaka of Brahmagupta son of Dīghu of Bhāllamāla (near Multān). He was born in A.D. 598 and wrote this work in A.D. 665. It was a practical treatise giving material in a convenient form for astronomical calculations, but this was based on a lost work of Āryabhata, who again agreed with the Sūrya-siddhānta. The Sanskrit literature translated into Arabic belonged mainly to the Gupta period.

The influence of Indian astronomy on Arab thought was much deeper than that of Indian geography, and although Greek and Iranian ideas had a deeper and more lasting effect, Indian geographical concepts and methods were well known. Indians were compared to the Greeks in their talent and achievements in the field of geography, but the Greeks were considered more accomplished in this field (al-Birūnī, al-Kūfīnī, 530).

Among the various geographical concepts with which the Arab scientists became acquainted were: the view of Āryabhata that the daily rotation of the
heavens is only apparent, being caused by the rotation of the earth on its own axis; that the mountain) on it directly under the North Pole; the water on all sides, and was shaped like a dome whose highest point had Mount Meru (an imaginary mountain) on it directly under the North Pole; the northern hemisphere was the inhabited part of the earth and its four limits were Dīnamūt in the East, Rūm in the West, Lanka (Ceylon) which is the Cupola and Sīlpūr, and the division of the inhabited part of the Earth into nine parts. The Indians calculated their longitudes from Ceylon and believed that this prime meridian passed through Udjadiyān [q.v.] (Ujjain). The Arabs took over the idea of Ceylon's being the Cupola of the Earth, but later believed that Udjadiyān was the Cupola, mistakenly thinking that the Indians calculated longitudes from that point.

Iranian Influences. There is sufficient evidence in Arabic geographical literature to point to Iranian influences on Arab geography and cartography, but the actual process of the transmission of Iran's knowledge to the Arabs has not been worked out in detail. J. H. Kramers correctly points out that during the 6th century Greek influence was supreme in Arab geography, but from the end of the 9th century onwards the Arab geographers adopted the system of the east from the west, and it was from Iran that these influences mainly came, for most of the authors came from the Iranian provinces (Analecta Orientalia, i, 147-8). Djundaysābūr was still a great centre of learning and research and there is little doubt that the Arabs were acquainted with some of the Pahlavi works on astronomy, geography, history and other subjects which were extant in some parts of Iran during this period. Some of these works were translated into Arabic and formed the basis of the Arabic works on the subject. Al-Masūdī ascribes to Hāshā b. 'Abd Allāh al-Marwazī al-Baghdādī an astro-nautical treatise Zīgī al-Shāh which was based on the Persian style. He also recorded a Persian work entitled Kāh-nāma which dealt with the various climates and formed part of the larger work entitled Ašīn-nāma, 'Book of Customs'. Again, he mentions having seen at Iṣṭakhr in 302/915 a work that dealt with the various sciences of the Iranians, their histories, monuments, etc. and other information that was not found either in Khudāi-nāma, Ašīn-nāma or Kāh-nāma. This work was discovered among the treasures of the Persian kings and was translated from Persian into Arabic for Hīshām b. 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (105-5/724-43). It is not unlikely that works of this nature formed part of the sources of the Arabs' knowledge on the geography and topography of Iran and on the limits of the Sasanian Empire, its administrative divisions and other details.

Among the various Iranian geographical concepts and traditions followed by Arab geographers, the concept of the Seven Kishwars (Haft Iklim) was the most important. In this system the world was divided into seven equal geometric circles, each representing a kishwar, in such a manner that the fourth circle was drawn in the centre with the remaining six around it, and included Trangshahr of which the most central district was al-Sawād. The Arab geographers continued to be influenced by this system for a long time, and in spite of the view of al-Bīrūnī that it had no scientific or physical basis and that the Greek division of the Climes was more scientific, the Greek division of the world into three or four continents never appealed to them. The concept of the two main seas, namely, the Bab al-Mūlīt (the Erythrean Sea, or the Indian Ocean) which entered the land from the Bab al-Mūlīt (the Encircling Ocean), one from the north-west, i.e., the Atlantic and the other from the east, i.e., the Pacific, but were separated by al-Barzakh ('the Barrier', i.e., the Isthmus of Suez), also dominated Arab geography and cartography for several centuries. As pointed out by J. H. Kramers, although it is very probable that the notion rests in the last resort on Ptolemy, the fact that the Indian Ocean is most often called Baby Fārs, seems to prove that this sea, at least, formed part of the original geographic sketch of the Persians. As to the origin of this sketch itself we find ourselves in uncertainty (Analecta Orientalia, i, 153).

Persian traditions deeply influenced Arab maritime literature and navigation also, as is evident from the use of words of Persian origin in the nautical vocabulary of the Arabs, e.g., bandar (port), nākhudd (shipmaster), rāhminī (book of nautical instructions), daftar (sailing instructions), etc. Certain Persian names like kham (rumb), kulb al-dījāh (pole), etc., also indicate Persian influences on the Arab windrose. Such examples can be multiplied. Persian influences are apparent in Arab cartography as well, an indication of which is of the system of the division of the inhabited world into two main seas, namely, the Bahr al-Pars, seems to prove to the existence of maps in ancient Iran (J. H. Kramers, op. cit. 148-9). As for the 'Indian map which is at al-Kawadhiyān' (Ibn Hāwkal, ed. Kramers, 2) Kramers pointed out that al-Kawadhiyān must contain here an allusion to more primitive maps of the Balkhī-Iṣṭakhrī series, because the maps of Ibn Hāwkal are partly in conformity with this series and partly different (Kramers, op. cit., 155). A correct identification of these maps or their discovery would certainly help to solve the problem of the origin of the maps of the Balkhī school. Here it may be pointed out that it was read Ibn Hāwkal's text as 'the geometrical map at al-Kawadhiyān' (a town near Timūrid in Central Asia), then he must have been referring to some map that was there and was used by geographers as a basis for cartography. It is quite likely that it was based on the Persian kishwar system, for al-Bīrūnī remarks that the term kishwar was derived from 'the line' (al-khufr) which really indicated that these divisions were as distinct from each other as anything that was drawn in lines would be (Sīfa't, ed. Togan, 61).

Greek Influences. More positive data are available on how Greek geographical and astronomical knowledge passed on to the Arabs in the mediaeval period. The process began with the translations of the works of Claudius Ptolemy and other Greek astronomers and philosophers into Arabic either directly or through the medium of Syriac. Ptolemy's Geography was translated several times during the Abbāsid period, but what we possess is the adaptation of Ptolemy's work by Muhammad b. Mūsā al-Khārūzīmī (d. after 232/847) with contemporary data and knowledge acquired by the Arabs incorporated into it. Ibn Khurradābhhīn mentions having consulted and translated Ptolemy's work (perhaps it was in the original Greek or in Syriac translation) and al-Masūdī also consulted a copy of Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
the Geography and also the world map by Ptolemy. It seems that some of these translations had become corrupt, and foreign material was interpolated into them which did not belong to the original work, e.g., the copy consulted by Ibn Hawkal (ed. Kramers, 13). Among other works of Ptolemy translated into Arabic and utilized by Arab geographers were: Almagest (Ar.: Almadisfi); Tetrabiblon (Ar.: al-Maßâliât al-arba'a); Apparitions of fixed stars, etc. (Ar.: Kûdû al-Anwâ').

Among other works translated into Arabic were: the Geography of Marinos of Tyre (c. A.D. 70-139) consulted by al-Masûdi who also consulted the world map by Marinos; the Timeaen (Ar.: Ta'mâ'da') of Plato; the Meteorology (Ar.: al-Akhâr al-ulâyiyya), De caelo (Ar.: al-Samâ' wa l-ilâm); and Metaphysics (Ar.: Ma' ba'd al-îabfa') of Aristotle.

The works of these writers and of several other Greek astronomers and philosophers, when rendered into Arabic, provided material in the form of concepts, theories and results of astronomical observations which ultimately helped Arab geography to evolve on a scientific basis. Persian influences were no doubt marked in regional and descriptive geography as well as in cartography, but Greek influence dominated practically the whole canvas of Arab geography. Even in fields where it may be said that there was a kind of competition between Persian and Greek ideas or methodology, e.g., between the Persian hizâvar system and the Greek system of Climes, the Greek were more acceptable and remained popular. The Greek basis of Arab geography was most prominent in mathematical, physical, human and bio-geography. The Greek impact had a very lasting influence, for it remained the basis of Arab geography as late as the 19th century (traces found in 19th century Persian and even Urdu works on geography written in India), even though on European minds Ptolemaic influence had decreased much earlier. It cannot, however, be denied that throughout this period there was an undercurrent of conflict between the theoretical concepts of the Greek masters on the one hand and the practice and observation of the merchants and sailors of this period on the other. Al-Masûdi himself refers to this in the case of the Ptolemaic theory of the existence of an unknown land in the southern hemisphere. On the other hand Ibn Hawkal considered Ptolemy almost infallible. The fact was that Greek information when transmitted to the Arabs was already outdated by about five centuries, and so difficulty arose when Arab geographers tried to incorporate fresh and contemporary information acquired by them into the Ptolemaic framework and to corroborate it with Greek data. The result was confusion and often misrepresentation of facts in geographical literature and cartography, as is evident from the works of geographers like al-Iдрîsî.

(IV) The Classical Period (3rd-5th/9th-11th centuries)

(a) The Period of al-Ma'mûn (157-218/832-33):

Over half a century of Arab familiarity with, and study of Indian, Iranian and Greek geographical science, from the time of the Caliph al-Ma'sûr (135-57/754-74) up to the time of al-Ma'mûn, resulted in completely revolutionizing Arab geographical thought. Such concepts as that the Earth was round and not flat, and that it occupied the central position in the Universe, were introduced to them for the first time properly and systematically. Henceforth, the Qur'anic verses dealing with cosmogony, geography, etc. and the Traditions were utilized only to give religious sanction to geographical views or to exhort the believers to study geography and astronomy. Thus, by the beginning of the 3rd/9th century the real basis was laid for the production of geographical literature in Arabic and the first positive step in this regard was taken by the Caliph al-Ma'mûn, who successfully surrounded himself with a band of scientists and scholars and patronized their academic activities. Whether al-Ma'mûn's interest in astronomy and geography was genuine and academic, or whether it was political is not certain. During his reign, however, some very important contributions were made towards the advancement of geography: the measurement of an arc of a meridian was carried out (the mean result gave 561/4 Arab miles as the length of a degree of longitude, a remarkably accurate value); the astronomical tables called al-Safû al-mamânisya (The verified tables) were prepared by the collective efforts of the astronomers; lastly, a World Map called al-Sârâ al-Ma'mânisya was prepared, which was considered superior to the maps of Ptolemy and Marinos of Tyre by al-Masûdi who had consulted and compared all three (Tanbih, ed. De Goeje, 33). It was most probably based on the Greek system of climes.

(b) The Astronomers and Philosophers:

The Arab astronomers and philosophers made equally important contributions to mathematical and physical geography through their observations and theoretical discussions. From the time of the introduction of Greek philosophy and astronomy in the second half of the 2nd/8th century up to the first half of the 5th/11th century a galaxy of philosophers and astronomers worked on various problems of mathematical, astronomical and physical geography. The works of the Greek scientists had already provided enough basis and material for this. Thus the results of the experiments, observations and theoretical discussions of the Arab scientists were recorded in their more general works on astronomy and philosophy or in monographs on special subjects like tides, mountains, etc. The contemporary and later writers on general geography in Arabic often, though not always, reproduced these results in their works and sometimes discussed them. Some of these writers reproduced various current theories, Greek or otherwise, about a problem in the introductory parts of their works. Thus a tradition was established of writing on mathematical, physical and human geography in the beginning of any work dealing with geography. This is noticeable, for example, in the works of Ibn Rusta, al-Ya'kîbî, al-Masûdi, Ibn Hawkal, etc.

Among the outstanding Arab philosophers and astronomers whose works were utilized and theories discussed by Arab geographers were: Ya'kîb b. Ishâq al-Kindî (d. 260/874), to whom two works on geography are attributed, (1) Rasm al-ma'ûnî min al-arâd and (2) Râsâla fi l-bîhâr wa l-mâdâ wa l-djaâs. One of al-Kindî's pupils, Ahmad b. Muham- mad b. al-Tayibi al-Saraghî (d. 286/899), is also said to have written two works, (1) al-Maddîk wa l-ma-mâlîk and (2) Râsâla fi l-bîhâr wa l-mi-yahî wa l-djaâs. Neither the works of al-Kindî nor those of al-Saraghî are extant, and what we know of their geographical views are from other sources which used them. It seems that the two authors utilized the works of Ptolemy and other Greek writers, as
we find in al-Masudi that their works did contain Ptolemaic information on physical and mathematical geography and astronomy. Ptolemy's work *Rasul ma'mar min al-ard* may have been a version of Ptolemy's *Geography* as the title of the work itself suggests; al-Masudi consulted a work of Ptolemy's entitled *Masihin al-ard* and a world map called *Surar ma'mar al-ard* (al-Masudi, *Muradi*, i, 275-7; Tanbih, 25, 30, 51).

Among other philosophers and astronomers whose writings served as a source of information on mathematical and physical geography were: al-Fazari (second half of the 2nd/8th century); Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Kâbir al-Farqbehni (d. after 247/862) author of *Al-Fusûl al-thalâkütn* (al-Masudi, *Muradi*, iii, 443; Tanbih, 199) and al-Muqadili dî 'ilm hay'âl al-afikâl; Abû Mas'har Dja'far b. Muhammad al-Balkhi (d. 273/886), author of *Al-Mushkil al-habîr dî 'ilm al-mudjamât*; al-Mas'udi consulted another work by him entitled *Kutub al-ulâf fi'l-payyâl wa 'l-bunyân al-azîm*; then Abû 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Dja'far al-Batkî (d. 372/982) and others. The fourth *Risâla* of the Rasûlî al-Khâwân al-Safâ deals with *Djughrâfiya*. Written in about 370/980, it simply deals with elementary knowledge about mathematical and physical geography based on Greek geography, since the main purpose of the writers was to guide the reader to achieve union with God through wisdom.

(c) General Geographical Literature:

By the 3rd/9th century a considerable amount of geographical literature had been produced in various forms in the Arabic language, and it appears that the Arabs had at their disposal some Pahlavi works, or translations thereof, dealing with the Sasanian Empire, its geography, topography, postal routes and details essential for administrative purposes. These works may have become available to those interested in geography and topography. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that early writers like Ibn Khurradджîbîh, Kudâmâ and others were heads of postal departments or government secretaries, as a result of which they naturally occupied a central position in Arab geographical studies and covered mathematical, astronomical, physical, human and economic geography. Among the representatives of this class of geographers were: Ibn Khurradджîbîh, al-Ya'kîbîh, Ibn al-Fâkhîh, Kudâmâ and al-Mas'udi. Since 'Irâq was the most important centre of geographical learning at this time and many of the geographers belonged to it, we may for the sake of convenience use the term 'Irâqî School for them. Within this School, however, two groups of writers may be discerned: those who bring together the following four directions, viz., north, south, east and west, and tend to consider Baghdâd as the centre of the world, and those who arrange it according to various *iklims* (regions) and for the most part treat Mecca as the centre. (2) To the second category of works belong the writings of al-Istakhriî, Ibn Bânalî and al-Mukaddasî, for whom the term al-Balki School has been used, as they followed Abû Zayed al-Balkhi (see below). They confined their accounts to the world of Islam, describing each province as a separate *iklim*, and hardly touching upon non-Islamic lands except the frontier regions.

(i) The 'Irâkî School. The works of Ibn Khurradджîbîh, al-Ya'kîbîh and al-Mas'udi are distinguished from the writings of other geographers of this School by two special features: first, they follow the Iranian *higwar* system, and second, they equate 'Irâk with Irângâh and begin their descriptions with it, thus placing 'Irâk in a central position in Arab regional and descriptive geography. According to al-Birûnî the Seven Khîwaris were represented by and equal circles. The central *higwar* was Irângâh which included Khurashân, Fârs, Djîbîl and 'Irâk. He considered that these divisions were arbitrary and had been made primarily for political and administrative reasons. In ancient times the great kings lived in Irângâh, and it was necessary for them to live in the central zone so that they would be equidistant from all parts of the Empire, its geography, topography, postal routes and details essential for administrative purposes. Such a division had no relation either to the physical systems or to astronomical laws, but was based on political changes or ethnological differences (*Sîfa*, ed. Togan, 5, 60-62). With the foundation of Baghdâd as the capital of the 'Abbâsîd Empire, 'Irâk naturally occupied a central and politically important position in the world of Islam. Ibn Khurradджîbîh equated 'Irâk with Irângâh and the district of al-Sawâd which was called as-*li* Irângâh in ancient times occupied the central position in his system of geography, and he begins his account with its description. Similarly, al-Ya'kîbîh considered 'Irâk as the centre of the world and 'the navel of the earth' (*surrat al-ard*); but for him Baghdâd was the centre of 'Irâk, for he was not only the greatest city of the world unparalleled in its glory, but it was also the seat of government of the Banû Hâshim. Because it occupied a central position in the world, 'Irâk had a moderate climate, its inhabitants were handsome and intelligent and possessed high morals. But in his system of geography Baghdâd is grouped with Şamarrâ, and the description begins with these two towns. A similar note of the superiority of 'Irâk is struck by the historian and geographer al-Mas'udi, who thought of Baghdâd as the best city in the world (Tanbih, 34; cf. Ibn al-Fâkhîh, 195 ff.). As against these writers, Kudâmâ, Ibn Rusta and
Ibn al-Fakīh display no enthusiasm for ʿIrāq or ʿIrānšahr. In their system Mecca and Arabia are given precedence. In Kudāma Mecca is given absolute precedence and all roads leading to Mecca are described. A similar tendency is also noticeable in Ibn Rusta (beginning of 4th/10th century) who departed completely from the Iranian traditions and assigned to Mecca and Medina the foremost place in his arrangement of geographical material. In his description of the Seven Iḥlīms he prefers to describe them according to the Greek pattern and not according to the ḥighwar system. In the geographical work of Ibn al-Fakīh the description of Mecca takes precedence, but a considerable portion of the work is devoted to Fārs, Khurāsān, etc. and the Iḥlīms are described according to the ḥighwar system.

An important feature of the works of Ibn Khurradadhbih, al-Yaʿkūbī and Kudāma is that the material in them is arranged and described following the four directions, namely, east, west, north and south according to the division of the world into four quarters. Such a method of description must have had its origin in some Iranian geographical tradition, and the Arab geographers must have had some pattern before them to copy. According to al-Masʿūdī the Persians and the Nabataeans divided the inhabited part of the world into four parts, viz., Khurāsān (east), Bāḥrān (north), Khurbarān (west) and Nimruz (south) (Tanbīḥ, 32; cf. al-Yaʿkūbī, 268). However, Kudāma points out the arbitrariness of such a division. For him the terms east, west, north and south had only a relative value. In Ibn Rusta and Ibn al-Fakīh, the arrangement is by regions.

Ibn Khurradadhbih, who may be called the father of geography, laid down the pattern and style for writing geography in the Arabic language. But, as J. H. Kramers pointed out, he was not an inventor of this style or pattern. He must have had some pattern or sample of an earlier work on the subject as a part of history, which explains the fact that his writings in Arabic as well as upon contemporary events resemble that of al-Iṣṭaḥkhrī and Ibn Hawkal. He incorporated the account of the merchant Sulaymān on India and China, but the special feature of his work is that, along with trustworthy and authentic information, it records long pieces of verse, various traditions and information of a legendary character. The work is poor in the treatment of general and mathematical geography.

Abu ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn al-Masʿūdī (d. 345/956), the celebrated historian, combined the qualities of an experienced traveller with those of a geographer of high distinction. Unfortunately his own account of his travels (Kitāb al-Kaḥfiyya wa l-taḥdīrāt) is not extant, but an approximate idea of his travels can be formed from his extant works, namely, Murājjud al-dhahab wa maʿādin al-dajawar and al-Tanbīḥ ʿl-taḥrīf (the work entitled Aḥkāḥ ar-ʾalāmān, etc. ed. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣāwī, Cairo 1938, and a MS of the Maulana Azad Library, Muslim University, Allgarh (Qutbuddin Collection, MS No. 561) entitled Kitāb Aḥdāb al-dunyā (in the colophon Kitāb al-Aḥdāb) are both wrongly attributed to al-Masʿūdī and have nothing to do with his great work Kitāb Aḥkāḥ ar-ʾalāmān (which is lost). Al-Masʿūdī regarded geography as a part of history, which explains the fact that his works deal with geography as an introduction to history. He drew upon the earlier geographical writings in Arabic as well as upon contemporary travel accounts and maritime literature. This he reinforced by the information collected by himself during his travels or from people whom he met. He does not give any systematic topographical account
of the 'Abbāsīd Empire or deal with routes of the kingdom or postal stations, but he presents an excellent survey of contemporary Arab knowledge on the geography of the Khorasan and al-Mas'ūdī's main contribution was in the field of human and general geography. He advanced geographical science by challenging certain theories and concepts of Arab geographers which he found baseless in the light of his own experience and observation. He did not hesitate even to question the age-old theories of the Greek masters like Ptolemy, e.g., the existence of land in the southern hemisphere. In the field of human and physical geography he emphasized the influence of the environment and other geographical factors on the physique and character of animals, plants and human beings. Al-Mas'ūdī was also influenced by Iranian geographical traditions, e.g., the Seven Highways system, considering 'Irāk as the central and the best iklim in the world and Baghdad as the best city, etc.

An outstanding geographer of this period whose influence on the development of Arab geography was as varied and deep as that of Ibn Khurradābdhi b. 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Djayhānī (earlier part of the 4th/10th century). Unfortunately, his work Kitāb al-Madsālik wa 'l-maṭālik (the Kābul MS has nothing to do with the great work of al-Djayhānī, see V. Minorsky, A false Jayhnī, in BSOAS, xiii, 1949-50, 89-96) has not come down to us; but it is quite likely that al-Djayhānī used the original text of Ibn Khurradābdhi's Kitāb al-Madsālik. Being in the privileged position of a waṣṭ and writing in Būqhārā he 'could extend the field of his investigation much deeper into central Asia and the Far East than was possible for his Arab contemporaries' (Minorsky, Muluz, etc., 6-7, London 1942). He collected first-hand information from different sources, hence the importance of his work. A large number of later Arab geographers utilized al-Djayhānī's work which, in the opinion of al-Mas'ūdī, was 'interesting because of its novel information and interesting stories'.

The anonymous Hudād al-ʿālam, written in Persian in 318/930, is one of the earliest works in Persian on world geography. The author utilized numerous earlier Arabic authorities on the subject and he had undoubtedly a copy of the work of al-Iṣṭākhṛ before him. There is a tendency in the work towards completeness and numerical exactitude. Besides, the author is independent of other geographers in his geographical generalizations and terminology. The originality of the author lies in his conception of the division of the inhabited world into 'parts of the world' and separate 'countries' (see Barthold, Preface to Hudād al-ʿālam, 21-33). The work appeared in an English translation with an excellent commentary by V. Minorsky (London 1937), one of the most exhaustive ever written on any Persian or Arabic geographical work in modern times.

(ii) The Balkh School. To the second main category of writers on general geography belonged al-Iṣṭākhṛ, Ibn Hawkāl and al-Mukaddasī as well as Abū Zayd Aḥmad b. Sahl al-Balkhī (d. 322/934) after whom this School is named. Al-Balkhī wrote his geographical work Sawai al-ḥabīlim (primarily a commentary on maps) in 308/920 or a little later. He spent some eight years in 'Irāk and had studied under al-Kindī. He had travelled widely before his return to his native place and had acquired a high reputation for knowledge and erudition. However, probably in the later part of his life he held orthodox views and wrote several treatises which were highly appreciated in orthodox circles. Although the text of al-Balkhī's geographical work has not yet been separately established, and the MSS, at one time attributed to al-Balkhī, have now been proved to be of al-Iṣṭākhṛ, the view of De Goeje still seems to hold good that the work of al-Iṣṭākhṛ represents a second and greatly enlarged edition of al-Balkhī's work, compiled between 318/930 and 321/933, in al-Balkhī's lifetime.

The geographers of the Balkh School gave a positive Islamic colouring to Arab geography. In addition to restricting themselves mainly to Islamic lands, they laid emphasis on such geographical concepts as found concurrence in the Kur'ān or were based on the traditions and sayings of the Companions of the Prophet and others, e.g., they compared the land-mass with a big bird (see above). This was in conformity with a tradition attributed to 'Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-Ḥāṣ (Ibn al-Fakhī, 3-4). Again, the land-mass, round in shape, was encompassed by the 'Encircling Ocean' like a neck-ring, and from this Ocean the two 'gulfs' (the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean) flowed inwards without joining each other, being separated by al-Barzāgh (q.v.), the 'barrier' at al-Kulzum, a concept found in the Kur'ān (see above). Again, unlike some other School of Geography, the Balkh School, the geographers of the Balkh School assigned to Arabia the central place in the world, for it had Mecca and the Ka'ba in it. These new trends in the methodology and treatment of the subject-matter became the dominant feature of the geographers of this School, and must in all probability have been a culmination of the early process wherein Mecca was given precedence over 'Irāk by one group of geographers. The prime object of these later geographers was to describe exclusively the bilād al-ʾĪslām which they divided into twenty iklims, except that they discussed the non-Islamic lands in general in their introductory notes. The basis of the division of these 'provinces' was neither the Iranian highwar system nor the Greek system of Clines. It was territorial and purely physical. This was a positive advancement on previous methods and in a way 'modern'. As pointed out by Ibn Hawkāl (2-3) he did not follow the pattern of the 'seven iklims' (of the map at al-Kawāthiyyān, see above), for although it was correct, it was full of confusion, with some overlapping of the boundaries of the 'provinces'. Hence he drew a separate map for each section describing the position of each 'province', its boundaries and other geographical information. An important contribution made by these geographers was that they systematized and enlarged the scope of geography by including in it new topics with a view to making it more useful and interesting, for they believed that a much wider range of people were interested in it, like the kings, the people of murūma and the leading sections of all classes (Ibn Hawkāl, 3). In cartography, besides drawing the regional maps on a more scientific basis, they may be said to have introduced the element of perspective. They drew a round map of the world showing the various 'regions' of the bilād al-ʾĪslām and other non-Islamic 'regions' of the world. The aim was to bring them in proper perspective and to show the relative position and size of each. But since it did not represent the true size and shape (round rather than square) of each iklim, they mapped each in a magnified form. Their drawing these on a purely physical basis was
probably the first experiment of its kind in Arab cartography. The maps of al-Istakhri and Ibn Hawkal are, in this respect, superior to those of al-Farisi, who divided the seven latitudinal Climes into ten longitudinal sections of the world, drew a map of each section separately with the result that these sectional maps do not represent geographical units but geometrical divisions. Al-Istakhri, Ibn Hawkal and al-Mukaddasi present for the first time the concept of a country as defined in geographical terms, and even go so far as to delimit the boundaries of each, just as they define the boundaries of the four main kingdoms of the world.

Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Fārisī al-Iṣṭakhri (first half of the 10th/11th century) seems to have been mainly responsible for spreading the ideas of the Balkhi School. Little is known of his life, but he travelled a good deal and incorporated the experiences of his travels in his work al-Masa’ilīk wa’l-madmlik (a new edition of this work has appeared recently, ed. by M. Djabir c. 366/977). From his childhood, Ibn Hawkal was interested in geography and had travelled widely between 331/943 and 357/968. He was so devoted to geography that he found none of the existing works on the subject satisfactory. He claims to have written his work was that he found none of the existing works on the subject satisfactory. He claims to have improved the work of al-Iṣṭakhri whom he had met. However, the claims of Ibn Hawkal may not be accepted unequivocally, for the similarity between the two geographers itself suggests that Ibn Hawkal had been considerably indebted to al-Iṣṭakhri. There is little doubt, however, that he ranks among the most outstanding geographers of the period, for in cartography he shows independence and individuality and does not follow others slavishly. Besides, he incorporated new information based on his travels or acquired from hearsay. He remained an authentic source of information for the succeeding geographers for several centuries to come.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Mukaddasi (d. 390/1000), the author of Ahsan al-takāsīm fi maʿrījat al-akhlāṣ was a very original and scientific geographer of his time. He rightly claims to have put Arab geography on a new foundation and given it a new meaning and wider scope. Since he considered the subject useful to many sections of society, as also to the followers of various vocations, he widened its scope, including in it a variety of subjects ranging from physical features of the īklim (region) under discussion to the natural history of the inhabitants, customs and habits, religious and sects, character, weights and measures and the territorial divisions, routes and distances. He believed that it was not a science that was acquired through conjecture (ṣiyāt), but through direct observation and first-hand information. Hence he laid his main emphasis on what was actually observed and was reasonable. From the earlier writers he borrowed what was most essential ‘without stealing from them’. Thus, according to the nature of the sources of information, his work may be divided into two parts: what he observed himself; what he heard from trustworthy people; and what he found in written works on the subject.

Al-Mukaddasi is one of the few Arab geographers who discusses geographical terminology and specific connotations of certain phrases and words used, besides giving a synopsis and an index of the īklims, districts, etc., in the introduction of his work for the benefit of those who want to get an idea of the contents quickly or wish to use it as a traveler’s guide. Unlike Iṣṭakhri and Ibn Hawkal, al-Mukaddasi divided the Mamlakat ʿl-Īslām into fourteen īklims (seven ‘arab and seven ‘aṭjam) perhaps to conform to the belief that there were seven climes north of the Equator and seven others to its south, an idea attributed to Hermes, the legendary figure known to the Arabs as an ancient philosopher of Egypt. In this respect he differed from Abū Zayd al-Balkhī and al-Diyāhānī, whom he however considered Imāms (here authorities). An important feature of his work is that like a muṣaffār he discusses at length certain questions relating to general geography, e.g., the number of the seas, etc., in order to bring them into conformity with the ʿurūf verses relating to them.

(d) Trade and exploration: the maritime literature:

An important aspect of the development of Arabic geographical literature of this period was the production of the maritime literature and travel accounts, which enriched the Arabs’ knowledge of regional and descriptive geography. This became possible firstly, because of the political expansion of the Muslims and the religious affinity felt by them towards one another irrespective of nationality or race, and secondly, because of the phenomenal increase in the commercial activities of the Arab merchants. Incentive to travel and exploration was provided by several factors, e.g., pilgrimage to Mecca, missionary zeal, deputation as envoys, official expeditions, trade and commerce, and, last but not least, the mariners’ profession.

From very ancient times the Arabs played the rôle of intermediaries in trade between the East (India, China, etc.) on the one hand and the West (Egypt, Syria, Rome, etc.) on the other. But with the foundation of Baghād as the capital of the ‘Abbāsid Empire and the development of the ports of Basra and Sirāf, the actual and personal participation of the Arabs now extended as far as China in the east and Sofala on the east coast of Africa. They had learned and mastered the art of navigation from the Persians, and by the 3rd/9th century Arab navigators had become quite familiar with the monsoon and trade winds, and their boats sailed not only along the coasts but direct to India from Arabia. They had become intimate with the various stretches of the sea between the Persian Gulf and the Sea of China, which they divided into the Seven Seas giving each a specific name. Again, they sailed from Aden to East Africa as far south as Sofala and freely sailed on the Red Sea, the Mediterranean, the Black Sea and the Caspian and also on a number of navigable rivers including the Nile and the Indus. Although their boats were small as compared to those of the Chinese, and the Indian Ocean was infested with whales, they performed long and
hazardous voyages with courage and fortitude. They used sea-charts (rahmdnls and dafdtir). Al-Mas′ūdī (Murūdī, 1, 233-4) records names of certain captains of boats whom he knew and expert sailors of the Indian Ocean; similarly, al-Mukaddasī (10-11) gives the name of an expert merchant-sailor whom he consulted on the question of the shape of the Indian Ocean. Ahmad b. Māḏjidī (q.v.), see also below) speaks of an old rahmdān composed by Muhammad b. Shāhād, Sahl b. Abbān and Layth b. Kahān (lived in the later part of the 3rd/9th century), but he considered them much below the standard (see Hourani, Arab seafaring, 107-8). Since none of these charts is extant, it is not possible to make a correct assessment of the contribution made by these early Arab navigators to nautical geography.

With the development of Arab navigation, Arab trade also expanded. With a strong political power in the Middle East and a developing economy at home, the Arabs acquired considerable importance as traders in the East. The sphere of their trade not only widened, but became more intensive. They even traded by barter with the primitive tribes of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, whose languages they did not understand. Arab trade with China declined from about the end of the 3rd/9th century, for it is said that in the peasant rebellion under Huang Chao (A.D. 878) large numbers of foreigners were massacred in China. From this time onwards Arab boats went only as far as Kala, a port on the western coast of the Malay Peninsula, no longer existing.

The Arabs' urge to explore new lands was mainly prompted by a desire for trade and rarely for the sake of exploration. Although some instances of early Arab adventures and exploration are recorded, many of them seem to have been 'wonder tales' (e.g., the interpreter Sallām's account of his trip to the wall of Gog and Magog under the orders of the Caliph Wāthik (227-32/842-7), see Minorsky, Haddād al-′ālam, 225). The story of a certain young man of Cordova (Spain) who sailed with a group of young friends on the Atlantic Ocean and then returned after some time, laden with booty, may have had some historical truth in it (al-Mas′ūdī, i, 258-9). On the whole the Arabs of this period did not make any substantial contribution to or improve upon the knowledge acquired from the Greeks. There is no doubt however that in regard to certain regions, viz., North and East Africa, West Asia, Middle Asia, India and a few other countries, their information was much more authentic and intimate.

The fact that the Arabs did not explore the regions unknown to them, even those of which they had a theoretical knowledge, may be explained by several factors: wherever the trade incentive was satisfied, they did not proceed beyond that point; secondly, certain notions or preconceived ideas continuously dominated their thought and dissuaded them from taking a bold step, e.g., the Atlantic was a Sea of Darkness and a Muddy Spring (al-′sāyn al-ḥamās′a). For the same reason they did not sail further south along the east coast of Africa, for they believed that there were high tidal waves and sea commotion there, although al-Bīrūnī, on the basis of certain evidence discovered in the 3rd/9th century, namely, the discovery in the Mediterranean of planks from boats of the Indian Ocean (see above), had conceived that the Indian Ocean was connected with the Atlantic by means of narrow passages south of the sources of the Nile (Sīfā, 3-4). Lastly, the fear of encountering aboriginal tribes and cannibals of the East Indies must have prevented the Arabs from sailing further east.

Among the travel accounts of this period that have survived, one of the earliest is that attributed to the merchant Sulayman b. b. Shahriyar, the captain of Ramhurmuz (299-399/A. D. 912-1009) who compiled a book of maritime tales, entitled Kitāb Qāwilat al-Hind in about 342/953. The book relates a number of very amusing and very strange stories concerning the adventures of the sailors in the Islands of the East Indies and other parts of the Indian Ocean. These were apparently composed for the general reader, and though mostly fantastic, they cannot be completely brushed aside as untrue and ignored in any serious study of Arab geography and exploration. It seems that during this period there was a great demand for wonderful and amusing tales, which fact is borne out by the existence of several MSS in Arabic dealing with ′adīb′ literature.

This period was on the whole marked by a spirit of enquiry and investigation and exploration among the Arabs. But the maritime literature, most of which seems to have perished, posed itself against the theoretical knowledge derived from the Greek and other sources. Hence at times there was a contradiction between theory and practice, and this was the fundamental problem with which the Arab geographers and travellers were faced. It was this conflict between theory and practice that finally determined the course of the development of Arab geography in the later period. When the 'practicalists' gave way to the theoreticians, the decline of Arab geography became certain. Why the word of the sailor, the traveller and the merchant was not
given due credence is difficult to explain, but a large amount of maritime literature must have perished through either neglect or animosity.

(e) Al-Biruni and his contemporaries:

The 5th/11th century may be taken as the apogee of the progress of Arab geography. The geographical knowledge of the Arabs, both as derived from the Greeks and others and as advanced by themselves through research, observation and travel, had, by this period, reached a very high level of development. Besides, geographical literature had acquired a special place in Arabic literature, and various forms and methods of presenting geographical material had been standardized and adopted. The importance of al-Biruni’s contribution to Arab geography is two-fold: firstly, he presented a critical summary of the total geographical knowledge up to his own time, and since he was as well-versed in Greek, Indian and Iranian contributions to geography and in that of the Arabs, he made a comparative study of the subject. He pointed out that the Greeks were more accomplished than the Indians, thereby implying that the methods and techniques of the former should be adopted. But he was not dogmatic, and held some important views that were not in conformity with Greek ideas; occasionally, as an astronomer he not only calculated the geographical positions of several towns, but measured the length of a degree of latitude, thus performing one of the three important geodetic operations in the history of Arab astronomy. He made some remarkable theoretical advances in general, physical and human geography. On the basis of the above-mentioned discovery in the Mediterranean of the planks of an Arabian Sea boat a hundred years earlier, he conceived the theoretical possibility of the existence of channels connecting the Indian Ocean with the Atlantic south of the Mountains of the Moon and the Sources of the Nile. But these were difficult to cross because of high tides and strong winds. He argued that just as towards the east, the Indian Ocean had penetrated the northern continent (Asia) and had opened up channels, similarly, to balance them, the continent has penetrated the Indian Ocean towards the west; the sea there is connected through channels with the Atlantic. Thus, although theoretically he laid down the possibility of circumnavigating the South African coast, in practice it was never accomplished by the Muslims. The idea, however, persisted until the time of the arrival of the Portuguese, when it was hinted by al-Nahrwalī that the Portuguese might have taken this route. Al-Biruni conceived that the land-mass was surrounded by water, that the centre of ‘Earth’s weight’ shifted and caused physical changes on its surface, e.g., fertile lands turned barren, water turned into land and vice versa. He described very clearly various concepts and the limits of the inhabited parts of the earth of his time, for which he seems to have had recourse to some contemporary sources which were not available to the earlier geographers. He made an original contribution to regional geography by describing India in detail.

Among the astronomers of the 5th/11th century who deserves mention was Ibn Yūnus, Abu ‘l-Hasan ʿAll b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān (d. 399/1009). While al-Biruni was working in India and other places, Ibn Yūnus made valuable observations in the observatory on the Mt. al-Mukattam in Egypt under the patronage of the Fatimid caliph al-ʿAzīz and al-Ḥakīm. The results of his observations recorded in the al-Zīj al-kabīr al-Ḥakīmi became an important source of up-to-date astronomical and geographical knowledge for the scientists of the Islamic East.

Among the geographers and travellers contemporary to al-Biruni there was the Iṣmaʿīlī poet-traveller Nasr-ī Khūsrow (d. 455/1060 or 453/1061) whose travel account entitled Safar-nāma written in Persian covers the author’s personal experiences in and descriptions of Mecca and Egypt. Abu ’l-ʿUbayd ‘Abd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Bakrī (d. 487/1094) was the best representative of lexico-geometry of the period in as far as place-names were concerned. His geographical dictionary Muwīj-dām mā sta’dām min ʿasāma al-sīlah wa l-mawādi is an excellent literary-cum-geographical work. It discusses the orthography of place-names of the Arabian peninsula mainly, furnishing literary evidence from Arabic literature, ancient Arabian poetry, Ḥadīṣ, ancient traditions, etc. His second geographical treatise Kitāb al-masdlik wa l-mamdlik wa l-masālik wa l-mamālik has not survived in its entirety. Al-Bakrī was, however, more a litterateur than a geographer [see Abū ’l-ʿUbayd al-Bakrī].

(V) The period of consolidation (6th/12th-16th centuries)

From the 6th/12th to the 10th/16th century Arab geography displayed continuous signs of decline. The process was accelerated and with some exceptions like the works of al-Idrisī and Abu ’l-Fida the general standard of works produced was low compared to those of the earlier period. The scientific and critical attitude towards the subject and emphasis on authenticity of information that was the mark of the earlier writers gave place to mere recapitulations and rapprochements of the traditional and theoretical knowledge found in the works of earlier writers. This was, in a way, the period of consolidation of geographical knowledge, and the literature may be divided into eight broad categories:

(a) world geographical accounts;
(b) cosmological works;
(c) the siyārāt literature;
(d) muwīj-dām literature or geographical dictionaries;
(e) travel accounts;
(f) maritime literature;
(g) astronomical literature;
(h) regional geographical literature.

(a) World geographical accounts:

The tradition of describing the world as a whole as practised by the geographers of the classical period continued to be followed by some geographers of this period, but works dealing exclusively with the world of Islam had become rare, for the ʿAbbasīd Empire had itself disintegrated. The pattern of description and arrangement was also different from the earlier works. There was a tendency towards rapprochement between astronomical and descriptive geography in these works, and Greek influence was still prominent in some works, while Persian influence had comparatively diminished probably because of the production of geographical literature in Persian as well. But geographical activity had expanded and places like Syria, Sicily and Spain had become important centres of geographical learning, and some very important works were produced there. Among very important works of world geography and astronomy produced during this period we may mention Munākah al-idrāk fi tabṣim al-afṣāk by
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Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Kharakl (d. 533/1138-9); Kitab al-Djughrifya by Muhammad b. Abu Bakr al-Zuhri of Granada (lived towards 531/1137); Nukhbat al-^ad^ib fi 'l-akbat al-sab'a by Ibn Sa'id (d. 672/1274); and Takwim al-buldan by Abu 'l-Fida (d. 731/1331).

Al-Zuhri's work was based on the Greek system of ^ilims and represented the trend of rapprochement between astronomical and descriptive geography. The work of al-Idrîsî, which also represents this tendency, is a fine example of Arab-Norman cooperation in geographical activities. It was produced at Palermo under the patronage of the Norman king Roger II. Al-Idrîsî, who was a prince, and belonged to the Hammûdîdd dynasty, was neither a renowned traveller nor a trained geographer before he joined the court of Roger. The aim of Roger in calling him to his court seems to have been to utilize his personality for his own political objectives. There is little doubt, however, that Roger was interested in geography and he was able to collect a team of astronomers and geographers in his court. As a result of their efforts, for the first time in the history of Arab cartography, seventy regional maps based on the Ptolemaic system of climes were drawn, and a large silver map of the world constructed. The total geographical information acquired from contemporary as well as earlier Greek or Arab sources was classified according to the relevant sections of which formed a description of one of these maps. The work was an important contribution to physical and descriptive geography. The work of Ibn Sa'id was based on the clime-system. It also gives the latitudes and longitudes of many places which facilitates their reconstruction into a map. By this time Syria had become an important centre of geographical activities. Abu 'l-Fida, the Syrian prince, historian and geographer, completed his important compendium on world geography in 721/1321. The work gives latitudes and longitudes of places and treats the subject-matter on a regional basis. It is arranged in a systematic way and covers descriptive, astronomical and human geography. The author seems to have utilized some contemporary sources, for we find some new information which is not available in earlier works.

(b) Cosmological works:

During this period several works were produced which dealt not only with geography but also with cosmology, cosmogony, astrology and such other topics. The main purpose of these works seems to have been to present in a consolidated and systematic form world knowledge for the benefit of the average reader. No doubt the authors utilized earlier Arabic sources, but on the whole the material is presented uncritically, and there is hardly any question of investigation or research, and the zeal of enquiry is totally lacking. The tendency to produce such works was mainly due to the decline in education and learning which affected the progress of geographical knowledge. The following are some of the works that belong to this category: Tuhfat al-ahlâb (or al-akhkhâb) wa nuhkbat al-'adâ'ib by Abu Hâmîd al-Çhânrâtî (d. 565/1169-70); 'Adâ'îb al-buldan and Âhtar al-buldân by al-Kazînî (d. 682/1283); Nu'hkbat al-da'hâr fi 'adâ'îb al-bar'a wa 'l-âhtar by al-Dîmâshqî (d. 727/1327); Khâridat al-^adâ'îb wa farhâdat al-ghârâ'îb by Ibn al-Wardî (d. 861/1457).

(c) The sîyârat literature:

A special feature of this period was that a number of works dealing with the towns and places of religious significance or places of pilgrimage were produced. These were not purely descriptive or topographical works. They dealt with the holy spots of Islam, tombs of saints, the takyas of the sîfs and rûhâs along with educational institutions (madrâsas) specializing in various schools of the Sîrâfî and other such topics. One finds in them detailed accounts of place-names in various towns like Mecca, Damascus, etc. On the whole such works were meant to be religious guides for pilgrims and devotees, which represent the period of religious reaction in Islam. Among the representative works of this type of literature are: 'Îdârât al-mâ'ârif al-sîyârat by al-Hârâwî (d. 611/1214); al-Dîrisî ta'rîkh al-maddâris by 'Abd al-Kâdir Muhammad al-Nu'aymi (d. 684/1289); in the Maulana Azad Library, 'AÎlgârî Muslim University, there exists a MS (Sherwâni Collection, MS No. 27/54) which, in all probability, is an abridgment of al-Nu'aymi's original work, written 50 years after his death.

(d) Mu'jâm literature or Geographical dictionaries:

The traditions of geographical studies developed in Syria bore many fruitful results. Besides the compendium of Abu 'l-Fida' and the sîyârat literature, Yâkût al-Hâmawi (d. 626/1229) produced one of the most useful works in Arabic geographical literature, namely, Mu'jâm al-buldân. Completed in 621/1224, this geographical dictionary of place-names, which includes other historical and sociological data, was in keeping with the literary and scientific traditions of the earlier period, and represents the consumption of geographical knowledge of the time. As a reference book it is indispensible even to-day for the student of Arab historical geography. The fact that Yâkût crowned the work with an introduction on Arab geographical theories and concepts and physical and mathematical geography shows the depth of knowledge of the author. The work also represents that period of Arab geographical development when scholars thought in terms of compiling geographical dictionaries, which would not have been possible without the vast amount of geographical literature that had already come into existence by this time and without the geographical tradition that was present in Syria. Another important work of Yâkût is the Kitab al-Muqadarîs wa ad-dalîl wa'l-mukhtalif sakât, composed in 623/1226.

(e) Travel accounts:

During this period the Arabs' knowledge of regional and descriptive geography was considerably enriched by the production of travel literature in Arabic on a large scale. Besides the usual incentives for travel like the pilgrimage to Mecca or missionary zeal, the extension of Islamic political and religious influences, especially in the East, had opened up for Muslims new vistas of travel and more opportunities for earning a livelihood.

Among the outstanding travel accounts may be included the work of al-Mâzînî (d. 566/1170); the Riha' of Ibn Djughayr (d. 614/1217); Ta'rîkh al-Mushtarsîr (written in c. 627/1230) by Ibn Mudjalawîn; then the Rihas of al-Nâbîtî (d. 639/1240), al-'Abdârî (d. 688/1290), al-Tayyibi (698/1200) and al-Tâjînî (700/1300) and others. Whereas these accounts are of great importance for the Middle East,
North Africa and parts of Europe, for they furnish contemporary and often important information, the work of Ibn Baiṭūṣa [q.v.] (d. 779/1377) entitled Dāfaq al-nugṣūr remains the most important medieval travel account in Arabic for the lands of India, South-East Asia and other countries of Asia and North Africa.

(f) Maritime literature:

During the period under consideration Arab maritime activities were confined to the Mediterranean and the Arabian Seas. In the Mediterranean the Arab navigators, piloting the boat of Vasco da Gama from Malindi on the east coast of Africa to Calicut in India in 1498. This incident indeed marks the turning point in the history of Arab navigation and trade in the East. The advent of the Portuguese had an adverse effect on the trade and commerce of the Arabs. Their maritime strength was destroyed and their trade systematically ruined by the Portuguese.

Ibn Mādījīd, who spent more than fifty years of his life on the high seas, may be considered as one of the greatest Arab navigators of all times. He wrote thirty nautical texts and was one of the most important Arab writers on oceanography, navigation, etc. His contributions bring him in line with the leading scientists of the period. His most important contribution is the work Kitāb al-Fawa'id fi usūl 'ilm al-bahri wa l-kaqd'id.

Sulaymān b. Ahmad al-Mahfīr, a younger contemporary of Ibn Mādījīd, was another important navigator of this period. He was also author of five nautical works written in the first half of the 10th/16th century. Among these may be mentioned of special importance: al-'Umda al-makriyya fi dabī al-'ulmām al-bahriyya compiled in 971/1561-2 and Kitāb Schākh tūfṣat al-fuḥūl fi tamhid al-usāl.

The works of Ibn Mādījīd and Sulaymān al-Mahfīr represent the height of the Arabs' knowledge of nautical geography. These navigators used excellent sea-charts, which are supposed to have had the lines of the meridian and parallels drawn on them. They also used many fine instruments and made full use of astronomical knowledge for navigation. There is little doubt that their knowledge of the seas was considerably advanced, especially of the Indian Ocean, for in their works they describe in details the coastlines, routes, etc. of the countries they visited. They were familiar with the numerous islands of the East Indies.

(g) Astronomical literature:

During this period some very important works were produced on astronomy, and one of the most outstanding astronomers of this period was the Timūrid prince-mathematician Ulugh Beg (d. 853/1449). But with the death of Ulugh Beg Muslim astronomical literature may be said to have come to an end, for this was the last scientific effort on the part of a Muslim prince, before the period of decline in the work of astronomy in Islamic society set in, to revise the data of Ptolemy and to perform independent astronomical observations. The results of Ulugh Beg's observations in which his collaborators also participated were included in the Zid-i ḍāid-i Sulṭānī.

(h) Regional geographical literature:

Between the 7th/1st and the 10th/16th centuries a large amount of geographical literature, both in Arabic and Persian, came into existence on a regional or 'national' basis. Although no outstanding contributions were made by the geographers of this period, regional geographical knowledge was enriched by the efforts of several historians and geographers. Geographical traditions of the classical period were kept up, but there was no originality in thought or practice. The astronomical, physical or human geography of the world was produced in consideration of the geographical literature of this period was closely connected with the extension of Islam and Muslim political power in the East, and due to the attention paid by Muslim potentates to historiography and geography mainly for political purposes.

In 'Irāq and Mesopotamia, the old centre of geographical activity, little was produced in geographical literature; Maʿrūth Kūdshī by Bar Hebraeus (d. 685/1286) showed much influence of Islamic tradition and has a semi-circular world map. In Egypt and Syria the Muṣaf literature was produced under the Ayyūbid and the Mamlūk. Interest in the Muṣaf literature and ancient Egypt from the time of the Ayyūbids culminated in the production of and collection of some fantastic accounts and stories about ancient Egyptian kings (!) and other tales of common interest. However, some new and fresh information on the Muslim states of the East, India and other countries was also incorporated in these accounts. Authors who wrote on such subjects were Ibrāhīm b. Wāṣif Shīr (wrote in 605/1209); Nuwayrī (d. 639/1242); Makrizī (d. 645/1249-1250); Ibn Fadl Allāh al-Umārī (d. 749/1349); al-Kalkaghāndī (d. 821/1418) and others. In North Africa, al-Ḥasan b. Abī l-Marrākūshī wrote Dājmūs al-mabādi' wa l-ghāydūl which gives latitudes and longitudes partly compiled by the author. Ibn Ḥulaidhīn Muḥaddīmī contains a chapter on geography, representing the tradition of some Arab historians of describing the world as a prelude to history.

In Īrān, Central Asia and India some historical works in Persian dealt with regional and descriptive geography, and some monographs on world geography were also produced. The geographical works were mainly based on earlier Arabic authorities; additional contemporary information was included in general histories and accounts of conquests. Among the important works we may mention: Ibn al-Balḥī, Fārs-nīma, written in the beginning of the 6th/12th century; Ḥamdallāh al-Mustawfī (d. 740/1340), Nuzhat al-balūb; Muḥammad b. Nadjīb Bakrān
(wrote for the Khwarizm-Shah Muhammad, 596-617/1200-20), Djihan-nama, which contains some interesting information on the geography of Transoxania; Djihanndma, which contains much valuable geographical information.

Bibliography: Arabic geographical literature is too vast to allow any brief survey here. Hence only a select bibliography is given below:


(S. Maqbul Ahmad)

VI. The Ottoman geographers

The Ottoman Turks do not seem to have begun to write geographical works until the middle of the 9th/14th century. The first of these were some small cosmographies in the style of Books of Marvels, which treat of the wonders of Creation. The best known of these works is probably the ‘Well-preserved Pearl’ (Durr-i meknun) by YazgHl-oglu Ahmed Bidjan (d. ca. 860/1456) [s.e.], the brother of the early Ottoman poet YazgHl-oglu Mehemmed (died 853/1453). The same Ahmed Bidjan was also the first to make a translation of extracts from an Arabic cosmographical work, the ‘Adidiuh al-makhbakHt of Kazwin (1203-1283), under the same title, in which the stress likewise is less upon scientific knowledge than upon the wonders of Creation (see Rue, Cult of Turkish Miss. in the Brit. Mus., 106 ff.). Kazwin (‘Adidiuh al-makhbakHt) was translated several times into Turkish (Brockelmann, S I, 888, indicates four Turkish translations of the work). Likewise under the same title there were in circulation Turkish translations of Ibn al-Ward’s (d. 1457) Khtarat al-‘adidiuh (indicated in Beitrige zur historischen Geographie ... vornehmlich des Orients, ed. Hans Mlck, Festband Eugen Oberttumner, Leipzig and Vienna 1926, 86 ff.), among them one with some contemporary additions by a man of the early Ottoman period called ‘Ali b. ‘Abd al-Rahman (see my articles Der Bericht des arabischen Geographen Ibn al-Wardiiber Konstantinopel in Festband Eugen Oberttumner, 84-91, and Ein altosmanischer Bericht fiber das vorosmanische Konstantinopel in AION, N.S., i, 1940, 291-9). Further, after SipHdHaze Mehemmed b. ‘Ali (d. 997/1588) had produced a new Arabic edition of Abu ‘I-Fidas ‘Tabarim al-bulbdn under the title AwlaHd al-masahik ilâ ma’refat al-bulbdn wa’t-malmakHt with the material arranged in alphabetical order and supplemented (Brockellmann, S II, 46), he translated extracts of the work into Turkish under the same title (Brockelmann, S II, 44).
One of the last of the translations from earlier geographical works is the "Views of the Worlds" (Menâsir al-tauâdim) by Mêhemîd b. 'Omer (not exclusively of theology and mythology. But this first part is actually only an introduction. The bulk of the work is contained in the second part, which describes the "world below", that is, the earth and its inhabitants. It contains first a universal geography, that is, a little general knowledge of the earth, followed by separate descriptions arranged in the mediaeval manner according to natural objects: oceans, islands, swamps and lakes, rivers, springs, warm springs, mountains and finally, comprising the main section of the descriptive geography, cities. In this section all of the geographical material is arranged according to the seven climates of Ptolemy, the "actual climates" (âklâm-i hâkîyye). Within this framework the localities represented are arranged according to the 28 "traditional climates" (âklâm-i ursîyye) of which 4 Ashîk borrowed from the work of Abu 'l-Fidâ', which result that some of the cities treated, according to their location, appear in more than one of the âklâm-i hâkîyye, the applications of the two principles thus overlapping. Under each heading 4 Ashîk indicates in order the reports of his authorities translated into Turkish, of the mediaeval Arabic and Persian writers such as Ibn Khurradadhîbû, Ibn al-Djawâlî, Yâkûtî, Kâzîmî, Hamdûlî, Manûshî and Ibn al-Wardi, each with a precise indication of the source. 5 Ashîk supplements these with his own reports, especially for Anatolia, Rumelia and Hungary, also with precise indication that this particular information derived from the "writer" (râkim-i bûrûfî), with the date of his visit to the city in question, thus affording a chronological sequence of his travels.

The geography is followed by an encyclopaedic descriptive natural science, that is, the solid, liquid and gaseous minerals, scents, metals, plants, animals and man. The work in its totality is a broadly sketched compendium of traditional geography and natural science.

Belonging in a wider sense to the translations of geographical literature is the manual of astronomy and mathematics written in Persian by 'Ali Kushbî (d. 873/1467), formerly director of Ulugh Beg's observatory in Samarkand and later the court astronomer of Mêhemîd II, which was several times translated into Turkish (see ZDMG, lxxxii, 1923, 40 note 2). To this category also belongs the "China Book" (Khîyât-i-nâmâ) originally written in Persian by Seyiid 'Ali Akbar Khihitî in 916, in which the author describes his journey to China in 912-14506-8 and his stay of three years there, and which he dedicated to Selim I. Under Murâd III, probably in 990/1582, it was translated into Turkish (see P. Kahle in AO, xii, 91 ff, and Opera Minora 322-3).

In the fields of marine geography and navigation the Ottoman Turks produced original works. In this respect special mention should be made of the work of Pîr Muhyî 'l-Din Re'sî (d. 962/1554), a nephew of the famous naval hero Mêhemîd Re'sî who knew every corner of the Mediterranean. In 949/1542-3 he produced a map of the world in two parts, of which only the western part has been preserved, which he presented to Sultan Selim I in Cairo (923/1517). For that portion of his work treating the west Pîr Re'sî used as sources maps containing the Portuguese discoveries up to 1508, as well as a map, since lost, containing the discoveries made by Christopher Columbus during his third voyage (1498). He had got the latter from a Spanish sailor who had gone with Columbus to America three times and who in 1501 at Valencia had been made a Turkish prisoner by Pîr Re'sî's uncle Kemal Re'sî (see P. Kahle, Die verschiedene Columbus-Karte vom Jahre 1498 in einer türkischen Weltkarte vom 1553, Berlin-Leipzig 1933; idem, A lost map of Columbus, in Opera Minora, Leiden 1956, 247-65; Ibrahim Hakki, Eski Harâstar, Istanbul 1936; Aet, Un Amiral Géographe turc du XVe siècle, Piri Reis, auteur de la plus ancienne carte de l'Amérique en Belletten, 1 (1937), 333-49; Sadi Selén, Die Nord-Amerika-Karte des Piri Reis (1528), ibid. 519-23).

Pîr Re'sî then wrote a nautical handbook of the Mediterranean, the Bahriye, containing 129 chapters each provided with a map in which he gives an exact description of the Mediterranean and all its parts. His models are Italian portolans and other navigational handbooks, the major part of which have disappeared. He first dedicated the work to Sultan Selim I in 927/1521. After the latter's death he prepared a second edition with many additional maps, a modified text, and a poetical introduction of some 1200 verses in Turkish on the lore of the sea and the sailor, which he presented in 932/1525-26 to Sultan Suleyman by means of the Grand Vizier Ibrahim Pasha (see P. Kahle, Piri Re'sî und seine Bahriye in Beiträge zur historischen Geographie ... Festband E. Oberhummer, Leipzig-Vienna 1929, 60-76; idem, Bahriye, das türkische Segelhandbuch für das Mittelmeer vom Jahre 1521, the first part of an unfinished edition, Berlin-Leipzig 1926; the complete work in facsimile, Kitâbi Bahriye, Istanbul 1935). A similar work of marine geography and navigation on the Indian Ocean was written in 961/1554 by Seyyidî 'All Re'sî b. Hüseyn, known as Katîb-i Rûmî (died 948/1542), entitled "the Ocean" (al-Muhît). 'All Re'sî made use of the experience of South Arabian sailors who had served as guides for Vasco de Gama on his voyage to Calicut, and also translated parts of Suleyman al-Mahîrî's al-'Umda al-Mahriyya into Turkish in his work (see W. Tomaschek and M. Bittner, Die topographischen Kapitel des indischen Seespiegels Mokhî, Vienna 1897; for the Arabic precursors see Gabriel Ferrand, Relations de Voyages et textes géographiques ... ii, Paris 1914).

Yet another work of marine geography from a later period is the "Book of the Black and White Seas" (Kitâb Bahr al-aswad wa l-'abâyad) written by Seyyidî Nûh during the reign of Mêhemîd IV (see F. Babinger, Seyyidî Nûh und die Türkische Segelhandbuch in Imago Mundi, xii (1955), 180-2). A kind of terrestrial counterpart to these works of marine geography is the "Collection of Stations" (Mefîm-i mendîlî), an illustrated book by Nâşûb al-Matrâkî (dates unknown) in which he describes briefly and depicts separately the stages of Sultan Suleyman Kânûnî's first Persian expedition (940-2/1534-5). It exists only in a single manuscript, in all probability the dedication copy for the sultan, in the University Library in Istanbul, and constitutes an important source for the military routes used by the sultans for their eastern expeditions (see Albert

The campaign itineraries of sultans Selim I and Süleyman I, as well as those of Murad IV are contained, moreover, in the collection of documents called Münchebât al-Salātīn of Feridūn Ahmed Beg (d. 991/1583), or his continuator (only the two volume second edition of the Münchebât contains the itineraries, Istanbul 1274-75/1857-59; the itineraries there are enumerated in F. Taeschner, Das Anatolische Wegenetz nach osmanischen Quellen, i, Leipzig, 1924, 20).

The most important comprehensive geographical work, constituting at the same time the transition in Turkey from the mediaeval oriental to the modern European point of view, is the "View of the World" (Diyahnumā) of the famous scholar Muṣṭafā b. 'Abdallah, known as Kātib Ṣelebī [q.v.] or Ḥadhīlī Khalīlī (1017-67/1609-57). The work has a complicated history. Kātib Ṣelebī began it twice and twice it remained uncompleted. In 1053/1643 he finished it in a form based on the model of such works as the one mentioned above of Mehmed ʻĂshīlī, which he used and acknowledged. After he had described oceans, rivers and lakes, he started on lands, of which the western came first, Muslim Spain and North Africa. The lands of the Ottoman Empire were to follow as the influx of original European literature in the face of which Turkish productions in the geographical field lost in originality and thereby in interest.

Concerning travel descriptions those of 'Abī Akbar from China and his sojourn there have been mentioned. Worthy also of indication is the brief description of Katib Celebi's Dijihnumā with the title Rawdat al-anfus. But the work was never printed owing on the one hand to the death of Ḥūdābādī, the work was never printed in originality and thereby in interest.

When Kūsa, the envoy of the sultan, had reached the headlands of Java, he began writing the description of Hungary. He came across a copy of the Atlas Minor of Gerhard Mercator, edited by Jodocus Hondius in 1621 at Arnheim. He abandoned the Diţihnumā and from 1064/1654 on, with the help of a French renegade, Ḥūdābādī, he worked at a translation of the atlas, to which he gave the title Lewadī al-nūr fi tafyrir-i Atlas Minur.

When this work was two-thirds finished Kātib Celebi began again to write his Diţihnumā, according to a new plan based on the western model. This time however he began in east Asia for which he used, in addition to European, Oriental sources as well, such as the Khidāy-nāme of 'Abī Akbar; these preponderated the further west he moved. When he had progressed in his description from east to west as far as Armenia (Eyālet of Vān), death hastened on by an accident stayed his hand (1067/1657). Thus the second version of his work also remained unfinished.

Yet another European work was to provide the impulse for the continuation of the Diţihnumā and eventually its completion. On 14 August 1668 the Dutch envoy Colier presented to Sultan Mehemmed IV in Edirne on behalf of his government a copy of the Latin edition in eleven volumes of Blaeu's Atlas Maior sive Cosmographia Blaviana (1662). A few years later, in 1686/1675, the Sultan had this work translated into Turkish by Abū Bakr b. Bahram al-Dimashkī (d. 1102/1691). Abū Bakr published his translation under the title Nyuçrat-al-Islām wa l-sūrūr fī tābrīr-i Atlas Māyūr, and based on it, with the further use of other, especially, Oriental sources, produced a "Major Geography" (Djughṛāfiyā-yi kehī) (see P. Kahle, The Geography of Abu Bekr Ibn Behram ad-Dimashki: Ms. A.S. 575 of the Chester Beatty Collection).

When later, in 1140/1728, the Hungarian renegade Ibrāhīm Mütəfērīka ǧašīda the first printing-press in Istanbul, the Dijihnumā of Kātib Celebi became the eleventh product (in 1142/1729) in the new Turkish art of printing. As a basis for this edition Ibrāhīm used the second version of the work, that is, the description of Asia begun by Kātib Celebi, and supplemented this with the corresponding portions ("insertions", ʻĀtīqah) from the work of Abū Bakr, so that the printed edition included the complete description of Asia. In the introductory chapters containing astronomical, mathematical and geographical data, he brought the work up to date by means of series of "printer's addenda" (tāghyī al-tābī) (see F. Taeschner, Zur Geschichte des Dijihnumā in MSOS ii, 29 (1926), 99-111; idem, Das Hauptwerk der geographischen Literatur der Osmanen, Kātib Celebi's Gihnumā in Imago Mundi 1935, 44-7; Kātib Celebi, Hayatis ve eserleri hakkında incellemeler, in But the work was never printed owing on the one hand to the death of Ibrāhīm Mütəfērīka (1157/1744) after which the press was silenced and, on the other hand, to the influx of original European literature in the face of which Turkish productions in the geographical field lost in originality and thereby in interest.

Concerning travel descriptions those of 'Abī Akbar from China and his sojourn there have been mentioned. Worthy also of indication is the brief description by Seyyid 'Abī Re'īs of his journey to India and after the unsuccessful Ottoman naval expedition against the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean, his fortunate return to the sultan's court in Edirne. These are contained in the tiny book Mir'āt al-mamālik (completed 964/1557 and printed Istanbul 1315; Eng. tr., A. Vambéry, Travels and adventures of the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reis . . . during the years 1553-1556, London 1899). The major work, however, in the field of travel description is the great, ten-volume "Travel Book" (Seyhātanāme) or "History of the Traveller" (Ta'virīh-ye seyyah) of Ewliyā b. Derwīš Mehemmed Žilli, usually known as Ewliyā Celebi [q.v.]. It is a unique work in the entire literature of the Islamic peoples. For forty years (1631-1670) Ewliyā Celebi travelled in every direction throughout the Ottoman Empire and its neighbouring lands, largely as field chaplain in the retinues of dignitaries, governors and ambassadors, as well as with divisions of the army. His work is thus a kind of memoir and contains in addition to a knowledge of the lands which he visited many insights into the higher politics of his period. Besides his own experiences he has mingled the results of his reading and the manifold products of his lively imagination in the work. Through his contacts with political personalities and the eleventh edition of this work, Ewliyā Celebi's book has become an important record for the history of his times.
A stimulation to travel description was provided by the annual pilgrimage to Mecca. There are indeed, especially from the 18th century, a series of texts which describe the journey from Úskudar, the point of departure on the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus for pilgrims to Mecca, and the ceremonies accomplished in Mecca. Most of the pilgrims limited their descriptions to the latter and touched only in passing the voyage itself. Some, however, did describe the journey and for that reason are of importance from the point of view of geography. The most detailed of these is the "ceremonies of the pilgrimage" (Manṣūk al-ḥadīd) by Meḥmeṃd Edīb (1173/1779) (printed in Istanbul 1322/1816-17; Fr. tr. by M. Bianchi, Itinerario de Constantinople à la Meccé in Recuei des Voyages et des Mémoires publiés par la Société de Géographie, ii, Paris 1825, in which the work is wrongly dated 1093/1682 instead of 1173/1779).

To travel literature in a certain sense belong also the reports from the ambassadors of the Porte to European courts (Sefeşetnâme). These belong at the same time to the category of historical literature, for which reason they are generally included by the historiographers of the Empire in their works (enumerated by me in ZDMG, lxxvii (1923), 75-8; more completely by Falk Reṣṭ Unat in Tarḥ Veshkalan, reprinted in Reşmi Tarḥ Mecmuası, 5 August 1969, and further in ZDMG).

A brief word may also be said concerning cartography. Pīrī Reş's world map of 1513, originally in two parts, has already been described above. In his sailing manual for the Mediterranean (the Bahriyye), Pīrī Reş included in each chapter, after the时尚 treated in the respective chapter. The late editor of the periodical İtınrares, Istanbul 1943; idem, Osmanh Türklerinde Him, 2nd/8th century, particularly Abu Muslim and al-Adhay, Nathr al-tdurar, the latter quotes three anecdotes and adds that Djuha was a member of the Bańu Fazāra bearing the kunya of Abu U'l-Ghusn; this is also mentioned in other works: the Nâẓîr al-durar, the Şahâb (s.v.) by al-Djawhari (d. 400/1009), the Aχâb ar-hamkâ wa 'l-mughaffalin (Damascon [1861]) by Ibn al-Dirawi (d. 597/1200), the 'Uyun al-tawdrikh (Paris MS. 1588, s. 160) by Ibn Shâkir al-Kutubi (d. 716/1316), the Hayâl al-hayawann (s.v. ādâgin) by al-Damîrî (808/1403), the Kamiš, the Mâsidh close to the Mediterranean with parallel meridians, based on them, a map representing the region of the "The ceremonies of the pilgrimage" (Manṣūk al-ḥadīd) by Meḥmeṃd Edīb (1173/1779) (printed in Istanbul 1322/1816-17; Fr. tr. by M. Bianchi, Itinerario de Constantinople à la Meccé in Recuei des Voyages et des Mémoires publiés par la Société de Géographie, ii, Paris 1825, in which the work is wrongly dated 1093/1682 instead of 1173/1779).
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A brief word may also be said concerning cartography. Pīrī Reş's world map of 1513, originally in two parts, has already been described above. In his sailing manual for the Mediterranean (the Bahriyye), Pīrī Reş included in each chapter, after the fashion of the Italian portulans and probably based on them, a map representing the region of the Mediterranean, which describes the journey from t)skiidar, the point of departure on the Asiatic coast of the Bosphorus for pilgrims to Mecca, and the ceremonies accomplished in Mecca. Most of the pilgrims limited their descriptions to the latter and touched only in passing the voyage itself. Some, however, did describe the journey and for that reason are of importance from the point of view of geography. The most detailed of these is "The ceremonies of the pilgrimage" (Manṣūk al-ḥadīd) by Meḥmeṃd Edīb (1173/1779) (printed in Istanbul 1322/1816-17; Fr. tr. by M. Bianchi, Itinerario de Constantinople à la Meccé in Recuei des Voyages et des Mémoires publiés par la Société de Géographie, ii, Paris 1825, in which the work is wrongly dated 1093/1682 instead of 1173/1779).
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DJUHA
al-mizdn, s.v. Dudjayn), but an earlier and clearer
passage from al-Kutubi (op. cit.) hints at the solution
to this problem: it says in effect that Dudjayn,
surnamed Djuha, died in 160/777 but adds, according
to Ibn Hibban, that two men, one the traditionist
[of Basra] Dudjayn, and the other Nuh = Diuha
[established at Kufa], have been confused because
both died in 160. This coincidence is, to say the
least, strange, and it is not impossible that the
traditionist of Basra was a victim of the spite of the
inhabitants of Kufa, but, until we are better informed,
there is no reason to doubt the historic existence of
Diuha, who might, moreover, have been called Abu
'1-Ghusn Nuh al-Fazari. Some Shlci authors regard
Djuha as a Shici and consider him as a traditionist
together with Abu Nuwas and Buhlul [qq.v.]; as a
matter of fact, al-Astarabadhi, Minhddi al-makdl,
Tehran 1888, 258, mentions a Musnad Abi Nuwds
wa-Diuhd wa-Buhlul. . . wa-md rawaw min al-hadith,
which was in the hand of Abu Paris Shudjac alArradjanT, d. 320/932 (cf. J. M. Abd-El-Jalil, Breve
histoire de la Hit. ar., Paris 1943, 169).
Al-Suyuti (d. 911/1505), who must have had at
his disposal sources inaccessible to us, saw in Diuha,
(in Kdmus) an open-hearted labial and declared that
most of the stories of which he is the hero are without
foundation; this proves that the character was well
known in Egypt, but throws no light at all on the
problem which now presents itself; which is, that
at an undetermined date towards the end of the
Middle Ages there appeared among the Turks another
symbolic figure who, under the name of Nasr al-Dm
Khodja [q.v.], partially and at least locally took the
place of Diuha. Indeed the first Arabic edition of
the collection of anecdotes published in lithograph
about 1880 at Bulak bore the unexpected title of
Nawddir al-Khudid Nasr al-Dln al-mulakkab biDiuhd al-Ruml, and the Egyptians again turned
Nasr al-Dm and Diuha into one and the same
person.
For R. Basset (in Fourberies, see Bibliography],
this confusion arises from the fact that the primitive
K. Nawddir Diuha was translated into Turkish in
the 9th/i5th or ioth/i6th century, and that this
Turkish version, adapted and amplified, was in turn
translated into Arabic in the nth/i7th century;
if this latter assertion corresponds with reality,
the first is not entirely accepted, and there is
every reason for believing, with Christensen (see
below), that the "follies" of Nasr al-DIn were an
independent collection into which were incorporated
the stories of Diuha which had been handed down
orally. This problem, already complex enough, will
be examined in the article NASR AL-DIN. We should
however note here that the introduction of the figure
of Djuha among the Turks may have been accomplished through the intermediary of Persia, where
A. Christensen (Juhi in the Persian Literature, in A
Volume . . . presented to E. G. Browne, Cambridge
1922, 129-36) discovered some early evidence of
Diuha (Djuhl/ Djuhi), notably in the Mathnawi of
Djalal al-Dm Rumi (d. 672/1273) and the Bihdristdn
of Djaml (d. 898/1492).
The method advocated by Christensen, consisting
in the search for stories about Djuha in literature
prior to the presumed appearance of Nasr al-Dm, was
recently applied independently and successfully by
c
Abd al-Sattar Ahmad Farradj, in his Akhbdr Diuhd
(Cairo n.d. [1954])- Taking advantage of the article
NASR AL-DIN in the El1 (by F. Bajraktarevic), he
took as his starting point R. Basset's thesis, without,
however, referring to the works of that distinguished

orientalist, and attempted partially to restore the
original K. Nawddir Diufyd, by a searching analysis
of early literary works in Arabic; he thus discovered
about 166 anecdotes of which two-thirds (107)
appeared in the edition of the collection of Nawddir
Diuhd', of the other 241 anecdotes of this latter
collection (which he had not immediately eliminated
on account of their manifestly recent insertion), he
counted 217 for which he could discover no early evidence, 17 in which Timur Lang (8th/i4th century)
appeared, and finally 7 which contained Turkish
words. From these figures, which are by no means
final, two provisional conclusions may be drawn: the
first, that the proportion of anecdotes attested at an
early date is comparatively considerable (40%), and
the second, that the additions of undoubted Turkish
origin are rather few (6%). These proportions are
given here only as an indication, for the published
collection which served as a basis for the calculation
is very far from containing all the stories in circulation under the name of Djuha which in fact belong
largely to the world's folk-lore. Farradj moreover
has not examined all the works, as a matter of
fact the more recent, which contain further stories
about Diuha, whether or not the name appears
therein, in particular Ibn Hidjdja (d. 837/1434),
Thamardt al-awrdk, Bulak 1300; al-Ibshihi (d. after
805/1446), Mustatraf,
Cairo n.d. ; al-Kalyubi,
Nawddir, Cairo 1302 (see O. Rescher, Die Geschichten
und Anekdoten aus Qaljubi's Nawddir, Stuttgart
1920); al-Balawi, K. Alif bd>, Cairo 1287; Nuzhat
al-udabd*, B.N. Paris MSS 6008, 6710.
The jests of Djuha are known outside the Muslim
world (see NASR AL-DIN), and on the east coast of
Africa they are attributed to Abu Nuwas [q.v.] but
the character is popular in Nubia (Djawha), in
Malta (Djahan), in Sicily and in Italy (Giufa or
Giucca) and, with greater reason, in North Africa,
where he was certainly introduced at an early period
(al-Husrl [d. 413/1022], Diamc al-Diawdhir, Cairo
I
953> 82, knows that a wit of the 3rd/9th century,
Abu 'l-cAbar, wore a ring on which was engraved
"Diuha died on [a] Wednesday"; in the nth/i7th
century Yusuf b. al-Wakll al-MIlawi wrote an Irshdd
man nahd ild nawddir Diuhd, see L. Nemoy, Ar.
MSS in the Yale Univ. Lib., New Haven 1956,
no. 1203). Some vestiges certainly remain, in Arabic
or Berber, of the primitive Arabic version, amplified
doubtless by folk-lore elements from other sources.
A. Moulie"ras (see Bibliography) has succeeded in
mustering 60 "fourberies" in Kabyle, and some of
them can be found in several studies of Berber dialectology (H. Stumme, Mdrchen der Berbern von Tamazratt, Leipzig 1900, 39-40; R. Basset, Zenatia du Mzab,
Paris 1892, 102, 109; idem, Recueil de textes . . . .
Algiers 1887, 38; idem, Manuel Kabyle, Paris
1887, 37*; B. Ben Sedira, Cours de langue kabyle,
Algiers 1887, passim; S. Biarnay, Dial, berbere des
BeVVioua du Vieil Arzeu, Algiers 1911, 130; E. Laoust,
Dial, berbere du Chenoua, Paris 1912, 185, 190). The
personality of the Berber Djuha formed the subject
of a rather detailed analysis by H. Basset, Essai sur
la litte'rature des Berberes, Algiers 1920, 170 ff.,
which for the greater part holds good for the Arab
Djuha. In dialectal Arabic, most manuals reproduce
some anecdotes (see especially F. Mornand, La vie
arabe, Paris 1856, 115-24; F. Pharaon, Spahis et
Turcos, Paris 1864, 174-210; Abderrahman Mohammed, Enseignement de Varabe parU. . ., Algiers 2i9i3,
1-28; Allaoua ben Yahia, Recueil de themes et versionst
Mostaganem 1890, 1-66, passim; L. Machuel, Mtthode
pour T^tude de Varabe partt, Algiers 5i9oo, 210 ff;.


references in H. Pérès, L'arabe dialectal algérien et saharien, bibliographic . . ., Algiers 1958, 111). For Morocco, there is a series in G. S. Colin, Chrestomathie marocaine, Paris 1935, 87-114, and Recueil de textes en marocain, Paris 1933-35. The Moroccans claim that the authentic Djiha (Zha) was originally from Fas, where a road bears his name (L. Brunot, Textes arabes de Rabat, Paris 1931, 118); as opposed to this Zha 'l-Fasi, malicious and humorous, there are some secondary characters, also called Zha, but who symbolize the gullible provincial. The Moroccans make a sharp distinction between their national and multi-form Zha and the "Egyptian" Djiha (Goba), confused in the printed collection with Nasr al-Din.

The Goha who was the hero of a tale by A. Adès and A. Josipovici, Le livre de Goha le simple, Paris n.d. [ca. 1916] has just (1959) made his appearance in the cinema in a film in two versions, Arabic and French, based on the above-mentioned novel and entitled Goha (although pronounced Zha by the Tunisian actors).

There the popular figure of Djiha can hardly be rediscovered. Of him al-Suyuti (in Kdmus) said: "No-one should laugh at him on hearing of the amusing stories told against him; on the contrary it is fitting that everyone should ask God to allow him to profit from the boraqah of Djiha [as a tábî’]; he was a little ingenuous, simple and sometimes clumsy, but in his expediences, capable, through his knack of doing the right thing, of extricating himself from the most delicate situations, he reminds us less of Gribouille than of Panurge and, to all the professional humorists (see F. Rosenthal, who are now forgotten; that it has gathered round his name of Djiha from among so many figures who were its the heroes, and that it has preferred him to all the professional humorists (see F. Rosenthal, Humour in early Islam, Leiden 1956) who flourished in the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries and vied with them in inventing droll stories [see NADIRA].

Bibliography: The first Arab edition of the Naswâd was followed in 1299/1883 by the Naswâd Djiha, then by the Kissât Djiha, Beirut 1890, and by a series of popular editions in booklet form. A translation of the Turkish collection was elaborated by Hikmat Şarîf al-Ta’arabulusî who published it under the title Naswâd Djiha al-kubrâ, Cairo n.d.; also to be noted are Hasan Huşni Ahmad, Djiha, ta’rîkhî, naswâdîn, bâsîcî, mimârî, fâjlâ, fitârî, Cairo 1950; ‘Âta’ Allah Tarîzî Fasga, Djiha al-kubrâ, in al-Rízâla, no. 993 (4 July, 1958). R. Basset has explained his thesis in an introduction to A. Moulières, Les fourberies de Si Diêk’a, Paris 1892, 1-79 and 183-7, which comprises a comparative and abundantly annotated table of the three versions, Turkish, Arabic and Berber; there are also some studies by the same author, published in the Revue des traditions populaires, as well as 1951, Contes, récits populaires, anecdotes, Djiha (Goba), pasîm, where some stories are translated. For

translations, see Galland, Les paroles remarquables, les bons mots et les maximes des Orientaux, Paris 1964, the works cited by R. Basset, in Fourberies, 12, and especially A. Wesselski, Der Hödscha Nasreddin, Weimar 1912, 2 vols. and T. García-Figuera, Cuentos de Jêhâ, . . ., Jerez 1934. —see also the Bibliography of the article NASR AL-DIN. (CH. PELLAT)

DJIHAYNA [see Supplement].

DJIŁAMARG [see GÖLEMREK].

AL-DJULANDÀ (also AL-DJULUNDÀ, according to TA and al-‘ibâb) b. MAS‘ÜD b. DIJAFAR b. AL-DJULANDÀ was the chief of the Ibâdî Azd in ‘Umân. During the caliphate of the Umayyad Marwân II al-Djulandà supported the claims of ‘Abd Allâh b. Yahyâ, known as Ta’lîb al-‘Askâr, who was defeated and killed in 139/752. When the ‘Abbâsîs came to power the Ibâdîs tried to assert their independence in ‘Umân and elected al-Djulandà as their first imâm, but in the year 134/752 al-Saffâh sent an expedition under Kházîm b. Khuzaym al-Tamîmi against the Khâridjîs in the ‘Umân region. He first drove the Suîfîs out of Djizlrat Ibn Kâwân (Kîshm [q.]); they took refuge in ‘Umân which was routed by al-Djulanda, so that when Kházîm crossed to ‘Umân he had only the Ibâdîs to subdue. They refused to pay homage to al-Saffâh and resisted successfully until Kházîm adopted the stratagem of setting fire to their huts, thus causing them to abandon their positions and rush to save their women and children. In their panic they were cut down with an estimated loss of 10,000 men, including al-Djulandà.

Bibliography: Tabarl, iii, i, 77-8; Ibn al-‘Aqrîr, v, 346-7; Mas‘ûdî, vi, 66-7; Ya‘kilî, ii, 405 (ed. Beirut 1960, ii, 339); Ibn Khâhir, x, 57; al-Salîmî, Tawfîq al-‘âlâm (1332), i, 66-72; Salîh Ibn Raziq, Imams and Sayyids of ‘Oman (tr. G. P. Badger), 7-8; Sirîn b. Sa’îd b. Sirîn, Kâshîf al-‘âmmâma (tr. E. C. Ross as Annals of Oman), Calcutta 1874, 12. (W. ‘ARAFAT)

DIJALFA [i] [see Supplement]. (ii) [see ISPÂHÂN].

DIJULUS [see KHLAPA, SULTân, TÂRÎD-I SAYF, TA’RÎH].

DIJUMÂ (Yaum al-), the weekly day of communal worship in Islam. The only reference to it in the Kur‘ân, LXII, 9-11, clearly indicates that the term is pre-Islamic, for v. 9 says: "When you are called to prayer on the day of the assembly", and not "to the Prayer of the Assembly". The decisive proof for the correctness of this interpretation is the fact that Ibn Ubayy read yaum al-‘arâbî al-kubrâ for yaum al-‘umma, the former being another pre-Islamic name for Friday, meaning eve of the Sabbath, cf. A. Jeffery, Text of the Qur‘ân, 1937, 170; R. Blachère, Le Coran, 1950, 825.

The expression yaum al-‘âjumâ’a, “the day when people come together”, an exact equivalent of Hebrew (and Aramaic) yôm hak-kenêsâ, designated the market day, which was held in the oasis of al-Madinah on Friday, “when the Jews bought their provisions for the Sabbath”, cf. Kâshânî, Badâtî al-‘ânâhâ, Cairo 1327/8, i, 268 and Ibn Sa‘îd iii, i, 83, where tâjîh (tâjîhâ) is to be read for ydhîr, as in Kâshânî. It is natural that the day preceding the weekly holiday of the Jews should have been chosen as the market day in a place like Medina, which had a large Jewish population. Similarly, in Islam, Thursday served as a weekly market day all over Arabia, cf. H. St. J. Philby, Arab travesties, Edinburgh, 1935, 25, 120, 235, 350, 5-6, 185-7, 357-9. This market day is well attested in pre-Islamic Jewish literature.
According to the unanimous testimony of the ancient Muslim sources, no Friday service was held in Mecca, cf., e.g., al-Ṭabarî, i, 1256. However, even before Muhammad arrived in Medina, the Muslims convened there for public worship, but it was Muhammad who ordered that it should be observed regularly on "the day when the Jews prepared for their Sabbath", cf. Ibn Sa'd, quoted above, and parallel sources. The Jewish and Christian institutions of a weekly day of public worship might have served as an example in general, as suggested by al-Rastabâlî, ii, 176. However, the reference to the Jews in the ancient account of the inauguration of the Friday service betrays no particular dependence on Judaism, nor a polemical tendency against the older religions—two assumptions in vogue in modern research on the subject, cf. D. S. Margoliouth, Mohammed, 1905, 258-9; M. Gaudfroy-Demobynes, Mahomet 1957, 522, and the works of Wensinck, Buhl and Watt quoted in the bibliography. It was Muhammad's practical wisdom, which decided for Friday, as in any case on that day the people of the widely dispersed oasis dwellings of Medina gathered regularly for their weekly market.

This origin of the Friday service explains one of its most puzzling aspects: It is held at noon, a very inconvenient time in a hot climate. The market is dissolved early in the afternoon, see, for Arabia, e.g., Philby, Arabian Highlands, 234. In classical times, ṣaẘaṣa dālāwats, the breaking up of the market, was a term designating the early afternoon, Liddell and Scott s.v. Thus noon was the reasonable time for the public prayer.

The admonition of the Kur'ān, not to leave the prayer and to run after business and amusement, LXII, 24, is to be understood against this background. The people of Medina were farmers, not business men; but Friday was their market day, on which also, as everywhere at fairs, amusements were provided.

The main feature of the Friday service is the khutba [q.v.], a sermon, the preacher of which holds in his hand a rod or sword or lance. These were originally, as C. H. Becker has pointed out, the insignia of the pre-Islamic Jews. Market days provide the community with an opportunity for the people gathered there to settle their law suits. Philby describes the sitting of the judges on the weekly markets and the same custom prevailed in the Greek world and on the yom hak-kenisa of the ancient Jews. The ancient epiphany yaum al-harba "the Day of the Lance", see TA, i, 206, s.v. ḥrb, may have had its origin in this aspect of the yaum al-djum'a. However, the biographies of the Prophet do not seem to stress that he preferred Friday over other days for sitting as a judge.

From its very inception the Friday service had a political connotation. In early Islam it was a proof that the participants had joined the Muslim community; later on, it implied a manifestation of allegiance to the caliph or governor who conducted the service, or whose name was mentioned in the sermon. This religious-political background explains why attendance at the Friday service—as opposed to the daily prayer—is a duty incumbent on all male, adult, free, Muslim good men; why, according to the Shāffis and many others, it should, if feasible, be held only in one mosque (the ḍjum'ā) in each town; and why it required a minimum attendance of 40 according to the Shāffis, or at least a sizeable number according to others.

The fully developed Friday ceremonial consists of an aṣkān, which is proclaimed inside the mosque, a khutba, which follows two sections, during which the preacher is standing up, interrupted by an interval, during which he is required to sit down, and a salāt, consisting of two rak'ās, which follows the sermon. Usually, a salāt of two rak'ās is performed also before the khutba. According to C. H. Becker, some of these features follow the pattern of the mass in the ancient Oriental churches.

The yaum al-djum'a is not a day of rest. According to Mâlik, the aṣkāb did not disapprove of the practice of some Muslims who refrained from doing work on Friday in imitation of the Jewish and Christian weekly holidays (al-Tartûshî, K. al-Hawâdîthî, Tunis 1959, 133). In general, the Sabbath institution is foreign to Islam (for a socio-economic explanation of this difference between Islam and the older religions cf. S. D. Goitein, Jews in the Arab World, New York 1955, 39-40). Still we have reports about government offices and schools being closed on Fridays in 'Abbâsîd times, and a query addressed to Maimonides around 1200 speaks about Jewish and Muslim partners in a jewellery workshop, who replaced one another on Fridays and Saturdays (cf. Mosâhe ben Maimon, Responsa, Jerusalem 1934, 62). In modern times most Muslim states have made Friday an official day of rest. Turkey has chosen Sunday, while in Pakistan Friday is a half-holiday, Sunday a full day of rest.

As a holiday, Friday is honoured by special food—already referred to in the Ḥadîth—and better clothing. The night preceding it is set aside for the fulfilment of matrimonial duties, to be followed on Friday morning by a bath, as well as perfuming. The Sabbath should be a foretaste of the world to come, where the righteous are granted the beatific vision of God. This idea, prevailing in ancient Judaism, was enormously expanded—or perhaps developed independently—by Islamic mysticism and religious folklore. In Heaven, Friday is called yaum al-mazîd, the day of Allah's special bounty (cf. Sûra L, 35). On it, Allah sends to each of the pious Muslims in Paradise an apple. When they take the apple in their hands, it splits in two, and out steps a beautiful maid with a sealed letter containing a personal invitation from Allah. Soon the general move of those who are thus invited begins. The men on horseback, the women in littles, the men led by Muhammad, who is accompanied by Adam, Moses and Jesus, the women led by Fâṭima and other women saints, all move towards the Holy Enclosure, where a gorgeous meal, described with glowing details, awaits them. At its conclusion the pious call on Allah asking Him to show them His face. Allah lifts His veil and reveals Himself to them (cf. al-Ṭabarî, Tafsîr, 1326, xxvi, 108; Abû Tâlib al-Makki, Kûl al-kulâb, i, 72; Abu 'l-Layth al-Samârâkî, Kurrât al-'uyûn, 130-1 and the extensive literature quoted in C. D. Goldin, Beholding God on Friday, in IC, xxvi, 1960, pp. 63-8).

Bibliography: in addition to that indicated in the article: The chapters on Dju'mâ in the collections of Ḥadîth and Fikî: Dimîşghi, Rahmat al-umma fi-khâlîlî al-umma, Bulûk 1930, 29 ff.; C. H. Becker, Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus in Islamstudien, Leipzig 1923, i, 472-500; Iden, Die Kanzel im Kultus des alten Islam in Nildelta-Festschrift, 1906, i, 331-51; now in Islamstudien, i, 450-71; I.
The modern word dümhüriyya—which is simply dümhür with an abstract ending—was coined, like many other Islamic neologisms, in Turkey, the first Islamic state to encounter the ideas, institutions, and problems of the modern world, and to seek and find new terms to denote them. It was at first used as an abstract noun denoting a principle or form of government, and meaning republicanism rather than republic, the usual term for which was still dümhür (for see for example ‘Atif Efendi’s memorandum of 1798, in Djewdet, Ta’rikh, vi, 395, speaking of ‘equality and republicanism’—mussawat wa-dümhüriyyet; the documents on the Septinsular republic (Jijes’-i Seb’a-i Müjdems’a Dümhür) of 1799 published by I. H. Uzunçarsılı in Belleten, i, 1937, 633—dümhüriyyet veğildikle iditme); the dispatches of Halet Efendi from Paris to E. Z. Karal, Halaft Efendimn Paris Büyük Elciligi (1802-06), Istanbul 1940, 35; cf. ‘Asım, Ta’rîkh, i, 61-2, 78-9, and the Turkish translation of Botta’s Storia d’Italia, Cairo 1249/1834, repr. Istanbul 1293/1876, passim. Şahîç Rûf‘a Râfî—Subh, ii, vii, 46-8. Turkish used dümhûr. Perhaps this was the word chosen by the dragomans of the Porte as equivalent, for official usage, to the Latin res publica. Thus, Venedik Dümhûru served both for democracy in both senses. From Turkey the term spread to the Arabs, Persians, Indians, and other peoples, and was used in the new political literature inspired by western liberal and constitutional ideas. In the 19th century republic and democracy were still regarded as broadly synonymous terms, and the same words were often used for both. It is instructive to trace the renderings of the terms democracy and republic in the 19th century dictionaries from English or French into Arabic, Turkish etc. Bocthor (1828) translates the two terms by Khâmad al-dümhûr bi-l’-hukâm and dümhûr or masyahyâ; Handjerî (1840) by hukâm al-dümhûr al-nîs [sic] and dümhûr; Redhouse (1860) translates democracy as dümhûr or dümhûriyyet ‘âsîla, republic as dümhûr, and republicanism as dümhûriyyet. Zenker (1866) and Smi Frasheri (1873) already identify dümhûriyyet with republic. In Urdu the same word, with a minor variation, has served both for democracy (dümhûriyyat) and republic (dümhûriyya).

Republican ideas are rarely expressed in the writings of the 19th century Muslim liberals, even the most radical of whom seem to have thought in terms of a constitutional monarchy rather than a republic. Even where the terms dümhûr and dümhûriyya do occur, they often connote popular and representative rather than republican govern-
ment (see for example the instructive comments of 'Ali Su'ud in 1876 on the 'true meaning' of djumhûrîya, cited in M. C. Kuntay, Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi, Ankara 1957, 32 ff.; cf. Akif Al'î, Al-fikr al-'arabi al-hadîth, Beirut 1943, 94). During the 20th century, however, republicanism developed rapidly. The first republic to be established was in the Muslim territories of the Russian Empire, when the temporary relaxation of pressure from the centre after the revolutions of 1917 allowed an interval of local experimentation. In May 1918, after the dissolution of the short-lived Transcaucasian Federation, the Ağharbâyânjân members of the former Transcaucasian parliament, together with the Muslim National Council, declared Ağharbâyânjân an independent republic—the first Muslim republic in modern times. In April 1920 it was conquered by the Red Army, and a Soviet Republic formed. The same pattern was followed by the Bashkirs and other Turkic peoples of the Russian Empire, who set up their own national republics, all of which were in due course taken over and reconstituted by the Communists, and incorporated, in one form or another, in the U.S.S.R.

The first Muslim republic to be established outside the Russian Empire seems to have been the Tripolitanian Republic, proclaimed in November 1918 by Sulaymân Paşa al-Bûrûnî [i.e. documents in 'A. K. Ghatrâ'îa, Dirâ'si fi ta'rikh 'Irîkîya al-'Arâbîyya, Damascus 1960, 105 ff.], and later incorporated in the Italian colony of Libya. The first independent republic to remain both independent and a republic was that of Turkey, proclaimed on 29 October 1923 (for texts and debates see A. S. Gözûbûyîk and S. Kili, Türk Anayasa metinleri, Ankara 1957, 95 f.; K. Arıburnu, Millî Mücadele ve inkişafîlarla ilgili kanunlar, i, Ankara 1957, 32 ff.; cf. E. Smith, Debates on the Turkish constitution of 1924, in Ankara Univ. Siyasat Bilg. Fak. Derg., xiii (1958), 821-23). In Syria-Lebanon republican ideas were current in some circles at an earlier date, and the forms of government set up by the French as mandatorial power were generally republican in tendency. The republics were not, however, formally constituted until some years later; Greater Lebanon was proclaimed a republic on 23 May 1926, Syria on 22 May 1930.

The ending of West European colonial rule in Islamic lands under the second World War brought several new republics into being. The republic of Indonesia was proclaimed in August 1945; Pakistan, independent since 1947, introduced a new theme by declaring an 'Islamic Republic' in November 1953. In Africa, the Sudan became a republic on attaining independence in January 1956; Tunisia, already independent, abolished the monarchy and proclaimed a republic in May 1959. Among the older Arab states in the Middle East two new republics were established after the revolutionary overthrow of the existing monarchical regimes—in Egypt in June 1953, in 'Irâk in July 1958. A union of Egypt and Syria, called the United Arab Republic (al-Djumhuriyya al-'Arabîyya al-Mutâhâdâ), was formed in February 1958 and dissolved in September 1961. The name United Arab Republic has been retained by Egypt.

An anti-monarchist revolution began in the Yemen in September 1962. At the present time the majority of Muslim states are called republics, though the common designation covers a wide variety of political realities.

Bibliography: given in the article. On the idea of freedom see turîyya; on political thought in general, see sîvâsî; on constitutions see duster; on parliamentary government, see maddîsî; on revolutionary and insurrectionary movements, see înîlîâb and tawwârîhîsî; on military rule, see nizâm 'âskârî; on socialism, see istirâkîyve; on the case-histories, see the articles on the individual countries.

Djumhuriyyet Khalk Fırkası (modern Turkish Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi, Republican People's Party), the oldest political party in the Turkish Republic, was organized by Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk] in Ankara on 11 September 1939/1923. It was successor to the Society for the Defence of Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia (Anadolu ve Rumeli Mîdûja'a-i i-Hukuk Djumhûrîyyetî), the organization formed by Kemal in 1919 as the political instrument to fight the War of Independence. The party's original name was Khalk Fırkası. On 10 November 1940/1924 the name was changed to Djumhuriyyet Khalk Fırkası, and at the 4th National Congress in 1935, in connexion with the language modernization programme, became the Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi [CHP].

Few exact membership figures for the party are available. Membership in 1948 was estimated at 1,898,000, or about 10% of the population.

The party is organized vertically beginning with the branch (ocak) in villages, localities and subdivisions of towns and cities. The number of these local branches was estimated to be about 23,000. The organization continues at the county (mahâye), district (kaza), and province (mülûkî) levels, and culminates in the national organization with head-quarters in Ankara. The party is headed by a General Chairman (Genel Baskan), a post occupied from 1923 to 1938 by Atatürk, and since that time by İsmet İnönü. In 1927 Atatürk was made "unchanging" (değişmez) General Chairman, and after his death the Special National Congress of 1939 proclaimed him "eternal" (ebedi) General Chairman. Most of the day-to-day work of the party is directed by the General Secretary. General Secretaries have included Recep Peker (1923-5 and 1931-6); Sükri Kaya (1936-8); Refik Saydam (1938-9); Dr. Filikr Tuzer (1939-42); Memduh Şevket Esenadal (1942-5); Nafl Atuf Kansu (1945-7); Tevfik Fikret Silay (1947-50); Kasim Gülek (1950-9); Ismail Rüstü Aksal (1959-62); and Kemal Sait (1962—). The National Congress meets periodically to make general policy and elect a 40-member Executive Committee. Fifteen regular Congresses were held between 1919 and 1961. The Sivas Congress of the Defence of Rights Society in 1919 is generally called the first Congress of the party. In addition there were special Congresses in 1939 and 1946. The 2nd National Congress in 1927 was the occasion of Atatürk's Six-Day Speech (Buyûk Nutuk).

Party organization has vacillated from time to time between tendencies toward more or less centralization. In the 1920's the national organization controlled its branches tightly through a network of Inspectors and sub-Inspectors. In 1930 maximum authority and responsibility were given to local and provincial party officials. The period of greatest centralization was between 1936 and 1939 when the Interior Minister was concurrently CHP General Secretary, and governors of the provinces were also
From 1923 to 1946 the CHP was the sole party in the Grand National Assembly, except for two occasions when opposition was permitted but then eliminated after short periods. The opposition were the Republican Progressive Party (Terakkiperver Düşünürler Vakfı) of 1924, composed of a group of constitutional conservatives who split off from the CHP when Atatürk began his personal direction and domination. The Progressive Party was closed by the government in 1925 in reaction to a resurgence of conservative sentiment in the country. In 1930 another attempt at opposition took place when Atatürk persuaded several close friends to form the Free Party (Serbest Fırka), but this party also was dissolved after three months when it became the rallying ground for counter-revolutionary groups. Neither of these parties contested a general election. After the failure of the Free Party Atatürk introduced several "independent deputies" into the 1931 and 1935 Assemblies. They were to criticize and to be free of party discipline, but not to organize as an opposition or oppose basic aspects of the CHP program. By 1939, these independents were limited to a token representation of non-Muslim minorities.

In the 1939 party Congress decided on the formation of an Independent Group of 21 members selected from among the already-elected CHP deputies. In the 7th Assembly in 1943 the size of the Independent Group was increased to 25. The Independent Group was abolished by the Special National Congress of 1946 when it was decided to permit opposition parties. Following the 1946 election a group of 35 young CHP deputies (the Otubâciler) rebelled against the policies of the Prime Minister Recep Peker, but did not leave the party. In 1945 opposition parties were again allowed, and four CHP deputies, Celal Bayar, Adnan Menderes, Refik Koraltan and Fuat Koprulu formed the Demokrat Parti (q.v.). In 1946 an election was held before the Democrats had time to organize in many provinces, and the CHP retained a heavy majority. In 1950, however, the Democratic Party won a majority, and the CHP went into opposition. In the 1954 election the CHP strength was reduced to 21, but in 1957 it again increased to 176. Following the overthrow of the Menderes government by the army in 1960, three opposition parties arose to compete with the CHP in the 1961 election, in which the CHP received 36.7% of the vote and returned 173 members to the 450-man Assembly, and to the newly-created 150-man Senate of the Republic. The CHP leader İsmet İnönü was appointed to head a coalition cabinet. The CHP's Assembly strength after each election since 1923 has been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CHP</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Nine Principles (Dokus Umde) proclaimed by the Defence of Rights Society in April 1923 were adopted by the CHP that September as its first programme. Its points proclaimed that sovereignty belongs unconditionally to the nation, that full authority is granted to the Grand National Assembly, and outlined political, social, and economic reforms to be undertaken. When Atatürk brought into the open his plans for rapid and radical transformation of the Turkish nation, the programme was expanded to include the principles which in 1931 became the Six Arrows (Altı Ok), Republicanism, Nationalism, Secularism (Lîdik), Populism (Halkevi), Etatism (Destetçülük), and Revolutionism (İhâlîdestâlûlık).

The CHP has published the proceedings of most of its Congresses, as well as numerous reports of programmes and activities. In the 1930's the Halkevi published a regular monthly magazine Ulku, and local Halkevi publications about the CHP. The central office today includes a Research Bureau which publishes analyses of political, social and economic problems. The party has published...
its own daily newspaper in Ankara since 1920 under the name "Hakimiyyet-i Milliyye" ("National Sovereignty"), and later as Ulus ("The Nation").

The modern Turkey, under the name of Turkey, was founded in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Atatürk, who was the first president of the Republic of Turkey, established a new political system in Turkey and worked to modernize the country. He introduced many reforms, including educational and cultural changes, and paved the way for Turkey's transition from a traditional Ottoman society to a modern, secular nation.

The growing influence of the British in the internal affairs of Turkey is also evident in the document. The East India Company entered into an engagement with the rulers of Turkey to acquire the port of Veraval, 300 nautical miles from Karachi, which witnessed the murder of the Dlwan Amar-dji, who was thereafter turned out by the victorious armies of Abd al-Rahim Khan-i-Khâman (q.v.). As a part of the sâha of Gujârat it was conquered and annexed to the Mughal empire by the victorious armies of Abd al-Rahîm Khan-i-Khâmain (q.v.).

The sacred temple of Somnath, sacked and destroyed by Sultan Ghazâna in 416/1025, continues to be called Djinâgâh while the new town lower down was named Mustâfâbad, although this name was never popularly adopted.

The city was renamed Mustafabad and Sayyids, 'ulamâ', kâtibs and other notables mainly from Afghân stock, whose ancestors had migrated from the Kâltâ-Kandahâr region to the plains of Hindustân in search of employment during the beginning of Mughal rule, taking advantage of the enfeeblement of the central authority, expelled the local fawdîdr Mir Dûst Allî and founded his independent dynasty in 1150/1737-8. A shrewd military commander, he successfully kept at bay the marauding bands of the Mârâthâs, who in the glow of easy victories wanted to overrun the whole of Kâthiawâr. During his rule of 20 years, marred by minor clashes with the Mârâthâs, he consolidated his position and firmly established his rule.

On his death in 1727-28 he was succeeded by his son, Muhammad Mâhâbat Khan I, whose very first year of rule was marred by an abortive dynastic conspiracy to depose him. Afâ'is rule of 12 years he died in 1184/1770 and was succeeded by his minor son, Muhammad Hâmid Khan, all other rival claimants having fully recognized the title of the Shir Khan family to the rulership of the new principality.

An otherwise inconspicuous rule of 27 years, which witnessed the murder of the Dîwân Amaar-djî father of Ranîro-djî (see Bibl.), he died in 1226/1811. The East India Company entered into an engagement with the ruler of Djinâgâh for the first time in 1222/1807. A year earlier, a settlement had been arrived at between Djinâgâh and the vassal states of Manâwâdâr and Mangrol and other tâlûkas, recognizing the overlordship of Djinâgâh, regarding the amounts of zorâlbî (tribute exacted by force), a relic of Muslim supremacy, due from the feudatory states etc., with the active intervention of the British Resident at Baroda. This incident, small in itself, throws ample light on the growing influence of the British in the internal affairs of even as
remote a part of the country as Kathiyawaf, long before the final eclipse of the Mughal rule in 1857. In 1821 the ruler of Djügär was recognized as the paramountcy of the East India Company, who undertook to collect türkali on behalf of the ruler and pay it into his treasury. He died in 1840 and was succeeded by a minor son.

Among the later rulers, Muhammad Räsül Khān (1822-1911) deserves special mention as a progressive and enlightened chief. It was during his rule that a college, a library and museum, a modern hospital a water-works and an orphanage were established. Steps were also taken for the protection and preservation of the historic edicts of Ašoka and the temple of Somnath was repaired at considerable expense to the State. On his death in 1911, his son Muhammad Mahābat Khān being a minor, the administration of the State was taken over by the Government of India. On his attaining the age of majority the prince, the ninth in succession and the last of the line of descent from Shaykh Safī al-Dīn Ishāk, the founder of the Safawid tārika, succeeded his father Ibrrāhīm as head of the Safawid order at Ardabīl in 851/1447-8; the date of his birth is not known. Djünayd for the first time organized the Safawid murids on a military footing and, unlike his predecessors, clearly aimed at temporal power as well as religious authority. His political ambitions at once brought him into conflict with Ibn Saḥaḥ, the Kara-Koyunlu ruler of Ardabīl, which figures on the agenda of the Security Council of the United Nations. The chief city of the State, Djünagafh, is one of the most picturesque towns in India. Its ancient citadel, the Īpārkōl, is one of the strongest mountain fastnesses in the sub-continent. It has two large-size cannons dating back to the times of the Turkish Sultan Sulaymān the Magnificent, brought to Djünagafh by gunners of foreign origin who were in the employ of the ruler. The town has a number of stately buildings, including the mausolea of the former rulers, their wives and the Minister Shaykh Bahāʾ al-Dīn, which are fine specimens of a style of architecture similar to that of the Deccan, the minaret with an exterior winding stair-case, after the style of the minaret of the mosque of Ibn Tūlūn, found nowhere else in the subcontinent.

Bibliography: Ranbēj-i Amar dāj-i, Tāriḵ-i Sāraḥ or Wahbi-i Sāraḥ, Persian text still in manuscript, Eng. transl. Bombay 1882 (one of the earliest histories of Djünagafh by a native of the State, who like his father and brother was Djāwān of Djünagafh. Many statements of the author are, however, not free from bias, as he suspected that in the murder of his father Djāwar-Dāj-i the ruler of the State was indirectly involved. According to modern manuscript sources listed in W. Hinz, Die Aufstiege zum Nationalstaat im fünfzehnten Jahrhundert, Berlin and Leipzig 1936, which contains the best and fullest account of Djünayd's life. For a discussion of the question whether Djünayd was the first Safawī shāykh to adopt the title sultan, see R. M. Savory, The development of the early Safawī state under Ismaʿīl and Tahmāsp, unpublished University of London thesis, 1958, 54-5.

(D. A. Bazmee Ansari)
Djunayd, last of the amirs of the family of the Aydin-oghlu [q.v.]. Djunayd who is given in the Ottoman sources the surname of Izmir-oghlu, succeeded for nearly a quarter of a century in prolonging the existence of the Aydin amirate through intrigues as clever as they were bold and by turning to account the dynastic wars between the sons of Bâyazid I. The recent researches by Himmet Akin, whose efforts were directed mainly towards documents in Turkish archives, have helped to enrich the insufficient information from sources, and to shed light on the original of this figure who has been unjustly called an adventurer. The son of İbrāhīm Bahādūr, Amir of Bodemaya, and grandson of Mehmed Beg, founder of the Aydin amirate, Djunayd appears in history after the departure from Anatolia of Timūr-Lang. In 804/1402 Timūr had restored the Aydin amirate annexed in 792/1390 by Bayezyd I, and returned it to the sons of ʻĪsā b. Mehemmed, Müsā, then Ummur II. Djunayd and his brother Hasan Ağha, who had been the kara-subاشिय (the upper fortress of İzmir (the fortress of the port, occupied since 744/1344 by the Knights of Rhodes, had been retaken in 804/1402 by Timūr) during Ottoman rule, contended for power with their cousins and obtained respectively İzmir and Ayasoluk and the province of Aydin. After 805/1404 Ummur II sought the aid of his kinsman Mentegheoghlu İlyās Beg, who helped him to reconquer Ayasoluk and imprisoned Hasan Ağha in Marmaris. Djunayd succeeded in arranging the escape of his brother who was brought to İzmir by boat, and then, thanks to the intervention of the former governor of the province of Aydin, Süleyman Celebi, who was proclaimed Sultan at Edirne he regained Ayasoluk and made up in spades the allies that were defeated by Mehmed; ʻĪsā fled, while Djunayd asked for pardon and safeguarded his authority by submitting to the victor. The following year Süleyman led a campaign in Anatolia; Djunayd, allied with the Amirs of Karaman and of Germiyān, made preparations for resistance; but, fearing betrayal by these allies, they deserted their side to ask pardon of the sultan; Süleyman, who now mistrusted them, took him into Rumelia and made governor of Ochrida. In 814/1414, however, Süleyman was killed in fighting his brother Müsā, and Djunayd profited from the troubles of the period and returned to İzmir, expelled the governor of Ayasoluk, appointed by Süleyman and reconquered his former amirate. But when Mehmed I had triumphed over Müsā and consolidated his power in Rumelia, he turned against Djunayd and took the fortresses of Kyma, Kayadik and Nif; then he besieged İzmir where the population welcomed him with open arms. But not content with the region of İzmir, he expelled from Ayasoluk the son of Ummur II, Mustafā, who was subject to the Ottomans, and gradually reconquered the former amirate of Aydın. In 827/1424 Murād II turned against Djunayd; the Sultan who blockaded the town. But Djunayd did not stop raiding the Ottoman territories, and seized the title of the new governor. Murād II sent against him a new army under the command of the son of Timurtash, Oruç, beşler-beş of Anatolia; the region of İzmir was conquered, and Djunayd had to take refuge in the fortress of İpsili, situated on the coast opposite Samos; he put to death his prisoner, the sister of Yakhshi. From İpsili, Djunayd sent a petition to Venice, asking help for himself and for the son of Mustafā, brother of the Sultan Mehmed, who did not reply. Djunayd’s army, under the command of his son Kurt Hasan, was defeated in the plain of Ak Hisar (Thyatira), and Kurt Hasan was taken prisoner. On the other side, with the help of some Genoese from Phocea, İpsili was attacked from the sea. Blockaded on two sides, Djunayd had to surrender; but although he had obtained a safeguard for his life, Yakhshi, to avenge his sister, put him to death, as well as Kurt Hasan.
and all the other members of his family. Such was the end of the Aydınlıoğulları.


**AL-DJUNAYD.** **ABU L-KÂSIM B. MUHAMMAD B. AL-DJUNAYD AL-KHAZZAZ AL-KAWARIRI AL-NIHAWANDI,** the celebrated Sûfi, nephew and disciple of Sari al-Sakati, a native of Baghdad, studied law with Wândi, the celebrated Sufi, nephew and disciple of Al-Djunaíd al-Khazzâz al-Kawârîrî al-Nihâwândî, with whom indeed he is said to have discussed law among all the great questions relating to mysticism, Muhsâbi giving his replies extemporaneously (“Lord of the Sect”), and later writing them up in the form of books (Abû Nu‘aym, Ḥiyâyat al-auliya‘i, Leyden MS, fol. 284a). He died in 298/910. With Muhsâbi he is to be counted the greatest orthodox exponent of the “Sober” type of Sufism, and the titles which later writers bestowed on him—ṣayyid al-lâ’tîfa (“Lord of the Sect”), ta‘ās al-fîbarâ (“Peacock of the Dervishes”), šaykh al-masâdhîyih (“Director of the Directors”)—indicate in what esteem he was held.

The Fihrist (186) mentions his Rasâ‘îl, which have in large measure survived, in a unique but fragmentary MS (see Brockelmann, S I, 354-5). These consist of letters to private persons (examples are quoted by Sarrâjî, Kitâb al-luma‘, 239-43), and short tractsates on mystical themes: some of the latter are cast in the form of commentaries on Kur‘ânic passages. His style is involved to the point of obscurity, and his influence on Hallâlî [q.v.] is manifest. He mentions in one of his letters that a former communication of his had been opened and read in the caliph’s estmore (Rasâ‘îl, fol. 3a-b). Of his own mystical experience he says “This that I say concerning myself I have often written. (Rasâ‘îl, fol. 6a). His writings of al-Junayd, and the extravagances of language which on the lips of such inebriates as Abû Yazîd al-Bû’tâmî and Hallâlî alarmed and alienated the orthodox, Djunaíd by his clear perception and absolute self-control laid the foundation on which the latter systems of Sûfism were built.


**AL-DJUNAYD B. ‘ABBÂD ALLÂH, AL-MÔRÂR, one of the governors and generals of the Umayyad caliph Hishâm who in 105/724 appointed him governor of the Muslim possessions in India (Sind, and Multân in the south Pandjâb), conquered some years earlier in 924/711-3 by Muhammad b. al-Kâsim. ‘Umar II had recognized Dîshâbâ b. Dîshib, the Indian king who had embraced Islam, as sovereign of these territories. Al-Junayd evidently had doubts about this man’s loyalty for he attacked him, took him prisoner and put him to death; by subterfuge he also contrived the assassination of Ibm Dîbashb’s brother who was anxious to go to Irâk to protest against what he considered to be pernicious behaviour. Al-Junayd remained governor of Sind until 110/728-9, and during his tenure of office made several expeditions (e.g., against the king of al-Kirâdî who was compelled to flee) and occupied various towns the names of which are recorded in Arabic sources. Since the Muslim conquest of territories outside Sind only took place from the second half of the 4th/10th century, it should be noted here that from the time of al-Junayd the Muslim invasions in the south penetrated into Gujjarat, and in the east as far as the plateau of Mâlûwa in central India. Other expeditions in the north, according to Arabic sources, enabled al-Junayd to reach the country of the Ghuzz, and also a dependency of China where he captured a town and a castle.

In 110/729 al-Junayd was dismissed from his post, and after his fall a revolt compelled his successor to give up Sind. However, he had not forfeited the caliph’s esteem for he was appointed governor of Khurâsân by him in 111/729-30 (according to al-Balâdhûrî, in 112); his military skill was relied on to restore the foundations on which had become precarious through attacks by the Turks, and Ağbras b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Sulami, the former governor of the Khurâsân, was at war with them. Al-Junayd hastened to give help, joined forces with Ağbras at al-Bûkhdâr and fought a number of battles with the Turks, finally crushing them at Zarmân, not far from Samarkand. On his return to Khurâsân (where he selected his lieutenants from among the Mu‘jar), he invaded Tûkhrâristân, but was soon forced to return to Transoxiana, summoned to the aid of the prefect of Samarkand, Sawra b. Hûr al-Thanîmî, in face of the threats of the Turkish Mâhân. Al-Junayd hurriedly crossed the Oxus. From Kiss he had a choice of routes to Samarkand, either through the steppes or across the mountains; he decided to take the latter, but when he reached al-Şibîb (= Wârût), he was attacked by the people of Şugid, Şâsh and Farghânà. The battle, in which a great number of Muslims perished, has remained famous in the history of Islam under the name Wâkât al-Şibîb. However, it was not a complete disaster: al-Junayd sent a message to Sawra ordering him to leave Samarkand and come to his aid, and Sawra obeyed, although he realized the full extent of the danger to which he was exposing.
himself. As was foreseen, he was attacked by the Turks and fell in the melee; his troops were wiped out. But al-Djunayd succeeded in disengaging from the Turks and was in great danger. He organized an expedition to free it. He defeated the Turks near al-Tawâvis (Râmadân 112/730 or 113/731), and afterwards made his entry into Buğhêrâ. Transoxiana had been occupied only about twenty years earlier by Kûtayba b. Muslim, and the conquest was far from being final; the instability of the situation can be gathered from the fact that Hishâm had to send from al-Âsyr and al-Kûfâ 20,000 men who rejoined al-Djunayd on the way and were later left at Samarkand. At the beginning of the year 116/734 al-Djunayd was recalled, having incurred the caliph's displeasure by his marriage to al-Fâdîla, a daughter of the rebel Yazîd b. al-Muhâllab. He died at Marw from a severe attack of dropsy even before his successor Ǧâsim b. 'Abd Allâh al-Hîlîlî arrived in Khurâtân. The latter could persecute only al-Djunayd's relatives and employees.

The report according to which al-Djunayd, after being dismissed from the office of governor of Sind, supported the anti-Umayyad movement fostered by Kûtayba b. Muslim (al-Djunayd seems to be absurd in view of the fact that he was almost immediately appointed governor of Khurâtân, and that he even had the leaders of this movement arrested there. The information which al-Dinawârî (387 ff.) gives in this respect is suspect for it is wrong chronologically, as is also the information about the deposition of Asad b. 'Abd Allâh (337).

Al-Djunayd must have been a general of exceptional qualities, and it was probably to his merits that the Muslims were indebted for the stability of their authority in Transoxiana during a very strong Turkish counter-movement. It is more difficult to judge his qualities as an administrator since on this point we have only one detail at our disposal: al-Djunayd left in the Bayt al-mâl of Sind 18 million dirhams (1 dirham = 1/8 dirhams of fine silver; see the glossary to al-Baladhuri and Dozy, Suppl.), and his successor sent the whole sum to the caliph.


**L. VECCIA VAGLIERI**

**DJUND,** a Khurâtân word of Iranian origin denoting an armed troop. In the Umayyad period the term applies especially to military settlements and districts in which were quartered Arab soldiers who could be mobilized for seasonal campaigns or for more protracted expeditions. Quite naturally it also denotes the existence of the system or the term applied to Syrian administrative districts (Tabârî, iii, 1134) which survived until the time of the Ma'mûls, but the diwan al-djund, which can be proved to have been still in existence under al-Mutawakkîl (Ya‘qûbî, Buldân, 267, and Ya‘qûbî, Wiet, 61), administered the non-Arab contingents. (Tabârî, iii, 654, 815, 1369, 1479, 1736) while for the geographers of the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries the agînîd, the equivalents of ansâr, denoted the large towns. The Umayyad organization of the djund seems to have been partly imitated in the province of Andalus. From 125/742 Arab, Syrian and Egyptian contingents received grants of land in nine districts (bâras), called mudjannada, in the Iberian peninsula [see ANDALUS, iii]. To the members of these djunds there were added, as in the East, enlisted volunteers (hâsham) who were all grouped together under the same denomination in the 4th/10th century and were distinct from the foreign mercenaries (hâsham) who gradually eliminated the old army. In Aghlabid Irîkîya the word djund, which at first denoted Arab contingents brought by the conquerors and successive governors, came ultimately to signify the personal guard, the nucleus of the new permanent army. Under the various dynasties connected with the Magrib, the term djund kept a restricted sense which is often difficult to define, rarely applying to the whole army. Similarly, with the Ma'mûls the word djund is sometimes applied to a category of soldiers in the sultan's service, but distinct from the personal guard [see HALKA].

**Bibliography:** Baladhûrî, Fustûl, 131-2, 144, 166; Ya‘qûbî, Buldân, 324-9 (Ya‘qûbî, Wiet, 169-83); Ibn al-Fâkîh, 109; Ibn Rusta, 107-8 (Ibn Rusta-Wiet, 119-20); Kûdâmî, K. al-Ḫâragî, Bûa, vi, 246, 247, 251; Yûkût, i, 136; Mukaddasî, 415, 416; Tabârî, i, 2090; iii, 1134; Abu al-Fîdâ’, Tabîrîm, iii/2, 2-3; Le Strange, Palestine, 24-30; M. Gaudefroy-Demobymes, La Syrie à l’époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, XXXII, CIV, 29-31; E. Herzel, Geschichte der Stadt Samarra, Hamburg 1949, 98, 99 n. 1 (on the origin of the word djund); R. Levy, The social structure of Islam, Cambridge 1957, 407-27; A. Vonderheyden, La Berbérie orientale sous la dynastie des Banû 'l-Ârab, Paris 1939, 81-91; Urdaci, Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides, ii, Paris 1947, 82, 88; J. F. P. Hopkins, Medieval Muslim government
DJUND — AL-DJURDJANI


DJUNDAYSABUR [see GOMBOHAPUR]

DJUND [see HALKA].

DJUNNAR, town in the Indian State of Bombay, 56 m. north of Poona. Its proximity to the Nana Pass made it an important trade centre linking the Deccan with the west coast. It was first mentioned by Malik al-Tujidjar in 840/1436. The district around Djunnar was one of the tarafs or provinces of the Bahman kingdom on the Deccan, during the administration of Ma'nud Gwân [q.v.]. It later formed part of the Sultanate of Ahmdnagar. In 1067/1657 the town was plundered by Shiwajid, the Marathé leader, who was born in the neighbouring hill-fort of Shiwnôr. The surrounding hills are famous for their Buddhist caves. These are described in great detail in the Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, xviii (Part iii), 140-231.

(C. COLLIN DAVIES)

DJUR [see FERUZABAD].

DJUR'AT, tahkalius of Kûndar Balîsh, an Urdu poet of Indian origin, whose real name was Yabûy Amân, son of Hâfiz Amân, one of whose ancestors Rây Amân, after whom a street in Old Dhiil is still known, suffered at the hands of Nâdir Shâh's troops during the sack of Dhiil in 1125/1719. The title of Amân or Man was conferred on the ancestors of Djur'at, according to Mirzâ 'Ali Lutf (Gulshan-i Hind, Hind, vii, 207, 73), by the Emperor Akbar. Born at Dhiil, Djur'at was brought up at Faydabad and later joined the service of Nawwâb Muhabbât Khân of Bareilly, a son of Hâfiz Rahmat Khân Rohilla [q.v.] at an early age. In 1215/1800 he went to Lucknow and ingratiated himself with prince Sulaymân Shukhô, a son of Shâh 'Alâm II [q.v.], titular emperor of Dhiil. The 'court' of Sulaymân Shukhô had become the refuge, after the sack of Imperial Dhiil, of great poets and writers like Mûshâfi and Insha Allah Khan [q.v.], included among his stipendiaries. Ten years later Djur'at died in that city in 1225/1810.

A pupil of Dja'far 'All Khan Hasrat, a poet of some note, he was a skilled musician and played on the guitar with dexterity. He was also a good astrologer and well-versed in social etiquette, qualities which made him extremely popular with people of high rank. On account of cataract, which afflicted him in the prime of life, he lost his eyesight; others say he feigned blindness in order to further his amours. Essentially a bon vivant, Djur'at was a lyrical and especially an erotic poet. Author of more than 100,000 lines (Ahad Dastur al-fasdhdt, Rampur 1943, 98 ff.), mostly passionate ghazals, he wrote some voluptuous mathnawis also, of which one, entitled Husna wa 'ishk, deserves mention. The well-known Urdu poet Mir [q.v.] spoke slightly of Djur'at whose compositions he described as mere bon mots, of the 'kissing and hugging type'. Mir's verdict has been characterized as wholly unjustified as he failed to appreciate the social and political conditions of Djur'at's times and the Lucknow of his days, where Mir was comparatively a stranger. It was Djur'at, who for the first time in Urdu poetry, addressed his ghazals to women, contrary to the time-honoured practice of showering praises on young, handsome boys and amrais. His divan was published in the now defunct Urdu-i Mu'âlîd (ed. Hâsalt Mohâhîl, Kanpur, October-December, 1927).

Bibliography: All the relevant hadîkhirs of Urdu poets (enumerated in Dastur al-fasdhdt, 99 n.); Muhammad Husayn 'Azâd, Abî haydî, s.v. Djur'at; Ram Babu Saksena, History of Urdu literature, Allâhâbâd 1940, 88-90; T. Graham Bailey, History of Urdu literature, London 1932, 55-6; Abu 'l-Layth Siddîq, Djur'at unka 'ahbâd aur 'iqbâliyya bâshârî, Karachi 1952 (the first critical study of Djur'at).

(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

DJURAYDI, a saint whose story is said to be related by the Prophet himself and has therefore found a place in the hadith. The various versions differ in details one from another, but one motif is common to them all, that the saint is accused by a woman, who had had a child by another man, of being its father; but the child itself, on being asked by the saint, declares the real father's name and thus clears the saint from suspicion. "Djuraydî" is the Arabic reproduction of Gregorius, and one version rightly states that he lived in the prophetic period (fatra [q.v.]) between Jesus and Muhammâd. There is a similar episode in the biographies of Gregorius Thaumaturgus, and it may be assumed as probable that the story became known among Muslims through the Christian tradition until finally it was adopted in the hadith.

Bibliography: Bukhârî, Sahîh al-$alîm [i.e. 'l-salîd], Bâb 7, Ma'salîm, Bâb 35; Muslim (Cairo 1283), v, 277; Makdisi, al-Bad' wa l-l*tîbîk, ed. Huict, Ar. text 135; Samarkandî, Tanbih, ed. Cairo 1309, 221; Migne, Patrologia Graecae, xxxvi, 901 ff.; Acta martyrum et sanctorum, ed. Bedjan, vi, 101 ff.; Horovitz, Sprueh griechischer Mimen, 78-83.

DJURBADHAKAN [see GULFAYMAGAN].

DJUND [see GURGAN].

AL-DJURDJANI, 'ARJ% AL-KHîR [see Supplement].

AL-DJURDJANI, 'ALL b. MUHAMMAD, called al-Sâyyîd al-Shâfî, was born in 740/1339 at Tâj'dîn near Astrâbâd; in 766/1365 he went to Harât to study under Kutb al-Din Muhammad al-Kâsî al-Tâhtânî, but the old man advised him to go to his pupil Mubârakshâh in Egypt; however he stayed in Harât and went in 770/1368 to Kârûmân where he heard Mubârakshâh and Akmal al-Din Muhammad b. Muhammâd, staying four years in Sâ'îd al-Sâ'îdâ'; he visited Constantinople in 776/1374 and then went to Shîrz where he was appointed teacher by Shâh Shujâ'î 779/1377. When Timûr captured the town, he took him to Samarkand where he had discussions with Sa'îd al-Din al-Taftazânî [q.v.]; opinions differed as to who was the victor. On Timûr's death he went back to Shîrz where he died 816/1413. The usual tales are told of his brilliance as a student. He wrote on many subjects, on grammar and logic in Persian. He belonged to an age which wrote commentaries on earlier works; as a theologian he allowed a large place to philosophy, thus half his commentary on al-Mawdûki of al-Tâjî [q.v.] is given up to it. On law, he wrote a commentary on al-Farâ'îd al-sirdâ'îyya of al-Sâjdawandî; on language, glosses on al-Mawwall a commentary on al-Taftazânî on Ta'khîs al-miftâh al-Sâkkâkî; on logic, glosses on a commentary by al-Kâzî al-Tâhtânî on al-Risâla. 
Mecca in the comparatively recent past (cf. Th. Noldeke, *Fiinfi Mo’allaqdt*, iii, 26 f.; Th. Noldeke, *ZDMG*, xi, 717; also *ZDMG*, lxx, 352; al-Hassan b. Thabit, *Chroniken der Stadt Mekka*, ed. Wüstfenfeld, i, 43 f. [= Ibn Hishām, 257]). This is further confirmed by the mention of the name of several localities in Iran.


**DJURM** (fine) (in the Ottoman Empire)

Though fines are known to the criminal law of the šarīʿa, some *jumah* admitted of monetary penalties in certain cases (e.g., Dede Efenidi, *Siyāsetname*, at end). The Ottoman *kanunnames* (*q.v.*; see also *DJAZA*), while pretending merely to apply and complete the šarīʿa, prescribed fines (*djīrma, ẓerme or ẓerme, ḥinlīk, ẓarīm̄et*) for a large number of offences. These even included crimes liable to *ḥadd* (*q.v.*), such as adultery, theft, the drinking of wine, etc. Generally fines were imposed in addition to corporal chastisement (*taẓlr*, *q.v.*), and sometimes in addition to blood-money (*diżya*), or damages (*tazmin*).

The fines of the third kinds: (a) a certain amount (one ʿākṣa, more rarely half an ʿākṣa or less) for each stroke inflicted on the offender; (b) a certain number of ʿākṣa for each ḍirham in the price of a price-controlled commodity; or (c) as usual in the *Dhi ʿl-Kadr* codes (Barkan, *Kanunlar*, 120-9) and many Ottoman provincial *kanunnames*—where no *lāzir* is mentioned, a fixed amount of money. The fines of the third group were, similarly to the poll-tax (*dziyāa*), mostly graduated in accordance with the financial circumstances of the offender—rich, medium, poor (and very poor), the ratio being 4:3:2, 8 (6):4:2:1, etc. They varied between 10 and 400 ʿākṣa, but a fifteenth century *fennān* (Anhegger-Inalok, *Kanunnames-i Sultanī, 58) and *kanunname* (*TOEM*, 1330, Suppl., 28) prescribed higher fines. In many cases non-Muslims were to pay only half the fine imposed on Muslims (*MOG*, i, 29; Barkan, 81), but this privilege was partly cancelled out by way of discrimination in the way they were depreciated. From the ioth/16th century, however, many offenders punishable with fines (and *lāzir*) were henceforth sent to the gallows or their money. In the early 12th/18th century several provincial *kanunnames* (Barkan, 333, 338, 354) abolished the fines, together with all other *risūm-ūršiyye*, as impositions contrary to the *šarīʿa*. In the first two modern Ottoman penal codes (1840, 1851) no mention is made of fines; in the latter (iii, 10) they are even expressly forbidden. The last Ottoman criminal code (1850) prescribed a great many fines (*diżyiyl-贴) naṣkā), now however in accordance with the French legal conception.


**DJURZ, DJURZAN** [see GURDASTAN].

**DJUSTANIĐS, DJUSTANĐS** [see DAYLAN].

**DJUWAYN**, name of several localities in Iran.

1. A village in Ardashir Khurra, five *farsān* from Shīrz on the road to Ardalan, usually called Djuiyamen, the modern Goyum, cf. Le Strange, 253; P. Schwartz, *Iran im Mittelalter*, 44, 173, 179 (not to be confused with Djuiyamen Abī Ṣaḥmād in the province of Dārābdīr, the modern Djuym, see Le Strange, 254; Schwartz, 102, 201).

2. Djuiyamen (also written Gūyān), a district in the Nīkpūr country, on the caravan route from Bīstām, between Dīlḡārm and Bayhak (Sabzawār). The district is next mentioned to this in Miskawayh, but later Fārīyūmād (see *J.R.A.S.*, 1902, 735) contained 189 villages according to Yāḵūt, ii, 164-6, whose
information is taken from Abu '1-Kasim al-Bayhaqi; they were all in the northern half, while the southern half was unsettled; cf. Le Strange, 392 ff. The plain of Djuwayn, enclosed on the north and south by ranges of hills, still forms a district of Sabzewar with about 65 townships, which lie along the river Djuwayn in a long series. In the middle of the valley, near the village of Azadhwur, lie the ruins of the ancient capital. The modern centre is Djugatay (Caghatay) which is situated to the south-east of it, at the foot of the hills on the south; cf. McGregor, Khorasan, ii, 145, 225; C. E. Yate, Khorasan and Sistan, 389 ff.

3. Djuwayn or Guvayn, a fortified place in Sidjistán, 3 to 5 km. north-east of Lâsh on the Farâhbrûd, appears under its modern name in ancient (see Marquart, Erdnahr, 198: Ta'arghî pôlîcî, emendation on Isidorus of Charax) and mediaeval itineraries (Istakhri, 248; Ibn Hawkal, 304). The importance of the sister towns of Lâsh and Djuwayn still rests on the fact that the roads from Kandhâr and Harât from the Afghan side, and those from Ma'hadâd, Yazd and Nasirâbâd on the Persian side, meet here. The Arab geographers say that Djuwayn was on the road from Harât to Zarandj was a Khârâzi stronghold (Mu'kaddasî, 306; Ibn Rusta, 174). It was sacked by Yakûhl, the Ghuzz leader, in 447/1055-6 (Tab., ii, 205-6); ed. Bahâr, 376 ff. Djuwayn, built on a slight elevation in the centre of a fertile plain covered with ruins, and surrounded by a quadrangular wall of clay, forms a striking contrast to the rocky stronghold of Lâsh; it appears to have considerably declined in the second half of the 19th. century. Cf. Le Strange, 341 ff.; Euan Smith in Eastern Persia, i, 319 ff.; A. C. Yate, England and Russia face to face in Asia, 99 ff.

Al-Djuwayn's researches were divided between the kalâm that Al-Djuwayn made his deepest impression on Muslim thought; and to him goes the glory of being the teacher of Abu Hâmîd al-Ghazâlî in this discipline. Unfortunately, his great work, the Shâmîl, has not been published. One manuscript (incomplete) is to be found in the National Library in Cairo (Al-kalâm, no. 1290), copied from a manuscript in the Kâhirî library; another copy, with extracts from al-Nasafi added, belonged to Dr. al-Khudayrî in Cairo. These manuscripts have been studied by G. C. Anawati (cf. Introduction à la théologie musulmane, Paris 1948, 183-5. On the other hand, the compendium K. al-’Irâdâd lâ kawdârî al-adilla fi usul al-’I’tikâd has been edited, and often studied and quoted. There are two modern editions: (1) by J.-D. Luciani, Paris 1958, with a French tr. (left unfinished by the death of the editor-translator); (2) by M. Y. Môsa and A. Abd al-Munjîm 'Abd al-Hamîd, Cairo 1950, which is the best critical edition.

Al-Djuwayn is important because he wrote in the intermediate period between the old Ashâ'irîm and the school which Ibn Khaldûn was to call "modern". This is marked by (1) a systematical enquiry, influenced—not without the introduction of new schemes—by that of the Mu’azzâm (where theories are rejected); (2) the emphasis laid, in the theory of knowledge, and with regard to the divine attributes, on the idea of "modes" (ahuîlî); thus taken over from the semi-conceptualist line initiated by the Mu’tazîlî Abu Hâshîm; (3) the importance attributed to rational methods, and the use of "reasoning by three terms" in the Aristotelian way: e.g. the proof of the existence of God, which is nevertheless a nusûlî (rather than a contingentia mundi). The Aristotelian syllogisms moreover remain affected by the inference "from two terms" (istîdîl), cf. Gardet-Anawati, Instr. à la théol. musulmane, 360-1. —The solutions to the principal problems are for the most part faultless to the Ashâ’irî tradition. Methodological trends proper to Al-Djuwayn exist, but they show themselves mainly in the presentation of the problems, the conduct of the discussions, and
the importance accorded to the channels (asbâb) by which conclusions are reached. In kaldâm as in fiqh, it was above all the question of the wâli that interested the Iâmâm al-Âlamârây.

Bibliography: In addition to the references in the article: Ibn Khallâkîn, Cairo no. 351; Subkî, Tabâbût, ii, 5071; iii, 249-82; Ibn al-Aghîr, (ed. Tornborg), x, 77 (ann. 485); Ibn Tağhrîrdî, 771; Wüstenfeld, Die Akademien der Araber, no. 38; idem, Shiâtîmîn, no. 365; Schreiner, in Gräts Monatschrift, xxv, 314 ff.; Brockelmann, i, 388.

ÂLÀD-ÂL-DIN AT-ÂL-MALIK B. MUHAMMAD (623/1226-628/1231), a Persian governor and historian, author of the Taârikh-i dijânâm-gûshây, a work which is almost our only source on the details of his life. His family belonged to Âzâd-wâr, then the chief town of Djuwaynî (q.v.), No. 2. According to Ibn al-Tîkakî (al-Fâhri, ed. Ahlwardt, 209) they claimed descent from Fâdî b. Râbî'î, the vizier of Hârûn al-Rashîd. 'Âlàd-al-Dîn’s great-grandfather, Bâhâ al-Dîn Muhammad b. 'Âlàd had waited on the Khârâzâm-Shâh Tékhî (q.v.) when in 588/1192 he passed through Âzâd-wâr on his way to attack Toghrîlî (q.v.), the last Saljuq ruler of 'Irâk-î 'Adîm. His grandfather, Shâms al-Dîn Muhammad b. Muhammad, was in the service of Sultan Muhammad Khârâzâm-Shâh (q.v.), whom he accompanied on his flight from Bâlkh to Nishâpûr. At the end of his life the Sultan appointed him Shêbîb Dîwân, a post which he continued to hold under Sultan Dijâlî al-Dîn: he died during the latter’s siege of Aklâtî, i.e., at some time between Shawwâl 626/August 1229 and Dijâmâdî i 627/April 1230. His son, Bâhâ al-Dîn, ‘Âlàd al-Dîn’s father, is first heard of ca. 630/1233-2 in Nishâpûr. Two of Dijalî al-Dîn’s officers, Yaghân-Sonkûr and Karâcâ, had been active in this area, and Cîn-Temûr, the Mongol governor of Khurâsân and Mázândarân, sent an army to dislodge them. Upon the approach of the Mongol forces Bâhâ al-Dîn together with some of the chief notables of the town fled to Tûs, where they sought refuge in a castle amidst the ruins of the city. The governor of the castle handed them over to the Mongols, by whom, however, they were kindly received: Bâhâ al-Dîn waited on a member of the conquering family, the chief notables of the town, and held the office of Shêbîb Dîwân not only under Cîn-Temûr but under his successors Körğûz and Arghûn Aka. In 633/1235-6 he accompanied Körğûz upon a mission to the Great Khan Ogedey, from whom he received a payza or “tablet of authority” and a yarîkh or rescript confirming his appointment as Shêbîb Dîwân. On several occasions he was left in absolute control of the occupied territories in Western Asia while the governor was absent in Mongolia. In 651/1253, being then in his 60th year, it was his wish to retire from the public service, but to this the Mongols would not agree, and he died during the same year in the Isfâhân region, whither he had been sent to carry out fiscal reforms.

‘Âlàd al-Dîn tells of himself that while still a youth he chose, against his father’s wishes, to take a position in the dijânâm. He twice visited Mongolia in the suite of Arghûn Aka, first in 647-91/1249-51 and then in 649-51/1252-3: upon the arrival of Hûlûgî in Khurâsân early in 654/1256, he was attached to his service and accompanied him on his campaigns against the Ismâ‘îlîs of Alamût and the Baghdâtî Caliphate. It was ‘Âlàd al-Dîn who drew up the terms of surrender of the last Ismâ‘îlî Grand Master Rûkûn al-Dîn Khur-Shâh, and it was through his initiative that the famous library of Alamût was saved from destruction. In 657/1259, a year after the capture of Baghdât, he was appointed governor of ‘Irâk-î ‘Arab and Khûzîstân, a post which he continued to hold for over 20 years, though under Abaḵa, Hûlûgî’s son and successor, he was nominally subordinate to the Mongol Sughûnchâk. During his tenure of office he did much to improve the lot of the peasantry and it was said, with some exaggeration, that he restored these provinces to greater prosperity than they had enjoyed under the Caliphate: at the expense of 10,000 dinârs of gold he caused a canal to be dug from Aûbâr on the Euphrates to Kûfâ and Nadjîf and founded 150 villages along its banks.

During the reign of Abaḵa both ‘Âlàd al-Dîn and his brother Shams al-Dîn (see below) the Sâbîb Dîwân were much exposed to hostile attacks, of which the consequences were more serious for the former than the latter. In the late autumn of 680/1281 he was arrested, at the instigation of a personal enemy, on the charge of embezzling from the Treasury the enormous sum of 2,500,000 dinârs. On 4 Ramâdân 680/17 December 1281, thanks to the intervention of certain members of the Il-Khân’s family, he was released from custody, only to be almost immediately re-arrested on a charge of maintaining a correspondence with the Mamlûk rulers of Egypt. His arrival in Hamâdân to answer this charge coincided with the Il-Khân’s death and he was retained in custody until the election of Abaḵa’s successor Tegûdîr or Ahmâd (1282-4), a convert to Islam, who at once gave orders for ‘Âlàd al-Dîn’s release and reinstatement as governor. He did not long survive his rehabilitation. Tegûdîr’s nephew, the future Il-Khân Arghûn (1284-91), arrived in Baghdât in the winter of 681/1282-3 and reviving the old charge of embezzlement began to arrest the governor’s agents and put them to the torture. News of these proceedings reaching ‘Âlàd al-Dîn in Arrân, where he then was, he had an apoplectic stroke and died on 4 Dhu ‘l-Hijâja 681/5 March 1283.

‘Âlàd al-Dîn’s references to the defects in his literary education must certainly be put down to conventional modesty; he is praised by his contemporaries as a highly cultured man and a patron of poets and scholars; and his history was held up as an unrivalled model of style. The work is divided into three main sections: I. History of the Mongols and their conquests down to the events following the death of the Great Khan Gûyûk, including the history of the descendants of Djiôtî and Câghatây; II. History of the dynasty of the Khârâzâm-Shâhs, based in part on previous works such as the Mağhûrî al-tadjârîb of Abu ‘l-Hasan Bayhâkî and the Diawâmî al-‘ulâm of Fâgîr al-Dîn al-Râzî, and a history of the Mongol governors of Khurâsân down to the year 665/1268; III. Continuation of the history of the Mongols to the overthrow of the Ismâ‘îlîs, with an account of the sect, based chiefly on works found in Alamût such as the Sargûhâsh-i Sâyîdîn; other works now lost are also quoted such as the Taârikh-i Diil wa Daylam and the Taârikh-i Sâlâmî (written for the Bûyid Fâgîr al-Dawla). The Taârikh-i dijânâm-gûshây, which has considerably influenced historical tradition in the East, is for us also a historical authority of the first rank. The author was the only Persian historian to travel to Mongolia and describe the countries of Eastern Asia at first hand; it is to his work and the Journal of William of Rubruck that we owe practically all we know of the buildings in the Mongol capital of Kara-Korum. The
accounts of Cingiz-Khan's conquests are given nowhere else in such detail; many episodes, such as the battles on the Sir-Darya above and below Otrar and the fact, pointed out long before by D'Ohsson (i, 232 ff.), that the citadel of Bukhārā according to Djuwaynī was defended by 30,000 men, all of whom were slain upon its capture, while Ibn al-Athlr (xii, 239), on the authority of an eye-witness, says the garrison consisted only of 400 horse. Again we find in Djuwaynī two versions of the struggle between the Kara-Khitay and Muhammad Khāzān-Khāzān, based apparently on different sources (written or oral). It was only by later compilers like Mirīkh and others that these contradictory accounts were woven into a uniform narrative, not, of course, in accordance with the more standards of modern criticism; European scholars, to whom such compilations were much more accessible than the original authorities, have been frequently led astray by them.

Towards the end of his life he composed in Persian (not in Arabic as stated by Quatremère and repeated by Barthold in El3) two treatises describing the misfortunes which had befallen him under Abaka, the first named Tashiyut al-dīn and the second bearing the same title: extracts from these short works have been published in the Persian introduction to Kazwinī's edition of the Ta'rīkh-i dīnān-gūzdā. Bibliography: The text of Djuwaynī's history is available in the edition of Mirza Muḥammad Kazwinī: The Ta'rīkh-i-yahūn-gūzdā of 'Alādīn 'd-Dīn 'Abd al-Malik-i-Djuwaynī, 3 vols., (GMS, Old Series, xvi, 1, 2, 3), London 1912, 1916 and 1937; and in the translation of J. A. Boyle, The history of the world-conqueror, 2 vols., Manchester 1958. On Djuwaynī as a stylist see Bahār, Sāhīb-i-Shamsā, iii, 57-100. (W. Barthold—J. A. Boyle)

Djuwaynī, Sha mans Al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad, Persian statesman known as "Sāhīb Dīwān", brother of the historian 'Alādīn Al-Dīn Djuwaynī (difference in their respective ages unknown), was made Chief Minister in 661/1262-3, and in 676/1277 he was still working on it in 658/1260, for he refers to the state of Mā warā' al-Nahr in 658/1259-60 (Kazwinī's text, i, 75, tr. Boyle, i, 96) and also to a Georgian rising that took place in the autumn of that year (text, ii, 281; tr., ii, 525); but there are no references to subsequent events, nor indeed to the operations against the Caliphate 658/1259-60, and there are many indications that the history was left in a state of incompletion.

Like his brother, Djuwaynī patronized theology, science and art to the best of his ability, and gave a large proportion of his income to this end (Hamd Allah Mustawfi, Ta'rīkh-i guzida, i, 584). A number of learned men such as Nasīr al-Dīn Tūsī [q.v.], and theologians have dedicated their works to him or to one of his sons, and poets have composed basādas to him (e.g., Sa'dī, Ṣahābīyā). Djuwaynī himself wrote Arabic and Persian poetry with great command of language which (with reservations about Arabic: Waṣṣā'il, i, 58) was also recognized by his contemporaries (several published in the Tehran periodical Armāghān, v, 284 ff.; xiii, 379 ff.). Besides these some of his writings from government offices have been preserved in collections (munaštādī). Bibliography: M. Fuat Köprülü in IA, iii, 255-9; Spuler, Mongolen, Berlin 1955, index (here references to the original sources are also to be found). (B. Spuler)

Djuwz (pl. adizz), i) a "foot" in prosody [see 'ašrāf], (ii) a division of the Kur'ān for purposes of recitation, and its subdivisions, when it was necessary to protect them from many a despot act on the part of their heathen overlords. His fortune grew simul-
to describe the (philosophical) atom in the sense of the ultimate (substantial) part, that cannot be divided further, *al-djuz* al-wdhid alladhi Id yatadizzan* (cf. al-Djurdjani, Toeplitz, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 76); *al-djuz* al-wdhid is sometimes used. Synonymy: "elementary and indivisible matter"; *diawhar fard*; *al-gauhar al-wdhid alladhi Id yanbasim.* — For other definitions of vocabulary see *DHARRA.*

Atomistic conceptions of the world (philosophical atomism) existed very early in Islam, sometimes along heterodox lines, sometimes fully accepted by official teaching. Thus we have the atomism of Muhammad b. Zakarim al-Razi (q.v.), and of numerous trends from the ʿilm al-kalām. One of the first elaborations, as Horten has shown, was that of the Muʿtazilī Abu ʿl-Hujayl (contested by al-Nazzam and the Ismaʿili Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī). — Al-Bākīllānī and his school inherited this atomism, modified it along Ashʿarī principles, formed from it a strict occasionalism, and organized it into a natural philosophy which has become famous. Many Ashʿarīs were faithful to it, in a rigid form in various manuals and later commentaries (al-Lakīm, al-Sanūsī of Tlemcen, al-Bāḫdārī, etc.)—sometimes in a mitigated form, e.g., al-Idjī and his commentator al-Djurdjānī (there is a similar tendency in the works of Avicenna and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī). — Al-Shahrastānī attemps to introduce an intermediate solution (see below). It would require revision. It is nevertheless an indication of the efforts of al-Idjī and al-Djurdjānī to give an account of all the theories—including the hylomorphic of the falsaṣa—in terms of atoms.

**Bibliography:** In the article. The fundamental work remains that of S. Pines, where essential references to Arabic texts and works in European languages are given. See in particular the article by O. Pretz, *Die frühislamische Tomismuslehre,* in Id., 1931, 117-30. Also Gardet-Anawati, *Introduction à la théologie musulmane,* Paris 1948, see index I, "Atomismes".

(L. Gardet)

**Djurdjānī,** Persian Gūzgān, the older name of a district in Afghanistan Turkestan between Murghāb and the Amīr Dāryā. Its boundaries were not well defined, particularly in the west, but it certainly included the country containing the modern towns of Maymana, Andkhūy, Shibargān and Sar-i Pul. Lying on the boundary between the outskirts of the Iranian highlands and the steppes of the north, Djurdjānūn probably always supported nomad tribes as it does at the present day in addition to the permanent settlements in its fertile valleys (cf. Ibn Ḥawqal, 322 ff.; Ḥādīṣī Khāṣṣa, *Dīkān-nām̄ád,* ed. 1145 A.H., 316). The principal wealth of the land lay in its flocks (camels: Ibn Ḥawqal, loc. cit.; Vāmberk, *Reise in Mittelasien,* 213; horses: Marquardt, *Erdbiographie,* 138, 147; Vāmberk, 222; sheep: Vāmberk, 213; Yate, *Northern Afghanistan,* 344; cf. ʿĪṣākhārī, 271; Ibn Ḥawqal, 322). Although the way from the highlands of Iran to Mā varḵān al-Nahr lay through Djurdjān, it was used not so much for friendly intercourse as for a military road for armies passing through it.

The district, which in the beginning of the 1st/7th century was attached to Tūkhāristān (see Marquardt, *op. cit.,* 67), was conquered on the occasion of the campaign of al-Ahnāf b. Kays in 33/653-4 by his lieutenant al-Akra. The marches suffered not only from the wars with the Turks but also from domestic differences within Islam. In the year 117/737 the Khākān was defeated by Asad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Kāšī near the capital of Djurdjān (Shubīrkhān). In 125/743 the ʿAlīd Yahyā b. Zayd, whose tomb was revered longer afterward (cf. Wellhausen, *Arab. Reich,* 312), fell in battle here against the Umayyads. During the ʿAbāsīd period the governor's residence was in Anbār (probably the Djurdjānīn of Nāṣir-i Khurān, 2, possibly the modern Sar-i Pūl); the native ruling house of Gūzgān-Khūghā, the Afrīqūn dynasty, continued however to survive, and had its capital in Kundurm (cf. ʿĪṣākhārī, 270; Ibn Ḥawqal, 321 ff.; Yaʿqōbī, 287). Shubīrkhān occasionally appears as the political centre of Djurdjān, while Muḥammadī (297) and Yākūt (ii, 149 ff.) mention al-Yahūdiyya (= Maymana [q.v.]) as the capital. The ancient name Djurdjān appears gradually to have fallen into disuse, to survive in literature only for some time longer. The various towns in it continue to be repeatedly mentioned as the scenes of hostile
attacks; only the invasions of Cingiz Khan and Timur can be mentioned here. Nothing shows the importance of the district more clearly than the fact that a number of towns have survived all these vicissitudes until the present day.

In modern times a number of petty Uzbek Khânates (Akôe, Andîkhîy, Shîbargân, Sarî Pul, Maymana) have been established in the ancient DÏûzïdjan, but they were much harassed by raids of their more powerful neighbours such as the invasions of the Turkoman nomads. Since the time of Dïšt Muham- mad these Khânates have gradually been incorporated in Afghanistan Turkestan. Today remains a vestige of independence under Afghanistan suzerainty.

Bibliography: Marquart, Œrnâls, 78, 80 ff.; S. de Sacy in Annales et voyages, XX (1873), 172 ff.; Le Strange, 423 ff.; Vâmberry, Reise in Mittelasien, 211 ff.; C. E. Yate, Northern Afghan-
nistan, 334-52. [R. HARTMANN]

AL-DIUZDJÂNÌ, Abû 'Amr (not 'Umar as stated by Storey, i, 68) Minhâdî al-Djnî 'Ughmân b. Sâîr al-Djûzdjânî, Muhammâd al-Djûzdjânî, commonly known as Minhâdhî jirîrâdî, the premier historian of the Slave dynasty of India, was born at Frîrzûkûh [q.v.] in the royal palace in 589/1193, as, on his own showing, he was 18 years of age in 607/ 1210-1 when Malik Rûkn al-Djnî Muhammad was slain at Frîrzûkûh. His father, Sirâdî al-Djnî, a leading scholar and jurist of his day, and a courtier of Sultan Ghîyâh al-Djnî, in Dîhll, was appointed kâdî of the army stationed in India by the Ghûrî sultan Muîzîz al-Djnî Muhammad b. Sâm, also known as Shîhâb al-Djnî, in c. 582/1186. He seems to have returned to Ghazna and was subsequently summoned from Frîrzûkûh to Bîmîyân by Bahâ' al-Djnî Sâm b. Shams al-Djnî Muhammad who appointed him the kâdî and passûr of his kingdom. Being a state dignitary his father was held in great esteem by the members of the royal family. Minhâdhî al-Djnî consequently passed his childhood in the hârim of the princess Mâhî-î Mulk, a daughter of Ghîyâhât al-Djnî Muhammad b. Sâm, sultan of Ghûr and Frîrzûkûh (538-99/1142-1202). In 622/1225 at the age of 33 he was sent as an envoy to the court of Malik Tâdj al-Djnî Yânîltîgh (incorrect form: Nîylîyînî; see V. Minorsky in BSOS, viii/1 (1935), 257), at the age of 38 he was sent on a similar mission again the following year.

The same year, i.e., 623-4/1226-7, he left for India, most probably at the invitation of Nâsir al-Djnî Kâbdâ, ruler of Uch, where he was appointed, in view of his erudition and well learning, principal of the Madrasa-i Frîrzûkûh, the first of the earliest educational institutions in India established by the Muslims. On the overthrow of Kâbdâ by the Slave sultan of Dîhll, Shams al-Djnî Ilichâshî, in 625/1228, Minhâdhî changed his loyalty and accompanied the conqueror to Dîhll, where he held, under him, high legal and judicial offices, including that of the Chief Justice of the realm. A great orator and an accomplished scholar, his discourses and lectures were attended even by the highest nobles and the grandees of the Sultanate. In 635/1239-40 he was made kâdî al-khâsî of the Slave king Muîzz al-Djnî Bâhrâm Shâh (reigned: 637-9/1239-41). Disturbed by the pre- vailing political instability and confusion at Dîhll, al-Dijûzdîanjî decided to try his luck at the court of Lâkhnawtî, the stronghold of Muslim occupation in Bengal. However, he did not find conditions very congenial there, and after a stay of two years returned to Dîhll in 642/1244-5.

He was once more the recipient of royal favours and held the double appointment of the kâdî of Gwâliyâr and the principal of the Madrasa-i Mâsiyrya, a college named after the sultan Nâsir al-Djnî Mâjmûd Shâh, son of fîstûmîsh, who reigned from 648/1250-63.

The same Sultan, greatly impressed with his vast and varied knowledge of Islamic jurisprudence and the dispensation of justice, appointed him once again the Chief Judge of the realm. He, however, fell a prey to the machinations of a court clique, headed by 'Imâd al-Djnî Rûkhân, Wâkîlî-Djî, who compassed his ruin, and he fell from grace in 651/1253, after having been in office for two years only. He was reinstated upon the receipt of a token of the title of 'Sâ'dî Dîjânî was conferred upon him. The next year he was re-appointed Chief Judge of the realm, through the good offices of his patron Ulugh Khânî A'zám, the powerful minister of Sultan Nâsir al-Djnî. He was alive u til until 658/1259-60 when he completed tâbâka 22 of his work. He seems to have died some time during the reign of Sultan Ghîyâh al-Djnî Balban (664-1265-686/1225), full of years and honours, and was, in all probability, buried at Dîhll. His fame chiefly rests on his magnum opus, the Ta'bakât-i Nâsiri, written mainly during the years 657-8/1259-60, after his retirement from active life, and dedicated to Sultan Nâsir al-Djnî Mâjmûd. It is the main source of information for the early Sultanate period, the author having utilized some of the works which are now no more extant. Among its notable omissions is the total lack of mention of the embassy of Radl al-Djnî Hasan b. Muhammâd al-Sâghînî [q.v.], who was sent by the 'Abbaśîbî Câlîph al-Nâsîr li-Djnî Allâh as a special envoy to the court of fîstûmîsh in 616/1219-20 (see TA under the root K.N.Dj and the Udîr monthly Mâ'ârîfî, A'zâm-gaR, June 1959). A Sûfî and a poet given to wājûd and samââ', he has been mentioned by 'Abd al-Hâgh Mûhadîdî in his A bhâr al-akhyûr (see Bibliography), where one rubûdî of Minhâdhî has been quoted. Some other tâdkhîras of Indian Persian poets (see Hablî in the Bibi.) also mention him, but his poetry and other achievements have been overshadowed by his historical talents.

Bibliography: H. G. Raverty, Eng. trans. of Ta'bakât-i Nâsiri, London 1881, ii, xix-xxxii (mainly gleaned from the Ta'bakât itself); Ta'bakût-i Nâsîri tel. 'Abd al-Hâgh [q.v.], 'Abd al-Hâgh Mûhadîdî, Lahore 1954, ii, 724-72 (mostly based on the Ta'bakât, but contains numerous other references); 'Abd al-Hâgh Mûhadîdî al-Dihlawî, A bhâr al-akhyûr, Meerut 1278/1861, 80; H. G. Raverty in JASB, ii, 1882, 76; Rieu, i, 72; Catalogue of Persian MSS. in the Bankipur Library, vi, 435; Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own Historians, ii, 259 ff.; 'Abbas b. 'Ikhbîl, Tarîkh-i islîmî-yi Mughalî, Tehran, 483; Hakim 'Abd al-Hâgh Lâkhnawî, Nushat al-khawdî, Haydârâbâd 1366/1947, i, 174-8; Aligarh Magazine (in Urdu) vol. xiii/i (Jan. 1934), article by Zakariyya Fayyâdî; 'Abd al-Hâgh Mûhadîdî, Tadhkira-i muşanînîfi-dî Dîhll, 7; Storey, i, 68-70; there are also casual references in Fawâ'id al- fulîdî by Amir Hasan Sidjzl; Barthold, Turkestân, 38 and index. [A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI]

DO'ÂB, ('Pers.') 'two waters', corresponding to the Greek µεταπόταμος, is in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent generally applied to the land lying between two confluent rivers, and more particularly to the fertile plain between the Dîhmân and the Ganges in Uttar Pradesh. The long tongues of land between the five rivers of the Pândjâb are also known as do'sûb. Between the Satlîjd and the
Bešas lies the Bist došab; between the Bešas and the Rawl, the Bari došab; between the Rawl and the Čenab, the Rečna došab; between the Čenab and the Dželam, the Čadi or Džel došab; and between the Dželam and the Indus, the Sind Sâgar došab. The names for these došabs are said to have been invented by the emir Akbar (šah-i Akbar, trs. H. S. Jarrett, ii, 311 ff.). The most famous došab in Southern India is the Rayštâr došab between the Kistna (Krishna) and the Tungabhadra rivers which formed a fluctuating frontier between the Hindu kingdoms of Vijayanagara and the Muslim states of the Deccan. (C. Collin Davies)

DOBRUDJA

The plateau between the Danube and the Lon river in the North, the Black Sea in the East and the Prowadijska river or the Balkan range in the North, the Black Sea in the South. Deli Orman in this area is distinguished from the steppe region, Dobrudja-Kîrîn, in the East which is considered as the Dobrudja proper. Called Scythia Minor in the Graeco-Roman period, it was included in the Byzantine province of Paristrion (Bardjan in Idrisi's world map) in 361/972. In Bulgarian Karvunska Chora, it was 'the land of Karbona' in the mediaeval Italian maps. Its modern name came from Dobrudja-eli (as Aydınl from Aydınl-eli) which in Turkish meant the land of Dobrudja, Dobrotic (as Karđica from Karłowicz) (cf. Scythia Minor, P. Raczynski, in Graeco-Roman period, ii, Berlin 1958, 305-6). The Cumans in the Kingdom, Sofia 1937, in Bulgarian). Furthermore Cuman Teli Orman (cf. G. Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, xvi, Cracow 1959, 499), an important town possessed by the Cumans from the 13th to the 15th century, became, primarily for the Barbarossa and the Mongols, a natural route leading to the invasion of the Baltic and the Carpathians. (C. Collin Davies)
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From the early 5th century A.D. until the 13th/14th century Dobrudja became, primarily for the peoples of Turkic origin coming from the Eurasian steppes, a natural route leading to the invasion of the Balkans or a refuge for those pushed by their rivals beyond the Danube. Thus in the footsteps of the Huns (408 A.D.) came Avars (in 534 and especially in 587 A.D.), Bulgars (especially in 596-799) with their capital in Preslav, southern Dobrudja, Pećeneks (440/1048), Uz (456/1064) and Klîpcâks (Cumans) (484/1092). Among those the Klîpcâks appeared to play politically and ethnically the most important part in the history of Dobrudja until the advent of the Ottoman Turks. T. Kowalski finds (Les Turcs et la langue turque de la Bulgarie du Nord-Est, in AC. Pol. Mém. de la commission orientaliste, xvi, Cracow 1933, 28) linguistic remains of these early Turkish invasions from the North in the Gagauz Turkish (cf. Gagauz). The name Deli Orman comes from the Cuman Teli Orman (cf. G. Moravesik, Byzantinoturcica, ii, Berlin 1958, 305-6). The Cumans in the Balkans were mostly Christianized, and, mingled with the native Wallachs and Slavs, they continued to play the rôle of a ruling military class among them (cf. L. Rasonyi-Nagy, Valachoturcica, Berlin-Leipzig 1927, 68-96; P. Nikov, The Second Bulgarian Kingdom, Sofia 1937, in Bulgarian). Furthermore the Mongol invasion of the Dağh-î Klîpcâk in 620/1223 and the foundation of the Khânameh of the Golden Horde in 635/1238 caused large groups of Cumans to flee to the West (cf. B. Spuler, Die Goldenene Horde, P. Nikov, The Second Bulgarian Kingdom, Sofia 1937, in Bulgarian). Furthermore the Mongol invasion of the Dağh-î Klîpcâk in 620/1223 and the foundation of the Khânameh of the Golden Horde in 635/1238 caused large groups of Cumans to flee to the West (cf. B. Spuler, Die Goldenene Horde, Leipzig 1945, 19-20). As to the bulk of the Klîpcâks who remained in the Dağh under Mongol rule, they mostly adopted Islam and were to play a significant part under the name of Tatar in Dobrudja's history in the following periods. With their support Noghiy (q.v.) established his overlordship on the Bulgarian kingdom by 681/1282, when the king and many of his boyars were of Cuman origin. The lower Danube with Sakdîl (Isaccea) was reported in the Arabic sources (Baybars, Zubdat al-šikra, in W. de Tiesenhausen, Almora devitî tarshine ait méteirn, Turkish trans. I. H. İnanlı, ibid., 282) as one of the headquarters of Noghay. He was, Z. V. Togan thinks (Umumi Türk tarihine giris, Istanbul 1946, 256, 325), acting against the Byzantines under the influence of the ghaza preachers of Saru Şaltuk, who was active in Sakdîl and the Crimea during this period. After the suppression of Noghay by Tobgut, Khan of the Golden Horde (autumn 669/1269), Yukan Bogha, his son, was placed in the lower Danube and Sakdîl and Noghay's son Ceke came into Bulgaria to seize the throne for a short time (cf. Baybars and Nuwarîy, ibid.). As for the Anatolian Turks who were said to come with Saru Şaltuk in Dobrudja in this period, we are now in a position to assert after F. Witterk's comparative study of the original Turkish account of Yaradîjlîgölü 'Ali with the Byzantine sources (Yaradîjlîgölü 'Ali on the Christian Turks of Dobrudja, in BSOAS, xiv (1952), 639-68) that these came actually to settle in Dobrudja after 662/1263-4 with Sultan 'iz al-Dîn Kaykâus who was then a refugee in Byzantium. Michael VIII Palaeologus gave permission to Kaykâus's followers in Anatolia to come to settle in Dobrudja, then a no-man's-land between the Golden Horde, Bulgaria and the Byzantine empire (the arguments of P. Mutafciev, Überschreitung der Argumente von Togan, in Die angebliche Einwanderung von Seljuk-Türken in die Dobrudsha im XIII. Jahrh., in Bulg. Acad. Sci. Lett., lvii/1, 2, are not valid after Witterk's study; cf. also H. von Duda, Zeitgenössische islamische Quellen und das Opusname des Jazygyoghî 'Ali..., ibid., 131-45; see also Adnan S. Erzi, in IA, v, 270). These Muslim Turks from Anatolia, mostly nomads, formed there "two or three towns and 30-40 oba, clans" (Yaradîjlîgölü in Witterk, 648; von Duda, 144). Abu '1-Fida's note about the majority of the population of 'Sakdîl' being Muslims (Geographie, ed. Reinaud and de Slane, Paris 1840, 34) apparently referred to them rather than the Tatars settled under Noghay. With his headquarters in Sakdîl Noghay, then converted to Islam, must have become after Berke Khan's death (665/1267), cf. Spuler, the protector of the Anatolian Turks in Dobrudja (cf. Z. V. Togan, ibid.). It is interesting to note that the emigration of them back to Anatolia about 766/1365 followed the death of Noghay and the arrival of Tutkal Bogha, apparently a pagan like his father Tobgut Khan. In 699/1300 Noghay's son Ceke too was killed by Svetoslav in Bulgaria. Yaradîjlîgölü noted (Witterk, 651) that these Turks decided to emigrate because the Bulgarian princes had risen up and occupied the larger part of Rumelia. Those who remained, he added, became Christians. These people of Kaykâus were, as Witterk demonstrated after Balasçev, named Ghâghauz after their lord Kaykâus (cf. Witterk, ibid., 686). But in 732/1332 Baba Şaltuk (later Baba-dagh) was, Ibn Batuta reported (Voyages, ii, 416; English trans. Gibb, ii, Cambridge 1959, 499), an important town possessed by the Turks. By 766/1365 an independent despotate under a Christianized Turkish family rose in the part of Dobrudja where the Gagauz always lived (in the Ottoman defter of 1006/1598, Tapu Kadastro Um. Md, Ankara, no. 399, some Christians in the area still bore Turkish names such as Arslan, Karagöz). Balki (578/1187) (also Balka; the name is Cuman name, cf. L. Rasonyi-Nagy, ibid.) identified it with the Rumanian Balita; Notes d'un historien, in Acad.
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Roum. Bull. Sec. His. ii-iv (1913), 97. Colpan, an important man under the son of Dobrotisch, bore the name of Varna a despotate independent of Byzantium and Bulgaria. Its capital was at Kalliakra by 765/1362 to 767/1366 (Neshri, 68). It is most likely that Dobrotisch too had accepted Ottoman suzerainty as had Shishman since 773/1371. Under Yanko (in 758/1357, A eta Patr. Const., ii, Bucarest 1958, 242). Then Yanko who had refused to join as his vassals the Wallachians, attempted to take Kilia while the raiders devastated the land of Dobrudja. According to a Turkish source (des Roumains, i, 375, and iii, 401-2, GOR, Hist, des Roumanes, iii, 385, 386). Siileyman, Bayezid's successor in Rumeli, appears then to have recognized the fact. But soon the akindjis renewed their raids against Mirkca (Neshri, 150; P. §. Nastrul, Studia et Acta Orientalia, i, Bucarest 1958, 242). To free himself of them Mirkca invited and gave his support to Mousa Celebi, Suleyman's brother and ruler (Neshri, 130; P. F. Panaitescu, Mircja 1e Bdtam, Bucarest 1961, 214). The akindjis joined Mousa against Suleyman, and left Mirkca alone. In 819/1416 he supported Mufjafa, another pretender, and Sheyh Badr al-Din against Mehmed I (q.v.) in Dobrudja and Deli Orman. The akindjis, akindji leaders, ruled over large numbers of the akindji leaders, Sufi dervishes who were in this akind area in great numbers joined them (cf. §. Yaltkaya, Seryk Bedredin's dar bir biktaap, in TM, iii, 251; Ordu, ed. Fr. Babinger, 45, ii, 111). Though in their official titles Mirkca and Mihai, his successor, always mentioned 'the two sides of the Danube' among their possessions it was apparent that Dobrudja and Silistre were then actually in the hands of the akindjis, who in their antipathy toward Mehmed I must have continued their friendly relations with the Wallachian voivodas. Mirkca's death (819/1416) Yanko and the ensuing confusion provided the Sultan with the opportunity to establish his control in Dobrudja in 822/1419. After he subdued his rivals in Anatolia, the Djandarids and then the Karamandid (see Karaman oglu), Mehmed I organized a large-scale expedition against Wallachia in which both Anatolian principalities sent auxiliary forces. An Ottoman fleet participated in the operations. In the summer of 822/1419 he crossed the Danube, captured and fortified Yergogi (Giurgiu) and attempted to take Kilia while the raiders devastated the enemy's country. Mihai first took refuge in Arges and then perished in an skirmish. Before his return the Sultan strengthened Sakgji and Yeni-Sale against future attacks of the Wallachians. No mention is made of Silistre during this expedition. Dan I, the new Voyvoda, recognized Ottoman suzerainty, though the Emperor Sigismund had started southwards with the intention of invading the Dobrudja. He was delayed by the Ottoman action against Severin (autumn 822/1419). (Iorga, GOR, i, 375, and Hist. des Roumanes, iii, 401-2, dates this expedition 820/1417. In this year Mehmed I was at war against the Karaman oglu in Anatolia, cf. Ibn Hadjar, text in §. Inalci, Ibn Hacer'de Osmanlilara dair haberler, AÜDTCC Dergisi, vi/5, 525. Following Neshri's confused chronology, Uzuinclari, Osmanls tarixi, i, new ed. Ankara 1961, 356; and A. Decei, IA, iii, 615, adopted 819/1416 as the date of the expedition against Wallachia. For our dating see further O. Turan, Tarshhi tahvimler, Ankara 1954, 20, 56; Atsu, Osmanl1s tarixi, i, 356, 357; Sudan gazetesi, Istanbul 1961, 20; Ibn Hadjar, ibid., the years 821/1418 and 822/1419; and a letter of Mehmed I to the Mamlik Sultan in Feridun, Munsh6d'i al-salldr, ii, 164-5). The Wallachians under Dan attempted to take Silistre during the period of the renewed civil war in the Ottoman empire in 825/1422 (Iorga, Hist. des Roumanes, iv, 20; Neshri, 154; 1Ashtipaghazade, ed. 1950, 205). Against him Firuz (Periz) Beg was appointed in this expedition (q.v.).

Firmly established in Dobrudja since Mehmed I's expedition in 822/1419, the Ottomans used it as
a base to extend their control on the other side of the Danube. The imperial army under Mehemmed II invaded Bohgdan [g.v.] in 881/1476, passing through Dobrudja (see MEHEMMED II). Bayezid II using the same route took Kilia and Akkerman in 889/1484. During this expedition he built the great mosque and the zawiya of Şarş Saltuk in Baba Kapabasi (Babadagh) and endowed them with all the tax revenues of the town and surrounding villages (for these endowments a waṣf defteri exists in the Tapu ve Kadastro Um. Md., Ankara, nos. 397). In his expedition against Bohgdan in 945/1538 Süleyman I too showed the same interest in this pre-Ottoman Islamic centre (cf. Feridun, i, 602-3).

According to the defters (see DAPÇAR-I KHAN) of the 10th/16th century (in the Bayzekdiet Archives Istanbul, Tapu nos. 65, 542, 688, 304, 483, 732, and, in Tapu ve Kadastro Um. Md., Ankara, nos. 397, 398, 399) the sandjak of Silistre and Akkerman comprised the kadın of Akkerman, Djankerman, Kili, Bendi, Isakdji, Kavarna and Kavarnovo in the nahiyes of Varna, Pravadi, Yanbolu, Abu, Ra, Karin-abâd and Aydos. Balchik, Kavarna and Kavarnovo were included in the nahiye of Varna. The Ottomans applied in Dobrudja typical Ottoman laws and regulations with special provisions for such groups as çığkındıjs, müsellerem, Dilbeli-Tatars, Matrak-Tatarlar, djebel-Tatars, which provided an auxiliary force to the Ottoman army under a Crimean prince (Mustecib H. Fazl, DRUŠICA ve Türkler, Köstence 1940, 36). In 1007/1599 Baldasarius Walther reported that in the plain of Dobrudja lived 6000 Tatar families, Dobrudja Tartarlar, who provided an auxiliary force to the Ottoman army under a Crimean prince (Müstecheb H. Fazl, ibid., 37).

In the regions of Tekfur-gölü, Hırsıova, Silistre and Varna also lived the Yurük [g.v.] groups: those of Kınasqalı 44 odaqlık, each odaqlık being regularly 30 men, Naj-doken 34 odaqlık, Tash-doken about 95 odaqlık by 1009/1600 (cf. T. Gökbilgin, ibid., 56, 70, 76, 212-30). Each odaqlık furnished five fighters for the army.

Turkish Muslims made up, in the countryside too, the majority of the population. The study of personal names and village names (the above mentioned defters are müfassal defters in which the names of the heads of the households are recorded) shows that an overwhelming majority of the villages were the new ones founded by the Turkish Muslim immigrants from Anatolia. We know that the Ottoman state made from the early conquest onwards forced settlements of Anatolian Turks in this important udı area (cf. Barkan, Kanunlar, 273, 274).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Number of Muslim districts</th>
<th>Number of non-Muslim districts</th>
<th>Tax revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silistre</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isakçı</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maçın</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baba</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hırsıova</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekfur-gölü</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balchik</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavarna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pazarlıq</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56 families of uzdu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalıakra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dervishes in the zawiya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As separate small communities gypsies lived in all these towns. They were mostly Christians. Only in Silistre 21 Jewish families were recorded. Here is a table of the ports in Dobrudja with their revenues from the dues on fish, salt, mills and the customs dues:
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that they considered it as an important ud/i area, and the Anatolian immigrants were encouraged to engage in agriculture by the increasing demand for wheat. Muslim and Christian Turks and Wallachians settled in the Dobrudja from the east of Silistria to the south of Mangalya were annexed to Romania. The rest of the Dobrudja made the part of the Prin cipality of Bulgaria under Ottoman suzerainty (Art. 1-2). Under the Romanian administration emigrations of Muslim population into Turkey continued especially in 1300/1883 when these were subjected to compulsory military service and in 1317/1899 during the famine in the Dobrudja (M. H. Fazil, 109-10). In 1338/1910 in the Romanian Dobrudja only thirty per cent of a population of 210,000 and in the Bulgarian Dobrudja forty per cent of a population of 257,000 were Muslim Turks and Tatars.
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The Bayvakelet Archives, Istanbul, Tapu Defterleri, nos. 304, 483, 732; Tapu ve Kadastiro Um. Md., Ankara, Kwadi-Kadime, nos. 9, 390; i, 556; v, 333). The towns of Hadjoğlu Pazarlık, Mangalya and Baba with their weekly fairs were important trade centres for the whole region (cf. Ewliya Celebi, Seyyahname, iii, Istanbul 1314, 392-71).

From 983/1575 onwards Cossack attacks became a constant threat to Dobrudja. In 995/1587 they burned down Baba (Babadag). In 1003/1595 Mihai, the rebellious Voyvoda of Wallachia, supported by the Cossacks, renewed Mircea's attacks on the Ottoman cities and fortresses in Dobrudja and caused a mass emigration (cf. A. Decei, in Hist. A., iii, 637). The continuing Cossack threat made the Ottoman government decide to create a new eyalet including the sandjaks of the Eastern Black Sea with Silistre and Özü as its capitals (cf. A. I. Manof, Gagauzlar, Acad. Roumaine, Bull. sect, hist., ii-iv (1914), 289-307; idem, Dobrotich, Dobrotich, in Rev. hist. du Sud-Est Européen, v (1928); Documente privind Istoria României, A. Moldova, i, Bucarest 1954 (the text of the treaty between Ivanco and the Genoese, 296-302); G. I. Bratianu, Recherches sur Vicina et Cetatea Alba, Bucarest 1935; Ewliya Celebi, Seyyahname, iii, Istanbul 1314 H., 335-75; Analale Dobrogei, publ. in Constanta since 1929; I.A, art. Dobruca (Aurel Decei). See also BABA-DAGI, DELI ORMAN, GAGAUZ, SARİ SALTİK (SarU DOGAR [see ZAFAR].

**DOGAR** [see ZAFAR].

**DOG** [see KALB].

**DÖGER**, name of an Oğuz tribe (boy). They are mentioned in the Oğuz-name (the account of the life of the Oğuz people before they embraced Islam, see F. Sümür, Ögösler’a ait distant mahiyet eserleri, in Ank. Ün. DTCD, xv/iii-1934), where it is said that some prominent beys of the Oğuz rulers belonged to this tribe. According to the Syrian historian Şams al-Din Muhammad al-Dižari (658/1260-739/1338), the Artuk dynasty, ruling the Mardin-Diyarbekir region, belonged to the Döger tribe (F. Sümür, op. cit., iv, 172; must therefore have taken part in the conquest of the Seljuk Sultanate in the first half of the 8th/13th century an important branch of the Döger was living south of Urfa (Edessa) and
around Dja'bar; their leader was, in 773/1371-2, a bey named Salim.

Salim played a part in the events of North Syrian history and died towards the end of the century. Three sons of his are known. Dimaşq, Ködja, probably the eldest, was in 801/1398 appointed na'dib of Dja'bar by the Mamlûk Sultan; profiting from the anarchy left by Tlmur’s invasion, he brought under his control also Rakka, Sarudj, Harran, Urfa and Silerek, but was killed in battle with the famous Arab Amir Nu‘ayr (Muhammd b. Mu‘annâ) and his head was sent to Cairo (806/1404). He was succeeded by his brother Gökçe Müsä, his brother-in-law, and finally Dimaşq, was hostile to the Ak-koyunlu and friendly with the Kara-koynulu: in 807/1405 he entertained at Dja'bar the Kara-koynulu ruler Kara Yusuf, who was travelling home from Syria; he assisted the Kara-koynulu in various campaigns, helping Kara Yusuf’s son Iskender to defeat Kara Yûlûk ‘Otha’mân in the battle fought at Sheykh-kendi (between Mardin and Naşûbîn) in 824/1421. In 840/1436 he defeated Kara Yûlûk’s grandson, ‘Ali Beg-oghlu Djihângir, and sent him prisoner to Cairo, but died in the same year. Thereafter, under pressure from the Ak-koynulu, the Dja’bar lost even Dja’bar; their leader was, in 773/1371-2, a bey named Salim.

Salim’s lifetime his younger brother Hasan Beg had entered the service of the Mamlûk Sultan and became na’dib of ‘Âdilûn; Hasan’s son Amrîzâ was na’dib of Karkî in 890/1485.

Apart from Salim’s family, other beys of the Dja’bar—‘Ali, Muhammed and Katî—are found in Syria as leaders of Dja’bar clans among the Turkmen of Haleb; Katî was in 857/1453 na’dib of Buçhâyra for the Mamlûks. In the time of Suleyman I, the Dja’bar of Syria were divided in three clans (oymak) in the regions of Haleb, Hamî and Dimaşq. The tax registers show two small groups in Jerusalem residing in the Bâb al-‘Amûd and Bânû Zayd quarters (cf. B. Lewis in BSOAS, vi/3 (1954), 479). Other clans were found around Dîyarbîrek, among the Boz-Ulus (one remnant of the Ak-koynulu confederacy), at Karkîk, and even among the Turkish tribes in Persia. In the 10th/11th century the name Dja’bar was found in many toponyms, few of which have survived.


DOGHANDJÎ, Turkish term for falconer, from doghan, falcon (toğan in Kipcak Turkish, cf. al-Tuha al-zahiriya fi ‘l-ğha al-Turkıyya, ed. B. Atalay, Istanbul 1945, 260), and in general use any kind of bird of prey. Bâzîdurr, from Persian, was also frequently used for the doghandji.

In the Ottoman empire the term doghandji, in the same sense as in later periods was found as early as the 8th/14th century (cf. P. Wittek, Zu einigen frühosmanischen Urkunden, in WZKM, ix (1957), 240; Bvi (1961), 103; for doghandji lüfti see H. İnalıoğlu, Sâret-i defter-i sancaks-i Artuwin, Ankara 1954, 105).

Hawking, a favourite traditional sport at the Ottoman court, gave rise to a vast organization in the empire. There were doghandjîs at the Enderûn and the Birûn (q.v.), and in the provinces. The doghandjîs at the Enderûn, under a doghandî-bashi, were found in the different odas (chambers). They accompanied the Sultan in his hunting parties. Their number varied according to the reigning Sultan’s care for the sport (nine in 883/1478, forty in the early 17th century, cf. I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osmanî devletinin saray teşkilatı, Ankara 1945, 422-23).

At the Birûn the doghandjîs, generally called shîkâr hâkîlî, made three different dijma’ât, groups, divided into bûlûks, cbâhrîgîyân, şakîngîyân and âmadjâdiyân, those taking care of bâhûrs, merlins and falcons, of şâhîn, peregrine falcons, and of âmadjâd, sparrow-hawks. They were under a cbâhrîgî-bashi, a şakîngî-bashi and an âmadjâdi-bashi respectively. The cbâhrîgî-bashi (q.v.) was the head of the whole organization, and in this capacity he was usually called mîr-i shîkâr. In the hierarchy of agâhs at the Birûn he stood in the fourth grade, the first being yenicerî-agâhs (cf. Kitânîmâne-i Âl-i ‘Othmân, ed. M. Ârif, in TOEM, 1330 H., appendix, 12). When promoted, the cbâhrîgî-bashi was made sandâq-begi under Mehemmed II (ibid., 13), and beglerbegi in the 11th/17th century. The şakîngî-bashi was then made cbâhrîgî-bashi, and the doghandî-bashi from the Enderûn şakîngî-bashi. The doghandjîs at the court all received ‘ulûfe, salary (cf. Ô. L. Barkan, H. 933-934 malt yîhna ait 15 H. 1330 H., TOEM, 260, 272, 280, 331). But in the 10th/16th century the name doghandjîs or bâzîdurr, cbâhrîgîs, şakîngîs and âmadjâdiyân under a doghandî-bashi. Their number with their dependents reached 2171 persons in Anatolia and 1520 in Rumeli in 972/1564 (Defter-i bâzîdûrîn-i vilayet-i Rumeli ve anadolu ve şeyhîrîn, in Belediye Küttîphanesi, Istanbul, Cevdet Kitaplarî, O 60. This important source gives in igmal, summary, the number of doghandjîs and the copies of the kümak, decrees, on them). They formed large groups especially in the sandjâks of Gallipoli (642), Vidin (706), Menteşeh (503), Mârâş (770) and Kârî (537). The local doghandî-bashi were appointed by the cbâhrîgî-bashi and were given timârs (q.v.). Under each doghandî-bashi there were two hânîs, şakîngîs, cbâhrîgîs (apparently from şare, wild) and mîr-i shikhân (q.v.) also held timârs and were in charge of training and taking to the court the birds of prey caught in their areas.

Under the doghandî-bashi there was a group of doghandîs living in the villages who were originally re’âyîs (q.v.), Christian and Muslim, to provide birds of prey. They were assigned to this service by the Sultan’s diploma, doghandî benî, which granted the possession for cultivation of a piece of land called doghandî ciftîlî or doghandî bâshînah (see ciftîlî) with the exemption from ‘ışshît, cbîrmîs (q.v.) and ‘awâmîr (q.v.) taxes. They paid the bîd-i hawâ (q.v.) taxes to their doghandî-bashi or to the Sultan’s collectors directly. If they cultivated any land outside their ciftîlîs they had to pay in addition the regular re’âyî taxes for it to the land-holder. Their sons had the right of inheritance on the ciftîlîs and, in their turn, became doghandîs (for all these cf. Ô. L. Barkan, Kanunlar, Istanbul 1943, 20, 272, 274, 280, 331). But in the 10th/16th century the re’âyî who were made doghandîs only one generation before were not granted these exemptions. The doghandîs of re’âyî origin were divided into different groups according to the kind of bird of prey they were to catch or train as bâzîdurr, cbâhrîgîs, şakîngîs or âmadjâdiyân. Also according to their functions they were divided into yavuzís, nest-tenders. The latter were in their
Turn divided into kayadís and dîdebanís, i.e., those who discovered the nests in the mountains and guarded them, and tuhákígis, those taking care of the nests in the mountains. The kayadís or yuwaadís delivered to the birds to the local doghandí-bâshî who were given a míhíralí tekbhiré certificate of delivery. Then at a certain time of the year the doghandí-bâshî and khasa doghandís took the birds to Istanbul to deliver to the akhrí-bâshî. Anybody who took a bird of prey from the guarded places or through a jayyád had to pay a fine of 500 akçe to the treasury. The ordinary ré'dây and 'ashteri were forbidden to hunt birds of prey.

From the 11th/17th century onward, the doghandí organization in the provinces was neglected, and, in most places, abolished. The doghandís were returned to the status of simple ré'dây with the abolition of their exemptions. But the organization in general survived until Rabî II 1246/September-October 1830 when Mahmûd II abolished it altogether.

(Hâhil Inâlcik)

DOLMA BAĞÇE [see İstanbul].

DONANMA, 'a deckling out, an adorning', Turkish verbal noun derived ultimately from ton, 'clothes'. The word is used in Ottoman Turkish in two restricted meanings:

(1) 'fleet of ships, navy' (presumably a calque of Itál. 'armata'), for which see art. BAHRIYYA, iii (adding to bibliography H. and R. Kahane and A. Tietze, The Lingua Franca in the Levant, Urbana 1958, 1-45).

(2) 'decoration of the streets of a city' (synonyms: şenilik, şehr-dým), for which see art. BAHRIYYA, iii (adding to bibliography H. and R. Kahane and A. Tietze, The Lingua Franca in the Levant, Urbana 1958, 1-45).

DONBOLİ [see KURDS].

DONGOLA (Arabic, Dunkula, Dunkulâ; obsolete forms, Dunkula, Damkala), the name of two towns in Nubia; more generally, the riverain territory dependent on these towns. All lie within the present Republic of the Sudan. The arabized Nubians of Dongola are called Danâlâ, a regional, not a tribal, designation.

(1) Old Dongola (Dunkula al-şajlûz), on the right bank of the Nile, is on the site of a pre-Islamic town, the capital of the Christian kingdom of al-Makûrra. It was besieged by an army under 'Abd Allâh b. Sa'd b. Abî Sarh [q.v.] in 31/652, but the Muslims withdrew after concluding a convention (bakâ, [q.v.]) which regulated relations between Nubia and Egypt for some six centuries. Mediaeval Dongola is described as a walled city with many churches, large houses and wide streets. The royal palace with domes of red brick was constructed in 392/1002. Within the royal residence (mudir) were added O. G. S. Crawford, The Fung kingdom of Senaar, Gloucester 1951, especially 33-6. Old Dongola in 1698 was described by Ch. J. Poncet, A voyage to Ethiopia, London 1709; reprinted by Sir William Foster (ed.), The Red Sea and adjacent countries at the close of the seventeenth century, (Hakluyt Society, Second Series, no. C); London 1949, 99-100. It was described in 1821 by L. M. A. Linant de Bellefonds, Journal d'un voyage à Méroud, (ed. M. Shinnie), Khartoum 1958, 32-4.

The official correspondence of the Mahdist period is preserved in the Sudan Government Archives in Khartoum.

(P. M. Holt)

DÖNME (Turkish: convert) name of a sect in Turkey formed by Jews upon their conversion to Islam late in the 11th/17th century in emulation of Shabbetai Tzvi whom they considered the Messiah.

The sect emerged out of mystic speculations justifying the conversion of Jews to Islam as a link in the chain of Messianic events, and served as a means to consolidate those who wished to emulate and remain faithful to the converted Messiah, even after his death. It attempted, in the spirit of the Messiah, to maintain secretly within Islam as much as possible of Judaism, its lore and rites, with sabbatian-messianic modifications. In the course of time the original concepts of the stormy period of messianism and conversion were largely blurred and forgotten, and the life of the group expressed itself in ritual peculiarities, social welfare activity, and basic devotion to the memory of the Messiah in expectation of his reincarnation or second advent, with subsequent dissensions concerning rightful succession to leadership.

Thus, intermarriage with Muslims was avoided; the fast-day commemoration of the destruction of the Temple (9th of Ab) became a day of rejoicing as the birthday of the Messiah; some knowledge of Hebrew was maintained; outward conformity with Islamic rites was encouraged while, in secret, Hebrew names were preserved and separate marriage and burial rites were observed. The group conversion took place, it seems, in Salonika in 1094/1683. Salonika became the centre of Judaism in the town, and the community maintained its identity and separate identity and life as, during the Condominium, it was fused with Wâdi Halfa and Beber [q.v.] to form the Northern Province.


The official correspondence of the Mahdist period is preserved in the Sudan Government Archives in Khartoum.

(P. M. Holt)
but there were branches in Edirne, İzmir, later İstanbul, and in Albania.

Inner squabbles, mostly engendered by various pretenders to Messianic succession and leadership, brought about the split into three sub-sects (the names vary: the recent being Hamdibeyler, Karakas, Kapancilar) all refusing intermarriage. This division may have been not unrelated to social divisions, and expressed itself in peculiarities of hairstyle and garb. The Dönme lived in separate quarters.

The sect considered itself the community of the believers (ma'amim). It maintained strict secrecy. After the initial period, its literary output appears to have shrunk to poems and prayers in Hebrew, Aramaic, Judeo-Spanish, and Turkish. Paucity of sources and secretiveness combine to make the study of the sect difficult, and its history obscure.

Around 1900, there were a few hundred families belonging to the central Salonika group. About 1900, the number of that group was estimated at 10,000. They were represented in trade, crafts, and the civil service.

Toward the end of the 19th century, a growing new layer of westernized young people came to the fore as teachers, doctors, lawyers, journalists, and these took part in Turkish public life, sometimes with considerable success. Most spectacular was the rise of İkândi Bey [q.v.] in the Young Turkish regime of 1908-09.

On the whole the Muslims were indifferent to the sect's existence, but from time to time there was a spurt of inquiry or persecution (e.g., in 1720, 1859, and 1875). Imputing Dönme origin to undesirables was not unknown.

A new phase began for the Dönme when, with the Graeco-Turkish exchange of population, the Salonika Dönme were forced to quit their ancestral town and to move into the Turkish Republic (1923-24). They settled mostly in İstanbul, smaller groups settling also in other cities. This change of domicile, the dispersal that followed, the loss of contact with the solid Jewish atmosphere of Salonika, the influence of the secular Turkish national school—all contributed to a growing loss of cohesion and indifference among the younger generation of the Dönme, although groups continued to exist in the area of social welfare, continued. The arrival in İstanbul of several thousand Dönme stimulated a discussion of sectarian segregation versus national assimilation in the Turkish press in 1924-5. Intermarriage with Muslims is slowly spreading and complete integration into modern Turkish society, despite setbacks, is on the increase.

Bibliography: Accounts will be found in the general works on Jewish history by H. Graetz, S. Dubnow, S. W. Baron. G. Scholem's capital researches on Jewish mysticism are summarized in the sketch included in The Jewish people, i, New York 1948; idem, Main trends in Jewish mysticism, New York 1941, esp. 267-282; idem, Shabbatāi Zebi (Hebrew), 2 vols., Tel Aviv 1957; idem, articles in Encyclopaedia Hebraica (xi, 1959, i. Ben Zvi), and IA iii, 646 ff.; i. Ben Zvi, The exiled and the redeemed, Philadelphia 1957; A. Danon, in REJ 1897; L. Sciaky, Farewell to Salonica, New York 1946, Ch. 9; A. Struck, in Globus 1902; A. Galante, Nouveaux documents sur Shabbatāi Zebi, Istanbul 1935; E. E. Rasmussen Jr., The Young Turks, Princeton 1957, 96 ff., 108 ff. Turkish reactions are reflected in A. Güvès, Sabatayt Sevi, Istanbul 1960; idem, and W. Gord-levsky's paper in Islamica, ii, 1926. Dönme texts have been published by M. Altas, I. Ben Zvi, R. Molho, G. Scholem; cf. Šefunot, iii, Jerusalem 1960.

DONMÜ [see MISRABA].
DOST MUHAMMAD [see DÖST MUHAMMAD].
DOUAR [see DAWAR].
DOWRY [see MAHR].
DRA'A [see DAR'].

DRAČ (DRAČ, DURĂ), Slavonic and hence Ottoman name for the classical Dyrrhachium (med. Latin Duraziacum, Ital. Durazzo, Alb. Durës), the principal port of modern Albania (41° 18' N., 19° 26' E.). The classical town was founded (c. 625 B.C.) under the name Epidamnus at the southern end of a narrow rocky peninsula (once an island) running parallel to the mainland coast, to which it was connected in antiquity at the North by a sand-spit and at the South by a bridge; the lagoon so enclosed has progressively contracted over the centuries. In Roman times, now known (perhaps after the Illyrian name of the peninsula) as Dyrrhachium, to its commercial prosperity was added immense strategic importance as the starting-point of the Via Egnatia, the continuation, after the short and easy sea-crossing from Brundisium, of the Via Appia, and the principal military road between Italy and the East. Hence in Byzantine times too Dyrrhachium was strongly fortified as the Western gateway to the Empire.

After falling to Venice at the partition of 1205, Dyrrhachium changed masters repeatedly, to be ceded to Venice in 1392 by the native Thopia dynasty, who were no longer able to protect it against the Ottomans. The Venetians rebuilt the walls on a narrower circuit and made vigorous but fruitless attempts to scour the lagoon, in order to arrest the silting of the harbour and the spread of malaria. During Mehmed II's Albanian campaign of 1467, Durazzo, practically deserted by its terrified inhabitants, escaped a determined assault (see F. Babinger, Mahomet II le Conquérant et son temps, Paris 1914, 311-3); the end came only in 1501 (17 August), when, the governor being temporarily absent, Durazzo fell to a night-attack by Ša Bag-oglu Mehmed Beg, sandjak-bey of the nearby Elbasan (Sa'd al-Din, ii, 113-4, following the contemporary account of Idris Bidili). Thereafter Durazzo was administered as a kad'a of Elbasan [q.v.]; its walls were reconstructed to enclose a still smaller area (600 m. x 250 m.) in the South-East corner of the antique city, leaving the ancient acropolis outside the enceinte.

Under the Ottomans practically nothing of Durazzo's old importance remained. Ewliya (1670) describes a small town of 150 houses with only one mosque; it had still (as in mediaeval times) a considerable salt industry and a not insignificant trade, and was administered as a voyvodalik under an emin (who, with the külli, resided at the more salubrious Kavaya, 20 kms. to, the South-East).

Durazzo's modern prosperity began shortly before the Second World War, with the construction by Italy of a first-class harbour; now linked by rail with Tirana and Elbasan, it has developed considerably both as a port and as a holiday-resort (pop. 30,000).

Bibliography: Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Dyrhachia (Philippson); K. Jireček, Die Lage und Vergangenheit der Stadt Durazzo in Albanien, in L. von und zu Kemnitz, Illyrische Forschungen, i, 1916, 152-7; L. Heuzey, Mission archéologique de Macédoine, Paris 1876, 349-92 and
plan; Ewliya Celebi, Seyidhatndme, viii, 710-2 = F. Babinger's abridged trans. and comm., MSOS, xxxiii (1930) 166 (with further references); H. Hecquard, Histoire et description de la Haute Albanie ou Géorgie, Paris 1858, 258-63; Baedeker's Dalmatien und die Adria, 1929, 235-6 (F. Babinger); Enc. II., s.v. Durazzo; S. Skendi (ed.), Albania, London 1957; Guide d'Albanie (Albturist), Tirana 1958, 166-73; ATL. AKNAWUTLJ above.

(V. L. Ménage)

DRAÇUT [see TURGHUD 3 ALI PASHA].

DRAÇA [see MASRAH].

DREAMS [see TA'BIR AL-RU'YA].

DRESS [see LIPAS].

DRUZES [see DURUZ].

DU'â', appeal, invocation (addressed to God) either on behalf of another or for oneself (âi..., or else against someone (allâ...); hence: prayer of invocation, calling either for blessing, or for imprecation and cursing, connected with the Semantic function of the descriptive effective value of the spoken word. Cf. Kûrân XVII, 11: "Man prays for evil as he prays for good."—Du'â therefore will have the same sense of personal addressed to God, and can often be translated as "prayer of request".

1. The scope and practice of du'â. 1. In the Kûrân, du'â always keeps its original meaning of invocation, appeal, Man "appeals" for good fortune (XXI, 49), and "when misfortune visits him, he is filled with unceasing prayer (du'â')" (ibid., 51). To practise du'â is to raise one's supplications to God; du'â here assumes the general meaning of "prayer", of two categories in particular: (a) prayer (and especially prayer of request) made by the pre-Islamic worthy men and prophets; (b) the vain prayer of the infidels. In the first case, God is He who hears, who answers the du'â; it was so for Abraham (XIV, 39-40; XIX, 48) and for Zachariah (III, 38). In the second case, "the prayer of the infidels is but vanity" (XIII, 14; cf. XLVI, 5); and the false gods hear not part of the prayer addressed to them (XXV, 14, etc.).—Some shades of meaning should be distinguished: thus, in verse XXV, 77 (addressed to the opponents), du'â evokes any relationship of man to God; "Save my Lord will not become anxious save through your prayer"; whilst, XIX, 40, repeating a saying of Abraham, distinguishes between salât, a ritual and liturgical prayer to be "performed", and du'â, prayer, personal invocation: "Lord, make of me one who performs the salât and let it be so for my posterity, O Lord, and accept my prayer (du'â')".

2. There are numerous hadîths which speak of du'â. Traditionists and jurists define its significance, the principal ones being reproduced by al-Ghazâlî, Ihâyâ 'usîm al-dîn (Cairo 1352), i, 274-8. — Tradition attributed to 'All: "my followers are those who have taken the earth as their carpet, their water as their perfume, prayer (du'â) as their adornment".

Du'â must be clearly distinguished from salât, vocal fixed prayer, and du'â', mental prayer or orison. Ibn Taymiyya (Fâlâtû, Cairo 1326, i, 197) proposes this scale of values: "the salât constitutes a form (djina) which is superior to Kûrânic recitation (birda); recitation in itself is superior to dhâhir, and dhâhir to individual invocation (du'â')" (from the trans. of Laoust, Essai sur les doctrines sociales et politiques de Takl-d-Dîn Ahmad b. Taimûr, Cairo 1939, 328-9). A critical enumeration frequently mentions salât, dhâhir [q.v.] (incessant repetition, ejaculatory prayer), dhâhir and wîrd (supererogatory "liturgies"), du'â. Inward prayer would be suggested rather by the root and jhâr (meditation), du'â always connoting the idea of a formulated request, of an invocation either beneficent or imprecatory.

3. The request addressed to God in the du'â can be greatly varied according to the circumstances. It is in this sense that it is legitimate to translate it (cf. translation from Laoust above) as "personal invocation"; it can also assume a communal value and aspect. The choice of words is free, but Kurânic texts or traditional prayers already in existence will often be used.

Treatises which recommend du'â, and especially the Sûfis treatises, like to define the conditions which must accompany it and the rules of its adab. Both of these seek to provide a maximum guarantee of its being received by God. A brief summary (al-Bâdûjî, Fâhîshâ «... 'allâ suckrat al-tsâkit, Cairo 1355/1934, 90-1) gives them as follows. (a) Conditions: to eat only food that is legally permitted; to pray, feeling convinced that the prayer will be answered; not to be distracted during prayer; that any sinful act, or give rise to enmity between those of the same blood, or harm Muslims' rights; and finally, not to ask for anything impossible, for that would be a lack of respect for God's power, or would be a lack of need. (b) Adab (how to pray): to choose the best times, and al-Bâdûjî suggests during the sujdâd, when one is prostrate, or while standing upright (kibâma), or during the summons to prayer (âdâbâh); to precede the du'â with ablutions and the salât on the one hand, and on the other with a confession of faults and an act of repentance; to turn towards the kibla; to raise the hands towards heaven (rafâ al-yadâyûn); to pronounce the "divine praise" (al-handsu il'îlãh) and the "blessing on the Prophet" at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of the du'â.

These detailed recommendations are in some measure "advisory". In some cases, however, when the object of the du'â concerns the common good of the Community, it assumes a ritual, set form recognized by all; in these circumstances it makes use of the procedure for salât. The most notable example is that of the istiškâh ("prayer for rain"): for this, the du'â must be preceded by a ritual prayer of two rakûnas [q.v.], two khaibas ("sermons"), and the rite (sympathetic magic) of the "turning of the cloak". The "prayer for the dead" made communally (frequently during the "sessions" of the brotherhoods) also obeys various regulations.

These conditions and rules for the du'â are intended to surround it with guarantees of efficacy. And we see that to the power of the word there are added the effective forces of legal purity and of gesture. This last point provides matter for discussion. Texts which widely recommend the practice of du'â speak constantly of ablation and the rafî al-yadâyûn; in doing so they rely on hadîths before raising his hands in the du'â the Prophet had performed the ablation of wudâ (al-Bukhârî, Maghâzi, ii, 53). But al-Nâsâ'î and Ibn Hanbal (ii, 243) only accept the raising of the hands in the du'â of the "prayer for rain".

4. Islamic devotional trends insist on the du'â as being regarded as a prayer of request for well-being, especially the public weal of the Muslim community, and the personal spiritual well-being of oneself and others. Beautiful du'â texts are not rare in Shi'î works of piety. The popular pietism of the
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Hanbalis often mentions it. It is to be seen mingled with the liturgies of hizb and wîrd in the handbooks of the religious brotherhoods. It is, then, much less an appeal of invocation (and of imprecation, especially) than an appeal trusting in the Divine Mercy. It is in this way that the utterance of the divine Names can turn either to the metrical repetition of the dhîkr or to a form of du\\u0627d\\u0646 which links its request with the evocation of each Name and each attribute, and thereby defines it; in this connexion, see the monograph written in the last century by Muhammad 'Ali Râqîâm al-Bukhârî, Klîbî mânhîyat al-sarîf fi shârîf al-du\\u0627d\\u0646 (ed. Haydarâbâd, 1337). The du\\u0627d\\u0646 becomes an equivalent of the spiritual impulse towards God.

II.—Questions raised in kalâm and falsafa.

The inculcation value and the effectiveness of word and gesture was no doubt the first consideration in the idea of du\\u0627d\\u0646, and derived from a Semitic understanding of the relation of man to what is holy. But the Hellenistic influence which moulded Muslim thought encouraged falsafa on one hand, and the 'ilm al-kalâm ("theology" or, more accurately defensive apology) on the other, to raise the question of the prayer of request and of its efficacy before the Almighty and the Decree of God.

The reply varies according to the school and the writer. Here are three typical examples. (A summary of the principles of kalâm is given by al-Bâdhîrî, loc. cit., among others).

(a). The Mu'tazila deny the uselessness of the prayer of request; in their eyes it would be derogatory to invoke Him, it is the attitude of adoration that He is guaranteeing.

(b). On the other hand the Agh\\u0614rî kalâm, centred upon the absolute and free will of God, was to restore its traditional value to du\\u0627d\\u0646. The "prayer for the dead" (al-salât al-mu\l al-

(c). Following quite different principles but a similar approach, the falsafa logically include the du\\u0627d\\u0646 in their universal determinism. The subject is treated on several occasions by Ibn Sînâ (e. g., Nâdijd, 2nd ed. Cairo 1357/1938, 299-303; Ma\\u0627n al-ayârû and Risâla fi mâhîyyat al-salât, ed. A. F. Mehren, Leiden 1894). The effective prayer of request is a result of the co-operation of terrestrial dispositions and celestial causes. The invocation by the du\\u0627d\\u0646 comes as a psychical influx which acts physically upon the phantasms of the celestial Spheres according to all the laws of the macrocosm, as inevitably as man's imagination acts upon his own body. Furthermore, it is these celestial Spheres which in reality gave men the suggestion to pray, this suggestion in turn taking its place in the universal chain of causes. And it can then be said, as a result in the interplay of causes, that the prayer is answered. The du\\u0627d\\u0646, according to Avicenna, puts man into direct relationship with the celestial Spheres alone. That is why "those prayers particularly which beg for rain and other such things" are found to possess "very great usefulness" (Nâdijd, 301; cf. L. Gardet, La pensée religieuse d'Avicenne, Paris 1951, 135-7).

These various attempts to provide a rational justification of the du\\u0627d\\u0646 testify to its importance in the religious life of Islam. But we must observe that the cosmological interpretation of an Ibn Sînâ does not in any way spring from the most current vision of the world. For the pious Muslim by and large, the du\\u0627d\\u0646 effects a relationship between the man at prayer and not the celestial spheres, but God, integrating and often sublimating the familiar conception of the power of the name (ism) over the one named (masamâma).

Bibliography: in the article. (L. Gardet)

DUALISM [see KHURAMIYYA, THANAWIYYA, ZIYAD] (b.i.).

DUBAYES [see MAZYAD].

DUBAYTI [see RUBÀT].

DUBAYY (commonly spelled Dubai), a port (25° 16' N., 55° 18' E.) and shaykhdom on the Trucial Coast of Arabia. The town lies at the head of a winding creek (khawr) extending some eight miles inland; ferries ply between Dayra, the market quarter on the north-east bank, and al-Shandagha and Dubayy proper, quarters on the south-west bank. The population of the town, about 42,000, is predominantly Arab with some Iranians, Indians, and Balûcîs (Hay, 114). The Arab inhabitants of the principality comprise members of al-Sûdân, al-Marar, al-Ma\\u0627zarî, Aî Bû Mu\l liar, al-Hawâmîl, al-Kûmantân, al-Mahâribî, al-Sâbîyis, and Aî Bû Fâlîh, tribal groups considered components of Banî Yâs in the Persian Gulf area, as well as members of al-Manâsîr, primarily a Bedouin tribe. The ruling family, Aî Bû Falâsà, are members of al-Rawâshid and, like the majority of the inhabitants, are Mâlikîs.

The frontiers of the shaykhdom are not completely defined. The land boundary between the shaykhdoms of Dubayy and Abû Zaby has a coastal terminus between al-Dibâbi al-Àî (sometimes called al-Dibayy) and Khawr Ghanâd; the land boundary...
between the shaykhdoms of Dubayy and al-Shāriqa terminates just north-east of Dayra. Two small coastal villages, Umm al-Su‘aym and Dūmāyra, and the larger village of Ḥagjarayn, about 50 miles inland in Wādi Jā‘aştā and separated from the rest of the principality's territory, acknowledge the overlordship of the Ruler of Dubayy. Some date cultivation is practised, but water is scarce.

Little is known about Dubayy before 1213/1799 when it was first mentioned in available sources (Lorimer). Dubayy was considered a dependency of Ābū Zaby during the first third of the 19th century, with the exception of a period of several years after 1241/1825 when Shaykh Sulṭān b. Şāk of al-Kawāsīm, Ruler of al-Shāriqa, increased his influence over Dubayy by marrying a sister of its governor, Mūḥammad b. Ḥazza‘ b. Zā‘al (India, Selections, xxiv, 317).

Dubayy became an independent principality in 1229/1813 when about 500 members of Āl Bū Fālā‘ṣ, under the leadership of Maktūm b. Bāż b. Suhayyāl, left Ābū Zaby and took control of the settlement of Dubayy (al-Sāmīlī, 31). Rivalry between al-Kawāsīm and Bāni Yās for control of the shaykhdom continued throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, but Dubayy preserved its independence by aligning itself sometimes with al-Shāriqa, sometimes with Ābū Zaby, and on occasion with the smaller shaykhdoms of ‘Ağmān and Umm al-Kaywāy. Dubayy increased in population and wealth, derived primarily from pearl fishing and entrepôt trade.

Like other Trucial States, Dubayy signed the General Treaty of Peace with Britain in 1235/1820 and the temporary Maritime Truce (later made perpetual) in 1251/1835 (see Ābū Zaby). In 1299/1882 the Ruler of Dubayy agreed not to establish relations with any foreign country except Britain without British consent, and in 1340/1922 he agreed not to grant rights to any oil found in his territory except to a person appointed by the British Government. The British Petroleum Exploration Company, Limited (formerly D'Arcy Exploration Company, Limited) holds a two-thirds interest, and Compagnie Française des Pétroles holds one-third interest in an offshore oil concession, while Petroleum Development (Trucial Coast), Limited, an Iraq Petroleum Company affiliate, holds an onshore concession. Until 1381/1961, no oil had been discovered.

The silting up of al-Shāriqa creek and the decline of Līnga [q.v.] have contributed to the recent prosperity of Dubayy. It exports pearls (a declining industry) and dried fish; it imports foodstuffs, textiles, and light machinery. A coastal route connects Dubayy with al-Shāriqa, nine miles to the north, and with Ābū Zaby town, about 80 miles to the south; desert tracks lead inland to al-Buraymi and to Muscat.

The administrative agencies of the shaykhdom have recently expanded and now include a Municipal Council, a Customs Administration, Courts, and Departments of Education, Health, Land Registration, and Water Supply. The town has a hospital, four schools for boys and two for girls, telegraph and telephone communications, regular mail service, and a small airport. The headquarters of the British Political Agent for all of the Trucial States except Ābū Zaby was transferred from al-Shāriqa to Dubayy in 1374/1954. The present (1962) Ruler of Dubayy is Shaykh Rāṣḥīd b. Sā‘līd b. Maktūm.

Berbers. Nevertheless, in the 19th century Debdu still possessed an autonomous administration; the Muslim population were dependents of the 'Amil of Taza. The year seen by his khatta (= receipt) was 1206. The Jews, while the Berbers. Nevertheless, in the 19th century Debdu still possessed an autonomous administration; the Muslim population were dependents of the 'Amil of Taza. The year seen by his khatta (= receipt) was 1206. The Jews, while the

Throughout the last centuries, Arab influence and the Arabic language have been dominant to such a degree that Berber is no longer used except in the surrounding mountains. The dialect of the Jews presents some interesting features (see Ch. Pellat, [see HARIR].

The tambourine of Islamic peoples may be divided into seven distinct types: 1. The rectangular form; 2. The simple round form; 3. The round form with jingling plates; 4. The round form with jingling rings; 5. The round form with small bells; 6. The round form with both jingling plates and jingling rings; 7. The round form with jingling plates and jingling plates.

1. The rectangular tambourine of modern times has two heads or skins with "snares" (aτατρ) stretched across the inside of the head or heads. We know from al-Mu'tarrazī (d. 670/1273) that the name duff was given both to a rectangular and to a round tambourine. According to the Arabic language of pre-Islamic Spain can be divided into two main types: 1. The rectangular form; 2. The simple round form; 3. The round form with jingling plates; 4. The round form with jingling rings; 5. The round form with small bells; 6. The round form with both jingling plates and jingling plates; 7. The round form with jingling plates and jingling plates.

1. The rectangular tambourine of modern times has two heads or skins with "snares" (aτατρ) stretched across the inside of the head or heads. We know from al-Mu'tarrazī (d. 670/1273) that the name duff was given both to a rectangular and to a round tambourine. As early as the 6th century A.D. we read of the duff in the poet Djabir b. Ḥuwayy and this was probably the rectangular instrument. The author of the Kashf al-nabīm says that the pre-Islamic tambourine (far dżhabīl) was different from the round Egyptian tambourine (duff misrī) of his day (fol. 193). Tuways, the first great musician in the days of Islam, played the duff murabbā or square tambourine (Aṣḥāni, i, 170). He belonged to the muḥammadīn and it was perhaps on that account that the rectangular tambourine was forbidden whilst the round form was allowed (al-Mu'tarrazī). At the same time the rectangular instrument was favoured by the dīth of Medina in the first century of Islam (al-Mufaddal b. Salamā, fol. 11).

We know also that the Syrians used this type of instrument since it is called r'dhi'ā (rectangular) in the Syrian version of the O.T. (Ezodus, xv, 20; judīth, iii, 7). To-day this form has fallen into desuetude in Arabia, Syria, and Persia, but may be found in the Maghrib. For designs see Christianwitsch, 32, pl. 11 where it is called a daff, and Höst, 262, Tab., xxxi, 11 where it is called a bandazyr. Actual specimens are to be found at Brussels, Nrs. 339, 340 (Mahillon, i, 400) and at New York, Nrs. 392, 1316 (Catalogue, ii, 52; iv, 50).

2. The simple round form. This was also called the daff (al-Mu'tarrazī) and it is said that this type, without jingling plates or bells, was considered "lawful" (Ewliya Čelebi, i, 226). Probably, this was the masbār or misbar of pre-Islamic and early Islamic times. It is true that Arabic lexicographers say that the misbar was a lute (ṣād), a definition borne out by Arabic writers on music (ʿIdār al-ṣārīr, iii, 186; al-Muṭafḍal b. Salamā, fol. 226, ʿIdār al-ṣārīr and al-ʿIntādā, fol. 131, Masʿūdī, Murādī, viii, 93) but it is extremely doubtful that the misbar or masbar was a lute. The mistake probably arose with an early lexicographer saying that "the misbar was a musical instrument (see the Mīṣbāh of al-Fayyūmī) like the ṣād (lute)" meaning "like the ṣād is a musical instrument". In the 11th century Glosarios Latino-Arabicorum the mazkar (502) or miskar (508) equates with tūfanum (tympanum). The type is still to be found under this name in Turkey (Lavignac, 3023) and in Palestine (ZDPV, i, 64, plate 8). The mazkar of Egypt has jingling rings attached to it.

3. The round form with "snares", This is similar to the preceding but with the addition of "snares" stretched across the inside of the head. We cannot be sure of its name in the early days of Islam but probably it was the ghirbāl, so-called because it was round like a sieve. Al-Ṣaghānī (d. 660/1261-2) says that this was the tambourine which was referred to by Muhammad when he said: "Publish ye the marriage, and beat for it the tambourine (ghirbāl)". Other accounts of this ghirbāl call this instrument the duff. In Algeria of modern times this type of instrument is known as the bandazyr or bandār, a name borrowed, seemingly, from the Arabic panderó, one of the instruments prevalent in Spain mentioned by Isidore of Seville. The bandazyr is
generally larger than the other types such as the duff, mazhar and tār, although in the Kashf al-

humum we read that tambourines were made in various sizes from the large tār (tār habir) to the small ḡarbāl (ḡarbāl ḍabhīk†). For the Egyptian instrument see Villoteau (1888), and for the Algerian see Christianowitsch (31, pl. 9), Delphin et Guin (37) and Lavignac (2931). In Morocco, according to Höst (261, pl. xxxi, 6), it was called the dīf (ديف). Actual specimens may be found at Brussels, Nrs. 308, 309 (Mahillon, i, 393, 400) and at New York, Nr. 452 (Catalogue, iii, 50).

4. The round form with jingling plates. This is similar to No. 2 but with the addition of several pairs of jingling plates (sunādī) fixed in openings in the shell or body of the instrument. This is the tār. Although the author of the Kashf al-
humum makes the name older than that of the duff, yet we have no substantial proof of this. We find the tār in the Yemen in the 6th/12th century (Kay, Yaman, 54) and in the 7th/13th century Vocabulista in Arabico it is given as tarr (= insignam). The Persian instrument is depicted by Kaempfer under the name of tār (741, fig. 7) and Niebuhr shows an Arabic example which he calls the duff (i, pl. 26). Höst (261, pl. xxxi) gives a design of a Moroccan instrument in the 12th/18th century under tīrā (تیر). In Algeria it is called the tār (Delphin et Guin, 42; cf. Taghbirat al-mizān, 93; Lavignac, 2844) and a design is given by Christianowitsch (pl. 10). The Egyptian tār is described and delineated by Villoteau (i, 988) and Lane (chap. xviii). Actual examples may be seen at Brussels, Nrs. 312-5 (Mahillon, i, 394-5) and New York, Nrs. 455, 1319, 1359 (Catalogue, iii, 51). In Egypt the smaller types were given the name of ḍīrīk (Villoteau, i, 989), by no means a modern name (Kashf al-humum, fol. 193). There are examples at Brussels, Nrs. 316, 317 (Mahillon, i, 395).

5. The round form with jingling rings. This is a similar instrument to the preceding but with jingling rings (ḏahlāḏīl) fixed in the shell or body instead of jingling plates. In Egypt, in the time of Villoteau (i, 988), it was known as the mazhar, but in Persia, a century earlier, Kaempfer calls it the ḍāʿirā (741, 4).

6. The round form with small bells. This is the same instrument as the preceding in regard to shape but the jingling apparatus, instead of being fixed in spaces in the shell or body, is attached to the inside of the shell or body. These small bells (adḏirās), often globular in shape like sonnettes, are sometimes attached to a metal or wooden rod fixed across the inside of the head. This instrument is popular in Persia and Central Asia where it is generally known as the ḍāʿira. An 11th/17th century instrument is shown by Kaempfer (741, 4). For a modern instrument see Lavignac (3976). Apparently ḍāʿira and duff became generic names for all types of the tambourine although the former must have been reserved for a round type.

7. The round form with both snares and jingling implements. In the Maghrib this instrument is called the ḍahāsāk (Delphin and Guin, 38, 65; Lavignac, 2932, 2944). In some parts, however, this type is called the ṭabla. In Egypt, according to Villoteau, it was the bandūyā.

If the drum (ṭabli) sounds the martial note of Islam, as Doughty once said, the tambourine sounds the social note. It is true that in the ḍāḥiliyya the tambourine was in the hands of the matrons and singing-girls (kānūdh) during the battle, sometimes in company with thereed-pipes (mīmār) as with the Jewish tribes (ʿAḏārān) to judge by the description (Haydar Mirzā, [q.v.]), a member of the tribe, provides information about them in his Taʻrikh-
DUGHLAT — DUKAYN AL-RADJIZ

Raghdi (ed. N. Elias and E. Denison Ross, London 1895). But his information is not everywhere reliable and, in the few places where the tribe is mentioned in other dynasties, contradicts the facts. According to Haydar a member of the Dughlat, Tulkic or perhaps his younger brother Bulaqi (the form Pulaudi printed in the edition of Abu ’l-Ghazz, 56 ft., does not appear in the manuscripts), is supposed in 748/1348-8 to have placed Khun Thughlu Temur on the throne at Aksu in the Tarim Basin. The latter in turn is supposed to have expressed his gratitude to the Dughlat by granting them “nine powers” and thus to have stabilized their power in the Tarim Basin. Haydar Dughlat claims to have seen this document “in the Mongol language and script” in his childhood, but says that it was lost during the reign of Shaybani Khân, d. 916/1510 [q.v.] (Ta’rikh-i Raghi, 54 ft., 305). But the inaccurate chronology of this historian in the pertinent notices tends to provoke strong doubt as to the genuineness of the document. Between 769/1368 and 794/1392 (?) power in Mogholistan (as eastern interior Asia starting at about Semiryce was at that time called) was wielded by Kamar al-Din Dughlat (Zharaf al-Din Yazdi, Zafer-name, ed. Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1887-8, i, 78 ft.), a brother of Bulaqi according to the Ta’rikh-i Raghi. After an early period of cooperation with Ulugh Tughlu (q.v.) he was forced by the latter, after a long struggle, to flee across the Irtish into the Altai (Yazdi, i, 494 ft.). Two of his brothers remained in the service of Timur (Yazdi, i, 104 ff., 505). His younger brother Buladil (the form Puladil according to other sources, contradicts these. According to the historian Muhammad Haydar Mirza, left in 1541 his position as governor of Ladakh in the service of the ruler of the Tarim Basin to proclaim his independence in Kashmîr (see Haydar Mirza). With the elimination of this line and the end of Abû Bakr’s (see above) rule in 920/1514, the independence of the Dughlat in the Tarim Basin came to an end. They continued to support the Cingizids there and wielded considerable power into the 17th century.

A tributary of the “Great Horde” of Kazakhks between the II and the Jaxartes bore the name Dulał into the 20th century, obviously derived from Dughlat. At the end of the 19th century, they included almost 40,000 tents (see N. Aristov, Zametki ob etnoloskom sostave Tyuruskikh plemen i narodnostey, St. Petersburg 1897, 77).

Bibliography: the sources are mentioned above. Studies include W. Brass, Zu den Vorleisungen über die Geschichte der Turkischen Mitteleuropa, Berlin 1935, 209-14 (French tr. Paris 1945); idem, Four studies on the history of Central Asia, tr. V. Minorsky, i, 1956, 54; R. Grousset, L’Empire des steppes, Paris 1939, index; P. P. Ivanov, Ocherki po istorii Sredney Asii (Outlines of the history of Central Asia), Moscow 1958, i and ii; B. Spuler, in Handbuch der Orientalistik, volume v, 5, index. The last two works named contain further detailed bibliography.

DUGHÂ (Ar.), “forenoon”, the hour of one of the prayers [see SALÂT].

DUKAYN AL-RADJIZ, the name of two poets who were confused by Ibn Kutayba (Shârîf, Zafar-nâmeh, ed. Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1887-8, i, 78 ft.), his two sons being named Dukayn (Ta’rikh-i Raghi 100). His eldest son Muhammad Shakhs appointed tribal chief (Ulus Begi) by Khân Wa’Is (ca. 1418-29) and took up residence in Semiryce (Ta’rikh-i Raghi 78). His younger son was driven out of the western Tarim Basin by the Timurids (1416? Samarkand in I. Rashidi, Ta’rikh-i Rashidi 78, 99). He was succeeded by his two sons Sâiniz Mirzâ (until 869/1464-5) and Muhammad Haydar (until 885/1480), both of whom performed great services in the development of the region. Then Abû Bakr Mirzâ, the son of Sâiniz, drove his uncle and Khân Yûns of Mogholistan out of the western Tarim Basin, after which he took up residence in Yarkand and defended himself in 904/1509 against an attack by the Khâns of Mogholistan. Not until 920/1514 was he eliminated by Sa’îd Khân (Ta’rikh-i Raghi 293).

In addition to the principal line other branches of the Dughlat repeatedly established small principalities, occasionally at war with the former. Muhammad, the great-grandfather of the historian Muhammad Haydar, fought in alliance with the Cingizids Yûns and with the Timurids Ahmad Mirzâ against Abû Bakr Mirzâ (see above). His sons Muhammad Husain and SAYYID Muhammad Mirzâ vacillated continuously between the two dynasties and were even from time to time in the service of the Uzbeks. The former was finally killed in Herat at the command of Shaybani [q.v.] in 914/1508-9. His brother fell victim in 1533 to the hatred of Khân Abû al-Ra’dhi of Mogholistan, who had come to power in the same year (Ta’rikh-i Raghi 106 ft., 305, 450). Muhammad Husayn’s son, the historian Muhammad Haydar Mirzâ, left in 1541 his position as governor of Ladakh in the service of the ruler of the Tarim Basin to proclaim his independence in Kashmîr (see Haydar Mirzâ). With the elimination of this line and the end of Abû Bakr’s (see above) rule in 920/1514, the independence of the Dughlat in the Tarim Basin came to an end. They continued to support the Cingizids there and wielded considerable power into the 17th century.

A tributary of the “Great Horde” of Kazakhks between the III and the Jaxartes bore the name Dulał into the 20th century, obviously derived from Dughlat. At the end of the 19th century, they included almost 40,000 tents (see N. Aristov, Zametki ob etnoloskom sostave Tyuruskikh plemen i narodnostey, St. Petersburg 1897, 77).

Bibliography: the sources are mentioned above. Studies include W. Brass, Zu den Vorleisungen über die Geschichte der Türkischen Mitteleuropa, Berlin 1935, 209-14 (French tr. Paris 1945); idem, Four studies on the history of Central Asia, tr. V. Minorsky, i, 1956, 54; R. Grousset, L’Empire des steppes, Paris 1939, index; P. P. Ivanov, Ocherki po istorii Sredney Asii (Outlines of the history of Central Asia), Moscow 1958, i and ii; B. Spuler, in Handbuch der Orientalistik, volume v, 5, index. The last two works named contain further detailed bibliography.

(D. BARTHOLD-[B. SPULER])
Abū Dula...
bitumen deposits. The tribe has a record of bad relations with the Shammar of the Dżdżara, and of friendliness with the 'Anaza in the Syrian desert; but tribal disorders on the borders of military posts and khāns in the 13th/19th century. The tribal area was occupied by the British in 1917, and insurgent action in the turbulent year 1920 was limited to one section of the tribe. Since then, settlement and prosperity have increased.

The tribe has given its name to the Dulaym iteq (province) of Irāq (population in 1947, 193,000) which, with headquarters at Ramādi, contains the kūdeṣ of Safā, Fallājāda and Ramādi.

(S. H. LONGRIGG)

DULDUL, the name of the grey mule of the Prophet, which had been given to him by the Mu'akwīs [q.v.], at the same time as the ass called Ya'ṣūr/ Ufayr. After serving as his mount during his campaigns, she survived him and died at Yanbu' so old and weather-beaten in tooth and foot that he had to be put into her mouth. According to the Shi'ī tradition, 'Alī rode upon her at the battle of the Camel [see DILJAMAL] and at Siffin. As Duldul in Arabic means a porcupine, it is possible that she derived her name from her gait, but this is far from certain. For the names of the horses of the Prophet, see G. Levi Della Vida, Les "livres des chevaux", Leiden 1928, 8, 51; for his she-camels al-'Aqūba' and al-Kawsā', see al-Dājīḥi, Hayawan, index.

Bibliography: Dhībir, Bīghādī, ed. Pellat, Cairo 1955, 22; Muḥ. b. Ḥabīb, Muḥabbār, 76; Ṭabarī, i, 1783; Masā'udī, Murūdī, iv, 317, 356, 369; Ibn al-ʿAthir, ii, 238; Nawāwī, 46; Damīrī, s.v.: TA s.v.; LA s.v. (CL. HUART-[CH. PELLAT])

AL-DULFİN [see NUDJUM]

DULŪK, the name given by the Arab authors to a hawza named on the borders of Anatolia and Syria, in the upper valley of the Nahr Karzin, at the foot of the Anti-Taurus (Kurd nişābūr), north-west of ʿAynātāb. It was the ancient Dolichce, famous for the cult of a Semitic divinity who in the Graeco-Roman period received the name of Zeus Dolichenos. Being at the intersection of the routes from Germanicia, Nicopolis and Zeugma, it had been conquered by ʿĪyād b. Ḍānim and became one of the fortresses which since the earliest days of Islam had defended the frontier against the Byzantines (cf. the verse of ʿAdī b. al-Rikān in Yākūt, ii, 583, and Nöldeke's remark in ZDMG, xlv, 700); it belonged to the ḍumad of Kinnasrin before being incorporated in the territory of the āwāsim [q.v.] organized by Ḥārūn al-Rashīd. Dulūk also played a part in the Hamdanid-Byzantine wars at the time of Sayf al-Dawla and Abū Fīrās, and was conquered by the Byzantines in 351/962 (Ibn al-ʿAthir, viii, 404), the year in which Abū Fīrās [q.v.] was captured. The citadel at this time was supplied with water by an important aqueduct, and it was surrounded by rich orchards.

Having become during the Crusades the seat of a bishop of the province of Edessa (under the name of Tulup), it was the theatre for numerous engagements between the Turks and the Crusaders. In 1350/1931, a Turkish village named near the Syrian border, and in that of Tell Dūlūk situated to the south of this locality where there is now a monument erected for a waḍī.


(D. SOURDEL)

DUMAT AL-DJANDAL, an oasis at the head of the Wādī Sīrāh, which runs from south-east to north-west, linking central Arabia on one side and the mountainous region of Hādath and Syria on the other; it is thus situated on the most direct route between Medina and Damascus, being about 15 days' journey on foot from the former and about 7 days or rather more from the latter. The Oasis is in a ghāṭa" ["depression"] or ḥadbā ["vast, low-lying area"], the length of which, according to Yākūt, is 5 parasangs or, in modern terms, according to Hālīs Wahba, 3 miles, the width half a mile and the depth 500 feet below the level of the desert surrounding it. The morphology of the region has brought about a change in the name of the oasis which, at least since the last century, has become al-Dīwāf (el-Dīf), "vast depression", "round basin", "flat, spongy floor of a valley or region in which water collects". Yākūt, who describes the locality at some length, is unaware of this change in the name.

Dūmā (the spelling Dawmā is not acceptable) is perhaps an Aramaic word: according to the ancient Arab scholars Ibn al-Kalbī and al-Zaidījdī, this term derives from one of the sons of Ismāʿīl (Dūm or Dūmān or Dūmā): incidentally the name Dūmāh also occurs in the Bible (Genesis, xxv, 14; Chronicles, i, 30) as the name of an Ishmaelite tribe. The Arab writers say that, as the Thāmāhī no longer provided sufficient grazing for the too numerous Ismāʿīlī clan, the son mentioned above emigrated to this region which took its name Dūma from him, and there he built a fortress. In fact, a fortress was already in existence before Islam at Dūmat al-Djandal, and its name Mārid is mentioned in an ancient proverb deriving from a phrase said to have been uttered by al-Zahhābī (lammaraḍa Mārid wa ʿazza al-Abāh). The remains of an ancient fortress still survived in the last century, and Euting made a sketch of them in 1883. The fortress was built of stone and in addition there stood around it a wall also of stone; it was on account of these constructions that Dūma was given the additional epithet al-Djandal, a common noun signifying "stone". In the pre-Islamic period the idol Wādī was worshipped there.

Yākūt, in his geographers, tells us that three places bore the name Dūma, one near al-Hira, another near al-Hira,
and the one with which we are concerned, in northern Arabia. This identity of names has given rise to confusion in certain Arab historical sources; and there has been a tendency to ascribe to Dumat al-Djandal events which took place in the other localities.

The inhabitants of Dumat al-Djandal were the Banū Kināna, for the greater part of this sub-tribe of the Banū Kalb had, before Islam, spread into the desert of al-Samawa in northern Arabia, from the plain of Dumat al-Djandal in the north as far as the two mountains of the Tayy (Aḍja‘ and Salmā) in the south. This territory had been allotted to them as their pasturages at a general assembly of the Kalb, held in order to put an end to a civil war between two groups (F. Wüstenfeld, Register, s.v. Kalb b. Wabara; cf. al-Bakrī, Muḍjam, 33 ff.). But in the oasis itself a certain number of the ‘Ibād of al-Hira had settled (in Balāḏūrī, the name appears as ‘Ībād al-Kūfīya‘, but De Goeje corrected it to ‘Ībād al-Hīra), that is to say a certain number of Christians who lived in that town and who were distinct from the Taḥkīk, nomads from the surrounding districts. It may be conjectured that these ‘Ibād in the oasis practised trade as well as agriculture, for Dumat al-Djandal was one of the principal markets of northern Arabia. The oasis of Dumat al-Djandal enjoys a certain fame in the annals of ancient Islam, particularly on account of the three expeditions undertaken by Muhammad to conquer it; the first, in 5/626, led by the Prophet himself, achieved no results since the inhabitants of the oasis scattered before he arrived; the second, in 6/627-8, commanded by ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Afwī, brought about the conversion to Islam of the chief al-Aṣbaqā‘ī, (son of a chief of the tribe), probably an error; b. ‘Amr al-Kalbī; the third was organized by Muhammad at Tabūk and entrusted to Khālid b. al-Walīd. The latter took possession of the town, levied a heavy war indemnity on the population and compelled the chief Ukaydīr b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Kindī al-Ṣakūnī (q.v.) to go to Medina to conclude a treaty with the Prophet; the text of the treaty is not preserved, al-Ṭabārī, with interpolations (al-Balāḏūrī, Futūḥ, II, 61 ff.; Ibn Sa‘d, i, 2, 36 ff.; Ṭākūt, ii, 627; see also M. Hamidallah, Waṭṭābī, i, 191; Wellhausen, Skitten und Vorarbeiten, iv, 133, n. 3, 404 n. 1; Caetani, Annali, 9 A.H. and 45, note 3). The difference in the names of the chiefs with whom the Muslims had to deal in 6 and 9, the difference in origin of these chiefs, one Kalbī the other Kindī, the diversity of certain details in traditions relating to Ukaydīr, led De Goeje to raise questions and Caetani to express doubts which appear to be excessive. In reality, various difficulties can be overcome if one distinguishes the Kalbī, nomads inhabiting a vast area and having their own chiefs, from the population of the oasis which was sedentary and composed of agricultural workers, merchants and artisans, and had immigrated even before Muhammad’s expeditions, as moreover al-Mas‘ūdī confirms (Tabābī, 248). In the account relating to Ukaydīr it should be noted that, according to al-Balāḏūrī (Futūḥ, 62) and Ṭākūt (ii, 626 ff.), Ukaydīr is said to have called his dwelling in Ṭarīq Dūma, in remembrance of Dumat al-Djandal, after leaving the oasis; another tradition also preserved by al-Balāḏūrī (ibid., 63) and Ṭākūt (ii, 627) relates on the contrary that Ukaydīr called the Arabian oasis Dumat al-Djandal in order to distinguish it from the Dūma near al-Hīra from which he came, but the first tradition appears to be the more probable, since there are grounds for maintaining that the name Dūma borne by the oasis is an ancient one.

References to Dumat al-Djandal occur in certain sources in connexion with the celebrated crossing of the desert made by Khālid b. al-Walīd in 12/633. Having been asked to rejoin the Muslim forces in Syria as soon as possible since they were in danger, Khālid set out, and is said to have attacked Dumat al-Djandal and killed Ukaydīr. De Goeje (op. cit., 15 ff.) considers al-Djandal here to be an interpolation, and supposes that the Dūma referred to by the sources is Dūma of al-Hīra; it seems impossible that Khālid could have made such a detour which would have taken him so far out of his way while delaying the accomplishment of his mission. De Goeje’s argument is very logical, and it has been accepted by Mednikov (Palestina, i, 453 ff.) and Caetani, so that the murder of Ukaydīr, if murder it was, would have taken place in Ṭarīq. Let us also add that ‘Amr b. c-Aṣ was ordered during the ridda to fight the Kalbī Wādī‘a who had revolted with some of the Kalb and entrenched himself at Dumat al-Djandal, whilst al-Aṣbaqā‘ī’s son had remained faithful to Islam (al-Tabārī, i, 1872, 1880); it was perhaps ‘Amr who conquered Dumat al-Djandal, but it is also possible to attribute this feat to Ṭayy b. ‘Amr. In fact, the latter, on an expedition under his command set out from Medina with this objective but ran into difficulties, but it is also related that Ṭayy was governing the oasis in 13/634 (al-Tabārī, i, 2136). In the same way, it was at neither Dumat al-Djandal nor Dūma near al-Hīra, but at Dūma near Damascus that, according to De Goeje (ibid., 16 ff.), the fair Laylā, the daughter of al-Dūmah, was governing of the oasis, and Mu‘āwiya, and it was there that they were to announce their verdict; but some sources place the meeting at Ṭadhrib (q.v.), and it has been explained supra, s.v. ʿAlī b. Aḥbār Ṭalḥa, that in fact there were two meetings, on different dates, one at Dumat al-Djandal and the other some months later and in very different circumstances, at Ṭadhrib (this point being established, the sequence of events becomes clear and the highly complicated question of their chronology becomes soluble). One of the actions which Mu‘āwiya took to harass ʿAlī was to dispatch a force to Dumat al-Djandal in 39/660; ʿAlī succeeded in driving it out, but the inhabitants of the oasis refused to recognize either his authority or Mu‘āwiya’s. When the centre of the Muslim empire was set up in Syria, under the Umayyads, and in ʿIrāk, under the ʿAbbāsids, Dumat al-Djandal lost all its importance; from then onwards it was no more than an oasis in Arabia inhabited by a poor sparse population of agricultural workers, since trade henceforth followed other routes; the Arab geographers in fact do no more than relate the historical events described above and quote from the verses of ancient poets.

We know that during the last centuries of Ottoman domination in northern Arabia anarchy was general and the situation only improved when the Wahhābīs imposed their authority over the country. They also
took possession of Dūmat al-Djandal which belonged to them until the time of Ta'llal, amir of Shammar, of the Āl Rašid, for in 1853 it became a dependency of Hāyāl. In 1909 it was occupied by Ibn Sa'ūd, chief of the Ruwālah tribes, in 1920 the amir of Shammar recovered possession of it, and finally ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Ibn Saʿūd, when he overthrew the amirate of Shammar, added it to his domains (1921). Immediately afterwards, Transjordania attempted to move her frontier southwards to Nafūd, but Ibn Saʿūd held firm and at the Congress of al-Kuwayt (1923-4) the question was not resolved. Ibn Saʿūd also made incursions into Transjordania, within the framework of his much wider activities against the Hijāj and ʿIrāk. The frontier was established by the Ḥadda Agreement between Ibn Saʿūd and Sir G. Clayton (2 November 1925), and the Wādī Sirhān along with al-Djawi [q.v.] and Kurayyat al-Milh thenceforward became part of Najḍ (OM, i-viii (1922-8), index).

The nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes who inhabit the region between Ta'yma2 in the south as far as Kerak in the north, Nafūd and Wādī Sirhān in the east are grouped under the collective name of al-Kuwayt [q.v.]. During the last century several European travellers visited the oasis; an account of their explorations will be found in Hogarth.


DUNAYA (Ar.), the feminine of the elative adjective meaning 'nearer, nearest', is used in the Kurʾān, often combined with 'life' to mean this world. It had more or less this sense before Islam (Noelleke, Muʿallalahi ʿAmr und des Ḥārisīh, 49). The heaven of the dunyā is the lowest of the seven; dunyā is what is contained in the succession of night and day, is overshadowed by the sky and upheld by the earth, is all that the eye can see, the world of the seen (gahādā). In the realm of the spirit it includes all that Christians mean by the world and the flesh and it denotes the part of existence which is governed by desire or desire, even speech with friends, so long as they are not aimed at the service of God. Denial of the dunyā means putting less trust in what is in your own power than in what is in the hand of God. All this is only a development of what is said in the Kurʾān: Those who buy this world at the price of the hereafter (sūra II, 80/86) and, The hereafter is better (sūra LXXVII, 16). The truly religious man will have no desires (Muhammad b. al-Ḥāmid, Zayyāt, al-Kašākib al-sayyūrā, 130), and an extreme statement is ascribed to the prophet: Grant to one who loves me and obeys me little wealth and few children and to one who hates me and does not obey me much wealth and many children. At the judgement the dunyā will appear as a horrid old hag and will be cast into the fire (Ghazzālī, Ḥukumat al-Dīn (1312 A.H.), 3, 54, 148) an idea which contradicts the fundamental thought of Islam.

Without going into legal details, the dunyā consists of things allowed and things forbidden. Good Muslims avoided what was forbidden but many carried scruple to excess, e.g., by refusing to eat the food of one who might have made some money by sharp practice in trade or by acting as a government servant. Asceticism was often considered good in itself and some went so far as to say: Entrust your affairs to God and take your rest.

Bibliography: see ʿĀHĪRA, and in addition: Iṣbāḥī, al-Mustaṭara, last chapter.

DURAYD B. AL-ŠIMMA, ancient Arabic poet and leader of the Banū Dišshām b. Muṣrawīya, one of the most powerful Bedouin opponents of Muḥammad, born ca. 530. He is a prominent figure of Arabic pre-Islamic antiquity: later generations, ...
he was the embodiment of ancient paganism which fought stubbornly against Islam.

His father was Muʿawiyah b. al-Harīth, called al-Šimma, leader of the Banū Dughjan b. Muʿawiyah, who belonged to the group of the Hawāzin tribes, and lived between Mecca and Tāʾif. Despite the similarity in their religion, and their economic, political and social ties, there was an ancient rivalry between these two places, which also concerned the Bedouin tribes who lived between Mecca and Tāʾif. This antagonism was caused by the contrast between the urban Kuraysh, and the pre-Islamic nomad Hawāzin, the difference of their cultural standing, and their different economic and political conditions. This period of the Hijāz was characterized by the resultant battles. These disturbances are known as the battles of al-Fidjar.

Durayd b. al-Šimma did not take part in these battles for personal reasons arising from his links with the Kināna tribes, although he himself had fought earlier against the Kināna, and although his father had played an important part in the Fidjar war.

He did, on the other hand, play an important part in the battles between Hawāzin and Ghatafān, where he lost his two brothers ʿAbd al-Yaghūt and ʿAbd Allāh. It was particularly the death of ʿAbd Allāh which resulted in the renewed enmity and battles, in which the tribe of the Banū Dughjan again played a prominent part. It was the duty of Durayd b. al-Šimma to avenge his brother's death, and he fulfilled this duty in numerous raids against the Ghatafān.

Friendly ties linked him with Banū Sulaym. He also asked for the hand of the young poetess al-Khansa, if he was the instigator of the alliance—which never materialized—between the Hawāzin and the Kuraysh. After Muḥammad had left for his last battle against Mecca, the Hawāzin, the Thakīf, and the predominantly nomadic Hawāzin, the difference of their cultural standing, and the different economic and political conditions. This period of the Hijāz was characterized by the resultant battles. These disturbances are known as the battles of al-Fidjar.

Durayd b. al-Šimma did not take part in these battles for personal reasons arising from his links with the Kināna tribes, although he himself had fought earlier against the Kināna, and although his father had played an important part in the Fidjar war.

He did, on the other hand, play an important part in the battles between Hawāzin and Ghatafān, where he lost his two brothers ʿAbd al-Yaghūt and ʿAbd Allāh. It was particularly the death of ʿAbd Allāh which resulted in the renewed enmity and battles, in which the tribe of the Banū Dughjan again played a prominent part. It was the duty of Durayd b. al-Šimma to avenge his brother's death, and he fulfilled this duty in numerous raids against the Ghatafān.

Friendly ties linked him with Banū Sulaym. He also asked for the hand of the young poetess al-Khansa if he was the instigator of the alliance—which never materialized—between the Hawāzin and the Kuraysh. After Muḥammad had left for his last battle against Mecca, the Hawāzin, the Thakīf, and the predominantly nomadic Hawāzin, the difference of their cultural standing, and the different economic and political conditions. This period of the Hijāz was characterized by the resultant battles. These disturbances are known as the battles of al-Fidjar.

Durayd b. al-Šimma did not take part in these battles for personal reasons arising from his links with the Kināna tribes, although he himself had fought earlier against the Kināna, and although his father had played an important part in the Fidjar war.

He did, on the other hand, play an important part in the battles between Hawāzin and Ghatafān, where he lost his two brothers ʿAbd al-Yaghūt and ʿAbd Allāh. It was particularly the death of ʿAbd Allāh which resulted in the renewed enmity and battles, in which the tribe of the Banū Dughjan again played a prominent part. It was the duty of Durayd b. al-Šimma to avenge his brother's death, and he fulfilled this duty in numerous raids against the Ghatafān.

Friendly ties linked him with Banū Sulaym. He also asked for the hand of the young poetess al-Khansa if he was the instigator of the alliance—which never materialized—between the Hawāzin and the Kuraysh. After Muḥammad had left for his last battle against Mecca, the Hawāzin, the Thakīf, and the predominantly nomadic Hawāzin, the difference of their cultural standing, and the different economic and political conditions. This period of the Hijāz was characterized by the resultant battles. These disturbances are known as the battles of al-Fidjar.

Durayd b. al-Šimma did not take part in these battles for personal reasons arising from his links with the Kināna tribes, although he himself had fought earlier against the Kināna, and although his father had played an important part in the Fidjar war.

He did, on the other hand, play an important part in the battles between Hawāzin and Ghatafān, where he lost his two brothers ʿAbd al-Yaghūt and ʿAbd Allāh. It was particularly the death of ʿAbd Allāh which resulted in the renewed enmity and battles, in which the tribe of the Banū Dughjan again played a prominent part. It was the duty of Durayd b. al-Šimma to avenge his brother's death, and he fulfilled this duty in numerous raids against the Ghatafān.
vii, 778-9 (detailed notice with several quotations). For rods, staffs, etc., see ʿANAZA, i; ʿAṢAFA; KADĪN; ʿABDALLĀH AL-DURRĀNĪ (J. BOWEN-PAGE, Al-DURRĀNĪ, the pearl. The ancient legend of its origin is found at great length in the Arabic authors, first in the Petrology (Steinbuch, ed. Ruska) of Aristotle, then with variants in the Rāṣīāʿī ʿIkwān al-Šafā and the later cosmographers. According to it, the ʾaṣūrūs (ʾorṭoρευω) rises from the depths of the sea frequented by ships and goes out to the ocean. The winds there set up a shower of spray and the shells opened to receive drops from this; when it is collected a few drops it goes to a secluded spot and exposes the drops morning and evening to the breeze and the gentle heat of the sun until they ripen. It then returns to the depths of the sea where it takes root on the sea-bed and becomes a plant. If the sun or the air reach it at midday or in the night the pearls are destroyed; they are also ruined if they stay too long at the bottom of the sea, just as over-ripe dates lose their beauty and flavour.

Scattered among these fables we find a few real facts and critical observations, for example the statement that the shells, though rough and unclean outside, are smooth and brilliant within, or that the substance composing the pearl is identical with that which lines the interior of the shell, which points to its being produced from the lacrimation of the animal. The fact that it is also found in the oyster’s egg or with the child in its mother’s womb. Of particular interest is the statement that there is a worm in the pearl, since it is now established that pearls are formed by the oyster when parasitic worms are present.

Masʿūdī gives us the earliest account of the provenance of pearls in various parts of the Indian Ocean and of the pearl-fisheries in the Persian Gulf; in the Murūdī he refers to an earlier work of his in which he appears to have drawn upon Yahya b. Masawayh’s book on stones, which was extracted from al-Safdī al-Dimashkī in its mother’s womb. Of particular interest is the statement that there is a worm in the pearl, since it is now established that pearls are formed by the oyster when parasitic worms are present.

Masʿūdī gives us the earliest account of the provenance of pearls in various parts of the Indian Ocean and of the pearl-fisheries in the Persian Gulf; in the Murūdī he refers to an earlier work of his in which he appears to have drawn upon Yahya b. Masawayh’s book on stones, which was extracted from al-Safdī al-Dimashkī in its mother’s womb. Of particular interest is the statement that there is a worm in the pearl, since it is now established that pearls are formed by the oyster when parasitic worms are present.
the power of the Durrani chiefs was further eroded by their virtual exclusion from administration and military employment, and by steadily increasing taxation and the government control of water distribution. This policy was continued after the incorporation of Kandahar into the Kabul dominions. Its success always varied inversely to the distance from Kandahar.

There is no recent information available about Durrani clan divisions and it is supposed that these have tended to be obliterated with settlement. There is information about the important period down to the mid-19th century. According to Elphinstone the tribe was nominally divided into two branches (Zirak and Pandjpay), although from an early period this division had lost all importance except to indicate the descent of the clans. The clans of the Zirak branch were the more powerful and wealthy. The Zirak branch included three important clans, those of Popalzay, 'Allokozy and Barakzay. The Akakays of the northern slopes of the Khudja Amran range in the Quetta-Pishin district of West Pakistan are a branch of the Barakzyas, supposedly separated by Ahmad Shah. According to Elphinstone the Pandjpay clans were those of Nurzay, 'Alizay, Ishakzay, Khugani, and Maku. There is little information about the last two although they still appeared as distinct entities on the Kandahar tax returns as late as 1784. The other Pandjpay clans lived principally in the more westerly areas—the 'Alizays in the fertile province of Zamin-dwar, where they settled in the early 19th century, the Ishakzays in Garmir on the lower Helmand and the Nurzays, who continued to live as nomads later also were found on the Halmand, and the Popalzays in other areas as well.

The clans of the Zirak branch, who were of the 18th-19th family of Ottoman descent of the clans, were the more powerful and wealthy. The Zirak branch included three important clans, those of Popalzay, 'Allokozy and Barakzay. The Akakays of the northern slopes of the Khudja Amran range in the Quetta-Pishin district of West Pakistan are a branch of the Barakzyas, supposedly separated by Ahmad Shah. According to Elphinstone the Pandjpay clans were those of Nurzay, 'Alizay, Ishakzay, Khugani, and Maku. There is little information about the last two although they still appeared as distinct entities on the Kandahar tax returns as late as 1784. The other Pandjpay clans lived principally in the more westerly areas—the 'Alizays in the fertile province of Zamin-dwar, where they settled in the early 19th century, the Ishakzays in Garmir on the lower Helmand and the Nurzays, who continued to live as nomads later also were found on the Halmand, and the Popalzays in other areas as well, e.g., the Barakzyas who originally settled in the Arghasun valley, south of Kandahar, also were found on the Helmand, and the Popalzays of the lower Tarnak and Arghasun valleys also moved into Tirin and the other districts in the hills north of Kandahar. The 'Allokozy lived in the Tarnak valley as far as Djaldak on the borders of the Ghilzays country and also were found down the Helmand as far as the Helmand. The various clans were divided into sub-groups, e.g., the Popalzays included the royal family of the Sadozays and possibly also the Bamaizays. These sub-groups, like some of the clans themselves, sometimes decayed or amalgamated to form new groups.


(To be continued.)

DURRIZADE, the patronymic of a famous family of Ottoman 'ulema of the 18th-19th centuries, five members of which attained the office of Shaykh-al-Islam (q.v.) on no less than nine different occasions between the years 1734 and 1815. Only these latter can be dealt with here, and details must be confined to the periods of their meshikhat, which, unless otherwise stated, was reached by the normal process through the offices of 'Adil-i Istanbul, 'Adil-i 'Askar of Anadolu and 'Adil-i 'Askar of Rumi. The second and last of these was a certain Ilyas, his date and place of birth are unknown. (The statement in the Sidilli-i 'Othmani that he was a native of Ankara probably derives from a misreading of the Dewah. While 'Adil-i 'Askar of Rumi for the second time, he was appointed Shaykh-al-Islam on 3 Djumada I H1181/26 January 1766, he was dismissed from office on the death of the incumbent Iskh Nd Efendi. In Shawkal 1148/February-March 1736 he was stricken with apoplexy, which in Dhu 'l-Hijja-April-May of the same year compelled him to retire from office. He died at his home in Usikdar in 1149/1736-7 and was buried in the cemetery of Karada Ahmed. (Subhi, 63b, 71b).

2. DURRIZADE MUSTAFA EFENDI. The son of the above by the daughter of the former 'Adil-i 'Askar 'Abd al-Kadir Efendi, he was born in 1127/1715. After having been 'Adil-i 'Askar of Rumi twice, he was appointed Shaykh-al-Islam on 21 Shawkal 1169/19 July 1756, but on 28 Djumada I of the following year (18 February 1757) he was dismissed from office and exiled to Gallipoli. His second occupancy of this office came on 5 Shawkal 1175/29 April 1762 and lasted until 24 Dhu 'l-Kada 1180/23 April 1767; and on 15 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1187/27 February 1774 he was appointed for a third time. Infirm with old age, he retired on 22 Rajab 1188/28 September 1774 and died the same year on 7 Dhu 'l-Hijja 1188/14 February 1775. He was married to the daughter of the former Shaykh-al-Islam Pashmakzade 'Abd Allah Efendi of a family claiming descent from the Khudja Afzal of the Kandahar beydd. In the cemetery of Karada Ahmed he retained the title of Dervis. In 1179/1765-6 he restored the mosque at Yefli Kapl (Hadikat ul-dewdmi, i, 237), and would also have appeared to have founded a family burial ground outside Edirne Kapl in the vicinity of the fountain of Laflzade. A work on the entitled Durr-i beydd is ascribed to him ('Othmanil muellifleri, i, 308), and his translation of a short Arabic tract is to be found in a manuscript in Topkapi, Emanet Hazinesi, no. 1308. (Wafa, i, 83a, 91a, 210b, 2003; ii, 285a; Djetwed, i, 72, 78.)

3. DURRIZADE SEYVID MEHME 'ATIR ALLAH EFENDI. The second son of the above, he was born in 1142/1729-30. After having twice occupied the post of 'Adil-i 'Askar of Rumi, on 17 Djumada I 1097/20 May 1783 he was appointed Shaykh-al-Islam and he retained this office until 20 Djumada I H1097/31 March 1785 when, suspected of complicity with the Grand Vizier Khalil Hamed Pasha in a conspiracy to depose Sultan 'Abd al-Hamid I, he was dismissed and sent to Gallipoli with orders to go on the pilgrimage. However, he died here of some dropsical affliction soon after his arrival, and the news of his death reached Istanbul on 6 Rajab 1199/15 May 1785. (Djetwed, ii, 71, 209, 317; i. H. Uzuncarh, in T.M, v (1935), 251, refers to a rumour that he was poisoned.)

4. DURRIZADE SEYVID MEHME 'ARAIF EFENDI. The younger brother of the above, he was born in 1153/1740-1 and reached the post of 'Adil-i 'Askar of Rumi on 26 Ramadam 1198/13 August 1784. On 17 Shawkal 1199/23 August 1785 he was appointed Shaykh-al-Islam, but was dismissed from office on 10 Rabii i II 1200/10 February 1786 because of his political activities, and after being ordered to go on pilgrimage, he was forced to live in exile in Kutahya. He was permitted to return to Istanbul in 1205/1790-1 when his enemy the Shaykh-al-Islam Hamidzade Mustafat Efendi was discharged from office, and on 22 Dhu 'l-Kada 1206/12 July 1792 he was again appointed to the meshikhat. Being held in some way responsible for this act, he received some years later when Napoleon launched his invasion, he was replaced in office on 18 Rabii i 1213/30 August 1798.
and after a few months' exile in Bursa, he returned to Istanbul where he died on 20 Džumada I 1215/9 October 1800 and was buried at Eşreфи Kapı. A collection of his fetwaş in Topkapı Sarayi, Yeniiler, no. 4493; and no. 4783 in the same library is a notebook he kept of appointments and disposals of the ʿulema in the years 1209–13 (Dînewet, ii, 299, 331, 347, iv, 456, v, 181; vi, 57, 68, 174).

5. Dürrizade Seyvind ʿAbd Allâh Efendi. The son of the latter, the date of his birth is not recorded. While nakib ʿal-ʾesrâʾî and a nominee (payyilî) for the post of ḥâdis ʿl-ʾasker of Rumeli, on 3 Shawwal 1223/22 November 1808 he was appointed Shaykh al-Islâm, remaining in office until 22 Shawān 1225/22 September 1810. His second term in the meşhikhat began on 30 Džumada I 1227/12 June 1812 and lasted until 10 Rabîʿ II 1230/22 March 1815. He died on 3 Džumada I 1244/11 November 1828 and was buried near his great-grandfather in the cemetery of Karadja Ahmed (Şanîzâde, i, 146, 399; ii, 114, 239; Lutfî Efendi, ii, 153; Khîrî Ilyâs, 8).

Bibliography: Details of about forty members of this family in the post of the nakib ʿal-ʾesrâʾî and to this family in positions of varying importance in the learned profession can be traced through the following references to the Sîdîjî-i ʿOthmâni, though the caution must be given that no detail, and in particular dates, can be accepted without verification from another source: i, 336, 399; ii, 338, 396; iii, 146, 242, 267, 363, 396, 476; iv, 75, 444, 556 (Nûr Allâh Efendi, 627. Mustaṣûm-zâde Şüleymân Saʿîd al-Dirî Efendi (with the combinations of Mûmîn Efendi and Rıfaʿ Efendi), Dewayât ʿal-mesâlîk, litho., Istanbul n.d., 91 (text corrupt), 100, 108, 112. Specimens of the fetwaş issued by all the individuals mentioned in this article can be found in the ʿIlmiyye Şânîzâmesî, Istanbul 1334, 515, 529, 551, 553, 575; i. H. Danışmend, İslâhî Osmanlı tarîhi kronolojisi, iv, Istanbul 1961, index; i. H. Unucaşîlî, Osmanlı tarihî, 192, Ankara 1959, 472, 484, 501, 502; F. E. Karataç, Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi Kutûphanesi Türkiye yazmalar kâtosluğu, 2 vols., Istanbul 1961. The works mentioned in the article are: Mehmed Şuhi Efendi, Taʿrîhâ, Istanbul 1198; Ahmed Wâṣîf Efendi, Taʿrîh, 2 vols., Istanbul 1219; Ahmed Dînewet Pashâ, Taʿrîh, 12 vols., Istanbul 1270-1301; Ayvansarayî Hâfiz Hüseyn Efendi, Halefa ve iqtidî-ı hâlâtÎn, 2 vols., Istanbul 1281; Mehmed ʿAṭâʾ Allâh Şanîzâde, Taʿrîhâ, 4 vols., Istanbul 1280-1; Ahmed Lutfî Efendi, Taʿrîhâ, 8 vols., Istanbul 1290-1306; Khîrî Ilyâs Efendi, Waḥdâʾ-i letâfiʿ-i Enderûn, Istanbul 1276. (J. R. Walsh)

Dürrizade ʿAbd Allâh Bey or Efendi (1809-1923), one of the last Shaykh al-Islâm of the Ottoman Empire, known for his fetwaş condemning the Turkish nationalist movement under Mustaṣûm Kemâl (Atatürk). He was born into a wealthy family claiming the title of the seyyid, most of whose male members belonged to the ʿilmîyye class, and five of whom had previously served as Shaykh al-Islâm (see preceding article). The son of the last there mentioned, ʿAbd Allâh, was Dürrizâde Mehmed Efendi, who rose to the rank of Kâdîʾasker of Rumeli, and was the father of the ʿAbd Allâh with whom this article is concerned.

ʿAbd Allâh attended secular elementary and intermediate schools, then studied at the Fâtih medrese, receiving his ʿidâyet from Eginî Khodjâ İbrâhim Hakî Efendi (d. 1894), at the time under-secretary (müsteşâr) of the Mescihhat. He received his first appointment as müdderîs (ibtidâ-i ʾkhârîdî) in 1881, and joined the Mescihhat in 1886, where by 1893 he rose to the rank of mûdderîs of the Sîlêymânîye. In 1897 he left the ʿilmîyye service to rejoin it in 1901 as member of the council for Şarîʿa studies (Medîlis-i Tedbîkhât-ı Şerîyye), and later as kâdıʾasker of Anatolia. Dismissed after the 1908 revolution, he joined the Kemalists and we Teraşkî (q.v.) movement and devoted himself to civilian pursuits (from which period he became known as ʿBeyʿ). After the armistice of 1918 he was placed in charge of a committee examining religious publications, became under-secretary at the Mescihhat on 1 February 1920, and Shaykh al-Islâm in the third cabinet of Damâd Ferîd (q.v. on 3 April, less than three weeks after the unaffiliated Allied occupation of Istanbul. In this office he signed on 11 April 1920 four fetwaş, of which the main one referred to the Kemalists as certain civil persons (who) have allied and united and chosen for themselves leaders . . ., with fraud . . . are deceiving . . . the loyal Imperial subjects and without authority are rising up to arms against the rebels and threatened eternal punishment for deserters from such any army and earthly penalties for those disobeying orders in this fight against the rebels.

For a brief period ʿAbd Allâh also became acting Minister of Education and, during Damâd Ferîd's attendance at the Paris Peace Conference, acting Grand Vizier (ṣâdeʾ aṣsam wekîlî). He was dropped from the cabinet upon its reorganization on 30 July 1920. At the time of the final nationalist victory in September 1922 he left Turkey for Rhodes and then Italy. On 23 March 1923 he left for Mecca where he died on 30 April in the act of performing the pilgrim's prayers at the Kaʿba. Although he died before the signature of the Treaty of Lausanne he was placed on the list of 150 persons (Yûzelliückler) excluded from its amnesty provisions.

Bibliography: Sîdîjî-i ʿOthmâni, iv, 691; Mehmet Zeki Pakalın in İslam Türk ansklopedisi, ii, 246-7, and in Sîdîjî-i ʿOthmâni ṭheylı (in the ms collection of Türk Tarih Kurumu); Ismail Hâmî Danışmend, İslâhî Osmanlı kronolojisi, iv (1955), 536 ff.; Galip Kemal Söylemezoğlu, Bâyındar ve selemleri, Istanbul 1939, 219 ff. For the original text of the fetwaş see Taʾwûṣ-ı Wâhîyû no. 3834 of 11 April 1336. (Faik Reşit Ünât and Dankwart A. Rustow)
The faith originated in the closing years of the reign of al-Hākim (q.v.), Fātimid Caliph of Egypt (386-411/996-1021). According to the Isma'īlī Shi‘ī faith then officially received in Egypt, al-Hākim, as imām, was the divinely appointed and authoritative guardian of Islam, holding a position among men and in his religious policy, which flouted alternately the feelings of Isma‘īlīs and Sunni alike. In his last years he seems to have wished to be regarded as a divine figure, above any rank which official Isma‘īlīs were in fact given, and of whom about 300,000, living in various parts of Syria, especially in the mountains of the Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon, and Hawrān, chiefly as cultivators and landlords.

The paramount shaykh is called al-tamīma. Chiefs of divisions or sections other than those of al-Mahāmīd may be given the title of shaykh, but the usual title is rasīl (pl. rūshādān).

AL-DURÚZ -- DURÚZ

The origin of the tribe is unknown. The similarity in name with Āl Dir‘, relatives of Āl Sa‘ūd who formerly lived in Wadi Sayfam and neighbourhood, is probably without significance. A popular tradition of the south says that al-Durúz have the same origin as the tribe of al-Manāḥīf—thence from Bani (or Ahl) al-Zannu. The frequency of naming from the mother—jalūn b. julāna—may be an indication of southern origin.

The paramount shaykh is called al-tamīma. Chiefs of divisions or sections other than those of al-Mahāmīd may be given the title of shaykh, but the usual title is rasīl (pl. rūshādān).

giving the current imām, al-Hākim, a supernatural status as embodiment of al-Čakl al-kulli, the highest cosmic intellect. But his public activity (408/1017-8) caused disturbances and forced al-Hākim to be more cautious. In 410, however, al-Hākim gave his support to another leader, Ḥamza b. ʿAll [q.v.] of Sūza in Irān, who gave to the Hākim cult its definitive Druze form.

Ḥamza had begun his mission in 408/1017 (the first year of the Druze era—the second being 410, when the public mission was renewed) and claimed to have been the only authorized spokesman for al-Hākim from the first. In 410, after al-Darazi’s death, he tried to rally the whole movement under himself. His doctrine was evidently more original than al-Darazi’s. It was, like Ismā’īlī doctrine generally, a doctrine of cosmic emanation from the One and of return to the One through human gnosis. But it was unique in its special emphasis on the immediate presence of the cosmic One and made correspondingly rather less of the subordinate emanations. Hence Ḥamza called his own followers “unitarians” par excellence.

For Ḥamza, al-Hākim was no longer merely ūmām, however highly exalted. Ḥamza himself was the ūmām, the human guide, and therefore al-Čakl al-kulli, the first cosmic principle; while al-Hākim was the embodiment of the ultimate One, the Godhead who created the Intellect itself and was accordingly Himself beyond name or office, beyond even good or evil. Compared to Him, ʿAll and the Ismāʿīlī ūmāms as such were secondary figures (though, since the One is ever present even when unrevealed, some of the latter, together with several obscure figures from earlier times, had also been embodiments of the One in their time). In al-Hākim, the One was uniquely present openly in history. The contrasting extravagances of his life expressed the workings of the ultimately Powerful, Whose acts could not be called to account, though they always revealed a meaning to His ūmām, the ʿabl, the cosmic intellect, Ḥamza. Al-Hākim was the present makām, locus, of the Creator; only in knowledge of Him could men purify themselves. Accordingly, Ḥamza’s teaching was no longer strictly an extremist Ismāʿīlīm, though it made use of extremist Ismāʾīlī conceptions and language; it claimed to be an altogether more moderate religion superseding both the Sunni taṣṣal and the Ismāʾīlī tawʾil.

Ḥamza evidently looked to al-Hākim to introduce, by his caliphal power, the messianic culmination of history, forcing all men to discard the various symbolisms of the old revealed religions, including Ismāʾīlīm, and to worship the One alone, fully revealed clearly in al-Hākim. In preparation for al-Hākim’s decisive move, Ḥamza, as ūmām, built up his own organization within the Hākim-cult circles to spread the true doctrine. Like al-Hākim and Ḥamza himself, the members of this organization embodied cosmic principles. There were five great huddād, cosmic ranks, adopted in a modified form from Ismāʾīlī lore: the ʿabl (Ḥamza—identical with ʿShā薪酬il, the “true Adam” during the current historical cycle, during which the One is also known as al-Bār); the Naṣir al-Kulliyiya, Universal Soul (Ismāʾīl b. Muḥammad al-Tamīml); the Čalima, the Word (Muḥammad b. Wāḥb al-Kurāshī); the Right Wing or the Sāḥib, the Preceder, in Ismāʾīlīm identified with the ʿabl but here denoted (Ṣalāma b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb); and the Left Wing or the Tālī, the Follower, in Ismāʾīlīm identified with the nafs (Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAll b. Aḥmad al-Samūkī, called Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Muḫtānā). Below these five ranks were a number of dāʾīs, missionaries; maḏḏāḥs, licensed to preach; and muḥāṣirs, persuaders—embodying respectively the cosmic ġidd, effort; āfīh, opening; and ṭayyār, fantasy. Subordinated to these were the common believers. In al-Hākim’s case, whatever was regarded as was not the individual person, the embodiment, but the unifying principle of which the embodiment was merely the current veil; in the ordinary person this implied an eternally reincarnated soul. To one or another of these ranks were attributed most of the titles or concepts that figured in the complex Ismāʾīlī system. Despite this hierarchy, however, the immediate presence of the One was kept primary and remained so in later Druzism.

Ranged in opposition to these true huddād, and equally the creatures of al-Hākim as the ultimate One, were a series of false huddād, accounting for the dark side of the cosmos, and embodied likewise in men of al-Hākim’s time—for instance, in al-Hākim’s Ismāʾīlī officials, teachers of the misleading doctrines of the old faiths. The eschatological drama was seen as the conflict between Ḥamza as Kāʾīm al-saʿāmīn, Master of the Time, with his true huddād, who would at last be openly supported by al-Hākim, and these false teachers whom al-Hākim would openly abandon. The followers of the Hākim-cult, whether under al-Darazi or under Ḥamza, seem to have been eager to precipitate events by proclaiming abroad the abolition of all the old faiths, including the gharī’s law of Islam and its Ismāʾīlī āfall interpretation. Despite Ḥamza’s relative caution, insults to the established faith were offered publicly, with al-Hākim’s tacit support, and riots ensued. The innovators, who regarded themselves as emancipated from the gharī, were accused of every sort of gross immorality. The Hākim cult seems to have contributed heavily to the growing political crisis of al-Hākim’s last years.

When al-Hākim disappeared, late in 411/1021, Ḥamza announced that he had withdrawn to test his adherents and would soon return to manifest his full power, placing the sword of victory in Ḥamza’s own hands. Soon after, at the end of 411, Ḥamza himself withdrew, to return with al-Hākim. The faith then entered into a period corresponding to the little gharīya of the Twelve ʿShīʿīs, with the Tālī, Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Muḫtānā [q.v.], as link between the absent Ḥamza and the faithful.

After al-Hākim’s disappearance, the Hākim cult seems to have gradually ceased activity in Egypt, but to have afforded the ideology for a wave of peasant revolts in Syria. There proselytizing was pursued actively by a number of missionaries, some of whose names have been preserved; the movement gained control of some mountainous areas, where they are said to have torn down the mosques and established their own new system of law. Presumably they dispossessed the old landlords in favour of a free peasantry. In 423/1032 the amīr of Antioch, aided by the amīr of Aleppo, suppressed a group in the Djabāl al-Summāk which included peasants who had gathered there from the vicinity of Aleppo.

In the midst of the turmoil, al-Muḫtānā at Alexandria (who had been appointed Tālī only at the last minute, in 411) tried to maintain Ḥamza’s authority and his own. He was evidently in touch with the absent Ḥamza and was preparing for his momentary advent from the Yemen. He encouraged the rebels in the Djabāl al-Summāk after their defeat. His many pastoral letters—some directed not only to Syria but to contacts and converts in all
Ismā’ili communities, as far away as Sind—served meanwhile to lay down Druze orthodoxy. He had to struggle against more than one claimant to leadership, of whom Ibn al-Kurdi, aided by one Sikkîn, seems to have been the most prominent; some of these seem to have encouraged a wide moral licence which he condemned. But with the years the general movement faded away and the Syrian peasant revolt seemed hopelessly torn by dissension; at last al-Muţkânat discharged all his di‘âs and, sometime after 425/1034, himself withdrew from the faith, as had Hamza; though he continued to send out letters as late as 434/1042-3.

Despite al-Muţkânâ’s discouragement, his work became the basis of such of the movement as did survive. Later Druzes have supposed it was al-Muţkânâ himself who compiled one hundred and eleven letters, many of them on his own, some of them by Hamza and by Ismā‘îl al-Tamîmî, and certain pieces by al-Ḥâkim, into a canon which has since served as Druze scripture, called Rasâ‘îl al-Ḥikma, the Book of Wisdom. From the time of al-Muţkânâ’s withdrawal began a period, lasting to the present among the Syrian Druzes, of passive expectation of Hamza’s and al-Ḥâkim’s return, which has corresponded to the greater sha‘bûs of the Twelfth Shi‘îs. Hamza’s hierarchical organization, including the di‘âs and lesser ranks, fell into disuse and the scriptural canon has served as guide in place of the absent ḥudûd. Though al-Muţkânâ had insisted on continuing proselytizing as long as possible, on his withdrawal it ceased and it was taught that thenceforth no further conversion to the unitarian faith could be accepted. (To this ban there have been a few exceptions). The Druzes became a closed community, keeping their doctrines secret, frowning on intermarriage and permitting neither conversion nor apostasy, and governing themselves as far as possible in such mountain fastnesses as they had seized, notably in the Wâdî Taym Allâh by Mount Hermon. These converts from the Syrian peasantry, led—according to tradition—by certain families from old Arabian tribes, formed in time a homogeneous people with distinctive physical features and social customs, possessing their own distinct political and ruling families. The aristocratic families have been noted equally for their habits of lawless raiding, for their uncompromising hospitality, and for their strict moral discipline which spared, for instance, the women of those who plundered and which was merciless toward unchastity in Druze women. (There is little foundation for the long series of Western speculations which assigned to the Druzes one or another exotic racial source, such as Persia or France).

During this period of autonomous closed group life there appeared a new system of religious practice strongly contrasting to the hierarchism which had disappeared. We know of a number of writers on the gnostic cosmology and cyclical sacred history implied already by Hamza, and commentators on the scriptural canon, but it is not known just when the new system took full form, though this was presumably at least by the time of the great Druze moralist (whose tomb is revered by both Druzes and Christians), ‘Abd Allâh al-Tânîkî [see al-Tânîkî, ‘abd Allâh], d. 885/1480. By this system the Druze community has been divided into ḫukkî (sing. ḫîl), “sages” initiated into the truths of the faith, and ḫîdîhî (sing. ḫîdhî), “ignorants”, not initiated members of the community. (Those aristocratic notables who are not initiated may be distinguished from the ordinary ḫâkîlî in their character of amîr). Any adult Druze (man or woman) can be initiated if found worthy after considerable trial, but must thereafter fulfill a number of obligations: regular daily prayers, abstaining from all stimulants, from lying, from stealing, from revenge (including raiding in feuds), and so on. The ‘ukkîl are distinguished by a special dress with white turbans. As long as one is still a ḫâhî, he is permitted more personal indulgences, within the code of honour of the Druze community, but he cannot look to spiritual growth; however, if he fails to be initiated in a given lifetime he can expect a renewed opportunity in a future birth.

The more pious or learned of the ‘ukkîl are accorded special authority in the community as sha‘bûs. In addition to what is required of the ordinary ‘ukkîl, they must be very circumspect morally, not making use of goods of a dubious source, avoiding any excess in their daily behaviour, keeping themselves on good terms with all, and ready to make peace wherever there is a quarrel. In each Druze district some one of these sha‘bûs, normally chosen from a given family, is recognized as holding the highest religious authority, as ra‘îs. The sha‘bûs are trained in a special school; they spend much time in copying religious works and especially the spiritual retreats in khâla, houses of religious retirement, built in unfrequented spots; some have even devoted their whole lives to such retirement. Preferably any ḡîl should support himself with his hands, but the sha‘bûs are a fit object of alms by the ḫâhîl, nevertheless. They are expected to offer spiritual guidance to their ḫîdîhî neighbours, presiding at such occasions as weddings and funerals.

All the ḫâhîl attend at least some of the mādîlis services, held on the eve of Friday in starkly simple houses of worship, though ḫîdîhî have been admitted to the least secret of these, when moral homilies are read in classical Arabic. The ḫâhîl alone are permitted to read the more secret books of the faith and to participate in, or even know about, its secret rituals—which the Druzes have allowed the outside world to suppose involves a metallic figure of a calf in some way, whether as representing the human aspect of al-Ḥâkim or possibly the animality of Hamza’s enemies. (The neighbours of the Druzes have not been slow to accuse them of licentious orgies at their secret services).

Hamza and al-Muţkânâ prescribed a sevenfold set of commandments, replacing the Muslim “pillars of the faith”, which have become the basis of the moral discipline of the ‘ukkîl and to some degree of all Druzes. They must above all speak truth among the faithful (or at least keep silent, but never misrepresent), a commandment which includes truth in the theological sense; but lying to unbelievers is permitted in defence of themselves or of the faith. This first commandment covers also any act, such as stealing, which must entail lying. The second commandment is to defend and help one another, and seems to imply carrying arms for the purpose. The other commandments are to renounce all former religions; to dissociate themselves from unbelievers; to recognize the unity of Our Lord (Mawlânâ, the general title given al-Ḥâkim as the One) in all ages; to be content with whatever he does; and to submit to His orders, particularly as transmitted through His sha‘bûs. Hamza prescribed, in addition, special rules of justice and of personal status to replace the
shari'a, notably insisting on equality of treatment between husband and wife in marriage; thus divorce was penalized in either partner unless for good cause. This principle is grounded under the general guidance of the ' ukhlād, but it is strongly affected by the principle of religious dissimulation—that to protect the secrecy of his faith, a Druze must affect to accept the faith of those in power about him; that is, normally, Sunni Islam. Druzes have accepted the Hanafi legal system, though with modifications such as permission of more unlimited bequests and placing of limitations on divorce. They celebrate the ' id—though not the Ḥajjdī or the Ramadān fast; many families use circumcision (or baptism), but attach no religious meaning thereto; at funerals they may use Islamic formulas but the key feature is the blessing of the ṣayyākhs. Like Syrians of other faiths, they visit the shrines of Khiḍr [q.s.] and the tombs of the prophets and saints. Nevertheless, even the ḡuḍḥāl know, and may freely speak of, the principle of their unitarianism. They possess a developed doctrine of creation and eschatology, which is founded in the teachings of the ' ukhlād. The number of souls in existence is fixed, all souls being reincarnated immediately upon death (unless, having reached perfection, they ascend to the stars); those which believed in Hamza's time are always reincarnated as Druzes, either in Syria or in the supposed Druze community in China. The variety of incarnations each soul passes through gives a thorough moral testing. (Some of the ḡuḍḥāl believe in reincarnation of the wicked in lower animals). In the end, when al-Ḥākim and Hamza reappear to conquer and establish justice in the whole world, those Druzes who have shown up well will be the rulers of all mankind. The best will then descend nearest to God—a notion which the ' ukhlād understand, like much else, in a spiritual sense.


(iii) — OTTOMAN PERIOD

When the Ottoman and the Mamlūk armies met in battle at Mārdj Dabīk in 922/1516, the Druzes fought on both sides. The Buhturids from the west of the country fought on the side of the Mamlūks, while the Ma'ānids of Shīb supported the Ottomans by allying themselves to Ghazālī, the nā'īb of Damascus. Under the Ottomans, the Druzes were governed by local dynasties, of which the Al Tanūqī, the Ma'ānids and the Shībābids, and particularly the last two (for whose genealogy see Zambaur, i, 108 ff.) were the most important. At the battle of Mārdj Dabīk the Ma'ānids were led by the Amir Fakhr al-Dīn I, who at the crucial point changed sides, abandoning the Ma'ānids Kānsī al-Ghūrī and going over to Sultan Selim I in Damascus. The Sultan rewarded him with overlordship over the amirs of Mount Lebanon, the Al Tanūqī dynasty being confined to Sayyād and Sūr (Blau, Zur Geschichte Syriens, in ZDMG, viii (1854), 480 ff.). In 931/1524 Ma'ānī rule passed to Fakhr al-Dīn's son Köķmaz. Druze attacks against the Ottomans led in 952/1545 to a punitive expedition by İbrāhīm Paşa, the wāli of Egypt. The son of Köķmaz, the Amir Fakhr al-Dīn
II [q.v.] challenged the wall of Tripoli, Sayf-oghlu Yusuf Pasha. He had some initial successes, but was eventually forced to withdraw to the Mountain, after the defeat of the rebels in 1016/1607 in the battle between Kuyudju Murad Pasha and Djanbulat-oghlu, the importance of whose family among the Druzes dates from this time. The Druze alliance dissolved as a result of the expeditions led by land the wall of Damascus, Hafîz Pasha, and by sea by the Kapudan Pasha Öküz (“The Bull”) Mehmed Pasha between 1028/1619 and 1022/1613. Fakhr al-Dîn requested permission to be present in 1021/1612 and on 30 Radjab 1022/15 September 1613 he went to Italy to seek help under the alliance, returning to the Djabal in 1027/1618. Ma’nid rule was preserved during his absence, particularly as his spies in Istanbul and Damascus gave preliminary warning of any Ottoman military measures. Although the Ottoman Sultan, by a fermand issued in 1034/1625, recognized Fakhr al-Dîn as Amîr of the Druzes from Aleppo to Jerusalem (Haydar, i, 715), the latter was subjected to constant pressure from Küçük Ahmed Pasha, who had been appointed wali of Damascus by Murâd IV. In 1044/1634 the Druzes were decisively defeated at Meğhrât Djazarin, the Amir and three of his children being carried off prisoner to Istanbul, where all but Usma’în disappeared. The death of Fakhr al-Dîn marked the end of Ma’nid ascendency. It was followed by Kayshî-yanamî dissension. Fakhr al-Dîn, like the ruling branch of the Ali Tanûq before the Ma’nid ascendency, belonged to the Yanamî clan (known as abî, “white” by the Ottomans, the Kayshîs being known as red, tabûlî, cf. Findikûlî Mehmed Ağâ, Taqwâ, Istanbul 1928, i, 215; C.-F. Volney, 1, 414, note 1). Amir Malham, who succeeded him in 1045/1635, represented the Kayshî clan and was opposed by the Amir Affâ’î Alâm al-Dîn on behalf of the Yanamîs. Dissension gave openings for Ottoman intervention, as in 1061/1651 by the wali of Tripoli, Hasan Pasha. In 1064/1654 Amir Malham extended his rule to Shadîf, by agreement with the wali of Damascus, Malham died in 1069/1659 and was succeeded in the Djabal by his brother Ahmad, the last Ma’mid ruler, who died in 1108/1697 and was succeeded by Shi’ahîds of the Kayshî clan. The latter had been protected by Amir Ahmad, who had refused to give them up to the wali of Damascus, Körpüli Fâdîl Ahmed Pasha, in 1070/1660. The wali of Damascus, helped by the wali of Tripoli, therupon defeated the joint Ma’mid-Shi’ahîd forces at Kasrawûn. The two dynasties later fell out, however, with the Ma’mids winning a short-lived victory at al-Fullû in 1076/1666 (Ibn Sabâtî, Şâlih b. Yahya, appendix, 237). After the death of Amir Ahmad, however, it was the Shi’ahîd amîr of Rusâ’îyâ, Bashîr b. Husayan, who was chosen overlord of the Djabal with the agreement of the Ottomans. The Yanamîs tried unsuccessfully to undo Kayshî ascendency: from the court in Istanbul Husayan, the son of Fakhr al-Dîn II, managed, for example, to relegate Bashîr to the position of regent to the 12-year old Haydar, of the family of the amîrs of Hasbeyâ, whose local supporters later poisoned Bashîr. But when Haydar became Amîr in his own right he crushed the Yanamîs at the battle of Ayîn-Dârâ which changed the whole feudal picture of the Djabal. Thereafter under the overlordship of the Shi’ahîds, who tried to prevent Druze-Maronite struggles, the Djanbulats reigned over Shûf, Abu ‘l-Lama’ held Matn, while at Shuwayfât the Arslan family of the Yanamî clan had to share their rule with Talmûn Yamanîs. In holding together the Djabal, the Shi’ahîds had to rely on the support of Ottoman Pashas, whose intervention led to the increase in the number of local sayyâhs, who in turn exerted pressure on the amîr. Thus, while the sayyâhs paid tribute to the amîr, it was they who decided in council whether to keep the peace or wage war. Amir Haydar died in 1144/1723 in the Shi’ahîd capital at Dayr al-Kamar, having in 1141/1729 abdicated in favour of his son Malham. Under the latter’s rule which lasted until 1167/1754, the port of Bayrût regained the importance which it had enjoyed under Fâkhr al-Dîn and became the second Shi’ahîd centre after Dayr al-Kamar. Many of Malham’s children were converted to Roman Catholicism, Christianity in general gaining ground in the Djabal. Malham and his successors generally tried to maintain a balance between local Muslims and Christians. Thus, when in 1171/1758 Greek pirates flying the Russian flag attacked Bayrût and when local Muslims retaliated by attacking the Franciscan monastery in the town, two of the Muslim leaders were hanged at the Amir’s orders. Malham was succeeded by his brothers Ahmad (the father of the historian Ahmad al-Shi’ahîd) and Mansûr, although Nûman Pasha, the Ottoman wali of Syûf, attempted to change the area from Shi’ahîd to ‘ale’âm, however, with the aim of having himself installed as amir. This, however, had to content himself with the area round Hasrî. Kûsîn died a Christian in 1182/1768, his son Bashîr II also making no secret of his Christian beliefs (Blau, op. cit., 496; Lammens, La Syrie, Beirut 1921, ii, 100 ff.). These conversions did not, of course, prevent the majority of Druzes from retaining their faith, a fact which sowed the seed of future trouble. Mansûr was dismissed in 1124/1715 by Derwîsh Pasha, the wali of Syûf, and replaced by Amir Yusuf. In 1185/1771 when the Russian fleet commanded by Alexei Orlov was encouraged by Zâhir al-Umar, the rebel ruler of Syûf and Acre, to bombard Bayrût, Mansûr sued for peace against payment of 25,000 piasters, while Amir Yusuf asked for Ottoman reinforcements, whereupon ‘Uglûn Pasha, the wali of Damascus, who had been despatched, Djarzor Pasha who occupied Bayrût in the name of Amir Yusuf. The latter succeeded, however, in ejecting this unwelcome deputy from Bayrût in 1187/1773 after a four-month siege, in which he was helped by the Russian fleet which he summoned from Cyprus. Nevertheless, Djarzor Ahmad Pasha continued to exert pressure from Acre and Syûf on the Shi’ahîds of the Djabal. Payment of a tribute and loyalty to the Ottoman cause in the face of the Napoleonic expedition from Egypt, did not shield Bashîr II from this pressure. Even although Yusuf Dîyâ Pasha, the commander of the Ottoman forces against Napoleon, confirmed Bashîr as ruler of the Djabal, Djarzor Ahmad Pasha had him expelled by forces commanded by ‘Usayn and ‘A’d al-Dîn, the sons of the Amir Yusuf, whom he wanted to appoint in his place. Bashîr sought refuge with the British admiral Sidney Smith, who took him in his flagship to al-Arîsh, returning later to the Djabal, Djarzor Ahmad Pasha contenting himself this time with keeping one of Bashîr’s sons as a hostage. Pressure on the Druzes decreased in 1804 with the death of Djarzor Pasha. In 1810 when the Wahhabîs threatened Damascus, the wali Yusuf Pasha asked the help of Sülâyman Pasha, the sandjak-beys of Acre, who in turn summoned the Druzes to Damascus. The Druzes forced the departure of Yusuf Pasha and were only with difficulty compelled to retire into the
Hawran by Suleymân Pasha's successor, 'Abd Allâh Pasha. Bashîr's absence from the Djaðbal had, however, caused so much resentment that the wills of Damascus and 'Abd Allâh Pasha were forced to allow the Shaykh to summon him back to the Lebanon. Bashîr thereafter sided with 'Abd Allâh Pasha, in his revolt against the Ottomans in Acre, whereupon his rival Shaykh Djândibûlî had 'Abbâs al-Shihâbî proclaimed amîr, while Bashîr and his sons had to seek refuge with Muhammad 'Ali in Egypt. Before long, however, Bashîr was back, defeated Djândibûlî at the battle of Barakû in 1844, and had him executed. In the following year, an attack on Bayrût by the fleet of the Greek insurgents led once again to a pogrom of local Christians, many of whom emigrated to the Djaðbal. Muslim feeling against Bashîr was also inflamed by the permission given to Melkite Christians to settle in the Djaðbal. In 1830 Bashîr once again helped 'Abd Allâh Pasha, this time to suppress a revolt in Nablûs. He then sided with Muhammad 'Ali against the Ottomans and helped the conquests of İbrahim Pasha.

(M. C. Şahîbeddîn Tekindâ) After the Kütâhây agreement of 1833 Bashîr did his best to help the Egyptians, securing in return a wide autonomy for the Lebanon. Egyptian rule was at first welcomed, particularly as certain impositions on non-Muslims were abolished, but difficulties arose when İbrahim Pasha tried to confiscate firearms and to call up Druzes. In 1835 İbrahim Pasha introduced troops into Dayr al-Kamar and tried to collect the arms of local Christians but preferred later to suspend his measures in so far as they affected the Druzes. Nevertheless a Druze revolt broke out in 1837 when an attempt was made to call up Druzes in the Hawran, who retaliated by assassinating İbrahim Pasha's emissaries. The Ottoman Government tried to stir up the Druzes and to supply arms to them, İbrahim Pasha retaliating by stirring up the Kurds and by closing Syrian ports to Ottoman shipping. A Druze revolt broke out in Ładji, but from his palace in Bayt al-Din, from where he exercised wide influence over the Maronites, Bashîr succeeded in preventing its spreading from the Hawran to the Lebanon, levelling charges that thanks to French support the Egyptians would be finally victorious. A general revolt in the Lebanon, including this time the Maronites, broke out again, however, when İbrahim Pasha made another attempt to call in arms and Egyptian forces in Bayrût found their communications cut. On 14 August 1840 the British naval commander Sir Charles Napier established contact with the rebels, who were supplied with arms after the joint bombardment of Bayrût the following month by British, Austrian and Ottoman ships. After vainly waiting for help from İbrahim Pasha in Dayr al-Kamar, Bashîr submitted to the Sultan, whose troops were in the process of reconquering Syria as a result of the London agreement. Bashîr's personal security was guaranteed, but he was nevertheless deposed in favour of a relative, Bashîr Kâsim. The Egyptian administration was on the one hand disorganized the feudal structure of the Djaðbal and, on the other, sharpened antagonism between the Druzes and the Maronites. Bashîr Kâsin's rule lasted for approximately one year and was underpinned by the Musâhir of Saydâ, Selîm Pasha, whose seat of government was transferred to Bayrût and who formed a mixed council of the various communities to advise the amîr. Taxation reform (the Egyptians had raised the taxation of the Djaðbal from 3,650 to 6,500 purses and this was then reduced to 3,500 purses) and the question of compensation led to communal friction, which erupted at Bayrût and Bâsfân, after which many houses and shops were set on fire at Dayr al-Kamar. Relative peace was restored after the Druze adventurer Şibäîl-ü Urûyân, who was in the service of the wilî of Damascus, was forced to return to that city from Zahbîa. These events caused much stir abroad and led to foreign complaints against the Ottoman administration. The Ottomans thereupon deposed Bashîr Kâsim, and entrusted the administration of the Djaðbal directly to the serasîker Mustaфа Nîrî Pasha, who in turn appointed to the amîrîate one of his infantry commanders, the mirîluwî Ğomer Pasha. Continued foreign displeasure led to the despatch to Bayrût of Sefîn Bey as an investigator in 1842, but the latter's report that the situation was satisfactory and that the appointment of either a Druze or a Maronite amîr was impossible, was disbelieved by foreign ambassadors at the Porte. Meanwhile new incidents were reported, whereupon Esâd Mukhîlî Pasha was appointed musâhir of Saydâ, and after his arrival at Bayrût the serasîker's mission was declared completed. Esâd Pasha appointed two kâ'im-makdîms, the Maronite Haydar from Bayt Abî 'l-Lâmî and the Druze Mir Ahmad from Bayt Arslân, and detached the northern districts of Djuñubayl from the Djaðbal, placing them under İbrahim Pasha. Another mission was then undertaken by the Foreign Minister Şehîb Efendi, who started by demanding that all arms should be handed in, an order which led to resistance and further complications. A further emissary, the ferîk (divisional general) Emin Paşa was sent to Bayrût in January 1846. He held secret talks with Şehîb Efendi in a kind of double organization, returning with him in June 1846. Şehîb Efendi's reforms provided for the retention of the two kâ'im-makdîms, advised by mixed councils, special deputies (wekilî) being elected in villages having a mixed population. The two kâ'im-makdîms were to receive a salary of 12,500 piastres a month each, and to be appointed and dismissed directly by the Sultan on the advice of the musâhir of Saydâ. The councils were given judicial as well as administrative and financial powers. Stability was thus established at the beginning of 1847, even although the failure to expel some trouble-making Druze leaders created difficulties. Taxes were apportioned between the two communities, the Maronites being asked to pay 1994 and the Druzes 1506 purses.

Peace was preserved until the khatt-i humdyun of 1856, which by its promise of concessions to non-Muslim subjects led to a more generalized Christian-Muslim rivalry. The first signs of trouble appeared in 1859. In the following year the Druzes and the Maronites clashed openly, whereupon Khuşhîd Pasha sent troops to the border between the two badas. This did not prevent the major outbreak of 1860: in May the Druzes attacked and set fire to villages in Matn; in June they were joined by Druzes from the Hawran, led by İsmûlî Atrash (the Djaðbal Druzes being led mainly by Saş Idjân-
bulat and Khaştār Ahmad). While the General Council of the province (Medjlis-i 'Umami) rejected the wālid's suggestion to send troops, the Druzes continued to demand the independence of the mutasarrifate of Djabal. At Rasheya, Ba'albak (where local government was overthrown by the Hārkūbīn family), Zaňla and Dayr al-Kamar. To crush the insurrection the Ottoman Government dispatched the Foreign Minister Fu'ād Pasha, arming him with emergency powers. His arrival coincided with a massacre of Christians in Damascus by the local mob, reinforced by Druzes and Bedouins. In the meantime Ḳurshīd Pasha had secured an armistice between Druzes and Maronites, of which Fu'ād Pasha did not approve, on the grounds that it compromised future judicial proceedings, but which he feared to denounce as bloodshed might then be renewed. France intervened directly by landing 5,000 troops and by suggesting the total expulsion of the Druzes from the Djabal. This Fu'ād Pasha succeeded in avoiding by taking firm action against guilty Druze leaders, pursuing and apprehending them, and finally putting them on trial at a court-martial at Muḥtārā, where some of them were sentenced to death. He also took severe punitive action in Damascus and had the wālid Ahmad Pasha sent under trial for trial in Ismā'īl Khusro Pasha having also been dismissed from Bayrūt. These measures made possible the evacuation of French troops from the Djabal. Under the agreement signed on 9 June 1861, the Djabal was completely detached from the wilayyats of Bayrūt and of Damascus and placed under a Christian mutażāsīrī, who was, however, to come from outside the district. The mutażāsīrī was appointed by the local government and not by the Ottoman authorities, as a result of incidents which were largely economic and social in origin. The Druzes rose up again and Shibli had to compromise future judicial proceedings, but which he feared to denounce as bloodshed might then be renewed. France intervened directly by landing 5,000 troops and by suggesting the total expulsion of the Druzes from the Djabal. This Fu'ād Pasha succeeded in avoiding by taking firm action against guilty Druze leaders, pursuing and apprehending them, and finally putting them on trial at a court-martial at Muḥtārā, where some of them were sentenced to death. He also took severe punitive action in Damascus and had the wālid Ahmad Pasha sent under trial for trial in Ismā'īl Khusro Pasha having also been dismissed from Bayrūt. These measures made possible the evacuation of French troops from the Djabal. Under the agreement signed on 9 June 1861, the Djabal was completely detached from the wilayyats of Bayrūt and of Damascus and placed under a Christian mutażāsīrī, who was, however, to come from outside the district. The mutażāsīrī was appointed by the local government and not by the Ottoman authorities, as a result of incidents which were largely economic and social in origin. The Druzes rose up again and Shibli had to
1839 by the forces of Shāh Shudīrāz and the English East India Campany he had extended his power over Balkh and Khulm (1266-7/1850), Shībargān (1271/1854), Maymana and Andkhuy (1271/1855) and Kunduz (1276/1859), although his authority was not entirely unquestioned. In the West he took Kandahār (1272/1855) and Harāt (1279/1863). At the same time he increased his power at the expense of the tribal chiefs, principally by developing a regular army to replace the feudal militia, which had been the basis of the Durrānī [q.v.] monarchy, and diverting to the support of this army the revenues which had formerly been appropriated by the tribal chiefs. He destroyed the power of the Khālsāyīs, murdered, imprisoned or exiled certain prominent tribal chiefs, and held both the Kizīlbaš and the Sunni elements, who had formerly made Kābul governments so unstable, under firm control. The weakness of his system was that it depended on the continuing co-operation of his sons, whom he employed as governors, a condition which was not maintained. None the less he established the geographical outlines of modern Afghanistan and laid the foundations of its internal consolidation. More than anyone else he deserves the title of the founder of Afghanistan.

Muhammad Akbar Khan, (d. 1848, wazīr Aḥmad Shāh) had numerous sons, the most important of whom was appointed governor of the Kandahār region and the leading figure in the disturbances of 1841-2), Ghulam Haydar Khan (d. 1274/1858), Shir Ālī Khan (the future amīr), Muhammad Amin Khān and Muhammad Sharīf Khān, who were all sons of a Bangash wife from Kurrām, and Muhammad Akbar Khān, (d. 1284, wazīr 1843-8), and the leading figure in the disturbances of 1841-2), Ghulam Haydar Khan (d. 1274/1858), Shir Ālī Khan (the future amīr), Muhammad Amin Khān and Muhammad Sharīf Khān, who were all sons of a Bangash wife from Kurrām, and Muhammad Akbar Khān, (d. 1284, wazīr 1843-8), and the leading figure in the disturbances of 1841-2). Bibliography: See Afghanistan. Also C. M. Macgregor (ed.), Central Asia, ii, Afghanistan, Calcutta 1871; Hamid al-Din, Dost Muhammad and the second Sikh war, in J. Pak. Hist. Soc., ii (Oct. 1954), 280-6; D. M. Chopra, Dost Muhammad in India, in Proc. I.H.R.C., xix (1941), 82-6; B. Saigal, Lord Elgin I and Afghanistan, in J.I.H., xxxiv (1954), 61-83; M. E. Yapp, Disturbances in Eastern Afghanistan 1839-42, in BSOAS, xxv/3 (1962), 499-523; H. B. Lumsden, Mission to Kandahar, Calcutta 1860. (M. E. YAPP)

DÜSTÜR, in modern Arabic constitution. A word of Persian origin, it seems originally to have meant a person exercising authority, whether religious or political, and was later specialized to designate members of the Zoroastrian priesthood. It occurs in Kalila va-Dimna in the sense of “counselor”, and recurs with the same sense, at a much later date, in the phrase Döstür-i mürkerem, one of the honorific titles of the Grand Vizier in the Ottoman Empire. More commonly, düstür was used in the sense of “rule” or “regulation”, and in particular the code of rules and conduct of the guilds and corporations (see futūwā and sīneh). Borrowed at an early date by Arabic, it required a language of a variety of meanings, notably “army pay-list”, “model or formulary”, “leave”, and also, addressed to a human being or to invisible diwān [q.v.], “permission” (see further Dozy s.v.).

In modern Arabic, by a development from the general meaning of “rule”, it has come to mean constitutional law and government in various parts of the Islamic world.

i. — TUNISIA

Until the middle of the 19th century, the despotism of the Bey (bāb) [q.v.] was tempered only by the momentary power of some members of his entourage who governed as they pleased. The foreign consuls, alarmed by the dangers of the situation, accordingly advised Muhammad Bey [q.v.] to be guided by the provisions of the qāḥṣi-i humaydān [q.v.] which had been promulgated in Turkey on 18 February 1856, granting certain guarantees to non-Muslim subjects of the Empire; but the Bey turned a deaf ear, and a grave incident was needed to precipitate the course of events. It was in fact the summary execution in 1857 of a Jewish carver who, after knocking down a Muslim child, was said to have hurled insults and blasphemies at the crowd that was threatening him with violence. He aroused the European Powers and made them decide to instruct their consuls to make representations to the Tunisian Government. It was in this way that Muhammad Bey was led to make a formal announcement, on 9 September 1857, of the principles of the Fundamental Pact (*'Ahd al-amān; see L. Bercher, En marge du pacte fondamental, in RT, 1939, 67-86) which repeated in part the qāḥṣi-i skarīl of Gülhāne (26 Ša'ban 1255/3 November 1839; see B. Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, London 1961, 104-5 and bibl. cited there) and guaranteed complete security to all inhabitants of whatever religion, nationality and race; the equality of all before the law and taxation, as well as freedom to trade and work, were recognized. At the same date the Bey announced his intention of granting the country a constitution. Some partial reforms were actually introduced (notably the setting up of a municipal council [see baladīyya]), and preparatory work was in fact started on a draft constitution in which the French Consul, Léon Roches, took part. On 17th September 1860 Muhammad al-Sādiq [q.v.], who had succeeded his brother Muhammad on 24 September 1859, himself gave a copy of the constitution drafted in French to Napoleon III in Algiers, and received the Emperor's approval. The constitution, consisting of 13 headings and 114 articles, was promulgated in January 1861 and put into force on 26 April of the same year.

By the terms of this constitution, the hereditary Bey was supreme head of the state and of religion, but he no longer controlled the revenues of the State and was allotted a civil list; moreover he was responsible, as were the ministers whom he had to have at his side, to the Grand Council which consisted of 60 councillors nominated for five years and chosen by the Tunisian Government from the ministers, high officials, senior officers and notables. “The agreement of the Grand Council is indispensable for all the procedures listed below: making new laws; changing an existing law... enlisting the army, its equipment or that of the navy... interpreting... expenditure...
Thus the Grand Council participated in the preparation of laws which were made valid by the Bey and his ministers. The executive power reverted to the Bey and his ministers, whilst the independence of the judicial power in respect of the legislature and the executives was recognized. The kābīds continued to preside over police courts for the trial of minor offences, courts of first instance were set up and the court of the ṣarīr [q.v.] continued to function for all questions within its competence. A court of appeal was to sit in Tunis and the Grand Council was to act as Supreme Court of Appeal. Finally, the provisions of the Fundamental Pact with regard to the rights of Tunisian and foreign subjects were confirmed and continued to function for all questions within its competence. A court of appeal was to sit in Tunis and the Grand Council was to act as Supreme Court of Appeal. Finally, the provisions of the Fundamental Pact with regard to the rights of Tunisian and foreign subjects were confirmed and completed.

The establishment of the French Protectorate suspended the operation of the Constitution of 1861. From the earliest years of the 20th century a number of Young Tunisians, the spiritual heirs of the general Khayr al-Din [q.v.], endeavoured to raise the material, moral and intellectual level of their compatriots, and founded various associations [see DHA*MYYA, iv] of a more or less political character. In 1907 was created a Consultative Conference, considered inadequate, and from that time the idea of demanding the grant of a Constitution was in germination. After the war, on 4 June 1920, the Tunisian Liberal Constitutional Party (al-Ittāf al-Hurr al-Dustūrī al-Tunūsī) was founded, more commonly known as the Destour Party. The vade-mecum of Tunisian nationalism at that time was a collective work, La Tunisie martyre, which called for: the election of a deliberative assembly composed of Tunisian and French members elected by universal suffrage; the formation of a government responsible to this assembly; the absolute separation of powers; the access of Tunisians to all administrative posts; the election of municipal councils by universal suffrage; the respect of public liberties. In 1922 the authorities of the Protectorate set up the Great Council, an arbitral commission, councils of caïdat and regional councils [see TUNISIA]; but the conservative class of the nation, who would have been satisfied with gradual reforms, lost ground to a new petty bourgeoisie, on the whole of French and Arab culture, which tried to reach the public in greater depth; a split, the beginnings of which had been apparent in the Destour Party since 1932, came about on 1 March 1934 with the creation of the Neo-Destour (as opposed to the Arabo-Destour) Party, which called for full and complete independence and organized mass demonstrations to achieve it. The leaders of this movement were exiled, and the second world war silenced the demands for independence. They were renewed immediately after the restoration of peace, and independence was granted to Tunisia by France on 20 March 1956; this was a triumph for the president of the Neo-Destour Party, M. Habib Bourguiba (al-Ḥabīb Abū Ṭuqayba), the future President of the Tunisian Republic. (Biography on the nationalist movements is copious but scattered among many papers, periodicals, bulletins, etc.; in particular REI, passim; OM, passim; also Ch. Khairallah, Essai d'histoire et de synthèse des mouvements nationalistes tunisiens, Tunis n.d.; H. Bourguiba, La Tunisie et la France, Paris 1954; F. Garas, Bourguiba et la naissance d'une nation, Paris 1956; P. E. A. Romeril, Tunisian nationalism, a bibliographical outline, in MEJ, xiv (1960), 206-15; N. A. Ziadeh, Origins of nationalism in Tunisia, Beirut 1962). As early as 29 December 1955 the Bey promulgated a decree permitting the establishment of a National Constituent Assembly, which was elected on 25 March 1956 and drafted a new constitution, promulgated on 25 Dhū 'l-Ka'āda 1378/1 June 1959, with 10 headings and 64 articles. It is laid down in the preamble to this Constitution that the 'Umayyad whose religion is Islam, that it forms a part of the Greater Maghrib, that its motto is "Liberty, Order, Justice", and that sovereignty belongs to the people. The Tunisian Republic guarantees the dignity of the individual and freedom of conscience, and protects freedom of worship provided that public order is not disturbed (art. 5). All citizens are equal before the law and for purposes of taxation, and enjoy full rights which can be limited only by law (arts. 6-7). Freedom of opinion, of expression, of the press, of publication, of assembly and of association are guaranteed, as well as trade union rights (art. 8). Inviolability of domicile, secrecy of the mails and freedom of movement are assured (arts. 9-10); right of property is guaranteed (art. 14). Part II treats of the legislative power exercised by the National Assembly which is elected for 5 years by universal suffrage, at the same time as the President of the Republic. The right to initiate legislature belongs to the President or to the President and the members of the Assembly (art. 28); the President may enact, in the interval between two ordinary annual sessions of the Assembly, decrees, which must be submitted for ratification by the deputies in the course of the following session (art. 31); in addition, in the case of imminent danger the President may enforce exceptional measures and report them to the Assembly (art. 32). The State budget is voted by the Assembly (art. 35). Part III is devoted to the executive power exercised by the President of the Republic, who must be a Muslim, aged at least 40 years, of Tunisian father and grandfather and in possession of full civic rights (arts. 37-9). He is elected for 5 years by universal suffrage, and is not eligible for re-election for more than three consecutive terms (art. 40). He promulgates the laws and ensures their publication within 15 days in the official newspaper, during which time he has the power of referring a bill back for a second reading before the Assembly; if the bill then receives a two-thirds majority the law is promulgated within a fresh period of 15 days (art. 44). The President decides government policy, and selects the members of the government who are to be responsible to him (art. 43). He nominates holders of civil and military office and is the supreme chief of the armed forces (arts. 45-6). The rest of the chapter deals with foreign relations, the making of treaties, the granting of pardons, and the vacancy of the Presidency. Part IV, very short, relates to the judicial power. The Constitution assures the independence of the judiciary (art. 53) and sets up a Higher Judicial Council which supervises the application of the guarantees granted to judges (art. 53). Part V institutes a Supreme Court which is to meet to try a charge of high treason brought against a member of the government. Parts VI, VII and VIII treat of the Council of State, which is at once an administrative jurisdiction and an Audit Office, the Economic and Social Council, and municipal and regional
councils. Finally Parts IX and X provide for the conditions for amending the Constitution, initiative for which belongs to the President or to one-third of the members of the Assembly, as well as of interim powers.


ii. — TURKEY

The word düstür (modern Turkish form düstur) is used in Turkish in the general senses of principle, precedent, code or register of rules. It was applied in particular to the great series of volumes, containing the texts of new laws, published in Istanbul (and later Ankara) from 1279/1863 onwards. (An earlier volume of new laws, not under this name, had already been issued in 1267/1851.) Three series (terîbî) of the Düstür were published, the first covering the years 1839-1908, the second 1908-22, and the third containing the laws of the nationalist régime in Ankara and, after it, of the Turkish Republic, from 1920 onwards (see G. Jäschke, Türkische Gesetzesammlungen, in WT, N.S. iii (1954) 225-34).

Düstür has not been used in Turkish with its modern Arabic meaning of constitution, for which the normal terms are cânûn-ı esâsi (basic law) and mecbûriyet (conditionalness). The former term is applied to the constitution itself, and was replaced during the linguistic reforms in the Republic by Anayasa; the latter denotes constitutional government. In what follows a brief sketch is given of constitutional development in Turkey during the 19th and 20th centuries.

The Sened-i İttifâk

The modern constitutional history of Turkey is usually dated from the year 1808 when, shortly after the accession of Mahmûd II, the Grand Vizier Bayrâkîr Mustaøa Paşa (g.v.) convened a meeting in Istanbul, to which he invited a number of the local rulers and dynasts (see Â'yân and Dereküy) who at that time enjoyed virtual autonomy in most of the provinces of the Empire. A number of the leading Â'yân and Dereküy, from both Rumelia and Anatolia, came with large retinues and military forces (İsmâ'îl Bey of Sereç is said to have come with 12,000 men, Kâlyondu Mustaøa, of Bilecik, with 5000, and others with considerable but unspecified numbers), and camped at various places outside the city; others, though not attending in person, sent agents to represent them. After an interval of discussions and negotiations to prepare the ground, a general consultative meeting (enâhaîmen-i mecbûret-i 'umdüm-i sâhî) was held, at which the Grand Vizier presided; also present were the Şaykh al-İslâm, the aghas of the Janissaries and of the sipahîs, and other dignitaries of the central government, as well as the invited Â'yân. The Grand Vizier made a speech in which he described the weaknesses of the Ottoman state and army and set forth a programme of reform. His proposals were unanimously approved, and the meeting resolved that a "deed of agreement" (sened-i İttifâk) should be drafted, signed and sealed, expressing the points of agreement reached between the parties. Contacts between officials, Â'yân and the Sultan followed, and on 17 Şebîbân 1223/7 October 1807 the final draft of the Sened-i İttifâk was sent to the Sultan for ratification. Mahmûd II, despite his strong objections to the document, found himself obliged to ratify and authenticate it with his imperial signature. The Sened-i İttifâk consists of a preamble, seven articles, a conclusion and a signature. The signatures, after describing the decline of Ottoman power and the weakness of the Ottoman state, explains that the following articles represent the unanimous agreement of the signatories, reached after several meetings, on the need to strengthen the empire and the faith and on the means of accomplishing this. Article one begins with what might be called a pledge of homage to the Sultan by the Â'yân, who together with the officers of the central government, undertake not to oppose or resist the Sultan, and to come to his help if others oppose him. The signatories pledge themselves collectively to enforce this against offenders, including other parties who have not signed the document. They accept these obligations for themselves during their lifetimes, and for their sons and heirs after them.

Article two is concerned with military matters. Since the main purpose of the meeting and agreements was to restore the military power of the Empire, the signatories undertake to cooperate in the recruitment of troops, and to come to the Sultan's help when required, against both foreign and domestic enemies. They accept joint responsibility for dealing with offenders.

Article three is financial, and records the promise of the signatories to respect and observe the rules and regulations laid down by the government in financial matters. They undertake to show solicitude in collecting and remitting sums due to the government, and to refrain from abuses, for the punishment of which they accept joint responsibility.

Article four establishes the authority and responsibility of the Grand Vizier. The signatories recognize the Grand Vizier as the absolute representative (vekil-i mutlaka) of the Sultan, and promise to obey his orders in all matters, as if they came from the Sultan. Other functionaries are to keep within the limits of their own offices and jurisdictions. If they exceed them, the signatories collectively will stand forth as accusers. Similarly, if the Grand Vizier himself acts against the laws of the Empire (hâkal-î cânûnî) or violates this agreement, takes bribes, practises extortion, or commits acts harmful or likely to be harmful to the state (devellet-î 'alıyyeye .. mudûrîr), then all the signatories conjointly will stand forth as accusers, and secure the removal of such abuses.

Article five regulates the relations of the Â'yân with one another and with the officials of the central government, on a basis of mutual guarantees. If any of the signatories violates the agreement, the rest will be collectively responsible for his punishment. The article guarantees the Â'yân in possession of their lands, and confirms the rights of succession of their heirs, who are also to be bound by the agreement. The same guarantees are extended by the Â'yân to the lesser Â'yân under their jurisdiction; this appears to involve a kind of sub-infeudation. The Â'yân undertake not to attack each other's lands, nor to oppress their subjects, and in general to deal
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justly with the government, the people, and with one another.

Article six deals with the contingency of a further outbreak of disorder in the capital, whether due to a Janissary meeting or other causes. In such an event, the aâyân promise to come at once to Istanbul with their forces, to restore order and the authority of the central government.

Article seven is concerned with the protection of the subjects from extortion and oppression. The aâyân undertake to deal justly with their subjects, and to observe and report on one another.

The significance of the sened-i ittifâk has been variously assessed. Turkish constitutional historians have seen in it a kind of Magna Carta, an attempt by a baronage and gentry to exact from the Sultan a recognition of their rights and privileges, and thus to limit the authority of the sovereign power. Şerif Mardin takes a diametrically opposite view; according to him, the agreement was planned by officials of central government, for whom the Grand Vizier was no more than a "military figurehead"; it "was aimed at curbing the powers of the local dynasties . . . and . . . was one of the first steps towards the transformation of the Ottoman Empire into a modern centralized state". The recognition of the independence of the aâyân was merely "a temporary compromise due to the weakness of the central powers" (Mardin, 146-8).

From the historical evidence it would seem clear that this agreement was negotiated between the Grand Vizier and other dignitaries of the central government on the one hand, and the leading aâyân on the other. Neither side imposed its will on the other, and indeed it is difficult to see how the aâyân could have been compelled, in view of the impressive armed forces that they had brought with them. Djewdet remarks that the meeting and agreement were made possible because the aâyân trusted Bayraşdâr Mustafa Pasha—though apparently not far enough to come to Istanbul without armies, or to move into the city when they had got there.

One party to the agreement is known to have objected to it—the Sultan, who saw in it a derogation of his sovereignty. According to Djewdet he signed it unwillingly, and with the intention of annulling it as soon as he had got rid of the threat. However, he nourished resentment of his sovereignty. According to Djewdet he signed the agreement was freely negotiated between the Sultan and other dignitaries of the central government, for whom the Grand Vizier was no more than a "military figurehead"; it "was aimed at curbing the powers of the local dynasties . . . and . . . was one of the first steps towards the transformation of the Ottoman Empire into a modern centralized state". The recognition of the independence of the aâyân was merely "a temporary compromise due to the weakness of the central powers" (Mardin, 146-8).

The effective agreement is between the Grand Vizier and other dignitaries of the central government on the one hand, and the leading aâyân on the other. Neither side imposed its will on the other, and indeed it is difficult to see how the aâyân could have been compelled, in view of the impressive armed forces that they had brought with them. Djewdet remarks that the meeting and agreement were made possible because the aâyân trusted Bayraşdâr Mustafa Pasha—though apparently not far enough to come to Istanbul without armies, or to move into the city when they had got there.

One party to the agreement is known to have objected to it—the Sultan, who saw in it a derogation of his sovereignty. According to Djewdet he signed it unwillingly, and with the intention of annulling it as soon as he had got rid of the threat. However, he nourished resentment of his sovereignty. According to Djewdet he signed the agreement was freely negotiated between the Sultan and other dignitaries of the central government, for whom the Grand Vizier was no more than a "military figurehead"; it "was aimed at curbing the powers of the local dynasties . . . and . . . was one of the first steps towards the transformation of the Ottoman Empire into a modern centralized state". The recognition of the independence of the aâyân was merely "a temporary compromise due to the weakness of the central powers" (Mardin, 146-8).

Whatever the historical balance of forces that produced it, the constitutional significance of the sened-i ittifâk lies in its character as a negotiated contract—an agreement between the Sultan and groups of his servants and subjects, in which the latter appear as independent contracting parties, receiving as well as conceding certain rights and privileges (cf. the comments of Djewdet, ix, 6 on the infringement of the Sultan's absolute prerogative).

The effective agreement is between the Grand Vizier and the aâyân; the Sultan merely ratifies it, and is clearly expected to reign rather than to rule.

The text of the sened-i ittifâk will be found in Şahâzâde, Ta'rîhî, i, 66-78, and Djewdet, Ta'rîhî, ii, 278-83. For accounts of the events leading to it, see Şahâzâde, i, 61 ff.; Djewdet, i, 2 ff.; A. de Juchereau de Saint-Denys, Révolutions de Constantinople en 1807 et 1808, ii, Paris 1819, 200 ff.; J. W. Zinkeisen, Gesch. des osman. Reiches in Europa, viii, Gotha 1863, 504 ff.; and views of the pact see I. H. Uzuncarsili, . . .

The approach to constitutional government

The 'Deed of Agreement' was short-lived. Almost immediately after its signature the Grand Vizier Bayraşdâr Mustafa Pasha was overthrown and killed, and in the years that followed Sultan Mahmud II subjugated the aâyân and brought what remained of the Empire under the effective control of the central government. The great reforming edicts of 1839 and 1856 have sometimes been described as 'constitutional charters', in that they lay down such general principles as the security of life, honour and property of the subject, fair and public trial of persons accused of crimes, and equality before the law of all Ottoman subjects irrespective of religion. Some of the other reforms of this period may also be said to have a quasi-consitutional character, such as the councils set up by Mahmud II and his successors (see maglis and tanâme) and especially the Council of State (şâhârâ-yi Dâvlet), founded in 1868. Modeled on the French Conseil d'État, this was a court of review in administrative cases; it also had certain consultative functions, and was supposed to prepare the drafts of new laws. Though its members were all appointed and not elected, it has been described as "a kind of rudimentary chamber of deputies". In 1845 the government actually experimented—unsuccessfully—with an assembly of provincial notables in the capital (Lutfî, Ta'rîhî, vii, 15-17; Ed. Engelhardt, La Turquie et le Tansimat, i, Paris 1882, 76; Lewis, Emergence, 110-1); the provincial organization law of 1864 provides for elected councils in the provinces.

Despite these developments, the general effect of the Westernization of the apparatus of government was to make it more difficult than ever for the Sultan to limit the autocratic authority of the central power. The old and well-tried checks on the Sultan's despotism—the entrenched intermediate powers of the army, the 'âlemâ and the notables—were one by one abandoned or enfeebled, leaving the reinforced sovereign power with nothing but the paper shackles of its own edicts to restrain it; the new laws were too little understood, too freely supported, too ineptly applied, to have much effect.

The growing autonomy of the state—at times of the Sultan, at others of the ministers acting in his name—did not pass unnoticed. Towards the middle of the 19th century a libertarian movement of political thought began to gain ground (see buktiyva, ii), deriving its inspiration from European liberal and constitutional ideas, which Muslim writers tried to identify with the older Islamic doctrine of consultation (by the ruler of his councillors—see ma Şhârâ). In 1839 a Turkish translation appeared of the account by the Egyptian Şayḫc Râfi' Rifâ'â al-Tahtâwî [q.v.] of his stay in Paris; this included an annotated translation of the French constitution, with an explanation of the merits of constitutional government. Constitutionalism did not, however, become a political force in Turkey until the eighteen-sixties, when its development was
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The Ottoman constitution of 1876 (see above) brought the first precedent of a constitution in a Muslim state; the Egyptian legislative assembly of 1866 and the French constitutional reform of the same year provided examples nearer home. Muṣṭafā Fāḍil Paşa [g.v.], the brother of the Khedive Iṣmāʿīl of Egypt, and later the Khedive Iṣmāʿīl himself, gave encouragement to members of the group of liberal patriots known as the Young Ottomans (see veşi 'otqamânîlar), some of whom campaigned actively for the introduction of a constitutional régime in Turkey. At first they were strongly opposed by the government, and driven into exile; the Grand Vizier 'Āli Paşa himself wrote refuting the arguments in favour of such a change (Mardin, 19-20). The death of 'Āli Paşa in September 1871, however, and the growing influence of Midhat Paşa [g.v.] brought a change in attitude at the centre, while the mounting pressure of external events made a concession to liberal opinion seem desirable. In May 1876 the British Ambassador Sir Henry Elliott reported that "the word constitution" was in every mouth. As early as the winter of 1875, Midhat Paşa told Sir Henry that the object of his group was to install a constitutional régime, with ministers responsible to "a national popular assembly" (Sir Henry Elliott, Some revolutions and other diplomatic experiences, London 1922, 226, 231-2). The stages by which the constitution was prepared are still imperfectly known. The first steps seem to have been taken soon after the accession of Murâd V, when exploratory discussions were held. The sickness and deposition of Murâd delayed matters, but work was resumed after the accession of ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd II, who had promised Midhat his support for the constitutional cause. A new constitutional commission, this time led by Midhat himself, was appointed on 19 Ṭaʾādālân 1293/8 October 1876 N.S. It consisted initially of the chairman and 22 members, including a number of civil and military paghas, a contingent of ʿašelma, most if not all of them in government service, and some high officials, several of them Christian. Other persons, including some of the Young Ottomans, were later added to the commission or to its drafting subcommittee. After some delays, and disagreements between the members and with the Sultan, a compromise text was finally adopted, and promulgated by the Sultan. Midhat Paşa, as president of the Council of State, as chairman of the commission, and, since 20 December 1876, as Grand Vizier, had played a predominant rôle in securing this result. (On the preparation and adoption of the constitution, see Bekir Şükri Baykal, 99 Meşruyeti, in Belâlet, vi/2-1 (1942), 45-83; documents in idem, Birinci vi/2i-2 (1942), 45-83; see also: Bekir Şükri Baykal, Beyrûnt-i iktiddâr (1944), 15-9; Mithat Cemal Kuntay, Birinci vi/2 (1942), 45-83; Mithat Cemal Kuntay, Belleten, xxiv/96 (1960), 601-36; Mithat Cemal Kuntay, Numâz Kenâ, ii/2, Istanbul 1956, 55 ff.; Yu. A. Petrovian, "Novle Osmanlî" i borba za Konstitutsiyu 1876 g. v. Turtsi, Moscow 1958; Ş. Mardin, The genesis . . . 78.)

The Constitution of 1876

The first Ottoman constitution (hâmîn-i esâsî) was promulgated by Sultan ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd on 7 Dhu 'l-Hijād 1293/23 December 1876 N.S. It is in form rather more than in content it was a constitutional enactment in the Western style, consisting of twelve sections with 119 articles, and accompanied by an Imperial Rescript (Khaṭā-i humâyun) of promulgation serving as a preamble. In framing their text, the Ottoman draftsmen seem to have been greatly influenced by the Belgian constitution of 1831, both directly and through the Prussian constitutional edict of 1850 which, while owing much to its Belgian model, adapted it to a number of respects to the more authoritarian traditions of Prussia. While the Belgian constitution was promulgated by a constitutional assembly representing the sovereign people, the Ottoman derived from the goodwill of the king, whose ultimate sovereignty was in no way thereby diminished. The Ottoman constitution also derives from the will of the sovereign who voluntarily renounces the exclusive exercise of some—though by no means all—of his prerogatives, and retains all residual powers. Again like the Prussian constitution, the Ottoman constitution gives perfunctory recognition to the principle of the separation of powers, but unlike the Belgian constitution does not apply it very rigorously.

The first section (articles 1-7) is headed "The Ottoman Empire" (Memâlîk-i Develî-i ʿOtqamamiyye); it defines the Empire, names its capital, and lays down the rights and privileges of the Sultan and the imperial dynasty. The Ottoman Sultanate, with which is united the supreme Islamic Caliphate (ḫilâfâ-i hubrâ-yi ʿislamiyye) belongs in accordance with ancient custom to the eldest member of the Ottoman dynasty (art. 3). The Sultan, as Caliph, is protector of the Islamic religion (din-i ʿislamiḫ hâmîsi) (art. 4. On the Ottoman claim to the Caliphate see Khilâfeh). The Sultan's person is sacrosanct (muekkadde) and he is not responsible (ḫâṣṣî-i muexâl) (art. 5). Article 7 enumerates some of the Sultan's prerogatives, in a form of words clearly indicating that the list is not intended as a complete definition, and that there is no renunciation of residual powers (iḥbâb-i muekaddes-i Pâdîgâhî dîvîmsînendî). In the official French translation "S.M. le Sultan compte au nombre de ses droits souverains les prérogatives suivantes . . . ". These include, together with such traditional Islamic rights as the striking of coins and mention in the Friday prayer, the appointment and dismissal of ministers, the making of war and peace, the execution (idjîr) of chartî and state law (akhbâm-i ʿerîfîyye ve hâmîmiyye), the regulation (nisâmîmâlerînî tânîmi) of public administration, the convocation and prorogation of parliament and, if he thinks it necessary (ladaʾ-ihkîddâ—i ḥâzîmatînî), to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies, on condition that new elections be held (aʾdâst yezîden intîkhâb olunmuş şartîlî). The second section (articles 8-26) deals with the public rights (iḥbâb-i ʿumâmîmiyye) of Ottoman subjects (lebaʿa). It defines Ottoman nationality, and affirms the equality of all Ottomans, irrespective of religion, before the law. Though Islam is the state religion, the free exercise of other religions is protected. Article 10 lays down that personal freedom is inviolable (hérrîyet-i şahbâsîyye ye türûlî taʾarrûdan maṣândur), and subsequent articles deal with freedom of worship, the press, association, education etc., together with freedom from arbitrary intrusion, extortion, arrest, or other unlawful violations of person, residence, or property.

The remaining sections deal with the ministers (articles 27-38), officials (1941), parliament (42-59), the Senate (60-64), the Chamber of Deputies (65-80), the judiciary (81-91), the high courts (92-95), finance (96-107), and provincial administration (108-112). A final section of "miscellaneous provisions" (mevûddî-i şetellâ) includes the notorious article 113, giving the imperial government the right to proclaim martial law on the occurrence or expectation of disorders, and giving the Sultan the exclusive right,
after reliable police investigations, to deport persons harmful to the state from Ottoman territory.

The executive power belongs to the Sultan, and is exercised in person or through a council of ministers (medjdls-i wishehd), presided over by the Grand Vizier, and including the Shaykh al-Islam. These two dignitaries are chosen and appointed by the Sultan; the appointment of other ministers is effected by imperial order (ir'ad-i akhkham). The ministers are individually but not collectively responsible—and to the Sultan if a government bill is rejected by the Chamber of Deputies, the Sultan can, at his discretion, either change the cabinet or dissolve the Chamber and order new elections.

The legislative power also belongs to the Sultan, but its exercise is shared, on a rather restricted basis, with a Parliament (medjdls-i umumtni). This consists of a Senate (hey'et-i d'uyd), nominated directly for life by the Sultan, and of a Chamber of Deputies (hey'et-i melb'itun), elected for four years on the ratio of one deputy for every 50,000 male Ottoman subjects. The Senate must not exceed one third of the numbers of the elected Deputies. The manner of election was fixed by an ir'ad of 28 October 1876, on a basis of restricted franchise and indirect elections. The power to initiate legislation in Parliament belongs to the government; proposals for legislation must first be submitted through the Grand Vizier to the Sultan, who may, if he thinks fit, instruct the Council of State to draft a bill. To become law, a bill must be passed by both Chambers, and receive the Sultan's assent. Bills rejected by either chamber cannot be reconsidered in the same session.

The judicial power is exercised through two systems of judiciary, the first (sher'i) concerned with the Holy Law of Islam, the second (mecmedî; in the official French translation rendered "civil") with the new laws made by the state. Judges are appointed by berdt; they are irremovable (la yaf'asil) but can resign, or be revoked after a judicial conviction. Article 86 guarantees the freedom of the courts from "any kind of interference".

The effective life of the 1876 constitution was of short duration. The first Ottoman parliament met on 17 December 1876 (11 Dehber 1294/11 March 1908 N.S.), with a Senate of 25 and a Chamber of 120 deputies. Its fifty-sixth and last meeting was held on 16 Djamâd II 1324/28 June 1877 N.S. [= 16 June O.S.]. After further elections, a second Parliament assembled on 13 Dhu 'l-Hijjah 1324/13 December 1877 N.S. [= 1 December O.S.], and soon showed unexpected vigour. On 13 February 1878 the deputies went so far as to demand that three ministers, against whom specific charges had been brought, should appear in the chamber to defend themselves (cf. article 38 of the constitution). The next day the Sultan dissolved the Chamber, and ordered the Deputies to return to their constituencies. In the words of the Proclamation "Since present circumstances are unfavourable to the full discharge of the duties of parliament, and since, according to the constitution, the limitation or curtailment of the period of session of the said parliament in accordance with the needs of the time form part of the sacred Imperial prerogatives, therefore, in accordance with the said law, a high Imperial order has been issued ... that the present sessions of the Senate and Chamber, due to end at the beginning of March ... be closed as from today". Parliament had sat for two sessions, of about five months in all. It did not meet again for thirty years.
The electoral law, the preparation of which was envisaged in the constitution, was drafted and debated in 1877, but did not become law until after the 1908 revolution. It improved and extended the framework of the *irade* of 1876, but retained the limited franchise and the system of indirect elections through electoral colleges. Elections under this law were held in 1908, 1912, 1914 and 1919. All but that of 1914 were contested by more than one party; none resulted in a transfer of power. In January 1920 the last Ottoman parliament, elected in the sixth and last general election in the Ottoman Empire, assembled in Istanbul. On 18 March the Chamber prorogued itself; on 11 April it was dissolved by the Sultan. Twelve days later the Grand National Assembly of Turkey held its opening session in Ankara.


The Republic and its antecedents

Almost from the beginning, the Grand National Assembly (Büyük Millet Mejlisi) convened in Ankara by the nationalists was concerned with constitutional problems. Its first formally constitutional enactment was the "Law of Fundamental Organizations" (*Teşkilât-ı esasiyye bânânı*) of 20 January 1921—in effect the provisional constitutional provision of the new Turkish state that was emerging (*Diistur*, 3rd series, i, 196; Gözübüyük and Kili, 85-7). The first article proclaims the revolutionary principle that "sovereignty belongs unconditionally to the nation" (hâkimiyet bîlî başydi şarq milletiîsrî), and that "the system of administration rests on the principle that the nation personally and effectively directs its own destinies". The second article declares that "executive power and legislative authority are vested and expressed in the Grand National Assembly (which is the only and rear representative of the nation". The third article lays down that "the state of Turkey (Türkiye devleti) is administered by the Grand National Assembly, and its government bears the name of "the government of the Grand National Assembly". The remaining articles are concerned with the holding of elections and the conduct of government business (text in *Diistur*, 3rd series, i, 196; Gözübüyük and Kili, 85-7; English version in D. E. Webster, *The Turkey of Atatürk*, Philadelphia 1939, 97-8). This enactment, with its equally revolutionary references to "the sovereignty of the nation" and "the state of Turkey", marked the first decisive step in the series of legal and constitutional changes that regulated the transformation of Turkey from an Islamic Empire to a secular national state. The next was a resolution adopted by the Assembly on 1 November 1922, after the final victory of the nationalists. It contained only two articles: the first declared that "the Turkish people consider that the form of government in Istanbul resting on the sovereignty of an individual [the Sultanate] had ceased to exist on 16 March 1920 [i.e., two and a half years previously, the day of the British military occupation of Istanbul] and had passed forever into history." The second recognized that the Caliphate belonged to the Ottoman house, but reserved to the Assembly the right to choose and appoint the most suitable Ottoman prince. This attempt to separate the Caliphate from the Sultanate proved a failure, and on 3 March 1924 the Caliphate was abolished and the last Caliph sent into exile. Meanwhile, however, another radical change had been accomplished. On 29 October 1923, after hours of debate, the Assembly passed a group of six amendments to the constitutional enactment of 1921. Their purpose, said Muşafa Kemal, was to remove ambiguities and inconsistencies in the political system of the caliphate, and to provide a new framework. The previous night, declared that "the form of government of the state of Turkey is a Republic... the President (re'is-i gümûrî) is elected by the Grand National Assembly in plenary session from among its own members... the President is head of the state... and appoints the Prime Minister...". The new order was confirmed in the republican constitution, adopted by the Assembly on 20 April 1924 (on republican ideas in Islam see gümûrîyya).

The republican constitution retains elements of the enactment of 1921 and even of the reformed Ottoman constitution, but introduces a great deal that is new. The constitution is promulgated by the Assembly, which can amend it by a two-thirds majority (art. 102). The only entrenched clause is article 1, stating that "the Turkish state is a Republic". "No amendment or modification" of this article "can be proposed in any form whatsoever". No article of the constitution can be disregarded or suspended for any reason or under any pretext, and no law may contain provisions contrary to the constitution (Art. 103; the constitution, however, provides no special machinery for testing the constitutionality of laws).

Both the legislative authority and the executive power are vested in the Assembly, representing the sovereign people. The Assembly exercises its legislative power directly, its executive authority through the person of the President, whom it elects, and through a Council of Ministers (articles 4-7). Article 7 also gives the Assembly the right—which it never exercised—to dismiss the Council of Ministers. Judicial authority is exercised by independent courts (art. 8). The Assembly consists of a single chamber, elected once every four years. The Assembly can, however, by a majority vote, decide to hold new elections before the expiration of its term (articles 13, 25). The President of the Republic is elected by the Assembly, by secret ballot and absolute majority, for the duration of one parliament. He is to promulgate laws passed by the Assembly within ten days but may refer them back, within the same period, with a statement of his reasons for doing so.
This right does not extend to the constitutional law or to budgetary laws. If the Assembly again passes a law which has been referred back, the President is obliged to submit it to the Assembly in case of high treason, but responsibility arising from decrees promulgated by the President devolves on the Prime Minister and the minister signing the decree (article 41). The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible for the general policy of the government, but each minister is individually responsible for executive matters falling within his jurisdiction and for the acts of his subordinates (article 46). The Prime Minister is chosen by the President, the other ministers by the Prime Minister. The remaining sections deal with the judiciary, which is free and independent, with "the public rights of the Turks", and with "miscellaneous matters", including provincial administration, officials, finance, and rules relating to the constitution.

The constitution was twice amended in matters of substance before its final abrogation. The first was in April 1928, when article 2 was amended by the deletion of the words "The religion of the Turkish state is Islam", with consequential changes in some other articles, to remove references to religion or holy law. The second was in February 1937, when article 2 was again amended, by the inclusion of the six principles of the Republican People's Party, declaring that the Turkish state is "republican, nationalist, populist, etatist, secular and reformist". Some other small changes were made at the same time.

The replacement of the text of the constitution by a 'pure' Turkish version in 1945, and the abandonment of the latter in 1952, are of purely linguistic interest.

General elections under the Law of Fundamental Organizations and the republican constitution were held in 1922, 1927, 1932, 1933, 1935, 1936, 1940, 1945, 1950, 1954 and 1957. Of these, only the last four were contested by more than one party; only one, that of 1950, resulted in an opposition victory and a transfer of power, bringing the Democrat Party to power. The political development of Turkey after 1945 gave reality to much that had previously been theoretical in the constitution. While the constitution itself was not touched, changes in the law of associations, the penal code, and the electoral law, accompanied by changes in administrative practice, made possible the creation and functioning of an effective constitutional opposition, which in 1950 became the government. The second electoral victory of the Democrat Party in 1954 was followed by a deterioration. Already before the election, on 7 May 1954, a new Press Law was passed, providing heavy penalties for libel against official persons, and for the publication of "false news or information or documents of such a nature as adversely to affect the political or financial prestige of the State or cause a disturbance of the public order". It was no defence to a charge brought under this law to prove the statements were true. After the election two new laws, of 21 June and 5 July, gave the government powers to retire judges after twenty five years' service, and to retire all officials other than judges and members of the armed forces after a period of suspension. At the same time, on 30 June, the electoral law was amended. On 27 June 1956 an amendment to the law of meetings and associations was carried against vigorous opposition in the chamber, placing severe restrictions on the holding of public meetings and demonstrations. In April 1956, during a period of mounting political tension, a parliamentary committee of the government party was formed to investigate the opposition, with legal authority. On 27 May the government was overthrown by a military coup d'etat. (On the period of transition from the Ottoman to the Turkish constitutions, see G. Jaschke, Die ersten Verfassungsentwürfe der Ankara-Türkei, in MSOS, xliii/II (1939), 57-80; idem, Wie lange galt die osmanische Verfassung?, in WI, N.S. v (1957), 118-9; idem, Auf dem Wege zur türkischen Republik, in WI, N.S. v (1958), 206-18; idem, Die Entwicklung der türkischen Verfassung 1924 bis 1937, in Oriental-Notizen, iii/9 (1937), 122-3; T. Z. Tunaya, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndan Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi hükümeti reajisme geçiş, in Prof. M. R. Sevgi's Armagan, İstanbul 1956; idem, Türkiye Büyük [Millet] Meclisi hukûmeti'ni kuruluşu ve siyasi caráhartları, in İstanbul Üniv. Huk. Fak. Mec. xxiv (1958). For the text of the 1924 constitution, see DÜSTÜR, 3rd series, v, 576-85, amendments of 1928, DÜSTÜR, ix, 142, of 1937, xviii, 307 ff. and xix, 37 ff., of 1945, xxvi, 170 ff.; transcription in Gözübüyük and Klöti, 101-23 (with amendments); English translation, with amendments to 1937, in D. E. Webster, The Turkey of Atatürk, 297-306, also in Helen M. Davis, Constitutions, Electoral laws . . . of the states in the Near and Middle East, Durham N.C. 1953, and, with useful notes, in G. L. Lewis, Turkey, London 1955, 339-43. On the period of transition, the parliamentary debates on the constitution were published by A. Ş. Gözübüyük and Z. Sezgin, 1924 anayassas hakkındaki meclis görüşmeleri, Ankara 1957; documents and debates will also be found in K. Arıburnu, Milli mücadele ve inkltiplarla ilgili kanular, i, Ankara 1957; cf. E. C. Smith, Debates on the Turkish Constitution of 1924, in Ankara Univ. Siyasal Bilgiler Fak. Derg., xiii (1958), 82-105. On the constitution and its antecedents see further E. Pritsch, Die türkische Verfassung vom 20 April 1924, in MSOS, xxvi-xxvii/II (1924), 166-251; for a lexical study of the 'pure' Turkish text of 1945, M. Colombe, Le nouveau texte de la constitution turque, in COC, iv (1946), 771-808; on the two main parties operating in this period see DEMOKRAT PARTİ and GÜMÜŞHYURET HALK İNKİSAPİ.

The second Republic

At the beginning of June 1960 the National Unity Committee which had taken over the government of the country a few days previously, as a matter of urgency, to set up a provisional constitution for the transitional period until a new constitution was established. The new law, prepared with the help of a small group of jurists, was published on 12 June, and entitled "Provisional law for the abolition and amendment of certain articles of constitutional law no. 492 of 20 April 1924" (translation in COC, xliii (1960), 266-70). The law begins with a general statement giving the legal and constitutional justification for the army's action in overthrowing the previous regime, which had "violated the constitution ... suppressed individual rights and liberties ... made it impossible for the opposition to function ... and established the dictatorship of a single party". The Turkish army, in conformity with its duty to "safeguard and protect the Turkish homeland and the Turkish Republic established by the constitution", as entrusted to it by article 34 of the army internal service code, took action, in the name of the Turkish nation, to carry out this sacred duty against the former administration ... and to reestablish a state of legality. The army therefore dissolved the Assembly and entrusted
It completed its work on 26 May, and on the following day, the first anniversary of the revolution, Gen. Gürsel announced that the draft had been accepted by an overwhelming majority of the Assembly. The text was then submitted to the Assembly, and the constitutional reform was formally completed on that day. On 28 March, the Assembly had already passed a law requiring that the draft constitution be submitted to the nation by a referendum, conducted along lines specified in the law. The referendum was held on 9 July, and resulted in the acceptance of the new constitution; 61% of the voters voted yes, 39% voted no, and some 2½ million, out of a total qualified electorate of 24 million, abstained.

The constitution provides for a Grand National Assembly of two chambers, the Senate and National Assembly. The former consists of 15 members nominated by the President, and 150 members elected for a term of six years, one third every two years, by a straight majority vote. The National Assembly, of 450 members, is to be elected every four years by a system of proportional representation. The President is elected by the Grand National Assembly in plenary session from among its own members, by a two-thirds majority, for a term of seven years. He appoints the Prime Minister, who chooses the other ministers. The government is responsible to the Grand National Assembly. A noteworthy innovation is the establishment of a constitutional court (articles 145-52), to review the legality of legislation, with power also to act as a court of impeachment of Presidents, ministers and certain high officials "for offences connected with their duties". The constitution contains explicit guarantees of freedom of thought, expression, association and publication, immunity of domicile, and other democratic liberties (section 2, articles 14-34). In addition, it contains a section on social and economic rights, with provision both for the right of the State to plan economic development so as to achieve social justice, and the right of the individual to the ownership and inheritance of property, and to freedom of work and enterprise (section 3, articles 35-53). The right to strike is in principle recognized, within limits to be determined by subsequent legislation. Other clauses in the constitution seek to safeguard the secularist Kemalist reforms from reaction, and to replace the Kemalist system by the democratic basis of government from a new dictatorship. The constitution was promulgated as law no. 334 of 9 July, in the official gazette of 20 July 1961, and entered into effect immediately. (An official English translation of the constitution was published in Ankara in 1962 and reprinted in OM, xliii (1963), 1-28, and in MEJ, xvi (1962), 215-38, with a commentary by K. K. Key; for an analysis of the constitution, see Ismet Girtili, Some aspects of the new Turkish constitution, ibid., 1-17; on the constituent assembly see R. Devereux, Turkey and the corporative state, in SAIS Review, (Spring 1962), 16-24. A useful summary of constitutional developments in 1960 will be found in Middle East Record, 1, 1960, London [1962], 452-4. See also surveys of events in COG, OM, etc. Bibliography: in addition to references in the above, see Fuad Basgil and others, Turquie (vol. vii of La vie juridique des peuples, edd. H. Lévy-Ullmann and B. Mirkine-Guetzévitch), Paris 1939; Siddik Sami Onar, İdare hukukunun umumi esaslari, Istanbul 1952; Recai G. Okandam, Umumi idare hukukumuzun ana khattari, Istanbul 1948; Ali Fuad Basgil, Türkiye siyasi rejimi ve anayasa prensipleri, ü1, Istanbul 1957; IA, article Kanun-i Esâss, by Hüseyin Nail Kubâli
Exposed to European influence earlier than other Arab lands, Egypt followed an independent course of constitutional development, although her constitutional experiments were by no means entirely unrelated to those of the Ottoman Empire. The first elaborate constitutional charter, it is true, was not promulgated until 1882, but a number of constitutional instruments, providing either for the establishment of representative assemblies or responsible cabinets, had been issued since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Bonaparte, after his capture of Cairo in 1798, issued several orders establishing diwan councils, composed of Egyptian and French members. The significance of those diwans, though they were purely consultative in nature, lies in the recognition of the principle that the people's representatives should be consulted on public affairs. Muhammad 'Ali (1805-48) revived those diwans, in the form of a Mājlis al-Mu'āzama, a consultative council which assisted him in the administration of the country. These councils, lacking the support of public opinion, were of brief duration. It was not until the reign of the Khedive Ismā'īl that further constitutional instruments were issued. One of them (1860) created a council of representatives, called Mājlis Shūrā al-Nuwwāb; another (1878) established a responsible Cabinet, called Mājlis al-Nuwwāb. Ismā'īl's immediate purpose in issuing such decrees was not necessarily to introduce constitutional reform, but to resolve financial difficulties, which could lead to foreign intervention. Legislation could be initiated either by the Cabinet or the Chamber and had to be confirmed and issued by the Khedive. No new taxes were to be imposed or the Chamber and had to be confirmed and issued by the Khedive. No new taxes were to be imposed without the approval of the Chamber. The budget was to be submitted to the Chamber for discussion, but the Government was under no obligation to adopt the views of the Chamber, save those relating to matters where sums of money had already been approved in the budget. The Chamber of Deputies was to be an elective body for a period of five years, its meetings open to the public, and its members inviolable. Its President was to be appointed by the Khedive, chosen from three candidates nominated by the Chamber. The Chamber was to have the right to interrogate the Ministers, ask questions of information, and supervise "the acts of all public functionaries, that the interests of the country may be watched over by the provincial councils from among their members. One of them embodied a fundamental law (lašīha asūsiyya) made up of 18 articles stating the functions of the Chamber and the procedure for electing it. The other, made up of 61 articles, called the law of internal regulations (lašīha niṣāmīyya, or niṣāmānāme), providing rules for the debates and internal procedure of the Chamber. The Khedive retained complete control over the Chamber by his final approval of its decisions. The meetings of the Chamber began on 25 November 1866, but it was suspended in 1879. It resumed its activities during the 'Urābī revolt and the constitutional framework which lasted from the British occupation to World War I. This law provided for the establishment of a Council of Ministers (Mājlis al-Nuwwāb), by virtue of which he entrusted power in its hands. This executive body, the first in the history of modern Egypt, was responsible, relieving the Khedive of responsibility, with the consequent limitation of his absolute powers. However, the decree was revised by Tawfīk Pāsha, who succeeded Ismā'īl in 1879, making the Cabinet responsible to him. Tawfīk often held the meetings of the Cabinet under his chairmanship. Before Tawfīk could bring the Cabinet under his full control and abolish the Chamber of Deputies, the latter took the drastic step of drawing up an elaborate constitutional charter. It was during the 'Urābī revolt that this Chamber, meeting as a National Constituent Assembly in 1882, prepared and promulgated Egypt's first written constitution, called al-Lātīḥa al-Asūsiyya. The Chamber began to discuss the draft in January 1882; it was promulgated on 7 February 1882. The Constitution of 1882 provided for the establishment of a parliamentary system and a responsible Cabinet, appointed by the Khedive. The Chamber of Deputies was to be an elective body for a period of five years, its meetings open to the public, and its members inviolable. Its President was to be appointed by the Khedive, chosen from three candidates nominated by the Chamber. The Chamber was to have the right to interrogate the Ministers, ask questions of information, and supervise "the acts of all public functionaries, that the interests of the country may be watched over by the provincial councils from among their members. One of them embodied a fundamental law (lašīha asūsiyya) made up of 18 articles stating the functions of the Chamber and the procedure for electing it. The other, made up of 61 articles, called the law of internal regulations (lašīha niṣāmīyya, or niṣāmānāme), providing rules for the debates and internal procedure of the Chamber. The Khedive retained complete control over the Chamber by his final approval of its decisions. The meetings of the Chamber began on 25 November 1866, but it was suspended in 1879. It resumed its activities during the 'Urābī revolt and the constitution of 1882 was abrogated. In 1883, a year after the British occupation, Tawfīk Pāsha issued an Organic Law reorganizing Egypt's constitutional framework which lasted from the British occupation to World War I. This law provided for the establishment of the following bodies: First, a Provincial Council, composed of from 3 to 8 members, according to the size of the province, established in each province (muḍiriyā), presided over by the muḍīr. The functions of the Council were to deal with purely local matters. The total number of the Provincial Councilors was 70. Secondly, the Legislative Council, composed of 30 members. Of these, 14 (including the President) were appointed by the Government and 16 elected by the provincial councils from among their members. No law or decree relating to general administrative matters was to be issued without prior submission to the Council, but the Government was under no obligation to carry out the resolutions of the Council. However, if the Council's resolutions were not carried out, the reasons for rejection had to be communicated to the Council. The budget was to be submitted to the Council for discussion, but the Government was not obliged to adopt the views of
the Council, nor could the Council discuss any financial matters touching on Egypt’s obligations under an international agreement.

Third World Legislative Assembly, composed of 82 members, included the six Ministers, the 30 members of the Legislative Council, and 46 delegates elected by the people. Candidates eligible for election had to be not less than 30 years old, able to read and write, and paying direct taxes of not less than 30 Egyptian pounds a year. No new direct taxes could be imposed by the Government without the approval of the Assembly. Moreover, the Assembly was consulted on every public loan and on all public matters relating to canals, railways, lands and land taxes. It also expressed an opinion on other financial, economic and administrative matters. As in the case of the Legislative Council, the Government was under no obligation to adopt the Assembly’s views on any question discussed, for the functions of the Legislative Assembly were purely consultative; but the reasons for not adopting them had to be stated. The Assembly met at least once in two years and its meetings were not open to the public. An electoral law was issued on 1 May 1883 and the first elections for the Legislative Assembly were held in November 1883. The Assembly continued to function until World War I.

In 1913, the Assembly’s functions and powers were increased under a new law issued in 1913, revising the Organic Law of 1883. The new Legislative Assembly replaced both the Legislative Council and Assembly. This Assembly, composed of 17 nominated members and 66 elected by indirect suffrage, had the power to veto proposals for the increase of direct taxes, but in all other matters its functions remained consultative and deliberative. Its proceedings were open to the public, since criticism had been levelled at its predecessor for holding closed sessions. It could delay legislation, compel Ministers to justify their proposals, interrogate them and call for information. The Legislative Assembly was intended to represent more closely the mass of the Egyptian people, but it could hardly satisfy the political aspirations of the small educated class. It met for a short period during 1914 until its sessions were suspended in 1915, never to be resumed again.

After World War I, Egypt regained quickly from a dependent to an independent status, having achieved remarkable political and social progress. The British occupation was terminated and the country was declared independent on 28 February 1922, subject to four reserved points (relating to the defence of Egypt, security of British imperial communications, protection of foreigners, and the Sudan). The Sultan of Egypt assumed the title of King on 15 March 1922, and a constitutional committee, composed of 32 members, was appointed on 3 April 1922 to draw up a draft constitution. The constitution, though communicated by the Committee to the Government on 21 October 1922, was not promulgated until 19 April 1923. Based on Belgian and Ottoman models, it provided for a monarchy endowed with many powers, which reflected the traditional pattern of administration. The King not only enjoyed the right of selecting and appointing the Prime Minister (and upon the latter’s recommendation, the ministers), but also the right to dismiss the Cabinet and dissolve Parliament. He also appointed the President of the Senate and half of the Senators, presumably upon the recommendation of the Cabinet. The Cabinet was fully responsible, for its members were derived from both houses of Parliament and were collectively responsible to the Lower House. Its life was formally dependent on a vote of confidence of the Lower House, but the King could dismiss it by a decree at any moment. Legislative power was vested in Parliament and the King. The Lower House was an elected body on the basis of universal manhood suffrage, but the Senate was half elected and half appointed. Legislation could be initiated in either House, but it had to be confirmed by the King. The latter had the power to return draft laws for reconsideration by Parliament.

From the establishment of the Sultanate (1914) to the Declaration of Independence (1922), Egypt had 8 cabinets; and from the Declaration of Independence to the end of the monarchy, Egypt had 32 cabinets. Thus the average life of a cabinet was less than one year. Parliament met on the whole regularly since the first general election of 1924, although in almost all cases the Lower House was dissolved before it completed its regular term of four years. There had been ten general elections held from 1924 to 1952. These were the elections of 1924, 1925, 1926, 1929, 1931, 1936, 1938, 1942, 1945 and 1950. Only the ninth Parliament completed its term of four years, while the second held only a single meeting. The constitution of 1923 was partially suspended by a royal decree in 1928 and replaced by another on 22 October 1933. The new constitution made no important change in the structure of government, but restricted the powers of Parliament, especially its right to withdraw confidence in the cabinet, and increased the powers of the executive. It also provided for elections in two stages, regulated by a new Electoral Law issued in 1930. These restrictions prompted opposition parties to attack the new constitution and boycott elections. However, the Government firmly enforced the provisions of the new constitution until 1936.

In 1936 a national coalition government was formed and a treaty of alliance between Britain and Egypt was signed. The nationalists had already demanded the restoration of the constitution of 1923 as a condition for their participation in the treaty negotiation, and the King formally restored it on 22 December 1935. After the declaration of Independence, 1 January 1952, Egypt remained in force until it was abolished by the Revolutionary Government on 10 December 1952. Before the intervention of the army in politics, the parliamentary system had deteriorated, because of the intense competition among political parties, the rise of rival ideological groups, and the failure of the ruling class to make concessions to the rapidly increasing oppressed masses. The inability of civil government to maintain public order invited the army to intervene and put an end to internal conflict and instability.

The Revolutionary Government appointed a constitutional committee, composed of fifty members of various shades of opinion, to draft a new constitution. The new draft constitution, reputed to have included a progressive and truly parliamentary system, was never officially promulgated. Instead a provisional constitutional framework was adopted on 10 February 1953, entrusting virtually full power to a Revolutionary Council, to be exercised by its chief, who presided over the Council of Ministers. The monarchy was maintained, but owing to the minority of the deposed King Farid’s successor, its powers were exercised by a Council of Regency. On 18 June 1953 the monarchy was abolished and a republic, headed by Muhammad Naguib (Neguib), was proclaimed. It was not until 16 January 1959 that a
new constitutional charter, which proved to be of short duration, was issued, entrusting full executive powers to the hands of President Ḥamāl ʿAbd al-Nāṣir. This constitution, embodying several innovations, declared Egypt to be an Arab nation, and introduced the presidential system, replacing the parliamentary form of government. The President was elected by a plebiscite. He possessed the power to appoint a Cabinet responsible to him and to nominate the members of Parliament, subject to the approval of the nation by a popular plebiscite. The constitution was confirmed by a plebiscite on 23 June 1956.

The union between Syria and Egypt in 1958 called for another change in the constitutional framework of the two countries. This union, regarded as the first step toward a more complete Arab unity, was called the United Arab Republic. A provisional constitution of 73 articles was issued on 5 March 1958, providing for a central executive and a central legislature; but all essential local affairs remained in the hands of local executive councils. Before agreement could be reached on its internal constitutional structure, the constitutional instrument has yet been issued. After the dissolution of the Union with Syria President Ḥamāl ʿAbd al-Nāṣir made several references to the constitution of 1956, which indicated that this constitution was still in force, pending the promulgation of a new constitution. Egypt's rulers are inclined to defer the formulation of a new constitution, pending the emergence of new patterns of government, hoping that the emerging constitutional structure will conform to Arab aspirations to unity. (For the United Arab States, see below, xviii).

The Persian constitutional movement of the early 20th century was the result of a process which had been going on in Persia, largely silently, throughout the 19th century. Up to this time the basic theories of the state and of life generally were set in the frame of Islam. The intrusion of the West into Persia in the 19th century perhaps more than any other single event had persuaded the old theories and bases of the state and to seek some new or additional base for it. The disastrous wars with Russia in the early part of the century concluded by the Treaty of Turkomānchay in 1828 convinced Persians of the need for reform, military and otherwise. Further it was through the various military missions which came to Persia from 1807 onwards that Persians had first become acquainted with modern military and scientific techniques and with the political changes which were taking place in Europe. Mīrzā Šāhīb, the first Persian known to have written an account of British parliamentary institutions, was sent to England in 1813 in pursuance of plans for military reform. He also visited Turkey and Russia. Writing in his diary of the fārsīmāl he castigates obscurantist mullas who opposed them. He gives in his diary what is probably the first account by a Persian of the French revolution. Diplomatic travel also played an important rôle in the dissemination of knowledge of western institutes. Abu ʿl-Ḥasan Shḥrāzī, who was sent on a mission to England by Fath ʿAlī Shāh, wrote in his Bayrat-nāma an account of the justice and security which he found in England, comparing it with the tyranny which prevailed in his own country. Nāṣir al-Dīn himself made three journeys to Europe, the first in 1873. The Persian merchant communities, both inside and outside Persia, were another important channel through which modern ideas spread. The Persian press published by members of the Persian communities in Istanbul, Calcutta and elsewhere also did much in the latter part of the 19th century to encourage reform. The first attempts at administrative, as distinct from military, reform were made by Mīrzā Taqī Khān Amīr Nīzhām, the first prime minister of Nāṣir al-Dīn, but proved largely abortive. He, too, had visited Russia and Turkey and seen the fārsīmāl in operation. The next minister to attempt fundamental reforms was Mīrzā Ḥusayn Khān Sīpāshālī Mughāl al-Dawla, who had studied in France, and served in Tiflis, Bombay, and Turkey, where he was Persian minister from 1859 to 1871. He subsequently held various offices in Persia, including that of prime minister. While in Turkey he wrote numerous letters, official and otherwise, in which he discussed, inter alia, European politics, civilization, education, the need for reform in Persia, the desirability of a popular assembly, freedom, the rights of the people, and equality before the law. He maintained that foreign intervention in a country was brought about by the backwardness of that country. The main object of both Amīr Nīzhām and Mughāl al-Dawla in their advocacy of reform and modernization was to prevent foreign intervention; and in this they were the precursors of the constitutional movement, which, though it was provoked in the first instance by the tyranny and injustice of the régime, was...
directed also against the encroachment of foreign powers and the disposal of Persian assets to foreigners. Plans for reform were put forward by various writers in the latter half of the 19th century. The most important figure among them in the intellectual awakening of Persia was, perhaps, Malkam Khān Nāsim al-Dawla, a Persian Armenian of Djulfa (Ishāhān), educated in Paris, who became minister to the Court of St. James in 1872. He profoundly believed in the need for Persia to westernize and repeatedly emphasised the need for the supremacy of the law. In an essay entitled Daftar-i tanzimdt, apparently written between 1858 and 1860, he drew attention to the internal woes of Persia, the threat of encroachment upon Persia from St. Petersburg and Paris, and the squandering of Persia's assets to foreign merchants. In later essays written after 1882, and especially in the last years of this reign, he repeatedly emphasised the need for the supremacy of the law. In an essay entitled Daftar-i tanzimdt, apparently written between 1858 and 1860, he drew attention to the internal woes of Persia, the threat of encroachment upon Persia from St. Petersburg and Paris, and the squandering of Persia's assets to foreign merchants.

The next phase in the struggle against the despotism was marked by the spread of secret or semi-secret societies, which began to be formed by those who were dissatisfied with the existing state of affairs. Ayn al-Dawla, who at that time was in London, and Djamal al-Dīn Afghānī, who was in some measure, a forerunner of the constitutional movement. It was successful in its object; and in January 1892 the tobacco monopoly was resceded. This victory against the government was not, however, followed by any material lessening of the pressure to which the people were subjected or limitation on the arbitrary rule of the Shah. Those who advocated modernization had still to work cautiously.
Shah 'Abd al-Azim; and they returned to the city. No steps, however, were taken to implement the promises given; these had in effect amounted to a promise of equality before the law for the different classes but had in no way limited the absolute power of the Shah. Towards the end of April a petition was presented to the Shah praying him to give effect to his promises. This proved fruitless as also did remonstrances to Ayn al-Dawla. Public opinion, stirred up by denunciations of the despotism and tyranny from the minbars of the mosques by Aka Sayyid Djamal and others, and the efforts of semi-secret and semi-secret societies, which attacked the despotism and endeavoured to spread modernist ideas, became increasingly roused. Ayn al-Dawla expelled Aka Sayyid Djamal and another preacher, Shaykh Muhammad, from the city. In the riots which attended the attempted removal of the latter on 28 Rabii' II 1324/21 June 1906 a sayyid was killed. Further riots ensued and after some days a large number of the religious classes, merchants, artisans, and others took refuge in Kumm, this exodus being known as the kidrat-i kubrā, 'the great exodus'. Meanwhile the bādars were closed and about 15 July a number of merchants, members of the guilds, and others took refuge in the British Legation. Their numbers rapidly increased and by the beginning of August had reached 12,000 or 14,000. They demanded the dismissal of Ayn al-Dawla, the promulgation of a code of laws, and the recall of the religious leaders from Kumm. The Shah did not yield to their demands until the end of the month, when he dismissed Ayn al-Dawla.

On 14 Dūmādā II/5 August, an imperial rescript was issued to the new sād-r-i a'zam ordering the setting up of a national consultative assembly (muṭāmmim-i kāndūn-i asdsī), composed of representatives of the princes, 'ulamā', members of the Kādjar family, notables, landowners, merchants, and members of the guilds, to consult on matters of state, to give help to the council of ministers in the reforms "which would be made for the happiness of Persia", and, "in complete security and confidence, to submit through the sād-r-i a'zam to the Shah their views on the wellbeing of the state and nation, the public welfare, and the needs of all the people of the land, in such a manner as shall be published by the royal signature and duly put into operation". Regulations for the assembly were to be prepared and signed by the elected representatives and ratified by the Shah, and "by the help of God Most High, the aforesaid consultative assembly, which is the guardian of our justice, will be opened and begin the necessary reforms in the affairs of the kingdom and the execution of the laws of the holy shari'a". By this time, however, the popular party had been further provoked by the intransigence of the Shah and the court party. Profoundly mistrustful, they demanded a guarantee of the Shah's good faith. Accordingly a second rescript addressed to the sād-r-i a'zam, supplementing the rescript of 14 Dūmādā II, was issued. This stated: "In completion of our earlier autograph, dated 14 Dūmādā II 1324, in which we explicitly ordered and commanded the setting up of a consultative assembly of elected representatives of the peoples, in order that the generality of people and [all] the individuals of the nation shall be aware of our full royal care, we again command and lay down that you should set up the aforesaid assembly in accordance with the description explicitly laid down in the former autograph, and, after the election of the members of the assembly, you should draw up the sections and provisions of the regulations of the Islamic consultative assembly in accordance with the approval and signature of the elected representatives, as is worthy of the nation and country and the laws of the holy shari'a, so that having been submitted to us and adorned by our auspicious signature and in accordance with the aforementioned regulations, this holy intention may take shape and be put into operation". On the issue of this rescript the bādars returned from Kumm and the British Legation respectively.

After the official opening of "the House of Parliament" on 28 Dūmādā II 1324/19 August 1906 disputes arose between the popular party and the sād-r-i a'zam over the ordinances for the assembly which the latter had drawn up. The bādars were again closed and the people once more prepared to take bast. The Shah gave way and on 17 September accepted the proposed ordinance as to the constitution of the assembly, which was to consist of 156 members, 60 from Tehran and 96 from the provinces, elections to take place every two years and the deputies to be inviolable. The immunity of the deputies was subsequently affirmed in article 12 of the Fundamental Law. The voting in Tehran was to be direct, in the provinces by colleges of electors. Elections began and on 18 Shawābān 1324/7 October 1906 the assembly was opened by Muṣaffar al-Dīn without waiting for the arrival of the provincial deputies. The assembly proceeded to elect the president of the assembly and other officers, and passed on 18 October rules of procedure. On 23 November a proposal for an Anglo-Russian loan was submitted to it by the Minister of Finance; this was rejected and an alternative plan for an internal loan approved a week later. A committee was meanwhile set up to draft the Fundamental Law of the constitution (kāndūn-i asdsī). This was ready by the end of October; but the Shah procrastinated and did not sign it until 14 Dūh l-Kāda 1324/30 December 1906. Subsequently a supplementary Fundamental Law (Muṭāmmim-i kāndūn-i Asdsī) was passed by the Assembly and ratified on 29 Shawābān 1325/7 October 1907 by Muhammad 'All Shah, who had meanwhile succeeded Muṣaffar al-Dīn. The Fundamental Law consists of fifty-one articles relating to the constitution, and was promulgated by the National Consultative Assembly and the Senate. The Supplementary Fundamental Law contains 107 articles concerning the rights of the Persian people, the powers of the realm, the rights of members of the assembly, the rights of the Persian throne, the powers of ministers, tribunals of justice, public finance, and the army.

Muṣaffar al-Dīn died in January 1907, and with his death the first phase of the constitutional revolution came to an end. The movement, which had begun as a popular demonstration against the deplorable state of the administration and country, foreign loans and concessions which were thought to be leading or contributing to national bankruptcy and foreign control, had thus ended in the grant of a constitution and the setting up of a National Consultative Assembly, a result which had been achieved virtually without bloodshed. It had been a sense of intolerable injustice or tyranny (zulm) which had eventually provoked the nationalists to action and the aims of the movement had never been clearly formulated. The general aim was simply the establishment of the rule of justice (ṣaddālat), which, in the tradition of mediaeval Islam, they saw to be the basis of good government, rather than the establishment of constitutional government and
representative institutions. The second phase of the constitutional revolution began with the accession on 8 January 1907 of Muhammad Ali, who, with his Shah, promulgated from the first bitterly opposed to the constitution. Neither the Assembly nor the ministers had had any experience of constitutional government; they were, moreover, hampered in their conduct of affairs by lack of money and military forces and by the Shah's intrigues against the constitution. The Assembly was determined to prevent fresh foreign loans, and to get rid of the Belgians from the Customs. In these aims it was successful. It also pressed for further financial reforms; and a law for the resumption by the state of all land held as Hiyal [q.v.]. Numerous political societies or angiumans had meanwhile been formed in Tehran and the provinces to defend the constitution. On 2 May 1907 Mirzâ Ali Aşghar Khân Amin al-Saltân was appointed Prime Minister and with his appointment the struggle between the Shah and the nationalists was intensified. Disorders, in many cases instigated and fomented by the Shah and the court party, broke out in the provinces. Turkey invaded north-west Persia in August. Russia was suspected, not without reason, of aiding and abetting the Shah against the National Assembly. The belief grew that there was secret collusion between the Shah, Amin al-Saltân, and the Russians to sell the country to Russia. This second phase of the constitutional revolution was in a great measure the first phase anti-foreign in the sense that it was primarily concerned to check the growth of foreign control in Persia, especially Russian. On 31 August Amin al-Saltân was murdered by a member of one of the popular angiumans. On the same day the Anglo-Russian Convention was signed, which, when it was communicated to the Assembly a month later, aroused profound mingling. Meanwhile the authority of the central government in the provinces had been reduced to almost nothing. Provincial councils (angiumanâ-yi ayâlayt va wilâyât) had sprung up in many parts of the country; these had destroyed the moral authority of the old régime, and the framework of such elementary administration as had once existed had virtually disappeared. On 7 October 1907 the Shah promulgated the Fundamental Law (see below); and on 12 November he visited the Assembly and swore loyalty to the constitution for the fourth time. Nevertheless on 15 December he attempted a coup d'état, arresting the prime minister Nâşir al-Mulk and other ministers. The popular angiumans both in the capital and in the provinces rallied to the defence of the Assembly. The Shah was momentarily worsted, but the truce was temporary and hope of reconciliation between the Shah and the nationalists was finally dashed by an attempt made on the Shah's life in February 1908. In the following months tension increased and eventually on 23 June fighting broke out between the royalist forces and the nationalists. The assembly and the neighbourhood were cleared by the Shah's forces. Thirty of the most prominent nationalist leaders were arrested and two of them strangled. On 19 November, on the 19th anniversary of the-establishment of the constitutional revolution, the Shah declared the Assembly dissolved and the constitution abolished as being contrary to Islamic law. Thus ended the second phase of the constitutional revolution, with the temporary closure of the Assembly.

Fighting broke out simultaneously in Tabriz which, after Tehran, had been the main centre of the nationalist movement, and the Shah's forces were expelled. Resistance lasted until April 1909 when the siege was raised by the entry of Russian troops to protect foreign life and property. The action of Tabriz gave the nationalists time to reorganize their forces; and eventually in 1909 a Bakhtiyari force under Sardâr As'ad and another force from Rasht under the Sipahsâr-i A'zam, Muhammad Wâli Khân, advanced on Tehran which they entered in July. The Shah fled and took refuge in the Russian Legation. A council was then held which voted his deposition and the succession of his son, Sultan Ahmad, a minor, with a regency. On 9 September the ex-Shah and his ministers were subsequently held and on 2 Dhu 'l-Ka'da 1327/5 December 1909 the second legislative session of the National Assembly was opened. The tasks facing the new assembly were such as might have daunted a more experienced body than they. The treasury was empty; the provincial administration was in a state of chaos; and Russian intervention threatened. Cabinet crises were frequent and the Assembly, divided into numerous small groups, was split by dissension. Russian troops, which had been introduced into Northern Persia ostensibly for a temporary occupation to defend foreign life and property, were not withdrawn. The anti-Russian feeling engendered among the nationalists by this and other actions produced a state of friction with Russia which culminated in 1911. In 1910 a proposal for a joint Russo-British loan to Persia was rejected on the grounds that its terms were incompatible with Persian independence. The possibility of the engagement of foreign advisers to reorganize the administration was meanwhile under consideration by Persia; and in 1911 Americans were engaged for the finances and Swedes for the police and gendarmerie. Russia was from the outset displeased at the invitation to the Americans. In May 1911 Mr. Morgan Shuster, an American citizen, engaged on a private contract with Persia as Treasurer-General, reached Tehran, with a small staff. On 13 June the Assembly passed a law giving him very wide powers. On 17 June the ex-Shah suddenly landed on Persian soil in an abortive attempt to regain the throne. Simultaneously his brother, Sâlâr al-Dawla, raised the standard of revolt in Kurdistan. Fraction meanwhile increased with Russia over the Treasurer-General's independent attitude in working for Persian financial reform and refusal to consult Russian wishes. Finally Russia seized on an incident arising from the confiscation of the estates of Shu'âb al-Saltâna, a younger brother of the ex-Shah, as a punishment for the part he had taken in the latter's rebellion, to demand an apology from the Persian Government; this was followed by a 48 hours' ultimatum on 25 November to dismiss Shuster and Lecoffre, an Englishman of French extraction serving in the Ministry of Finance, from Persian government service, to engage no foreigners without the consent of Russia and Great Britain, and to defray the cost of the military expedition which Russia had sent to Enzell to reinstate the ultimatum. In the event of non-compliance Persia was threatened with an advance of Russian troops from Rasht and an increase in the indemnity. British diplomatic protests at St. Petersburg were overridden and Russia persisted in her demands. The Assembly refused to comply. Russian troops advanced to Kazwin. Skirmishes took place between Persians and Russian troops in Rasht, Enzell and Tabriz. Anti-Russian feeling ran high in Tehran; and finally to avoid disasters by impotent resistance to Russia, the regent, Nâşir al-
Mulk, and the cabinet forcibly dissolved the obdurate assembly on 3 Muharram 1330/24 December 1911. On the following day Shuster was dismissed. The third and final phase of the constitutional revolution thus ended leaving Persia once more in a state of virtual chaos. The constitution remained suspended until 7 July 1914, when the third legislative session was opened.

The later history of the National Consultative Assembly was not dominated, as it had been during the period of the revolution, by the struggle between the despotism and the nationalists. It became accepted as part of the institutions of the country, even if in the Pahlawi period its power was restricted. During the Great War of 1914-18 Persia was a cockpit for the intrigues and operations of the belligerent powers. The resentment entertained by the Persians against Russia and Great Britain as her ally was fanned by German intrigue and the majority of the deputies of the assembly were either neutral or pro-Central Powers. On 15 November 1915 when Russian troops advanced from Kâzwân the Assembly broke up, and most of the members evacuated Têhrân with the Turks and Germans and left for Kum. The constitution was, thus, again suspended; the fourth legislative assembly was not convened until 1921; since when, apart from a brief period in 1953 when Dr. Muşaddik dissolved the assembly, successive assemblies have sat until 1967, when the reigning Shah, Muhammad Rišâ Pahlawi, dissolved the Assembly and Senate by decree.

The nationalist movement had been supported by many of the leading members of the religious classes; and in the writing of many of those who had advocated reform, and 'the rule of law', the 'law' had been equated with Islam. Reference to this point of view is found in the preamble to the Fundamental Law, which states that the purpose of the National Council to be set up under the fârnâm of 24 Diumâdâ II 1324/4 August 1906 was "to promote the progress and happiness of our kingdom and people, strengthen the foundations of our government, and give effect to the enactments of the sacred law of His Holiness the Prophet". Article 1 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law further lays down that the official religion shall be Islam, and states that the "Shah and his successors shall be judges according to the Shari'a, which faith the Shah must profess. Article 2 states that "At no time must any legal enactment of the sacred National Consultative Assembly, established by the favour and assistance of His Holiness the Imam of the Age (may God hasten His glad advent), of the Shah Majesty the Shahinshah of Islam (may God immortalize his reign), the care of the Proofs of Islam (may God multiply the likes of them), and the whole people of the Persian nation, be at variance with the sacred principles of Islam, or the laws established by His Holiness the Best of Mankind, (on Whom and on Whose household be the blessings of God and His peace)". The same article lays down that a committee of not less than five mughâlanda shall be set up "so that they may carefully discuss and consider all matters proposed in the Assembly, and reject and repudiate, wholly or in part, any such proposal which is at variance with the sacred laws of Islam, so that it shall not obtain the title of legality. In such matters the decision of this committee of ulamâ shall be followed and obeyed, and this article shall continue unchanged until the appearance of His Holiness the Proof of the Age (may God hasten His glad advent). This article became inoperative during the reign of Rišâ Shâh, and up to the time of writing has not been revived. Article 27 of the Supplementary Fundamental Laws states that the judicial power "belongs to the shari'a courts in matters pertaining to the shari'a (shari'iyya) and to the civil courts (madhâhib 'adliyya) in matters pertaining to customary law (surfiyya)". This, while contrary to the conception of Islam, was a recognition of existing practice.

The drafters of the constitution, although they made concessions to Islam, were also considerably influenced by the example of Belgian Constitutional Law and French law; and the conceptions underlying the constitution were in many respects fundamentally new to Persia. Thus, Article 26 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law states "that the powers of the realm are all derived from the people"; and the Fundamental Law regulates the employment of those powers. Similarly Article 35 states "sovereignty is a trust, as a divine gift, confided by the people to the Shah" which implies a radical change in the conception of the ruler. The main concern of the drafters was probably to limit the arbitrary nature of the Shah's rule and to give the people some defence against the arbitrary actions of government officials. A number of the articles of the Fundamental Law clearly derive from the unhappy experiences of Persia in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when the reigning Shah recklessly contracted foreign loans and gave concessions to foreign concerns. Article 24 states "the conclusion of treaties and covenants, the granting of commercial, industrial, agricultural and other concessions, irrespective of whether they be to Persian or foreign subjects, shall be subject to the approval of the National Consultative Assembly, with the exception of treaties, which for reasons of state and the public advantage, must be kept secret". Similarly Article 22 lays down that "any proposal to transfer or sell any portion of the national resources, or of the control exercised by the Government or the Throne, or to effect any change in the boundaries and frontiers of the kingdom, shall be subject to the approval of the National Consultative Assembly". Further Article 23 states that "without the approval of the National Consultative Assembly, no concession for the formation of any public company of any sort shall, under any plea soever, be granted by the state". The Assembly has shown itself jealous of the rights accorded to it under these articles, as is shown by its refusal to ratify the oil agreement concluded by Prime Minister Kâzwân and the Russian government in 1949. Articles 25 and 26 respectively lay down that state loans under whatever title, internal or external, and the construction of railroads and roads depend upon the approval of the Assembly. The latter of these two articles was included, presumably because of the experience of the Russo-Persian railway agreement of 12 November 1890, by which the Persian Government engaged for the space of ten years "neither itself to construct a railway in Persian territory, nor to permit nor grant a concession for the construction of railways to a company or other persons". Article 27 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law states that the legislative power is derived from the Shah, the National Consultative Assembly and the Senate, each of which has the right to introduce laws "provided that the continuation thereof be dependent on their not being at variance with the standards of the shari'a, and on their approval by the two Assemblies (i.e., the National Consultative Assembly and the Senate), and the royal ratification; but the enactment and approval of laws concerning the revenue and
The executive power, which belongs to the Shah, was carried out by the ministers and officials of the state in the name of His Imperial Majesty in such manner as the law defines’. Article 28, reflecting the influence of Montesquieu, lays down that these three powers shall always be separate from one another, a principle which has been much cherished by Persian constitutionalists. Article 39 states that no Shah can ascend the throne unless, before his coronation, he appears before the Assembly in the presence of its members and those of the Senate and the Council of Ministers and undertook by oath to defend the independence of Persia, the frontiers of the kingdom, and the rights of the people, to observe the Fundamental Law and promote Shi’ism of the Dja’farí rite. Similarly, by Article 40, a regent cannot enter upon his functions unless he repeats the oath above. Article 44 lays down that “the person of the Shah is exempted from responsibility and in all matters the ministers are responsible to the National Consultative Assembly and the Senate”. The appointment and dismissal of ministers, however, lies with the Shah (Art. 46); but not of other officials save where this is explicitly provided by the law (Art. 48). Article 49 states that the issue of decrees and orders for giving effect to the laws is the Shah’s right, provided that he shall under no circumstances postpose or suspend the carrying out of such laws. The supreme command of all military forces is vested in the Shah (Art. 50); as also it is the Shah’s right, provided that he shall under no circumstances deprive the Shah of his power, to dissolve the two chambers separately or together, subject to his stating the reason and simultaneously ordering new elections so that the said chambers may convene within a period of three months; dissolution may not be ordered twice for the same reason. On 9 May 1961 the Shah used the powers thus granted to him and dissolved the National Consultative Assembly, as emended by the Constituent Assembly of April 1949 enables the Shah to dissolve the two chambers separately or together, subject to his stating the reason and simultaneously ordering new elections so that the said chambers may convene within a period of three months; dissolution may not be ordered twice for the same reason. On 9 May 1961 the Shah used the powers thus granted to him and dissolved the National Consultative Assembly.

On 8 May 1957 a joint meeting of the National Assembly and Senate was convened. On 27 April 1949 a regent was appointed by royal decree (Arts. 80 and 83 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law); but by Article 81 judges are declared irremovable save with their own consent. The Shah was also given certain rights with regard to the Senate, which was to consist of sixty members, to “be chosen from amongst well-informed, discerning, pious, and respected persons of the realm”. Thirty were to be nominated by the Shah, fifteen from Tehran and fifteen from the provinces; and fifteen were to be elected from Tehran and fifteen from the provinces (Art. 45). Its sessions were to be “complementary to the sessions of the National Consultative Assembly” (Art. 43 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law). Because it was felt that the principle of nomination was undemocratic the Senate was, in fact, never convened until 1950.

In 1921 Riḍá Khan (later Riḍá Sháh Pahléwi) became Minister of War and shortly afterwards the de facto ruler of the country. In 1925 a constituent assembly (mjâlîs-i mun‘assîsân) was convened. On 31 October it declared the rule of the Kádjár dynasty terminated and that another Constituent Assembly was to be convened, to make the necessary changes in the laws; and on December 12 a single act suppressed Articles 36 (which had vested the monarchy in Muhammad ‘Ali Sháh and his heirs), 37 and 38 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law, substituting for these three others. The new Article 36 entrusted the sovereignty of Persia to Riḍá Sháh Pahléwi and his male descendants. Article 37 states “the heir apparent shall be the eldest son of the Sháh whose mother shall be of Persian origin. If the Sháh has no male issue the heir apparent shall be proposed by hand and approved by the National Consultative Assembly on the advice of the Shah and the cabinet shall not belong to the Kádjár family. But whenever a son is born to the Sháh he will become heir apparent by right”. Meanwhile a marriage was about to be arranged between the heir apparent and Princess Fawziyya of Egypt. Presumably with a view to the possibility of issue by this marriage the law of 14 Aḥád 1357 declared the expression “of Persian origin” to include a child born of a mother who before the marriage contract with the Shah or the heir apparent should, in accordance with the high interests of the country, on the proposal of the government and the approval by the National Consultative Assembly, have been given, by a farman of the reigning Sháh, the quality (ṣafí) of a Persian”. Princess Fawziyya was in due course declared an honorary Persian. The new Article 38 provided for a regency but excluded members of the Kádjár family from holding this office.

No further changes were made in the Constitution by Riḍá Sháh, who kept the National Consultative Assembly in being but reduced it to a mere cypher. In the early years after the Second World War Muhammad Riḍá Sháh, who had succeeded to the throne in 1941, and his advisers apparently believed that the National Consultative Assembly had become too powerful vis-à-vis the executive. In any case, it was decided to convene, for the first time, the Senate and to make certain changes in the Constitution. A Constituent Assembly was duly convened on 27 April 1949. Another additional article (aṣl-i šikáh) made provision in certain cases for revision of the Fundamental Law. The drafters of the Fundamental Law and Supplementary Fundamental Law had presumably included no provision of this sort in the Law (except Article 21 of the Fundamental Law, which permits the modification or abrogation of any article regulating the functions of the ministries with the approval of the Assembly), not because they were unaware of the fact that most western constitutions contained such provisions, but because they did not wish to give any opportunity to the court party to alter the constitution. Article 48 of the Fundamental Law, which gave the Senate the right in certain circumstances to dissolve the National Consultative Assembly, as emended by the Constituent Assembly of April 1949 enables the Shah to dissolve the two chambers separately or together, subject to his stating the reason and simultaneously ordering new elections so that the new chambers may convene within a period of three months; dissolution may not be ordered twice for the same reason. On 9 May 1961 the Shah used the powers thus granted to him and dissolved the National Consultative Assembly.
maximum figure of 200; Article 5 was emended, *inter alia*, to extend the legislative term of the National Consultative Assembly from two years to four. Article 7 concerning the quorum for debates was also emended. Lastly Article 49 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law was supplemented as stated above.

Article 46 of the Fundamental Law lays down that after the constitution of the Senate all proposals must be approved by both Assemblies. Article 34 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law, however, states that "the deliberations of the Senate are ineffective when the National Consultative Assembly is not in session". Proposals may originate in either assembly, except that financial matters "belonged exclusively to the National Consultative Assembly. The decision of the Assembly in respect to the aforesaid proposals, shall be made known to the Senate, so that it in turn may communicate its observations to the National Consultative Assembly, but the latter, after due discussion, is free to accept or reject these observations of the Senate". The responsibility of the National Consultative Assembly for financial matters is reaffirmed by Article 27 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law, which, as stated above, lays down that the enactment and approval of laws concerning the revenue and expenditure of the kingdom are among the special functions of the National Consultative Assembly. Article 27 also lays down that "the explanation and interpretation of the laws is among the special duties of the National Consultative Assembly". The debates of the Assembly are normally public (Art. 13 of the Fundamental Law); though Article 34 makes provision for secret sessions. Bills other than those on financial matters, which originate with the government, must first be laid before the Senate by the responsible minister or the Prime Minister, and after acceptance there by a majority of votes must then be approved by the National Consultative Assembly; when any measure is proposed by a member of the Assembly it can only be discussed when at least fifteen members shall approve the discussion (Art. 39 of the Fundamental Law); Article 13 of the Rules of Procedure of the National Consultative Assembly and Article 82 of the Rules of Procedure of the Senate lay down that Bills which originate in the Senate or the National Consultative Assembly must be signed by at least fifteen members, except that in certain cases a bill signed by less than fifteen Senators may be voted on after reference to a committee. By Articles 1, 2 and 3 of the Civil Code, bills passed by the two houses are published within three days of receiving the royal assent in the Official Gazette and become law ten days thereafter in Tehran and ten days plus one day for every six *farsakhs* in the provinces, unless special arrangements are laid down in the law itself.

One of the most important functions of the National Consultative Assembly is the fixing and approving of the budget, which power it is accorded by Articles 27 and 96 of the Supreme Fundamental Law and Article 61 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law. The Minister of Finance according to Articles 12-17 of the Law for the General Finances (Kānim-i mubāshāt-i 'umāmi) of 10 Isfand 1312/1 March 1934 must submit this to the Assembly annually by 1 Day (23-4 December) and they must pass the budget by 25 Isfand (6-7 March). During and after the Second World War this provision was often contravened in that the Assembly refused to pass the budget as a whole and merely authorized the payment of a proportion of the budget at intervals throughout the financial year. Under Articles 101 and 102 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law the National Consultative Assembly is given power to appoint a Financial Commission to examine and analyse the accounts of the Department of Finance and to liquidate the accounts of all debtors and creditors of the Treasury. It is especially deputed to see that no item of expenditure fixed in the Budget exceeds the amount specified, or is changed or altered, and that each item is expended in the proper manner. It shall likewise inspect and analyse the different accounts of each department of state, collect the documentary proofs of the expenditure indicated in such accounts, and submit to the National Consultative Assembly a complete statement of the accounts of the kingdom, accompanied by its own observations". Article 94 further states that "no tax shall be established save in accordance with the law," and Article 99 that "Save in such cases as are explicitly excepted by the law, nothing can on any pretext be demanded from the people save under the categories of state, provincial and municipal taxes". These provisions reflect the anxiety of the drafters of the Constitution to bring order into the financial affairs of the country and to relieve the population of the burden of extraordinary and irregular levies to which they had formerly been subject.

Article 69 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law gives both Assemblies the right to investigate and examine every affair of state. Ministers may be questioned by members of both houses, provided that the speaker gives the responsible minister prior information of the question; an answer must be given within one week. The government and individual ministers may be interpellated by members of both houses, provided a written request is made to the speaker. Article 67 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law states "If the National Consultative Assembly or the Senate shall, by an absolute majority, declare itself dissatisfied with the cabinet, or with one particular minister, that cabinet or minister shall resign their or his ministerial functions".

Ministers may not accept a salaried office other than their own (Article 62 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law). Their number is to be laid down by law according to the requirement of the time (Art. 62). No one may become a minister unless he is a Muslim by religion, a Persian by birth, and a Persian subject (Art. 58). Sons, brothers, and uncles of the Shah may not become ministers (Art. 59). Ministers are responsible, individually and collectively, to the National Consultative Assembly and the Senate (Article 61) and may be called to account or brought to trial by them (Art. 29 of the Fundamental Law and Arts. 65 and 69 of the Supplementary Fundamental Law). Article 64 states that Ministers cannot divest themselves of their responsibility by pleading verbal or written orders from the Shah. A tendency to do so nevertheless emerged during the reign of Rūdān Shah and has again appeared in recent years. The internal organization of the Assembly is not based on political parties; the deputies are divided into groups or "fractions". Moreover, since the government is not composed of members of the Assembly there is no clear-cut division into a pro-government party and an opposition. In the second and third legislative sessions the majority of deputies belonged either to the Pīdāalīyūn Party or the Democrat Party. An attempt was made in the abortive elections of 1956 to conduct them on a two-party basis, two parties
having been formed under the inspiration of the court, the Milll and the Mardum parties, whose functions were to be respectively that of His Majesty's Government and His Majesty's Opposition.

The experiment was not successful.

The regulations governing the election to the first National Assembly were laid down in the Electoral Law of 20 Radjab 1324/9 September 1906. The electors were divided into six classes: (i) princes and the Kâdîr tribe, (ii) notables (â'yân wa ahrâf), (iii) ulama and students of the religious schools, (iv) merchants, (v) landowners and peasants, and (vi) members of the trade-guilds. Each elector had one vote and could vote in one class only, but the classes were not compelled to elect a deputy from their own class or guild. The persons so selected then assembled in the chief town of the province and elected members for the National Consultative Assembly according to the number specified in the law for each province. In Tehran elections were direct, number of deputies at 120; and provided for one elected member for the National Consultative Assembly on 14 Urdibihisht 1328/4 May 1949 laid down inter alia that senators were to be elected "by two degrees" by male suffrage. The term of the Senate was fixed by this law at six years (whereas Article 50 of the Fundamental Law had fixed it at two years). The Senate is opened by the Shah as soon as two thirds of the members have been elected. On 23 October 1952 a bill was passed limiting the Senate's term to two years. According to this bill electors must be at least twenty-five years old and have lived in or have dwelt for at least the preceding six months in the constituency where they vote. Members of the armed forces may not vote. Senators must be at least forty years old; they must be Muslims, and live in or be known in a district for which they are elected. They must be chosen from (i) the religious classes of the first rank; (ii) persons who have been deputies for at least three legislative sessions; (iii) persons who have the position of minister, ambassador, governor-general, public prosecutor, head of a tribunal of the Court of Cassation, or had at least twenty years' service in the Ministry of Justice; (iv) retired officers of the rank of field-marshal (sipah-bud), general, or major-general (sarlashkar); (v) university professors who have held such office for at least ten years; (vi) landowners and merchants who pay at least 500,000 rs. in direct taxes; and (vii) certain classes of attorneys. Senators are precluded from accepting government appointments and must resign if they accept such offices.

The Supplementary Fundamental Law in Articles 90-93 makes provision for the establishment of provincial councils (andijumam-i ayâltâ wa wâliyatâ) to be elected by the people to "exercise complete supervision over all reforms connected with the public interest, always provided that they observe the limitations prescribed by the law". In the early period of the constitution provincial councils were set up in many areas but the practice fell into abeyance after the Second World War. The constitution passed by the National Consultative Assembly on 14 Urdibihisht 1328/4 May 1949 laid down inter alia that senators were to be elected "by two degrees" by male suffrage. The term of the Senate was fixed by this law at six years (whereas Article 50 of the Fundamental Law had fixed it at two years). The Senate is opened by the Shah as soon as two thirds of the members have been elected. On 23 October 1952 a bill was passed limiting the Senate's term to two years. According to this bill electors must be at least twenty-five years old and have lived in or have dwelt for at least the preceding six months in the constituency where they vote. Members of the armed forces may not vote. Senators must be at least forty years old; they must be Muslims, and live in or be known in a district for which they are elected. They must be chosen from (i) the religious classes of the first rank; (ii) persons who have been deputies for at least three legislative sessions; (iii) persons who have the position of minister, ambassador, governor-general, public prosecutor, head of a tribunal of the Court of Cassation, or had at least twenty years' service in the Ministry of Justice; (iv) retired officers of the rank of field-marshal (sipah-bud), general, or major-general (sarlashkar); (v) university professors who have held such office for at least ten years; (vi) landowners and merchants who pay at least 500,000 rs. in direct taxes; and (vii) certain classes of attorneys. Senators are precluded from accepting government appointments and must resign if they accept such offices.

The Supplementary Fundamental Law in Articles 90-93 makes provision for the establishment of provincial councils (andijumam-i ayâltâ wa wâliyatâ) to be elected by the people to "exercise complete supervision over all reforms connected with the public interest, always provided that they observe the limitations prescribed by the law". In the early period of the constitution provincial councils were set up in many areas but the practice fell into abeyance after the Second World War. The constitution passed by the National Consultative Assembly on 14 Urdibihisht 1328/4 May 1949 laid down inter alia that senators were to be elected "by two degrees" by male suffrage. The term of the Senate was fixed by this law at six years (whereas Article 50 of the Fundamental Law had fixed it at two years). The Senate is opened by the Shah as soon as two thirds of the members have been elected. On 23 October 1952 a bill was passed limiting the Senate's term to two years. According to this bill electors must be at least twenty-five years old and have lived in or have dwelt for at least the preceding six months in the constituency where they vote. Members of the armed forces may not vote. Senators must be at least forty years old; they must be Muslims, and live in or be known in a district for which they are elected. They must be chosen from (i) the religious classes of the first rank; (ii) persons who have been deputies for at least three legislative sessions; (iii) persons who have the position of minister, ambassador, governor-general, public prosecutor, head of a tribunal of the Court of Cassation, or had at least twenty years' service in the Ministry of Justice; (iv) retired officers of the rank of field-marshal (sipah-bud), general, or major-general (sarlashkar); (v) university professors who have held such office for at least ten years; (vi) landowners and merchants who pay at least 500,000 rs. in direct taxes; and (vii) certain classes of attorneys. Senators are precluded from accepting government appointments and must resign if they accept such offices.

Those who had prepared the way for constitutional reform in their published works and in the discussions of the secret societies which preceded the constitutional revolution had emphasized the need for equality before the law. This was provided for in the section of the Supplementary Fundamental Law which concerns the rights of the people (Arts. 8-25). Article 8 lays down that the people shall enjoy equal rights before the law. Article 9 that "All individuals are protected and safeguarded in respect to their lives, property, homes, and honour, from every kind of interference, and none shall molest them save in such way as the laws of the land shall determine". Article 10 lays down that "No one can be unreasonably arrested, save flagrante delicto in the commission of some crime or misdemeanour, except on the written authority of the president of a tribunal of justice given in conformity with the law. Even in such case the accused must immediately, or at latest in the course of the next twenty-four hours, be informed and notified of the nature of his offence". Further, Article 14 provides that "No Persian can be exiled from the country, or prevented from residing in any part thereof, save in such cases as the law may
explicitly determine”. It was, perhaps, a major advance that such principles should be clearly formulated and written into the constitution, even if, like various other provisions of the constitution, they should be from time to time ignored.

H.M. the Padshah (also called amir, etc.) is the servant and protector of Islam and the sovereign of all subjects of Afghanistan (art. 5); in consideration of his services, a hereditary monarchy is created, the nation agreeing to raise to the sultanate his male heirs in the male line (art. 4). The sovereign’s prerogatives are as follows: his name is mentioned in the Friday khutba, the coinage bears his portrait, he confers decorations, approves laws and announces their effective date, nominates and dismisses ministers, nominates to public office, is responsible for the exercise of the laws, commands the armed forces, declares war and concludes peace, and signs all treaties; he possesses the right of amnesty and pardon (art. 7).

The ministers are responsible to the sovereign (art. 31) and may be arraigned before the Supreme Court (arts. 33-4). They give a public account, at the audience which takes place before the independence festival, of work accomplished during the year (arts. 25-7).

For the details of ministerial organization the Fundamental Law refers to the Law of Fundamental Organizations, which provided for ten ministries including a Council of State and two autonomous administrations (Posts and Telegraphs, and Public Health); the Council of State is in charge of reform, services to the state, and tribunals.

The Fundamental Law makes no provisions for a parliament, but for a Consultative Council of State (hay’at-i shürā-i dawlat) at Kabul and Councils of Consultation (madžlis-i maṣḥawara or muqtabṣawara) with representatives of the government in the provinces, at all stages up to district level (art. 39); these latter Councils consist of officials set up by the Law of Fundamental Organizations and elected members in equal number, while the Council with its headquarters at Kabul is composed half of members nominated by the sovereign, the other half being also elected by the people (arts. 40-1). Art. 42 stipulates the functions of these councils: matters submitted to the government representatives are examined and, if necessary, transmitted to the ministry concerned; if the government representative does not wish to accept the decision, he may apply to the Consultative Council who examine the matters and transmit them, with their comments, to the competent ministry.

Laws, in the drafting of which it is necessary to take into consideration the practices, needs and provisions of the sharī’a, are examined by the Consultative Council, sent to the Council of Ministers, and put in operation after they have received the approval of the ministers and the sovereign (art. 46). The Consultative Council studies the budget prepared by the Finance Ministry, as well as foreign contracts and obligations (arts. 48-9).

As regards the judiciary power, the Fundamental Law confines itself to establishing certain guarantees (publicity of proceedings, the rights of the defence, the independence of the judges who are not to allow proceedings to be delayed, arts. 50-3), the competence of tribunals (art. 54) being established by the Law of Fundamental Organizations, which provides for: justices of the peace, tribunals of first instance, courts of appeal and a Court of Cassation. Extraordinary jurisdictions are forbidden (art. 55), but a Supreme Court is instituted for the trial of ministers (arts. 56-7).

Provisions relating to finance (arts. 58-62) and the institution of an Audit Office (art. 61) are followed by details on the administration of the provinces (arts. 63-7). The following articles treat of the revision of the Fundamental Law, which must receive two-thirds of the votes in the National Consultative Council (art. 70), and of the interpretation and drafting of laws (art. 71).

It is obvious that the constitutional work undertaken under the reign of Amān Allāh represented a considerable progress towards the modernization and democratization of the country. The people began to participate modestly in political life by the election of representatives to various councils, whose role was, it is true, merely consultative; on the legislative and executive sides the government and the sovereign exercised a preponderant power, and the judiciary itself, although more independent, was not free from governmental authority, since the Court of Appeal was presided over by the minister of justice and the chief hadī was an ex officio member of it. One may notice that this Constitution is not exactly a slavish imitation of western models, and has a certain originality; there is, indeed, no provision for assuring the Islamic nature of the laws, but the duty of conforming to the sharía is underlined at several places, and the provisions concerning the Hanafi practice are striking; even more striking is the xenophobia and the sort of rigorism which appear in the retention of the ḏiyya and the wearing of the ṣumūr imposed on some non-Muslims resident on Afghan territory.

To what extent this Constitution was applied is not exactly known, since many incidents followed in the country’s internal affairs. In the summer of 1928 after Amān Allāh’s return from a visit to Europe Afghanistan was troubled by a serious movement of revolt on the part of tribes instigated by mulūds hostile to certain forms of westernization, though not, indeed, to the provisions of the Constitution. The revolt soon spread to the eastern and northern provinces, and Kabul fell into the hands of Bāzā’-i Šaqaw who proclaimed himself amir and took the name of Ḥabīb Allāh. Amān Allāh having given up resistance and his throne, Nādir Šāh, who was related to the royal family, continued the struggle against the usurper and succeeded in recapturing Kabul. Under the new sovereign the title of Nādir Šāh, he made great efforts to govern the country with wisdom and prudence and, two years later, on 31 October 1931, promulgated a new Constitution (in Pashto and in Persian: waṣī-ī asāsī-yi dawlat-i ʿalîyya-i Afgānīsān), which reiterated the greater part of the provisions of the Fundamental Law of 1923, but differed substantially from it by the creation of a Senate (madžlis-i aʿyān) and the definitive institution of a National Consultative Assembly (madžlis-i shūrā-yi miill), already created by a Diqāga in August-September 1928, confirmed by another Diqāga in 1930, and inaugurated by the Šāh in October 1930.

The new Constitution comprises 110 articles (instead of 73) arranged in the following way: general provisions (arts. 1-4), rights and duties of the sovereign (arts. 5-8), rights of citizens (arts. 9-26), organization of the National Consultative Assembly (arts. 27-66), of the Senate (arts. 67-70), of the Councils of Consultation in the provinces (arts. 71-2), rights and duties of ministers (arts. 73-83), and of officials (arts. 84-6), tribunals (arts. 87-94), the Supreme Court (arts. 95-6), finance (arts. 97-101), provincial administration (arts. 102-3), the army (arts. 106-8), and miscellaneous provisions (arts. 109-10).

On the whole the Constitutional matters are
better arranged than in the Fundamental Law of 1923, but many articles are retained almost entirely. The general provisions differ little; however, art. 1 (old art. 2) imposes the obligation on the sovereign to follow the Hanafi school, and no longer speaks of djizya and the distinguishing emblems of ghimmis. The wording of art. 5 (old art. 4) is slightly modified: the monarchy is hereditary in the family of Nader Shah, and it is he who nominate his successor; he must now take the oath (art. 6) according to a solemn formula, and a civil list is allotted to him (art. 8). Art. 23 (old art. 11) is more liberal towards the foreign press, although art. 21 (old art. 14) provides that the teaching only of Islamic sciences is free.

The National Consultative Assembly is composed of 106 deputies elected for three years; they must take an oath and enjoy parliamentary immunity. The Assembly is charged with approving laws and regulations, financial laws, grants and concessions of all kinds, the construction of railways, etc. Members of the Senate (arts. 67-70) are nominated by the sovereign; they are a counterbalance to the Assembly in the approval of laws either before or after that body; this Senate was inaugurated in November 1937. The Councils of Consultation persist in the provinces, but they are now elected (art. 71) and the wording of art. 21 (old art. 61) is not expressly provided for; on the other hand three articles (106-8) are devoted to the army; it is there laid down that foreigners are not admitted to it except in the capacities of surgeons or instructors.

In general the second Afghan Constitution marks a noticeable progress from the former; it appears not only more liberal but also more democratic in that the people have their elected representatives in the assemblies which, indeed, have especially a consultative part to play but participate more intimately in the political life of the nation.


fifteen general elections held till the abolition of the Parliamentary system.

The revolution of 14 July 1958, produced by a growing dissatisfaction with the monarchy and the Parliamentary system, abrogated the Constitution of 1925. The newly established Council of Sovereignty, composed of three members, issued a decree establishing a republican regime for 'Irāq and promising the calling of a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution for the country. In the meantime there is no parliament. Decrees, having the force of laws, are issued by the Cabinet and approved by the Council of Sovereignty. (On the Arab Union, see below, xviii.)


vii. — SA'ŪDĪ ARABIYA

As early as 31 August 1926 the kingdom of the Hiḍjāz provided itself with a "Constitution" comprising 9 sections and 79 articles, but this has few points in common with the constitutions of Arab countries studied in this article. By virtue of this text the Arab State of the Hiḍjāz was "a constitutional Muslim monarchy" (art. 2) in which "all the administration is in the hands of H.M. King 'Abd al-'Azīz I", but the latter is "bound by the laws of the gharī'a" (art. 5). The judicial norms must conform to the Book of God, to the sources, in addition to the usual constitutional assurances, between Zaydis and Shafi'i, is responsible to the king (art. 8). Section III deals with the affairs of the kingdom, which are divided into 6 groups: sharī'a affairs, internal affairs, financial affairs, financial affairs, public instruction, military affairs (art. 9). Sharī'a affairs include everything which pertains to religious jurisdiction (al-ṣa'dūq al-ṣharī'), the two Holy Cities, waqf, mosques and all religious establishments (art. 10). The laws of Islam, which comprise officials and notables nominated by the king, village and tribal councils (art. 11). A department of audit is provided for (art. 43) as well as a general inspectorate of officials (art. 46 ff.). Section VII deals with employees of the State, section VIII with municipal councils, and the last section with administrative committees of municipalities.

A royal decree of 29 January 1927 raised Nadīd to the status of a kingdom and unified it with the kingdom of Hiḍjāz. A further royal decree of 18 September 1932 created the kingdom of Sa'ūdī Arabia, changing the name of the original kingdom, and the succession to the throne. The 'imām was to hold absolute power, but with the aid of a prime minister and other ministers belonging to his family. After the revolution of September 1952, a constitutional document was issued by the revolutionary council (majlis al-thawra) setting forth the aims of the revolution and laying down general principles of government. The former begin with the restoration of the 'true Sharī'a', the abolition of communal discrimination and the equality of all Yemenites before the law, the removal of conflicts between Zaydis and Shafi'is, followed by a series of national, political and social objectives. The principles, in addition to the usual constitutional assurances, include the statements that the Yemenite people is the source of all authority (art. 3) and that all laws derive their validity from the Sharī'a of Islam, which is the official religion of the state (art. 6). The text of the document was published in Fatīḥ al-Djazlra, Aden, issue of 8 November 1962. (Ed.)
ix. — SYRIA AND LEBANON

Like 'Irāk, Syria and Lebanon began their constitutional life after their separation from the Ottoman Empire after World War I, although some of their leaders had taken an active part in Ottoman constitutional experiments. The first constitutional step undertaken by Syria took place after the capture of Damascus by Amir Fāsyl in 1918 with the avowed intention of establishing an Arab constitutional state. Fāsyl called a Syrian Congress in 1920, representing the whole of geographical Syria (later known as Greater Syria), including Lebanon and Palestine, on the basis of the Ottoman Electoral Law. This Congress, functioning as a legislative and a constituent assembly, laid down a draft constitution of 148 articles which, though no formal vote was taken, had been accepted in principle. The Congress was still considering the draft when the French army entered Damascus and it adjourned on 19 July 1920, never to meet again.

The constitution provided for a limited monarchy, a bi-cameral legislature, and a responsible Cabinet. Syria (i.e., Greater Syria) was to be an indivisible political entity, but its boundaries were left undefined. The Syrian Government was to be an Arab Government, its capital Damascus, and its religion Islam. The constitution included a Bill of Rights guaranteeing civil liberties and freedom of thought and of religion. Both the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies were to be elected bodies: the deputies by secret ballot in two degrees, and the Senators by the Chamber of Deputies of each province. The administration of the country was to be on a decentralized basis; each province was to have its own local administration with a single legislative body called the Chamber of Deputies. The judiciary was to be independent, with a High Court appointed by the King as the supreme judicial organ.

Syria remained under direct French control from 1920 to 1930 before another constitutional step was taken. While Syria was still in the midst of the revolt of 1925-7, the French came to an understanding with Lebanon and promulgated a constitution in 1926, thus providing a constitutional model for Syria.

LEBANON

The Lebanese constitution provided for a republican régime—the first to be proclaimed in the Arab East in modern times—and a bi-cameral Parliament, to be elected by a two-stage universal manhood suffrage. The Cabinet was to be individually and collectively responsible to Parliament. The President, elected by the two Houses of Parliament in a joint session, was given the right to appoint the Prime Minister and, with a vote of three-quarters of the Senate, to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies. This elaborate structure for a small state called for a constitutional framework for Lebanon prompted the French on the need for establishing a constitutional government. Elections for a Constituent Assembly were held in 1928. A drafting committee of 27 members was appointed and a draft constitution was ready in August before the Assembly. The draft stipulated that Syria within its “natural boundaries” (i.e., Greater Syria) would be an indivisible political unit and an independent sovereign state, in form of government republican, and the religion of its head Islam. The constitution also provided for a Bill of Rights, in which the principles of liberty, equality, private property, etc. were guaranteed. The head of the executive power was the President of the Republic, elected by Parliament for a period of five years, but he was not eligible for re-election until the lapse of five years from the expiration of his term. The President selected the Prime Minister and appointed the Ministers upon the latter’s recommendation. The President was not responsible, since his decisions were countersigned by the Prime Minister and the Ministers concerned. The Cabinet was composed of not more than seven members responsible to Parliament. The Ministers were not all members of Parliament, but they could attend and take part in discussion. Parliament was made up of one House (Madjlīs, or Chamber of Deputies), which was freely elected every four years. Every male Syrian who had attained his twentieth year was eligible to vote. The constitution provided also for a High Court composed of 15 members chosen from Parliament and from the judges of the courts. The constitution was ordinarily amended by two-thirds of Parliament upon the request of either the Government or Parliament. The draft constitution, ignoring the terms of the Mandate, prompted France to inform the Constituent Assembly that certain articles, such as the one dealing with the “natural boundaries” of Syria, which included Lebanon, and others which contradicted France’s international obligations, must be revised. Upon the Assembly’s refusal, the French dissolved the Assembly in 1928 and promulgated the Constitution in 1930, having revised the articles to which they had objected. The Syrians, tacitly accepting the situation, participated in the elections for Parliament in 1932. The first President of the Republic was elected in 1933. However, the Syrians and the French could not agree on a treaty regulating the relations between France and Syria after independence. Thus, when the war broke out in 1939, the French suspended the Constitution and governed the country through a “Council of Directors”.

The circumstances of World War II gave Syria an opportunity to achieve independence and resume constitutional life. In 1941, Syria and Lebanon were declared independent and elections for the resumption of parliamentary life were held in 1943, although the legal termination of the Mandate did not take place until 1946. The Constitution of 1930, revised by deleting the articles referring to the Mandate, was
restored and a new President was elected. This constitution remained in force until 1948, when a military coup d'état was led by Husni al-Za'im, who overthrew the Government and suspended the constitution. A new draft constitution, reputed to embody progressive principles, was not promulgated, since Za'im himself was overthrown by the army in August 1949. Elections for a Constituent Assembly were held in a relatively free atmosphere, although the army remained in control of authority. The assembly issued a new draft constitution, prepared by a committee of 33 members under the chairmanship of Nâmid al-Kudsi, on 3 September 1950, and promulgated on the same day by the President of the Republic.

The Constitution of 1950 made no fundamental changes in the form or structure of the government as it existed in the constitution of 1930. Its innovations were to be found in the general articles expressing the hopes of the Syrian people. Syria was declared to be "an indivisible political unity" and to form "a part of the Arab nation". The Bill of Rights, composed of 28 articles, defined in detail the fundamental principles of freedom and the social and economic rights of the citizens. The articles relating to land stated that "a maximum limit for land ownership shall be prescribed by law", but no such law was ever issued until Syria was united with Egypt in 1958. The constitution also provided that "the state shall distribute state lands to peasants to whom land is not available sufficient for their support, against small rents to be repaid in instalments" (Article 22). Labour was regarded as "the most basic factor in social life" and "the right of all citizens". "The state shall provide work to citizens and shall guarantee it by directing and promoting the national economy" (Article 26). Education was also declared a right of every citizen. Elementary education was compulsory and free in all government schools. Secondary and professional education, though not compulsory, was also free in all government schools. Military service was compulsory, and the family, regarded as the basis of society, was to be protected by the state. The state was also to encourage marriage and endeavour to remove the material and social obstacles thereto. The articles, regarded as the most progressive in Arab lands, were overshadowed by Egypt's more radical socialist measures when Syria joined Egypt in a union in 1958. However, before Syria joined that union, she had yet to experiment with a new constitutional charter, issued under the Shishakli regime in 1954, by virtue of which the presidential system of government was introduced for the first time in Arab lands. This short-lived constitution was abrogated soon after the collapse of the Shishakli regime and the Constitution of 1950 was restored. The latter constitution may well be regarded as still (1963) before the Japanese invasion in 1942.


(j. Khadduri)
ment, in the person of the Governor-General, of advice which he could ignore.

Reforms in the composition and powers of the Volksraad in 1920, 1922, 1925 and 1927 did little to transform the body into an effective legislature. After 1927 it had co-legislative powers with the Governor-General, but he retained a veto. The system of election remained indirect, and the franchise narrow.

When the Japanese sensed that their defeat was inevitable they acted to hasten Indonesian independence. On 1 March 1945 they appointed a joint committee, the majority on which was Indonesian, to discuss plans for independence. Meetings held from 28 May to 1 June and from 10 to 17 July reached general agreement on the basic political principles which should guide the future Indonesian nation. Sukarno, a prominent nationalist leader since the 1920s, and subsequently Indonesia’s first President, played a major part in the discussions. It was his speech on 1 June, expounding his panca sila (“five foundations”, five basic principles) which made possible a workable measure of compromise between those who wanted a theocratic Islamic state (the Indonesian population is 90% Muslim) and those who, though nominally Muslim themselves, feared extreme Muslim orthodoxy. It is significant that over 90 of the leaders of the national movement were drawn had had western as opposed to strictly Islamic educations (Soelaeman Soemardi, Some aspects of the social origins of the Indonesian political decision-makers, in Trans. 3rd World Congr. Sociology, London 1956).

Sukarno’s panca sila were: nationalism (kebangsaan); internationalism, or humanitarianism (perikemanusiaan); democracy, or representation (keadilan rakyat); social justice (keadilan sosial); and faith in one God (ke-Tuhanan, or pengakuan ke-Tuhanan Jang Maha-Esa). His exposition of the principles was subtle and persuasive, reassuring, for example, the strongest supporters of the concept of an Islamic state that their best guarantee of influence was by working through the elective and democratic institutions which were going to be formed. The text of the speech is to be found in Kemenkerian Penerangan, Lahirnya Pantjasila, 2nd Engl. edn. Djakarta 1952). The Djakarta Charter, signed by nine leading nationalists on 22 June 1945, is identical in wording with the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution, with the exception of the words italicized in the following extract: “The Republic is founded in the person of the Governor-General, of advice which he could ignore. The preamble paraphrases the panca sila, the concluding part reading: “We believe in an all-embracing God; in righteous and moral humanity; in the unity of Indonesia. We believe in democracy, wisely guided and led by close contact with the people through consultation, so that there shall result social justice for the whole Indonesian people”.

Art. 1 lays down that Indonesia is a unitary state with a republican form of government. Sovereignty lies with the people, and is exercised through a People’s Consultative Assembly (Madjesi Permusjawaratan Rakjat). Art. 2 stipulates that the Consultative Assembly is to consist of the members of the Chamber of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakjat), together with representatives of regions and groups. It is to meet at least once every five years, and to take its decisions by simple majority vote. Art. 3 entrusts it with the responsibility for enacting the permanent constitution and the main guiding lines of state policy. Art. 4 gives the President the power of Government, to be exercised in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, and a Vice-President is elected by the Chamber of Representatives to assist him to enact laws in agreement with (persetujuan dengan) the Chamber of Representatives, and to issue ordinances for the proper execution of laws. Art. 6 stipulates that the President is to be an autochthonous Indonesian, and that he and the Vice-President should be elected by the People’s Consultative Assembly by a majority vote; art. 7 lays down his term of office at five years, with the possibility of re-election; art. 10 gives him supreme command of the armed forces; art. 11 empowers him to declare war, conclude peace, and to make treaties with foreign powers, all with the sanction of the Chamber of Representatives, while art. 12 gives him the right of proclaiming a state of emergency, the conditions and consequences of which are to be regulated by law.

Art. 16 provides for a Supreme Advisory Council ( Dewan Pertimbangan Agung), which is obliged to answer questions submitted by the President, and has the right to make proposals to the Government. Art. 17 provides for Ministers of State, whose function it is to take charge of Government Departments, and who are appointed and dismissed by the President.

Arts. 19-22 govern the Chamber of Representatives. It is to assemble at least once a year, and its sanction is required for all laws. If a bill fails to receive this sanction, it is not to be submitted again during the same session. Members of the Chamber have the right to initiate laws; if the President does not ratify these, they are not to be submitted again during the same session of the Chamber. Presidential ordinances during states of emergency require the sanction of the Chamber of Representatives in its next session, and if this is not obtained, the ordinances lapse. Art. 23 governs the financial arrangements. The annual budget is regulated by law. Arts. 24-8 govern the judiciary, and guarantee the basic human rights—freedom of speech, equality before the law, and the right to work. The remaining arts. deal with religion, national defence, social welfare, the national language, and the surrender of the Constitution. The last is effected by a two-thirds majority of the People’s Consultative Assembly
when at least two-thirds of its members are in attendance (art. 37).

Four transitional and two additional provisions complete the document. Of these, nos. 2 and 4 of the transitional provisions provide for the perpetuation of arrangements existing at the time the Constitution was drafted until the new ones proposed in it could be brought into being, and arrange for the President, assisted by a National Committee (Komite Nasional Indonesia Pusat—KNIP), to exercise the powers of the People’s Consultative Assembly, the Chamber of Representatives, and the Supreme Advisory Council until such time as they can be established.

The Constitution reflects a variety of influences. The American Presidential system has obviously been more attractive than the western European parliamentary system, even though the former operates in a federal nation and the latter mainly in unitary ones. Despite the determination of the nationalists to owe as little as possible to the Dutch, several features of the 1945 Constitution are reminiscent of the Constitution of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The Supreme Advisory Council, for example, is not unlike the Dutch Council of State. The President and the Chamber of Representatives exercise legislative power under the Indonesian Constitutional System, whereas the States-General under the Dutch. Other influences suggested by commentators include that of the draft Chinese Constitution of 1936 (M. Yamin, *Proklamasi dan Konstitusi Republik Indonesia*, Djakarta and Amsterdam 1952, 139), the constitution of the former Netherlands Indies (J. H. A. Logemann, *Het Staatsrecht van Indonesië*, 3rd ed. Gravenhage and Bandung 1954, 34); and the Chinese Organic Law of 1931 (H. Feith, *The decline of constitutional democracy in Indonesia*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1962, 43).

The first Cabinet under the Constitution was appointed by President Sukarno on 31 August 1945. The chosen ministers were responsible to the President and not to the KNIP, which had been formed on 29 August. It consisted of the members of the dissolved PPKI, plus a further selection of outstanding nationalist leaders, and representatives of the main economic, ethnic, religious and social groups in Indonesia. Its functions were advisory, not legislative.

However, following a meeting of the KNIP on 16 October 1945, the Vice-President, Hatta, announced that, pending the formation of the Consultative Assembly and the Chamber of Representatives, the KNIP itself was to be vested with legislative powers, and was to participate in the working out of the general orientation of state policy. The functions of the KNIP were normally to be assumed by a smaller component of it, known as the Working Committee, whose size permitted of more rapid decision taking. The term “Working Committee” seems to have been taken from the Indian National Congress (G. McT. Kahin (ed.), *Major governments of Asia*, Ithaca, N.Y., 1958, 504 n. 9).

At the instigation of the Working Committee, the President decreed on 14 November 1945 that Ministers should in future be responsible to the KNIP. Since the Working Committee met a good deal more frequently than the parent body, in effect Ministers were now responsible to it. The old Cabinet was dismissed, and a new one, under Sjahir as Premier, was formed.

The change was the result of unease, in the first months of the new state, on the part of those nationalists who had served with the anti-Japanese underground, at the power and influence of nationalists who had worked with the Japanese during the war, and at the presence in the new Cabinet of a spokesmen of the ex-resistance nationalists. The consequence of the change was to substitute for a Presidential system a western European type parliamentary one. It is noteworthy that 94% of the cabinet ministers in Indonesia from 1945 to 1955 had been educated in Western schools and universities (Soemardi, *op. cit.*).

In the following four years the President assumed emergency power on three occasions (29 June to 2 October 1946; 27 June to 3 July 1947; 15 September to 25 December 1948), for the terms of which he exercised full personal control. On the third occasion, however, he did so, not on his own decree, but after an Act passed with the concurrence of the Working Committee and countersigned by the Ministers of Defence, Internal Affairs, and Justice.

Apart from the period before the modification of the Constitution in November 1945, there were two other Presidential Cabinets (26 January 1948 to 4 August 1949, and 4 August to 20 December 1949). In these, the Vice-President was premier, composition was not based on party political bargaining, and "... it was generally considered that a Cabinet so established could not be forced to resign by the President (working in the office of President in Indonesia as defined in the three constitutions in theory and practice, Ithaca, N.Y., 1957, 17).

At the time the KNIP was formed, the PPKI also decided on the formation of an Indonesian National Party (Partai Nasional Indonesia), which was to be the sole Indonesian political organization. However, government announcements of 3 and 14 November 1945 made it clear that all trends of democratic opinion were entitled to political existence and organized expression. Once again the defeat and discrediting of the former Axis powers was probably a consideration.

There were two abortive agreements with the Dutch before Indonesia’s independence was finally recognized. The Linggadjati Agreement (signed 25 March 1947) granted the Republic of Indonesia de facto recognition in Java, Madura and Sumatra, and provided for a “United States of Indonesia” to be formed with Dutch co-operation. The Renville Agreement (17 January 1948), which was concluded at the instigation of the United Nations, gave the Dutch the temporary right to hold the territory they had seized in the interim, on condition that they would hold plebiscites in these areas to determine the wishes of the inhabitants. The Dutch realized that the overwhelming majority of the people under them would opt for the Republic of Indonesia, so they ignored this condition, and instead set about fostering local states like the ones they had created and sustained in Borneo and the eastern islands. Throughout this period the Dutch worked unceasingly to create a viable federal structure in the areas they controlled, in contrast with their pre-war policy of maintaining a unitary structure in their colony, and rejecting federal proposals (see A. A. Schiller, *The formation of federal Indonesia, 1945-49*, The Hague-Bandung 1955, 14-25 et passim).

In mid-1949 delegates of the Dutch-fostered federal states and of the Republic of Indonesia met at an Inter-Indonesia Conference (Konferensi Inter-Indonesia) to begin planning the institutions of the state which would take over from the Dutch. In general the proposals which emerged from this, and
from the work of a technical committee set up to complete a draft constitution, were embodied in the 1949 draft Constitution of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia (RUSI). This was issued as an Annex to the agreements reached during the Round Table Conference at the Hague (23 August to 2 November 1949), granting Indonesia "unconditionally and irrevocably" sovereignty over the whole territory of the former Netherlands East Indies.

The Constitution was entirely the work of the two Indonesian factions, republican and federalist, but the Dutch expressed their approval. It was an unbalanced, and, as it was to transpire almost at once, an unworkable structure that the new Constitution envisaged. Since Indonesia had won unconditional independence, it was not of course in any way binding on her.

The main provisions were as follows. There was to be a President, who would act as Head of State, and had to be "an Indonesian" (art. 69). The President was "inviolable" and his Ministers responsible, jointly for the entire Government policy, and each individually for his part of it (art. 118). The Government consisted of the President and his Ministers by the provisions of art. 68. All Presidential decrees, with the exception of those nominating three cabinet formateurs, required the counter-signature of two Development Ministers or formateurs (arts. 74 and 119). The President remained in supreme command of the armed forces, but if necessary these were to be placed under the command of a Commander-in-Chief (art. 182). There was no provision for a Vice-President, but the Cabinet had to include a Prime Minister (art. 74).

There would be a bicameral legislature. The Senate was to have two representatives appointed by their respective governments, from each of the 16 component states, while there were to be 150 members of the House of Representatives (or more if that number did not include at least the minimum numbers of representatives of minority ethnic groups stipulated) (arts. 80, 81, 100). The first House of Representatives was to be appointed (arts. 109-10), and the provisions allowing for a minimum representation of minority ethnic groups (nine Chinese, six Europeans, three Arabs) were retained. Generally speaking, the provisions governing the legislative procedure were very much as in the Constitution of 1949, with the necessary modifications to allow for the disappearance of the Senate (arts. 64, 89-92, 94-5). The Chamber of Representatives (acting for the only two remaining Dutch-sponsored states) and leaders of the Republic of Indonesia agreed on the essentials of a new unitary state to replace the existing structure. It was also agreed that Sukarno should be President of the new state. The House of Representatives of RUSI and the Working Committee of KNIP were to draw up a new Constitution, on the basis of the 1949 document, but incorporating the basic provisions of the Constitution of 1945. For the following two months delegates worked on the detail of a new provisional Constitution, a task completed by 20 July 1950.

Once ratified by the respective legislatures, this document was signed for the two parties on 15 August, and came into operation on the fifth anniversary of the proclamation of independence in 1945, 17 August 1950.

It differed in important respects from the federal Constitution which had preceded it. It was unicameral, sovereignty being exercised by the Government and the Chamber of Representatives (art. 1). There was to be a Vice-President, appointed on the first occasion by the President on the recommendation of the Chamber of Representatives (art. 45). The President was specifically given the power to dissolve the Chamber of Representatives (art. 84), which he had lacked under the 1949 dispensations, but this power was circumscribed by the additional provision that his decree of dissolution had also to order the holding of elections for a new Chamber within 30 days. The Presidential supreme authority over the armed forces, reiterated in art. 127, was limited by art. 85 which made it imperative for military decrees to be counter-signed by the responsible Minister.

The Chamber of Representatives in the first place was to be made up of the RUSI House and Senate, plus the members of the Working Committee of KNIP and the Supreme Advisory Council (art. 77). Subsequently, at general elections, there was to be one representative for each 300,000 Indonesians (arts. 58-9), and the provisions allowing for a minimum representation of minority ethnic groups (nine Chinese, six Europeans, three Arabs) were retained from the 1949 document.

Generally speaking, the provisions governing the legislative procedure were very much as in the Constitution of 1949, with the necessary modifications to allow for the disappearance of the Senate (arts. 64, 89-92, 94-5). The Chamber of Representatives was not specifically barred from forcing the Cabinet or any member of it to resign. This was generally taken as tacit under-writing of full Cabinet responsibility in the western European manner. The usual guarantees of individual liberties and welfare were incorporated. The Preamble, as with that of 1949, echoed Sukarno's panca $ila.

The 1950 Constitution was, as originally envisaged, intended to be simply provisional, like its predecessors, pending the election of a Constituent Assembly to devise the permanent Constitution. But in fact it remained in operation until suspended in 1959.
An important source of operational friction lay in the disproportion between the duties of the President according to the Constitution and the personality, character and standing of the President. As Head of State, Sukarno was theoretically confined to the kinds of activities open to a constitutional monarch in western Europe. But he was also undistinguished leader of a long and arduous national revolution, invested thereby with tremendous prestige and capable of quite unique command of the loyalty of the mass of the people. It was impossible to keep him out of the political process to the extent that the Constitution assumed. His frequent policy speeches, critical of other parts of the state machine, were often taken as governmental pronouncements, and could seriously embarrass the Cabinet, who need not have been apprised in advance of their contents. If conflict developed between Cabinet and President it was the Cabinet that had to go. The President was in permanent occupation, inviolable by the terms of the Constitution (art. 83), had the power to dissolve the Chamber of Representatives, and was secure in the knowledge that nowhere in the Constitution (unlike that of 1949) was there any definition of "government".

Another serious impediment to the smooth working of the institutions devised was the increasing development of personal strains among the dramatis personae. The 1945-9 Government had functioned as well as it had done partly because of the intense pressure to which it was unremittingly subjected. Personal differences were secondary to the overall objective of independence. With the unifying factor of Dutch persecution gone, divergences of viewpoint and incompatibilities revealed themselves.

Another weakness lay in the great number and frequent irresponsible self-statements of the political parties. Before the elections of 1955, of the 236 seats in the Chamber of Representatives, no party ever held more than 52. Party discipline was almost completely lacking. The views of party members in a Cabinet and their colleagues in the national organization often diverged. Parties not represented in the Cabinet did not function as a restrained, constructive, responsible institution but patently in their actions suggested that habits of obstruction acquired in the long and bitter fight against the Dutch had become ingrained. The Cabinet time and again found itself under the necessity of acting by emergency decree in order to clear arrears of legislation over the heads of the Chamber (which had, of course, to ratify in its next session, but this it usually did). In this kind of situation, a great deal depended on personalities, their mutual compatibility, and in particular their relations with the one permanent feature of the political landscape—President Sukarno. No cabinet lasted longer than two years, and most a good deal less than that.

It is noteworthy that in his speeches and writings over many years Sukarno had made plain that his view of democracy did not coincide with traditional Indonesian patterns of decision making, expressed in the terms musjawarah (deliberation, discussion), muafaqat (agreement, deliberation), and golong rojong (mutual aid, co-operation). The first implies that the leader should act only after consultation with those led, and that his leadership should consist of guidance rather than dictation. The second has the connotation of decision reached not through majority, but by final arrival at the general will, the greatest attainable degree of consensus. The third emphasizes the co-operative aspects of economic and social life, and is implicitly critical of arrangements which encourage or condone the clash of vested interests, the spirit of competition, and the thrust of individualism.

Sukarno's political role, so circumscribed by the letter of the 1950 Constitution, as compared with that of 1945, grew progressively more significant and direct. The essence of his proposals was that the Cabinet should represent a broad cross-section of the parties, including the communists, and that it should work with a National Council, which would include key ministers, and representatives of different interest groups in Indonesian society—trade unions, youth movements, religious, artists, farmers and peasants, journalists, women, veterans of the revolution, foreign-born citizens, Indonesian business circles, the armed forces, and the outer islands. It would be the task of the National Council to advise the President and the Cabinet and to make recommendations.

His suggestions met with resistance, and regional rebellions, which had since Independence finally erupted and subsided, now flared. A state of War and Siege was declared, giving recognition to the exercise of civil authority by regional military commanders. As Sukarno was unable to find a politician who could form a Cabinet on his principles, he himself stepped in and established a "National Caretaker Cabinet" under a respected non-party man, Dr. Djuanda Kartawidjaja. Two of the members of the Cabinet were reputed to be sympathetic to the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). The National Council, nominated by the President, further strengthened his hand. Although Djuanda told the Chamber of Representatives that the Cabinet, as before, would continue to be responsible to it, clearly a major change in the role and power of the Presidency had taken place.

In 1958 a revolt in Sumatra offered the most serious challenge yet to Sukarno, and an alternative Cabinet and Government were formed. The legitimate Government succeeded in crushing this revolt, and in the process effectively cleared its path of the individuals and parties hostile to it who had been unwise enough to become implicated. The Army, under the leadership of General Nasution, confirmed its growing authority and influence. The PKI, on the other hand, had shown in regional elections in Java that its strength, too, was increasing. Sukarno now favoured a return to the Constitution of 1945, with its basically presidential pattern. After considerable discussion and pressure, the Cabinet accepted his demand in December 1958. When the elected Consultative Assembly, whose function was the enactment of a permanent Constitution to replace that of 1950, failed to endorse the return to that of 1945, it was dissolved. The President

However, Sukarno's major concern in mooting guided democracy was that western democracy, with its counting of heads and statistical majorities, was not in accordance with traditional Indonesian patterns of decision making, expressed in the terms musjawarah (deliberation, discussion), muafaqat (agreement, deliberation), and golong rojong (mutual aid, co-operation). The first implies that the leader should act only after consultation with those led, and that his leadership should consist of guidance rather than dictation. The second has the connotation of decision reached not through majority, but by final arrival at the general will, the greatest attainable degree of consensus. The third emphasizes the co-operative aspects of economic and social life, and is implicitly critical of arrangements which encourage or condone the clash of vested interests, the spirit of competition, and the thrust of individualism.

Sukarno's political role, so circumscribed by the letter of the 1950 Constitution, as compared with that of 1945, grew progressively more significant and direct. The essence of his proposals was that the Cabinet should represent a broad cross-section of the parties, including the communists, and that it should work with a National Council, which would include key ministers, and representatives of different interest groups in Indonesian society—trade unions, youth movements, religious, artists, farmers and peasants, journalists, women, veterans of the revolution, foreign-born citizens, Indonesian business circles, the armed forces, and the outer islands. It would be the task of the National Council to advise the President and the Cabinet and to make recommendations.

His suggestions met with resistance, and regional rebellions, which had since Independence finally erupted and subsided, now flared. A state of War and Siege was declared, giving recognition to the exercise of civil authority by regional military commanders. As Sukarno was unable to find a politician who could form a Cabinet on his principles, he himself stepped in and established a "National Caretaker Cabinet" under a respected non-party man, Dr. Djuanda Kartawidjaja. Two of the members of the Cabinet were reputed to be sympathetic to the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). The National Council, nominated by the President, further strengthened his hand. Although Djuanda told the Chamber of Representatives that the Cabinet, as before, would continue to be responsible to it, clearly a major change in the role and power of the Presidency had taken place.

In 1958 a revolt in Sumatra offered the most serious challenge yet to Sukarno, and an alternative Cabinet and Government were formed. The legitimate Government succeeded in crushing this revolt, and in the process effectively cleared its path of the individuals and parties hostile to it who had been unwise enough to become implicated. The Army, under the leadership of General Nasution, confirmed its growing authority and influence. The PKI, on the other hand, had shown in regional elections in Java that its strength, too, was increasing. Sukarno now favoured a return to the Constitution of 1945, with its basically presidential pattern. After considerable discussion and pressure, the Cabinet accepted his demand in December 1958. When the elected Consultative Assembly, whose function was the enactment of a permanent Constitution to replace that of 1950, failed to endorse the return to that of 1945, it was dissolved. The President

However, Sukarno's major concern in mooting guided democracy was that western democracy, with its counting of heads and statistical majorities, was not in accordance with traditional Indonesian patterns of decision making, expressed in the terms musjawarah (deliberation, discussion), muafaqat (agreement, deliberation), and golong rojong (mutual aid, co-operation). The first implies that the leader should act only after consultation with those led, and that his leadership should consist of guidance rather than dictation. The second has the connotation of decision reached not through majority, but by final arrival at the general will, the greatest attainable degree of consensus. The third emphasizes the co-operative aspects of economic and social life, and is implicitly critical of arrangements which encourage or condone the clash of vested interests, the spirit of competition, and the thrust of individualism.

Sukarno's political role, so circumscribed by the letter of the 1950 Constitution, as compared with that of 1945, grew progressively more significant and direct. The essence of his proposals was that the Cabinet should represent a broad cross-section of the parties, including the communists, and that it should work with a National Council, which would include key ministers, and representatives of different interest groups in Indonesian society—trade unions, youth movements, religious, artists, farmers and peasants, journalists, women, veterans of the revolution, foreign-born citizens, Indonesian business circles, the armed forces, and the outer islands. It would be the task of the National Council to advise the President and the Cabinet and to make recommendations.

His suggestions met with resistance, and regional rebellions, which had since Independence finally erupted and subsided, now flared. A state of War and Siege was declared, giving recognition to the exercise of civil authority by regional military commanders. As Sukarno was unable to find a politician who could form a Cabinet on his principles, he himself stepped in and established a "National Caretaker Cabinet" under a respected non-party man, Dr. Djuanda Kartawidjaja. Two of the members of the Cabinet were reputed to be sympathetic to the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). The National Council, nominated by the President, further strengthened his hand. Although Djuanda told the Chamber of Representatives that the Cabinet, as before, would continue to be responsible to it, clearly a major change in the role and power of the Presidency had taken place.

In 1958 a revolt in Sumatra offered the most serious challenge yet to Sukarno, and an alternative Cabinet and Government were formed. The legitimate Government succeeded in crushing this revolt, and in the process effectively cleared its path of the individuals and parties hostile to it who had been unwise enough to become implicated. The Army, under the leadership of General Nasution, confirmed its growing authority and influence. The PKI, on the other hand, had shown in regional elections in Java that its strength, too, was increasing. Sukarno now favoured a return to the Constitution of 1945, with its basically presidential pattern. After considerable discussion and pressure, the Cabinet accepted his demand in December 1958. When the elected Consultative Assembly, whose function was the enactment of a permanent Constitution to replace that of 1950, failed to endorse the return to that of 1945, it was dissolved. The President
re-introduced the 1945 Constitution by decree on 5 July 1959.

In March 1960 the elected Chamber of Representatives was dissolved, and an appointed gotong royong (mutual co-operation) one took its place. President Sukarno formed a new Cabinet, with a Chief Minister, Dr. Djuanda, but he himself added the Premiership to his other roles as President, Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces, Chairman of the Supreme Advisory Council (the name by which the National Council came to be styled), and Chairman of the National Planning Council. Parties which could not accept the new circumstances were banned. Civil servants were forbidden to join political parties. The formation of a National Front was announced.

The present (February 1963) Indonesian Constitution is, therefore, the one with which Indonesia embarked in August 1945. The personal primacy of Sukarno has been recognized and endorsed by making of the Presidency the key political institution, wielding executive and legislative power, the former with the assistance of Ministers appointed by and responsible to the President, the latter with the consent of the Chamber of Representatives. The President and Vice-President are responsible to the Consultative Assembly, which elects them, and in which resides the sovereignty of the people. Functional group elements are included in the Chamber of Representatives, the Consultative Assembly, and the Supreme Advisory Council. Ten political parties, including the PKI, have been accorded recognition. General elections, due to be held in 1962, were postponed until "after the return of Irian Barat". These would be the first elections under the 1945 Constitution.


(J. A. M. Caldwell)

**LI**

Libya proved to be the first North African country west of Egypt to be emancipated from foreign control and organized, despite her relative backwardness, as a modern constitutional state following World War II.

On 21 November 1949, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution declaring Libya, comprising the three provinces of Cyrenaica, Tripolitania, and Fazzan, to be established as a united and independent state. The resolution also provided that Libya shall be a constitution to be laid down by her people's representatives, meeting in a national assembly. The General Assembly appointed a United Nations Commissioner, Adrian Pelt, to advise Libya's national assembly in the drawing up of her constitution.

The national assembly met on 25 November 1950 and appointed a constitutional committee composed of 18 members (each province was represented by six members). The actual drafting was entrusted to a working group of six. The national assembly began its debate over the draft as soon as the constitutional committee had completed the first chapter. The assembly formally completed its work on 7 October 1951 and the constitution was promulgated on that day. A draft electoral law, based on several Arab electoral laws, was submitted to the assembly on 21 October and was adopted on 6 November 1951.

The Libyan Constitution provided the innovation of a federal system by virtue of which the three provinces of Cyrenaica, Tripolitania, and Fazzan agreed to join in a union under a single monarchy entrusted to King Idris I. This union proved to be a happy compromise, capable of development into a more intimate unity, as the amendment of 1962 demonstrated. Under the federal system, Libya possessed one national (federal) government and three state (provincial) governments. The powers of the national government, such as foreign affairs, defence, and matters relating jointly to the three provinces, were specifically stated; the residuary powers remained in the provinces. The national government is composed of a bi-cameral parliament, a Cabinet responsible to the Lower House, a supreme court to decide the constitutionality of laws, and a federal administrative system. Each state (provincial) government was composed of a wali (governor), an executive council, a legislative assembly, provincial courts, and a provincial administrative system. The wali was responsible to the King and the chief of the executive council was responsible to the provincial legislative assembly. The first amendment to the constitution, enacted in 1962, simplified this elaborate system of government by making the wali responsible to the federal government and abolishing the head of the provincial executive council, making the council responsible to the wali. The progress achieved under the Libyan federal system justified the steps undertaken by the national assembly to provide such an elaborate constitutional framework, without which the three provinces would, perhaps, have been unable to unite into one state, governed by one monarchical system. This system has proved to be fairly stable, for Libya has had only one sovereign since 1951, six Cabinets, and three Parliaments (1952, 1956, 1960). The Lower House proved to be quite vocal in its criticism of governmental measures and was capable of withdrawing confidence in one of the governments (1960), although Libya's parliamentary system, in the absence of a party system, was on the whole subservient to the executive.


(M. Khadduri)

xiii. — SūDAN

The convention of 19 January 1899 between Great Britain and Egypt, confirmed by the treaty of 26 August 1936, made the Sudan an Anglo-Egyptian condominium, but the British authorities tended, after the second world war, to lead the country towards autonomy and independence. Negotiations between Britain and Egypt were broken off on 27 January 1947, the Egyptian government making known its desire to submit "the cause of the Nile Valley in its entirety" to the Security Council.

From 1944, however, a Consultative Council of the Northern Sudan comprising 8 members nominated by the governor-general and 18 elected by the provincial councils established in the same year had been instituted. On 9 March 1948 the Consultative Council of the Northern Sudan had adopted an organic law providing for the creation of an Executive Council and a Legislative Assembly; this text, promulgated on 19 June by the governor-general, aroused protests from Egypt and the Sudanese protagonists of the unity of the Nile Valley, who refused to take part, on 15 November 1948, in the elections to the Legislative Assembly; the latter was to have included 52 elected members (for the North), 13 appointed by the provincial councils of the South, and 20 nominated by the governor-general.

In March 1951, at the request of the Assembly which had been constituted, the governor-general charged a commission of 13 members, all Sudanese, with the drafting of a Constitution, which was adopted by the Assembly on 23 April 1952 under the name of "Ordinance on Autonomy". This text was composed of a preamble and 21 chapters containing 105 articles. Chapter III deals with the governor-general and the executive, Chapter V institutes a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies; legislation is dealt with in Chap. VI, finance in Chap. VII; the following deals with the Controller-general, Chap. IX with the judicial power; a judicature administering the shari'a (art. 79) is maintained under the presidency of the Chief kālī; conflicts of jurisdiction are decided by a court of jurisdiction of which the Chief kālī and a judge of the High Court of the shari'a are members (art. 80). Chap. X creates a commission of public administration, while the last section deals with interim provisions.

This text should have become effective on 9 November 1952, but the Egyptian revolution had broken out in the meantime; on 29 October the Egyptian government had, however, published a memorandum recognizing the right of the Sudanese to self-determination, and finally the ordinance on autonomy was promulgated on 21 March 1953 after the signature of the Anglo-Egyptian agreements of 12 February envisaging amendments to be added. The Chamber of Deputies was to consist of 97 elected members, and the Senate of 30 elected and 20 appointed members; elections were therefore arranged for November and December 1953, and on 6 January 1954 the Chamber elected the president of the council who formed the first government.

After a period of transition, independence was officially proclaimed before the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, in joint plenary session on 1 January 1956. On the same date a provisional Constitution was brought into operation comprising 11 chapters and 121 articles; it largely repeats the Ordinance on Autonomy, but Chap. III is completely modified, since it now provides for the election by parliament of a supreme commission of 5 persons which is to be the highest authority in the State (art. 10-1). Chap. IV deals with the executive power of the Prime Minister, appointed by the supreme commission, which also appoints ministers. The Council of Ministers is responsible to parliament (art. 27). The legislative body (Chap. V) continues to consist of the Senate (20 members appointed by the supreme commission, 30 elected) and the Chamber of Representatives, Chap. VI deals with legislative procedure, the following chapter with finance, property, contracts and lawsuits, Chap. VII provides for the appointment of a Controller-general of accounts by the supreme commission. Chap. IX deals with the judicial power, comprising a civil division and a shari'a division presided over by the chief kālī (art. 93). Art. 95 provides that the shari'a division shall consist of tribunals and shall exercise the powers provided by the ordinance of 1902 on tribunals of Sudanese Muslim law, and other modificatory laws. Chap. X treats of public offices, and the last chapter contains interim provisions.

On 22 May 1958 both chambers of parliament joined in a Constituent Assembly to examine the definitive form of the Constitution, and in spite of the opposition of the Southerners, appointed 40 members charged with preparing a new draft. The text presented did not obtain the approval of the Southerners since it provided for a unitary and not a federal State, and also because it provided that Islam should be the state religion and Arabic the official language. Finally the Constituent Assembly voted for a motion recommending that the constitutional committee should take note of the demands of the Southerners. It had however, no time to bring its deliberations to a satisfactory conclusion, since on 17 November 1958 a coup d'État put the government of the country in the hands of the army. The following day the high command of the armed forces published decrees by the terms of which the Sudan was a democratic republic whose supreme constitutional organ was the high command which delegated its legislative, executive and judiciary powers to General 'Abbūb. The constitution is suspended.

Bibliography: See the accounts of the events of the dates indicated in COC, OM, MEJ, MEA, etc.; J. E. Godchot, Les constitutions du Proche et du Moyen Orient, Paris 1957, 345-72, and bibl. cited; P. M. Holt, A modern history of the Sudan, London 1961. (Ed.)

xiv. — PAKISTAN

Pakistan, on coming into existence on 15 August 1947, was governed by the Government of India Act 1935, as amended by the Indian Independence Act 1947, which repealed all provisions of the former statute authorizing control from England and the reserved powers of the Governors and Governor-General. The Constituent Assembly, summoned in July 1947, was not only to make new constitutional laws but also to exercise the powers of the Federal Legislature under the Act of 1935. Pakistan com-
mented as a federal state; in addition to the former British Indian territory, within the territory of Pakistan were the princely states of Bahawalpur and Khairpur (Bahawalpur, Khayrpur [q.v.]), the Balochistan states, and the N.W. Frontier states. The Independence Act had broken the link between these states and the Crown but they executed instruments of accession to Pakistan, surrendering powers over defence, foreign affairs and communications.

Legislative subject-matter was distributed between the centre and the Governor's provinces by three lists, one enumerating matters within the exclusive competence of the Constituent Assembly, another matters exclusively assigned to the provincial legislatures, and a third matters over which power was concurrent, though central legislation would prevail in case of repugnancy, unless assented to by the Governor-General. Administrative power generally covered the same field as legislative power, though most matters on the concurrent list were within the provincial power and the centre could direct a province to act as the instrumentality for execution of its laws and to take prescribed steps for the construction and maintenance of communications. Distribution of powers between the centre and the states was determined by their instruments of accession.

At the centre the Governor-General, though appointed by the Crown, was nominated by the Government. The Governor-General appointed the Provincial Governors. Ministers were appointed by the Governor-General and Governors; they could hold office for 10 months without being members of the appropriate Assembly. The Governor-General and the Governors could legislate by Ordinance when the appropriate legislature was not in session. The Governor-General could proclaim an emergency, if faced with a threat of war, rebellion, or mass-movement of population, which would have the effect of extending the federal power to all provincial matters; he could also, if he thought the security of Pakistan in danger or the provincial constitution could not be worked, direct the Governor to assume, as his deputy, all the executive and legislative powers of the Province.

The High Court at Lahore, the Chief Court at Karachi and the Judicial Commissioner in N. W. Frontier and Balochistan were, when Pakistan became independent, the highest tribunals in the provinces in which they were situated. A High Court at Dacca (Dhaka) for East Bengal and a new Federal Court were created. To the powers of the latter under the Government of India Act 1935 were transferred the appellate jurisdiction of the Privy Council by statutes passed in 1949 and 1950.

In 1952 a draft constitution was presented to the Constituent Assembly but discussion was postponed until September 1953 in the hope of reconciling conflicting views regarding it.

Before this constitution could be finalized, the Governor-General dismissed the Constituent Assembly on 25 October 1954 and litigation followed, resulting in this action being upheld. A fresh Constituent Assembly was summoned and first met on 5 July 1955. On 30 September it enacted the Establishment of West Pakistan Act which came into force on 14 October, integrating the territories of the west wing into a single province and amalgamating the High Court of Lahore, the Chief Court of Sind and the judicial commissioners in N. W. Frontier and Balochistan into a single High Court.

The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan came into force on 2 March 1956. It was federal, in so far as relations between the centre and the two provinces were concerned. Legislative and administrative powers were distributed as before, save that the provincial power was to some degree enhanced by the transfer of some powers to the provincial list and by giving the provinces power over matters not enumerated in any list. The centre had exclusive power to impose certain taxes. All other taxing powers were assigned to the provinces, which were also entitled to a share in the proceeds of income tax, purchase tax and some export and excise duties, all imposed by the centre. Grants to provinces were also contemplated. These and the provincial shares in distributable taxes were appropriated on the advice of a National Finance Commission, consisting of the finance ministers of the Federation and the Provinces sitting with other members appointed by the President in consultation with the Governors.

The head of the state was styled "President"; he was to be elected by the members of the central and provincial legislatures; it was necessary that he should be a Muslim and not less than 40 years of age. His term of office was five years and he could not be elected more than twice. He was liable to impeachment only by a resolution supported by two-thirds of the members of the National Assembly. The Constitution contemplated that he would generally act on the advice of his ministers. He was obliged to appoint as Prime Minister the person most likely to command the confidence of a majority of the members of the National Assembly. Though he held office at the pleasure of the President, he could not be dismissed unless the President was satisfied that he had lost that confidence. Other ministers were appointed and removed by the President, but any minister who for six consecutive months was not a member of the National Assembly ceased to be a minister. The Prime Minister was elected by the President, though he could dismiss any minister and suspend him on a decision by an individual minister being reviewed by the whole cabinet. The purpose was to ensure collective responsibility of the ministers to the National Assembly.

All legislatures were unicameral. The National Assembly was composed of 150 members from each wing and, for the first ten years, five seats in each wing were to be reserved for women. A candidate for election had to be 25 or older and qualified for the franchise, i.e., he had to be a citizen of Pakistan, of sound mind, not subject to any disqualification and resident in the constituency for which he was enrolled. The National Assembly had a maximum life of five years; it was summoned, prorogued and dismissed by the President; two sessions in each year with a maximum of six months between sessions were obligatory. The Assembly elected a speaker and deputy speaker and was empowered to make its own rules of procedure. Ordinary legislation was passed by a simple majority, bills being presented to the President, who could assent, veto or return a bill for reconsideration. The veto could be overruled by a two-thirds majority and the President was obliged to assent to a reconsidered bill, passed by a simple majority, with or without amendment. The initiative in all financial matters was vested in the Executive. No bill or amendment dealing with taxation or appropriation or involving expenditure
from the revenues of the Federation could be moved except on the President's recommendation.

The President could legislate by Ordinance in emergencies, if the National Assembly was not in session; such legislation was subject to the same constitutional limitations as Acts of the National Assembly but would expire six weeks after the commencement of the next session of the National Assembly or earlier if disapproved by the National Assembly.

The powers to declare a national emergency and suspend a provincial constitution were retained but proclamation for that purpose had to be approved by the National Assembly. A new emergency power was created, to proclaim a financial emergency if the President was satisfied that financial stability was endangered; this also required the approval of the National Assembly. The effect of the first two powers was the same as before. The effect of the third was to empower the centre to control financial business in the Provinces.

The pattern of the central executive and legislature was reproduced in the Provinces with slight differences. The Governor occupied a position comparable to the President but was appointed by the President, holding office at his pleasure but normally continuing for five years. It was essential that he should have administrative experience but not that he should be a Muslim. Corresponding to the Prime Minister was a Chief Minister. Each Provincial Assembly had 300 members with 10 extra seats for women for the first 10 years. Nobody could be a member of the National Assembly and a Provincial Assembly.

There was no distribution of judicial power. The Federal Court became the Supreme Court. It had original jurisdiction in disputes between Provinces and between the Federation and a Province. Appeals lay from the High Courts on constitutional matters, in civil cases involving property worth Rs. 15,000 or certified to involve an important legal point and in criminal cases where a sentence of death or transportation for life had been passed in appeal from an acquittal to a High Court or by a High Court in the exercise of its extraordinary original jurisdiction, or when a High Court had overturned a conviction, or found a defendant guilty of contempt. The Supreme Court could also grant special leave to appeal from any order of any judicial or quasi-judicial tribunal other than a court martial. It also had an advisory jurisdiction to give an opinion on any point of law referred to it by the President. The High Courts' previous powers and jurisdiction were continued and they were empowered to issue writs for the protection of a Fundamental Right and "for any other purpose", which, as interpreted, meant in any matter where justice called for action and the petitioner had no adequate alternative remedy. The Supreme Court was also empowered to issue writs but only to protect a Fundamental Right. A Supreme Court Judge was only removable on an address supported by two-thirds of the members voting in the National Assembly; a High Court Judge could be removed on a report of the Supreme Court after enquiry.

A feature of the 1956 Constitution was its chapter on Fundamental Rights, which included a guaranteed legal remedy against any law infringing a Fundamental Right. This chapter demanded equality before the law and prohibited discrimination in respect of access to places of public resort and in appointment to government service on grounds of religion, caste, sex, place of birth or residence. No person could be deprived of life or liberty save by authority of law, and punishment under a retroactive law was forbidden. A person arrested on a criminal charge had a right to be informed of the grounds of his arrest within 24 hours and a right to consult and be defended by a pleader of his own choice. A person preventively detained had a right to the grounds of detention, a right to make a representation and, in case of prolonged detention, a right of recourse to an advisory board. Citizens were, subject to conditions, entitled to freedom of speech, assembly, association, movement, residence, religion and freedom to follow a profession and deal with property. Expropriation of agricultural land or any interest in a commercial undertaking, except for public purposes, under a statute providing fair compensation, was forbidden. Religious denominations could maintain religious institutions and provide religious instruction in their educational institutions. No person could be denied admission to an educational institution on grounds of race, religion, caste or place of birth but no student could be obliged to participate in activities connected with any religion but his own.

There was also a chapter of Directive Principles, not enforceable in the courts, but intended to be followed by the executives and legislatures. They enjoined the promotion of social uplift and the protection of economic well-being. Steps were to be taken to strengthen the bonds between Muslim countries, to promote international peace, to enable Muslims to lead their lives in accordance with Islamic principles, to see that Islamic institutions were properly managed, and to provide facilities for instruction in the religion of Islam.

Another chapter forbade the enactment of any law repugnant to the injunctions of Islam and the revision of the existing law to bring it into conformity with those injunctions. To effect these purposes a Commission was to be appointed to define the injunctions of Islam and to recommend measures for their enforcement, but an Act of the National Assembly would be necessary to implement any recommendation made. Nothing effective appears to have been accomplished in the exercise of these functions.

On 7 October 1958 the Constitution of 1956 was abrogated by the President, who placed the country under martial law. All legislatures were dismissed and political parties dissolved. The President exercised the federal executive and legislative functions, assisted by ministers appointed by him and responsible to him alone. Provincial Governors exercised the powers they would have had under the Constitution of 1956 on the suspension of a provincial constitution, but subject to control by the Martial Law Authorities. At first the distribution of powers was continued but in 1959 all matters on the provincial list were transferred to the concurrent list. The statute law previously in force was continued and protected from attack as repugnant to a Fundamental Right. The acts of the Martial Law Authorities were protected from review by the courts, whose powers, except to the extent indicated, remained intact.

It was not intended that the Martial Law experience was to continue indefinitely. In 1959 the Basic Democracies Order was promulgated, creating a hierarchy of local government boards, town and union committees, district committees and divisional councils. In the lowest tier, at least two-thirds of the members were elected by persons formerly entitled to vote at elections to the legislatures, but
the Sub-divisional Officer was chairman of the thana or taksil committee, and in the higher tiers the elected element would be diluted.

In the year 1960 the members of local councils elected under the Basic Democracies Order were required to declare by secret ballot whether or not they had confidence in the President. If the majority showed confidence, the President would take steps for the promulgation of a new constitution under which he would be deemed to have been elected President for the first term. The motion having gone in the President’s favour, he appointed a commission to make recommendations for the new Constitution. It was promulgated on 1 March 1962. There are at the centre the President, Ministers and a National Assembly and a Governor, Ministers and a Provincial Assembly in each province but it would be difficult to maintain that the Constitution is federal in fact. There is a list of central subjects. All other matters are within the provincial power, but the National Assembly may encroach on the provincial field on the grounds that the security of Pakistan demands it or that uniformity is necessary throughout Pakistan. It is no longer possible to impugn a law as ultra vires the enacting legislature, and the rule that, in case of conflict, a central law prevails over a provincial law is of universal application.

After the expiry of Field-Marshal Ayyub Khan’s term of office, the President, who must be a Muslim and have attained 35 years, will be elected by an Electoral College, composed of one Elector chosen by each electoral unit, of which there are 40,000 in each Province. The President’s term is five years; he is liable to be impeached for violation of the Constitution or gross misconduct, or removed for incapacity, by a resolution supported by three-quarters of all members of the National Assembly. But any such motion is discouraged by the threat that, if half the members do not support the resolution, those who gave notice of the motion will cease to be members of the Assembly.

The executive capital is Islāmābād and the legislative capital Dacca (Dhaka). Presidential government replaced parliamentary government, for the President appoints the Ministers, and may remove them without assigning reasons; they cease to hold office on a change of President. The original intention was that they should not be members of the National Assembly, but this is no longer compulsory.

The National Assembly, elected by members of the Electoral College, will consist of 156 members, half from each wing, from which three seats will be reserved for women. It has a maximum life of 5 years. It can be summoned not only by the President but also by the Speaker at the request of one-third of all the members. If summoned by the President, it is prorogued by the President; if the Speaker summons it, he prorogues it.

The President dismisses the National Assembly, but he may not do so if the unexpired portion of its term is less than 120 days or before a vote on a motion to impeach or remove him. The President ceases to hold office 126 days after the dissolution of the Assembly, unless his successor has earlier entered on his office. In case of disagreement between the President and the National Assembly, the President may refer the matter to the Electoral College. As under the 1956 Constitution, the President may assent to or veto a Bill or return it for reconsideration; if he takes either the second or third course and the Bill is again passed by a two-thirds majority of all members, he may refer the matter to the Electoral College, where he may be overruled by a simple majority of the total membership.

The President retains the power to legislate by Ordinance when the National Assembly is not in session. If the Ordinance is approved by the National Assembly, it is deemed to become an Act of the Assembly; in any other case it expires 180 days after promulgation or 42 days after the Assembly next meets, whichever is less. The President is also empowered to issue a proclamation of general emergency in the same circumstance as previously and it must be laid before the Assembly, which has no power to disapprove. While this proclamation is in force, the President may legislate by Ordinance, whether the Assembly is sitting or not. The Ordinance, must be laid before the Assembly, which has no power to disapprove. If it approves, the Ordinance is deemed to be an Act of the Assembly; in any other case it ceases to have effect when the President withdraws the proclamation.

Under the 1956 Constitution the power of the National Assembly to refuse demands for grants, except to meet expenditure charged on the revenues of Pakistan, was a powerful instrument whereby the legislature could control the executive, but under the 1962 Constitution the Assembly cannot refuse to meet demands for recurring expenditure, including an increase up to 10% of the expenditure incurred in the previous year.

As before, the pattern of the executive and legislature in a province is similar to that at the centre, but the Governor is appointed by the President and is subject to his directions; he may be removed at any time without reasons being assigned. Provincial ministers hold office at the Governor’s pleasure but cannot be removed without the Governor’s concurrence.

Each Provincial Assembly, elected by members of the Electoral College, consists of 150 members, five seats being reserved for women. Its maximum term is five years. In case of conflict with the Governor, he or the Speaker may request a reference to the National Assembly; if the National Assembly decides in favour of the Governor, then and only then can the Governor dismiss the Provincial Assembly. The Governor’s powers to legislate by Ordinance can only be exercised when the Provincial Assembly is not in session and, mutatis mutandis, resemble the powers of the President.

The Supreme Court no longer has powers to issue writs, and its appellate jurisdiction is limited to appeals from a High Court; while it still may grant special leave to appeal, an appeal only lies as of right against a sentence of death or transportation for life imposed by a High Court, a committal for contempt by such court, or on its certificate that a substantial question of constitutional law is involved. The High Courts have also lost their writ jurisdiction, but, where there is no adequate remedy, they may declare an act of a public authority illegal and direct such authority to act in conformity with law. A High Court may also satisfy itself as to the legality of the custody in which any person is held and the right of an incumbent to hold public office.

The old Fundamental Rights, revised and restated, appear in the guise of Principles of Law Making and the Directive Principles as Principles of Policy, but they are only binding on the consciences of legislators and public officials; no law can be impugned as violative of the Principles of
Law Making and no official act can be declared invalid as violating a Principle of Policy.

One Principle of Law Making is that no law shall be repugnant to Islam, and it is provided that any legislature, the President or a Governor may refer a proposed law to the Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology for opinion as to whether it violates any of the Principles. The members of this Council are appointed by the President, having regard to their understanding and appreciation of Islam and the economic, legal and administrative problems of Pakistan; they hold office for three years. Apart from the function involved above, they may make recommendations to the Governments on means of encouraging Muslims to live in accordance with Islamic principles. When a question of repugnancy of a proposed law to a Principle of Law Making is referred to the Council by the President or a Governor, he must inform the Assembly of the date on which the advice is expected, but, if the Assembly, the President or the Governor thinks immediate action necessary in the public interest, the law may be enacted before the advice is furnished.


(A. Gledhill)

XV. — MAURETANIA

On 28 September 1958 the Mauretanian people approved the French draft Constitution submitted to referendum, and chose adherence to the Communauté; on 28 November of the same year the Territorial Assembly opted for the status of Member State of the Communauté, proclaimed the Islamic Republic of Mauretania, and transformed itself into a Constituent Assembly. A committee prepared a draft which was adopted by the Assembly on 22 March 1959. This first Constitution comprised a preamble and 9 chapters, containing 53 articles. In the preamble the Mauretanian people proclaims its adherence to Islam, the principles of democracy. Art. 2 declares that Islam is the religion of the Mauretanian people, but guarantees to everyone freedom of conscience. National sovereignty belongs to the people, who exercise it through their representatives and by way of referendum. Chap. II treats of the government, which is composed of the Prime Minister and other ministers. The Prime Minister decides and carries out the policy of the State, exercises the power of making regulations, ensures the execution of the laws, appoints to offices of the State, negotiates and concludes agreements with the Communauté (art. 12), appoints the members of the government and dismisses them (art. 13). Before entering into office the ministers of the government must take an oath according to a formula designed only for Muslims. Chap. III relates to the National Assembly, which holds the legislative power (art. 17) and is elected for five years (art. 18). The deputies enjoy parliamentary immunity (art. 19) and take the oath in a prescribed form, although the text only defines these forms in the case of Muslim deputies (art. 21). Chapter IV deals with the relations between the government and the Assembly; chap. V treats of the constitutional commission, chap. VI with justice: provisionally, the control of justice is in the domain of the competence of the Communauté (art. 43), but the civil courts of Muslim law are to conduct enquiries and dispense justice according to this law in all civil and commercial matters. The organization of these courts is to be determined by law. Laws shall be introduced to codify the rules of Muslim law applicable in the Islamic Republic of Mauretania (art. 44). A High Court is provided for by art. 45. Chap. VII deals with territorial entities, which are the district and the parish; chap. VIII provides for the procedure to be followed for the revision of the Constitution, and chap. IX contains interim provisions.

The National Assembly elected on 17 May 1959 took office and prepared a new constitutional text necessitated by the accession of Mauretania to independence. This text was promulgated on 20 May 1961. It consists of a preamble and nine chapters including 61 articles. In comparison with the Constitution of 22 March 1959 it presents noticeable differences especially in the new provisions which relate to the President of the Republic, who is endowed with very extensive powers. He must be of the Muslim religion (art. 10); elected for five years by direct universal suffrage (art. 13), he takes the oath before the National Assembly in a prescribed form (art. 16). As holder of the executive power (art. 12) he decides the general policies of the nation and selects the ministers, who are responsible to him (art. 17); he possesses, moreover, the power of enacting regulations (art. 18), commands the armed forces (art. 20), signs and ratifies treaties (art. 22), and exercises the right of pardon (art. 23). In case of imminent danger he takes the exceptional steps required by the circumstances (art. 25). It is he also who declares a state of war or a state of emergency (art. 42).

Chap. III is devoted to the National Assembly, elected for five years and invested with the legislative power (arts. 26-7). Deputies enjoy parliamentary immunity (art. 29). Chap. IV deals with the relations between the President of the Republic and the Assembly, especially on matters which fall within the orbit of the law (art. 33) and those which refer to the power of regulation (art. 35). The President of the Republic may, with the authority of the Assembly, take measures by decree which are normally within the purview of the law (art. 36). The initiation of laws belongs to the President of the Republic and the members of the Assembly (art. 37). The President promulgates the laws and arranges for their publication in the Official Gazette within 15 days, during which time he has the power to refer back the draft or the proposal to the Assembly for a second reading. According to chap. V, international treaties and agreements can only be ratified by virtue of a law (art. 44). Chap. VI establishes the independence of the judiciary (art. 47), which dispenses justice in the name of the people. The superior council of the magistracy assists the president of the Republic (art. 50). The Supreme Court receives the
declarations of candidates for the presidency of the Republic (art. 13), declares when the Presidency is vacant (art. 24), and decides in case of dispute on the regularity of the election of deputies (art. 28), and scrutinizes the constitutionality of laws (arts. 41, 45); it also scrutinizes the correct functioning of the referendum and publishes its results. Its other powers, its composition, its rules of procedure and the procedure which are applicable before it are fixed by law (art. 57). In the case of high treason the President of the Republic and the ministers may be impeached by the National Assembly and sent before the High Court. Chapter VII concerns parishes, administered by elected councils. The following chapter provides for the procedure of revising the Constitution, and the last contains interim provisions.

**Bibliography:** Documentation française, *Notes et études documentaires*, no. 2689 of 20 July 1960. (Ch. Pellat)

xvi. — KUWAYT

On 16 November 1962 the amir of Kuwayt published the first Constitution of the amirate, voted by a Constituent Assembly who had spent the previous two months examining a draft prepared by specialists. Discussion had been lively, and many articles had been accepted only after long discussions. The discussion which holds most interest for Islamic scholars is that which arose on art. 2, which provides that “the State religion is Islam, and the ghar'a an essential source of legislation”; some members wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.

This Constitution thus declares in its first articles that Kuwayt is an independent and sovereign Arab State, that its people are part of the Arab nation, that Islam is the State religion and that the ghar'a is an essential source of legislation, but that all matters relating to family law and personal status are excluded from the scope of this provision. The Islamic scholars who opposed the Constitution had wished to say the essential source, and their opponents had to struggle to make them admit the impossibility of applying Islamic law to the letter (which for example provides that the thief is to have his hands cut off) and its incompatibility with the needs of a modern State as regards banks, insurance and other financial institutions.
Section IV deals with the government, which is responsible to the King and to the Chamber of Representatives (art. 65); it is responsible for the execution of laws (art. 80) or by a vote of censure (art. 81).

Section VI lays down the principle of the independence of the judicial power and sets up a High Council of Judiciary. According to the provisions of Section VII members of the government can be impeached by the Chamber of Representatives and sent before the High Court of Justice. Section VIII deals with provincial and local government, and Section IX with the Higher Council for national development and planning. Section X treats of the constitutional chamber and the Supreme Court. Section XI provides for the possibility of revising the Constitution, but art. 108 declares that "the monarchic form of the State and the provisions relating to the Muslim religion cannot be the object of any constitutional revision". Finally, Section XII contains transitional provisions.

**Bibliography:** La Pensée, Rabat, i/2 (1962); Italian version in OM, xli/12 (1962), 909-16. (CH. FELLAT)

xviii. — **Federal constitutions**

The year 1958 was marked by three attempts to create unions or federations of Arab states: on 1 February, the United Arab Republic (al-Dwiąm al-arabiyya al-muttaḥida) of Egypt and Syria; on 8 March, the United Arab States (al-Duwal al-arabiyya al-muttaḥida), of the United Arab Republic (but more particularly the former Egypt) and the Yemen; on 14 February, the Arab Union (al-Ibtidāy al-arabī), of 'Irāk and Jordan. All three were ephemeral, but they lasted a sufficiently long time for them to provide themselves with federal constitutions, drafted within a remarkably short time.

Reference has already been made to the constitution of the UAR, to which a little must be added here. As early as 5 February 1958 detailed provisions on the future status of the new republic were presented to the Syrian Chamber of Deputies and the National Assembly of Egypt by the heads of the two states; on 21 February the populations of both countries were asked to approve by referendum the creation of the UAR and the choice of Diasmāl 'Abd al-Nāṣir as President of this republic: about 99.99% of the voters replied in the affirmative to both questions; on 5 March the provisional Constitution of the UAR was promulgated, providing for an executive council in each of the two provinces and a central government, in addition to the already elected President. This Constitution reproduced almost verbatim in its 73 articles the essential provisions of the Egyptian Constitution of 16 January 1956. It differed from the latter, however, by not declaring that Islam was the State religion and that Arabic was the official language, and moreover did not specify whether sovereignty belonged to the nation. Certain articles also were modified in a sense generally favourable to the common executive power; thus the cumulative legislative assembly were not elected by universal suffrage, but nominated by the president of the republic; the rights of the latter concerning the dissolution of the assembly were more extensive than in the Egyptian constitution; the Chief of State not only retained the right of direct government 'in case of necessity' by decree 'having the force of law', but all the restrictive conditions imposed on him in this respect in the Egyptian constitution disappeared in this provisional constitution; the President was not even obliged, when proclaiming a state of emergency, to refer this to the Assembly. The remaining provisions were in general similar at all points to those of the Egyptian constitution. The Syrian coup d'état of 28 September 1958 made an end of the Union and abolished the federal constitution on 29 September.

The very day after the proclamation of the UAR at Cairo, delegates of Egypt and the Yemen began talks which culminated, on 8 March, in the signature at Damascus of the charter of the United Arab States by the president of the UAR and the crown prince of the Yemen, the amīr Sayf al-Īslām Bahr. By the terms of this charter, which consisted of 32 articles divided into three chapters, each State was to preserve its international personality and its own government; no reference was made to the religion or language of the union. All citizens were to be equal and have equal right of work; they were guaranteed freedom of movement, guarantees of movement, and co-ordination of external policies, of diplomatic representation, of the armed forces, of economic activities, of the currency and of education were treated in chapter I. A supreme council, composed of the heads of member States, was to be assisted by a Council of the Union composed of an equal number of representatives of the member States. Presidency of this Council of the Union was to be assumed for a year at a time by the member States in turn. The supreme Council was charged with establishing the higher policy of the Union in matters of defence, economy and culture; it was to promulgate the laws, appoint the commander in chief of the armed forces, and draw up the budget of the union; the Council of the Union was to be its permanent organ; it would have to establish the final programme, which it would submit for ratification to the Supreme Council. A council of defence, an economic council and a cultural council were also instituted. Chapter III contained general and provisional regulations on the seat of the Council of the Union, the entry into force of the laws, the suppression of diplomatic representation between the member States, and customs regulations. The federation having been broken on 26 December 1961, the constitution lapsed on that date.

As an answer to these regroupings within the Arab world the Hāshimite sovereigns Faysal of 'Irāk and Husayn of Jordan announced, on 14 February 1958, the creation of a union between their kingdoms, and on 19 March following, the Constitution of the Arab Union, drawn up by a mixed 'Irāk-Jordanian commission, was promulgated simultaneously at Bagdad and 'Amman. It comprised 80 articles in 8 chapters. "Membership of the Union is open to any Arab State desirous of joining", but each State would retain its independent identity and its own system of government; any treaties previously concluded would affect only the States which had signed them. Here again there is no provision on the religion or language of the Union. The seat of government was to be at Bagdad and 'Amman alternately; a common executive power was to be established, but each State was to retain its own flag. Legislative power would belong to the president of the Union (the king of
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Irak) and to an Assembly of forty members (20 from each State), who were to be elected for four years by a council of ministers. The President would nominate, dismiss and accept the resignation of the Prime Minister and conclude treaties, and would be the Supreme chief of the army. The ministers would be collectively and individually responsible to the Assembly of the Union; each ministry had, within a month of its formation, to define its policy in a declaration made to the assembly. In case of urgency, during the interval between sessions of the assembly, the president could promulgate federal decrees having the force of law, provided that he submitted them to the next meeting of the Council of the Union. Chapter IV, which deals with the judicial power, is almost exclusively concerned with the institution of a Supreme Court charged with the task of judging the members of the Assembly and the ministers, of settling any disputes which might arise, of giving its advice on legal questions submitted to it by the Prime Minister, of interpreting the Constitution, of giving its advice on legal questions and of hearing appeals on sentences of the federal courts. Chapter V deals with the powers of the Union as regards foreign affairs, security, customs, economic questions, and education. The finances of the union were to be furnished by the member states in defined proportions. The Assembly would discuss the budget, and a Court of Audit was to be instituted. Chapter VII envisages the conditions under which the Constitution could be amended. Finally, chapter VIII contains various provisions on the state of emergency, the first assembly, the first budget, the necessity of member States revising their own constitutions to bring them into line with that of the Union.

On 26 March the Jordanian and Iraki parliaments ratified the Constitution of the Union. At Baghdad the Chamber of Deputies decided to amend the Iraki Constitution of 1925, and was then dissolved to allow the vote on the amendment to be taken by a new assembly; on 10 May the latter voted the amendment, and on 12 May approved the text of the Constitution of the Union. On 18 May the first federal government was formed. On 14 July 1958 the Iraki Revolution put an end to the Union and in consequence to the federal Constitution.

The authors who have shared in the composition of this article DUSTÜR have made it their chief endeavour to trace the history of the constitutional movement in the countries concerned and to analyse more or less briefly the promulgated texts. This has the advantage of presenting the reader with a fairly complete synthesis, but also the occasional drawback of obscuring to some extent those points which must be of primary interest to students of Islam, namely the place accorded to Islam in the constitutions of the Muslim countries. We shall therefore set ourselves here to group together the common elements and to note the points of divergence, taking into account only those texts at present (beginning of 1963) in force (or suspended without being replaced), and disregarding constitutions that are too archaic (Sa'di Arabia), rigorously secular (Turkey), Soviet, or of a special local character (Lebanon, Indonesia). Thus we shall confine our attention to the constitutions of eight Arabic-speaking states (Egypt, Irak, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Mauretania, Syria and Tunisia) and three non-Arab Muslim countries (Afghanistán, Irán and Pákistán).

The chronological order in which these eleven constitutions were promulgated is of no more than secondary interest, for all of them (except that of Afghanistan) can be regarded as recent and on the modern pattern, the oldest (Irán) having been revised and, so to speak, brought up to date. Both in the monarchies: Afghanistan (with qualifications), Irán, Jordan, Libya and Morocco, and in the repu-
blics, the uni- or bi-cameral parliamentary system has been universally adopted, though the sovereign or head of state enjoys powers that are generally very extensive and participatory in the country’s political life (we cannot fail to notice, moreover, that at the present moment (January 1963) three out of seven republics—not counting the Sudan—are headed by officers brought to power by the army in order to put an end to the abuses of a misconstrued liberal regime.

To the parliamentarianism of democratic tendency is added the solemn proclamation of the Rights of Man and the principles of liberty and equality, painstakingly included in the texts; the functioning of the institutions is minutely regulated, with the result that these constitutions, while far from being identical, are absolutely comparable to those of the Western countries which have more or less served as their models. The difference lies, on the one hand, in the fact that the Eastern Arab countries declare themselves to be “an integral part of the Arab nation” and that Tunisia and Morocco proclaim that they belong to the “Greater Maghrib”, on the other hand, and above all, in the provisions relating to Islam which they all contain.

To begin with, Islam is expressly declared to be the state religion in all the constitutions enumerated below. That exception is that of Syria. Morocco takes the precaution (art. 108) of excluding from any future revision the provisions relating to the Muslim religion, i.e., the second half of art. 6 (which additionally guarantees to all the freedom of worship). It goes without saying that in these countries the head of state could not belong to any religion but Islam; four constitutions make express provision to this effect: those of Syria (art. 3), of Pakistan (art. 10), of Tunisia (art. 37) and of Mauretania (art. 10). Art. 120 of the Egyptian Constitution of 1956 is silent about the religion of the head of state, but there can be no doubt as to the will of the framers of the constitution; in the monarchies it is evident that the sovereign must necessarily belong; in Afghanistan the sovereign must be a Muslim; in Iran (art. 1) the King must belong to the Hanafi school; in Iraq the state religion is Twelver Shi’ism to which the Constitution (art. 108), of Tunisia (art. 37) and of Mauretania (art. 10). Art. 120 of the Egyptian Constitution of 1956 is silent about the religion of the head of state, but there can be no doubt as to the will of the framers of the constitution; in the monarchies it is evident that the sovereign must necessarily belong; in Afghanistan the sovereign must be a Muslim; in Iran (art. 1) the King must belong to the Hanafi school; in Morocco the King is Commander of the Faithful (amir al-mu’minin); in Libya (art. 51) the representative of the throne, regent or member of the regency council, must be a Muslim.

Syria (but see also the Sudan) is thus the only Muslim country not to have declared that Islam is the state religion, but in this regard art. 3 of the constitution voted on 5 September 1950 (retained in that of 22 September 1953) is instructive; in effect, the original draft, which actually made Islam the official religion, has been modified by the Constituent Assembly in the following manner:

1. the religion of the President of the Republic is Islam;
2. Islamic fikoh is the principal source of legislation;
3. freedom of belief is guaranteed. The State respects all revealed religions and assures them complete freedom of worship on condition that they do not disturb the public order;
4. the personal status of the religious communities is safeguarded and respected.

This notion of respect for revealed religions only is unique in the constitutional system of the Muslim countries and has no parallel except in the clause of the constitution protecting the freedom of worship, on condition that it do not disturb the public order.

Moreover, this
The council is charged with giving its opinion on the "Islamicity" of the laws at the request of the President of the Republic or of a governor; and the Head of State, though he may respect the 'ulamā', knows that he can hardly count on them, and does not fail to invite them to become better informed of the requirements of the modern world. Their incapacity has been shown up clearly by the so-called Munir report, which has come to a conclusion revealing the incompetence of the traditional leaders of traditional Islam, were not only unfitted to run a modern state, but were deplorably unable under cross-questioning even to give realistic guidance on elementary matters of Islam. The court of inquiry, and subsequently the world, was presented with the sorry spectacle of Muslim divines no two of whom agreed on the definition of a Muslim, and who were yet practically unanimous that all who disagreed should be put to death. The application of Islamic law may be studied in the article şar'î (see meanwhile G.-H. Bouquet, Du droit musulman et de son application effectue dans le monde, Algiers 1949; J. N. D. Anderson, Islamic law in the modern world, London 1959), but we must notice here that the general tendency of the constitutions, even in Pakistan, is to institute civil courts charged with giving judgement, in matters of personal status and succession, on the basis of codes established according to the requirements of Islamic law. It is worth emphasizing, then, that of the modern institutions that of Jordan is unique, in the judicial sphere, in providing expressly for the maintenance of religious jurisdictions (art. 104) consisting in şar'î courts and in councils for the other religious communities. The competence of these latter councils in matters of personal status and mortmain property is fixed by the law (art. 109), while the şar'î courts are constitutionally considered consultative (art. 108) in the following matters: personal status of Muslims; claims for payment of diya [q.v.] between Muslims or parties consenting to this mode of settlement; questions concerning wakf [q.v.] property. In other countries the kâibs have been retained, but their existence is more or less precarious.

**Bibliography:**


**DUYÜN-I 'UMMİYYE,** the Ottoman public debt, more particularly the debt administration set up in 1881. The Ottoman government had made its first attempts to raise money by internal loans in the late 18th and early 19th centuries (see şaham and kâ'im). The needs and opportunities of the Crimean War brought a new type of loan, floated on the money markets of Europe. The first such foreign loan was raised in London in 1854, the second in the following year. They were for £3,000,000 at 6% and £5,000,000 at 4% respectively. Between 1854 and 1874 foreign loans were raised almost every year, reaching a nominal total of about £200 million. Usually, since Turkey was regarded as a poor risk, the loans were granted on very disadvantageous terms; the money received was for the most part used to cover regular budgetary expenditure, or else spent on projects unconnected with economic development. The end came on 6 October 1875, when the Ottoman government defaulted on its payments of interest and amortization. A period of negotiations followed, and agreement was finally reached between the government and representatives of the European bondholders. This agreement was given legal effect in the so-called Muharrem Decree, issued on 28 Muharrem 1290 (20 December 1881), setting up an "Administration of the Public Debt" (*Duyûn-i ummiyye*—in French *Administration de la dette publique ottomane*), directly controlled by and answerable to the foreign creditors. Its primary duty was to ensure the service of the Ottoman public debt, which was consolidated at a total of £166,400,320, or £121,050,912, at the prevailing rate of 110 piastres to the pound sterling. For this purpose, the Ottoman government ceded certain revenues to the Council "absolutely and irrevocably . . . until the complete liquidation of the debt". These consisted of the revenues from the salt and tobacco monopolies, stamp-duities, and the taxes on spirits, silk, and fisheries, together known as the *rûstem-i sîte,* six taxes. In addition to these taxes, which it collected directly through its own agents, the Council was to receive tribute from the Balkan principalities, and, if necessary, a share of customs receipts. The executive committee, or Council, consisted of six delegates, representing British and Dutch, French, German, Italian, Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman bondholders, together with a seventh representing a group of priority bondholders, most of which were held by the Imperial Ottoman Bank. Already in 1861 the Council had over 3000 revenue collectors at its disposal. By 1911 its total staff stood at 8931—more than that of the Ottoman Ministry of Finance. The Council of the Debt had become a very powerful body, with far-reaching influence on the financial and economic life of the Ottoman Empire, and even, to an extent that has been variously assessed, on its politics.

The Debt Administration continued to function during the First World War and under the Allied occupation, in spite of the withdrawal of the British, French and Italian delegates during the war and of the German and Austrian delegates after the armistice. The work was carried on under the authority of the remaining delegates, and amounts due to enemy creditors deposited for future payment. It came to an end with the victory of the nationalists under Mustafâ Kâmil, and the creation of the republic. The treaty of Lausanne determined the share of the new Turkey in the debt of the defunct Empire. Negotiations followed, and agreements regarding liability and payment were signed in 1928 and 1933. The debt was finally liquidated in 1944. *Bibliography:* F. A. Belin, *Essai sur l'histoire économique de la Turquie,* in J.A., 1885; C. Morawitz, *Les finances de l'Empire,* Paris 1902; A. du Velay,

DÜZAKH [see DJAHANNAM]

DÜZME MUSTAFÂ [see MUSTAFÂ DÜZME]

DWÂRKÀ, a town in the Okhmandal district in the north-west of the Kâthiâwad peninsula of Gujârât, India, associated in Hindû legend with the god Krishna and hence considered to be of special sanctity by Hindus. It is known also by the name of Dârvakhâd or Dawin (K. Ta*rikh al-Hind, ccxvii/i (1930), 41 ff., of pre-Iranian origin). The origin of the name is uncertain. It was the seat of the Catholicos: several synods were held there, notably the one in 654 which made a final break with the Greek Church and established the Armenian era, beginning on 1 July 552. But its importance also came from the fact that it was a centre of transit trade between Byzantine Anatolia, Persia and the countries of the Caucasus. Together with Nisibis and Callinicos (Rakka) it was one of the customs-ports where a tithe was levied on the Romans' and Persians' merchandise (Menander in Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Excerpta de legationibus, ed. C. de Boor, i, 180 and Güterbock, Byzans und Persien, 75, in W. Heffening, Das islamische Fremdenrecht, 109-10).

Dvin was destroyed, Asoghik tells us (ii, ch. III, trans. 84-85), by Heraclius during his famous campaign against Persia. The Arabs, advancing from Mesopotamia which they had already conquered, captured the town on 6 October 640 (the date fixed in Manandeans work); it was pillaged, 12,000 Armenians were massacred and 35,000 were carried off as prisoners. Other invasions followed but did not reach Dwin; on the other hand, the invasion by Habib b. Maslama, which Arab sources place either in 244/645-6 or in 31651-2, and the historian Seblos in 652-3, ended in the surrender and capture of Dvin and a treaty, the text of which has been preserved by al-Baladhuri, and in which Habib granted "the Christians, Zoroastrians and Jews" of Dvin the amîn and security for their persons, goods, synagogues and churches, in return for payment of ḍizya and ḍjizya. The Armenian authors do not seem to have preserved any recollection of the agreement concluded with Dvin and the other towns (Nakhêwân, Têfîs, Şâmârî). Dvin was destroyed, Asoghik tells us (ii, ch. III, trans. 84-85), by Heraclius during his famous campaign against Persia. The Arabs, advancing from Mesopotamia which they had already conquered, captured the town on 6 October 640 (the date fixed in Manandeans work); it was pillaged, 12,000 Armenians were massacred and 35,000 were carried off as prisoners. Other invasions followed but did not reach Dwin; on the other hand, the invasion by Habib b. Maslama, which Arab sources place either in 244/645-6 or in 31651-2, and the historian Seblos in 652-3, ended in the surrender and capture of Dvin and a treaty, the text of which has been preserved by al-Baladhuri, and in which Habib granted "the Christians, Zoroastrians and Jews" of Dvin the amîn and security for their persons, goods, synagogues and churches, in return for payment of ḍizya and ḍjizya. The Armenian authors do not seem to have preserved any recollection of the agreement concluded with Dvin and the other towns (Nakhêwân, Têfîs, Şâmârî) and only mention the general treaty concluded between Theodore Reshtuni and Muṣâwîya. The capture of Dvin by Arabs did not signify a lasting occupation of the town by the Arabs; for some time it was subjected alternately to Byzantine and Arab domination. The emperor Constans II was able to have a synod held in Dvin in 645 (or 648-9), and even after the agreement between Muṣâwîya and Theodore Reshtuni, this same Constans II penetrated as far as Dwin where he summoned another synod. After this, the town was reoccupied by the Arabs, and then once again by the Byzantine general Maurianos; in 657-8, it was with the help of a new and temporary Byzantine domination that the Catholics Cereses, who had left Dvin, returned there. Arab sovereignty was finally established in Dvin and in Armenia when the authority of the new caliph Muṣâwîya was fully affirmed by the Arabs (416/601). Nevertheless, it is from the time of Habib b. Maslama's expedition that Arab sources mark the start of the administration of Armenia by Muslim governors. Dvin became the residence of these governors, and when, in addition to Armenia, they also had to rule the Dzâira and Ağharbaydżân and were not residing in Dvin, they had a deputy there. Thanks to the establishment of an Arab administration whose main task was the collection of taxes, and of a garrison, an Arab population settled in the town and grew constantly bigger. In fact, according to an observation of Markwart (Südarmenien, 175), the Arabs, unlike the Persians, caused wholesale evictions of the towns to be evacuated for their own use,
transforming them little by little into Arab towns. Dwin was given a governmental palace (dār al-imāra), a mosque, a State prison and a mint. The operation of (in Russian): Dwin is attested from the beginning of the 2nd/8th century, and it was one of the first to function in the caliph's territories. The place of origin, given on the coins as Arminiya, is Dwin (see Minorsky, Studies on Caucasian History, 117 and Kh. Mughedian, Contribution to the history of monetary circulation in Dwin, according to finds of coins, in Bull. Ac. Sc. Armenian S.S.R., xi (1956), 84-117).

Dwin was the scene of various events of greater or lesser importance during the Arab domination; it seems to have been a period of decadence for the town which was abandoned by part of its Christian population, especially the nobility, until the end of the 3rd/9th century and the establishment of the monarchy. In the Umayyad period, under the reign of 'Abd al-Malik, the governor 'Abd Allah b. Ḥattim b. al-Nu'mān b-Ṭalḥah caused the martyrdom at Dwin of a holy man named David and exiled several Armenian princes to Damascus (Asoghik, ii, ch. ii, tr., 73; see other references in Grousset, Histoire de l'Arménie, 309 ff.). His brother 'Abd al-'Aziz who was governor from 86-97/705-15, in the reign of al-Walid, restored Dwin, fortified it and surrounded it with ditch and walls on the mosque (al-Balādūrī, 204; cf. Asoghik, ii, ch. iv, tr., 529; Ghevond, vi, 34-5; Grousset, 314). During the Umayyad period, the Mamikonians were pre-eminent among the great families of the country; with the 'Abbasid period the Bagratunis took the lead. However, the rise of the Bagratunis did not affect the position of Dwin which, with Bardha and Arran, and where the governors and their deputies remained firmly established. In the reign of al-Manṣūr (316-58/754-75) and the rule of Ḥasan b. Kahtāba a revolt of Armenian nobles broke out. It began with an attack on a tax-collector by Artavazd Mamikonian who had taken up arms in Dwin under the very eyes of the governor; it was carried further by Mughēsh Mamikonian who, after seizing Dwin, was defeated and killed in the battle of Bagrevand in 775 (see Grousset, 324 ff.).

During the civil war between al-ʿAmīn and al-Maʿmūn, the Arab amīr in command at Manazgerd, al-Dḥāhrāf, of the family of the Kaisikīs' (Kaysites), and who was married to an Armenian princess, took possession of Dwin for himself, and his son ʿAbd al-Malik remained there until he was killed by the actual inhabitants of Dwin in 823-4 (Grousset, 345 ff.; Laurent, L'Arménie, 322). In the time of the caliph al-Wāḥidī (227-32/842-57), Ẓahlīl b. Ṭayyīd b. Mazāyid al-Shāhābī, governor of Armenia, died, possibly by assassination, during an expedition against the rebellious governor of Georgia; his body was brought back and buried in Dwin in 230/844-5 (Laurent, 345). After the assassination of the governor of Armenia Yūsuf b. Abī Saʿīd Muhammad in Mūsā in 237/852, the caliph al-Mutawakkil (243-7/857-61) sent into Armenia Būḥā detail ʿAlī ʿAbārī who wintered in there and elsewhere, as divulged in several massacres (Grousset, 355 ff.; Laurent, 120, n. 5 345-6).

After the recognition of Bagratuni Ashot (Ashūt) as prince of princes (baṣṭār b-al-baṣṭārka) in 862, and then as king in 886 (or 887: Asoghik, iii, ch. ii, tr., 735-7; Ghevond, vi, 375-379), Dwin was in theory included in his possession for which he regarded himself as the caliph's vassal; but in fact it was independent of him, and he did not establish his capital there. At the beginning of the reign of Ashot's son Sembat (Sanbat) the Martyr (890-914), subdued with Sembat, he intervened in Armenia. This was after the terrible earthquake which ravaged Dwin in 280/893 and destroyed the Catholicos' palace (the latter consequently decided to move to Etiāmzān). Afgān came and occupied Dwin. War with Sembat followed, in the course of which the wives of both Sembat and his son Mughēsh were sent as prisoners to Dwin, only being released in 896-9 (see Grousset, 402 ff., 413 ff.). Afgān was succeeded by his brother Yūsuf who captured Sembat, tortured him to death and exposed his crucified body in Dwin, where many Armenians were martyred. The Catholicos Ter Yohannes fled to Greek territory (Asoghik, iii, ch. v, tr. 123; for these events, see Grousset, 435 ff.). In opposition to Sembat's lawful successor Ashot II, Yūsuf gave his support to his cousin Ashot II, son of Shāhu whom he established in Dwin and recognized as king. In addition, in the canton of Goghān, situated on the left bank of the Araxa below Dwin, he set up an Arab amīr whose successors were subsequently to play a part in the history of Dwin. Yūsuf revolted against the caliph and was taken prisoner in 307/919. During his captivity one of his officers, Ẓubīk (Subuk), governed Adharbaydjan and Armenia; he re-established good relations with Ashot II, whose rival was compelled to give up Dwin, though it did not, however, return to Ashot's possession. In 921 the emperor Romanus Lecapenos sent an expedition against Dwin under the command of the Domesticos (Demeslikos). According to Asoghik (iii, ch. vi, 124), Subuk (Sphkhi) drove him back with the aid of Ashot whom he had called upon for assistance. When Yūsuf returned to Adharbaydjan in 310/922, Dwin was at first governed by Nasr Subuki, ghulmām to Subuk who had just died, and then, after Nasr's recall, by Bīgh (or Bāshīr) who started hostilities with Ashot but was defeated by him. In 314/926 Yūsuf left Adharbaydjan, the caliph having entrust him with the conduct of the war against the Karmanians, in the course of which he met his death in the following year. It was at this point, in 315/927-8, that a new Byzantine expedition took place, commanded by the Domesticos John Corecas, against Dwin which was defended by Nasr Subuk. It fell: the Greeks, with the help of siege-engines, breached the walls and succeeded in making their way into the town, but were driven out as a result of the assistance given to the defenders by the inhabitants. This is what Ibn al-Aṯīr relates (viii, 129-30). It may be questioned whether, in spite of the differences of names and dates, the two expeditions under discussion were not in fact one and the same.

The dynasty of the Sādiḏīs in Adharbaydjan came to an end in 317/929, though for a time it was continued by Sādiḏī officials. We then enter a confused period in the history of Dwin. We do not know which amīr was in command in 325/937 (see Grousset, 425-55) secured from him the release of the Christian prisoners, nor who was the Muslim personage who,
in about 937, came as far as Dwin and inflicted a defeat on Abas, but was then defeated by king Gagik of Vaspurakan, who compelled the Muslim population of Dwin to pay tribute and leave hostages. It is possible that at this time Dwin was more or less subject to the authority of Daysam b. İbrahim al-Kurdi, a temporary ruler of Ağharbaygân who was thus successor to the Sâdids and heir to their rights over Armenia; we possess a coin of his, struck at Dwin in 330/941-2. But at that about date, Daysam was driven out by Marzubân b. Muhammâd b. Muhammâd b. Musâfîr, the family of the Kangârisds of Tarenk who founded the dynasty of the Sassâlids or Musâ-fîrîds [q.v.]. Then, Marzûbân having been captured by the Buwayhid Rûkân al-Dawlâ in 337/948-9, Daysam succeeded in reconquering Ağharbaygân and made himself master of Dwin, expelling two adventurers, Fadl b. Dinâfar al-Hâmândânî and İbrahim al-Dâbbî, who had seized the town. But already a new power had appeared at Dwin, that of Muhammâd b. Shaddât, founder of the Kurdish dynasty of the Shaddâdids which was to rule over the territory between the Kûr and the Araxes. Muhammâd gained control of Dwin in about 340/951, by what means we do not know. İbrahim b. al-Marzûbân, acting in the name of his father who was still held prisoner, tried to drive him out of Dwin; the first attempt failed, and Muhammâd built a fortress at the gates of Adhrabâyân. A second attempt by İbrahim compelled Muhammâd to flee, and a Daylamite garrison was installed in Dwin itself. But soon the townspeople reconciled Muhammâd who triumphantly resisted an attack by king Aḫšot III the Charitable of Ani. Marzûbân, however, had managed to escape from prison in 341 or 342/952 or 953-4 (for the date, see M. Canard, Hist. de la dynastie des Hâmadânîes, i, 133). He disposed of Daysam in Ağharbaygân and came to attack Dwin. Muhammâd b. Shaddât, caught between Marzûbân’s army and the Daylamite garrison still in the town, and deserted by the inhabitants, took refuge in Vaspurakan and then in Byzantine territory where he tried in vain to enlist help to reconquer Dwin. He died in 344/955, leaving three sons, one of whom we shall see again later at Dwin.

From the time of Marzûbân’s reconquest, Dwin seems to have remained in the hands of the Sallârîds, although it does not occur in the list of regions paying tribute to the Sallârîd, given by Ibn Ḥawkal for the year 344, perhaps because it was administered directly by a deputy. İbrahim b. al-Marzûbân was deprived of Ağharbaygân in about 368/979 and died four years later. It is no doubt his son Abu ‘l-Hâyğî, the Enums of Delmangan in Aşogik, iii, 311, whom we find still in possession of Dwin in 982-3, but shortly afterwards the town was taken by the amir of Goghûn, Abu Dulaf al-Shaybanî (Aputlûf in Aşogîk). In 377/987, Abu ‘l-Hâyğî al-Rawwâdî al-Kurdi, the Arabo-Kurdish amir of Ağharbaygân and successor to the Sallârîds, took it from him, but Abu Dulaf reconquered the town from Mamlân, successor to Abu ‘l-Hâyğî. The Bagratunî king Gagik II of Ani in order to compel him to give his kingdom to the empire, promising to allow him to have the territories he conquered from Gagik. When Gagik finally abdicated (1055), the emperor wanted Abu ‘l-Awsâr to restore to him the regions taken from Gagik. He sent an army against Dwin, but it was defeated. Another expedition followed in 1046-7, commanded by the eunuch Constantine and a general of Armenian origin, Kekaumenos, grandfather of the historian Kekaumenos and, according to that writer, formerly ‘toparch’ of Dwin (for the difficulties raised by this point, see Markwart, Sûdarmenten 562 ff.). A further expedition was dispatched against Abu ‘l-Awsâr in 1048 or 1049 (rather than in 1055-6, see Minorsky, 55, 59 ff., as opposed to Honigmann, Östergren, 182). In both expeditions alike, the Byzantines failed to lay siege to Dwin. However, by this time the Turks were already invading Armenia. When, in 446/1054, Tughîrîl Bagran arrived in the territory of Adhrabâyân, Abu ‘l-Awsâr submitted to him and, in agreement with the Turks, made a raid on Ani, returning laden with booty. He died in 1067.

Dwin then passed into the hands of a branch of the Shaddâdids which settled at Ani, after the capture of that town by Alp Arslân (1064) in 1072. This situation lasted until 555/1165, when a Turkish amir seized the town. It then fell to Tughân Arslân, lord of Bitûs and Arzân and vassal of an Artûkîd. As a result of the struggle between Mâhmûd and Tughîrîl, it was recovered by the Shaddâdîs Fadlûn III, who died in 1130, but was recaptured at that date by a son of Tughân Arslân. According to Minorsky (op. cit., 131), it was at that moment that Salâdîn’s grandfather Shâdî, a Kurd born in a village near Dwin, is said to have left the country and gone to Takrit. (We know, as Ibn Khallîkân relates, i, 105, that Salâdîn’s family were natives of Dwin). In 557/1162 the Georgians sacked the town and destroyed the mosque. But despite repeated attacks they were not able to gain possession, since the town was taken by the atabeks of Ağharbaygân who were descended from Eldûgûz (Ildégis, vizier of Sultan Mâhmûd). In 1203 Dwin was captured by the Georgians, from whom it was taken by the Kârîz-imshâh Djalâl al-Dîn in 1225. Then came the Mongols, who destroyed the town between 1236 and 1239.

It will be seen from this sketch that, from the end of the 9th century, Dwin suffered ceaselessly from all the repercussions to the upheavals that took place in Ağharbaygân, that all the powers which had been built up in the neighbouring countries tried to get possession of it on account of its position and commercial importance, and that it was only in the hands of the Armenians in exceptional circumstances, despite the large Armenian population which no doubt formed the majority. However, several of the Muslim overlords were related by marriage to Armenian princely families, for example, even Abu ‘l-Awsâr, as son-in-law of king Aḫšot.

The Arab geographers have left us certain descriptions of Dwin. It was, Ibn Ḥawkal tells us, a larger town than Ardabîl, surrounded by walls,
inhabited by many Christians, and its cathedral mosque stood beside the church, as was the case in Muslim countries. All these products formed the basis of a flourishing export trade. Ibn Hawkal's Epitome boasts of the gardens, fruit, and the cultivation of cereals, rice and cotton in the locality of Dwin, the springs and flowing waters; and his account also mentions the destruction of the town by the Georgians. Al-Mu'izz ad-din says that Dvin is a very cold region, and speaks of its textile products, its gardens, the citadel built of stone and clay, and the markets "in the shape of a cross"; he gives the names of the gates of the town, specifies that the mosque stands high up on an eminence and that in his day the fortress was falling into ruin. According to him, the number of inhabitants, the majority of whom were Christian, was declining. He mentions the site which was used by the Muslims, that of Abu Hanifa, and says that there was a convent of St. Sis in Dvin.

Excavations have been carried out on the site of Dvin, now occupied by villages. The results will be found in a work of K. Kafadarian, La ville de Dvin et ses fouilles, Erevan 1952, in Armenian with a résumé in Russian (see also BSE, xiii (1952), 467). In the upper part of the town remains have been found of the governors' palace, built after the earthquake of 893 and, below the ruins, traces of a palace of the same sort but dating from an earlier period. In the centre of the town have been found the remains of the palace of the Catholicos, built in 467 or 485, and also of a church of basilian design with a single nave, dating from the 6th century A.D. But the most important building discovered at Dvin is the cathedral whose complicated history can be re-traced: originally a pagan temple with three aisles, it was built in the 3rd century inclusive and converted into a church at the beginning of the 4th century when an apse was added, and in the middle of the 5th century refashioned as a basilica with three aisles, and also possessing an external gallery; then, in the 7th century, with the building of lateral apses and a central cupola resting on four large pillars, it became a cruciform church with a cupola. This great church was destroyed in the earthquake of 933.

Remains have also been found of dwellings, workshops for weaving, jewellery etc., cellars, warehouses, tools (ploughshares, iron shovels, etc.), gold and silver articles, pottery, china, architectural fragments decorated with sculptures of secular subjects (grape-gathering) etc. The discoveries have shown that the economic life of Dvin was active particularly from the end of the 3rd/4th century until the 5th/6th century inclusive, that is to say until the rise of the Armenian kingdom.

Bibliography: The history of Dvin is described in detail in Markwart, Südarmenien und die Tigriquerellen, see index and in particular 562 ff. (cf. also, by the same author, Strefsehüge, 404-5), but the outstanding work is V. Minorsky, Studies on Caucasian history. London 1932, in which for the first time a study is made of the important historical source of Münedjidim Bagh, collated with the Armenian sources: see particularly 116 ff., Vicissitudes of Dvin; it is upon Minorsky's work that the present article has been based; it has been used in two studies of Ter Levondian entitled Dvin under the Sallarids and Chronology of Dvin in the 9th-10th centuries, included in the volume in honour of Dvin in Armenia, ed. M. Canard, Cambridge, Mass. 1950, 377-8; E. Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze des byz. Reiches 109-110, 107-11, 29, 158, 174, 175-7, 182; see also De Morgan, Hist. du peuple arménien (1910), 105, 116, 118, 123, 134, 135-6, 138, 244. References to the Armenian historians will be found in Grouset, Histoire de l'Arménie, Paris 1947, passim, and also in the works of Laurens and Minorsky given above. See also G. H. Sarkisian, Tigranakert (Tigranocerta), Hist. of the urban communities of the Byzantine Empire, Erevan, Russian ed., 19, 106, 135, and Ter Levondian cited above, see idem, The emirate of Dvin in Armenia in the 9th-10th centuries, (dissertation of the University of Leningrad, 1958), and On the question of the origin of the emirate of Dvin in Armenia, in the volume in honour of I. A. Orbeli, Researches on the history of the culture of the peoples of the Orient, Moscow-Leningrad 1950 (in Russian).

DYEING [see SABBAGH].

DŽABIĆ, ALI FEHTI, b. Mostar 1853, d. Istanbul 1918, from 1884 muf'ti in Mostar (Herzegovina). The Austro-Hungarian provincial government of Bosnia and Herzegovina re-organized Muslim religious institutions in order to keep them under its control. As early as 1886 the Muslims of Sarajevo aspired to religious autonomy, and the dissatisfaction of the Muslims in Herzegovina, under Džabić's leadership, steadily increased. Džabić sought religious autonomy at the conference of Bosnia-Herzegovina Muslim leaders in Sarajevo in 1893, but he remained in the minority. From the year 1899 onwards, the movement for the religious autonomy of the Muslims in Herzegovina, under Džabić's leadership, entered an acute phase. The movement had linked up with the struggle of the orthodox Serbs for religious autonomy. The Austro-Hungarian authorities persecuted
Džabić’s group so that Džabić was removed from his position of mufti (1900). In the meantime the movement had also begun to spread in Bosnia, so that the Austro-Hungarian authorities were compelled to enter into negotiations. No agreement was reached, because the Austro-Hungarian authorities were unwilling to accept certain paragraphs in the draft statute which related to the choice of organs of religious administration and to the attestation of the reis al-ulema on behalf of the shaikh al-İslâm in Istanbul. In 1902, when Džabić with five of his friends went to Istanbul for consultations, he was forbidden to return to his country, and stayed in Istanbul until his death. He lectured on Arabic language and literature at the university, and contributed to many journals. On the occasion of the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1908) he wrote a pamphlet in Arabic to the parliamentary deputies of the Arab countries, in which he attacked Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Turkish government because of its indulgence. As a result, he was removed from the university. He made an anthology of poems for the Companions of Muḥammad, which he wanted to publish in three volumes with his commentary, but he published only one of them: Ḥusn al-sababa fi sharḥ aqṣār al-sababa; he also wrote a commentary on Abū Tālib’s poem in defence of Muḥammad (printed in Istanbul 1327 A.H.).

**Biography:** V. Škarč, Osman Nuri Hadzić and N. Stojanović, Bosna i Hercegovina pod austro-ungarskom upravom, Srpski narod u XIX veku, Belgrade 1938; M. Handžić, Književni rad bosansko-hercegovačkih muslimana, Sarajevo 1934. ( Branislav Đurđev)

**EAST AFRICA** [see BAHR AL-HIND, BAHR AL-ZANDI, DAR-ES-SALAAM, KITUKI, KILWA, MALINDI, MOGADISHU, MOMBASA, SOMALI, SWAHILI, TANGANYIKA, ZANJABIR, etc.]

**EBUZZIYA TEFVIK** (Ebu 'l-Diyāʾ Tewfik) (1848-1913), a well-known Ottoman journalist. Born in Istanbul, he had only a sketchy education, and was largely self-taught. At the age of sixteen or seventeen he met Nāmik Kemâl, and, through him, Shinās, and became a frequent caller at the offices of the newspaper Taṣwîr-i Ejbâr, where the literary avant-garde used to meet; he claimed to have been the sixth to register as a member of the Society of New Ottomans (Yeni 'Othmanîlar Diemîyyetî), founded in 1865, but this claim is questionable.

Tewfik started his journalistic career in 1868-9 by writing articles in Taṣawīr. When Shinās died, Tewfik and Kemâl (who soon gave up his rights in the venture) bought the printing presses on behalf of the Egyptian prince Mustâfâ Fâdîl Paşa (g.v.). The first three products of the newly-acquired press were a collection of the political writings of Reşîd Paşa, Nâmik Kemâl’s Salâh al-Dîn-i Eyyâbî, and Tewfik’s own first work, the play Edîjî Kâdâ. In his preface to this play, which was well received, Tewfik defends the realist thesis that a writer must describe the morals and customs of his age without projecting his own personality. Tewfik was also a regular contributor to Kemâl’s Übret, which appeared in 1872. He then took over the editorship of Ḥadîka, as from its issue dated 9 November 1872. When the latter was suspended for two months following its 56th issue, he issued the Sirâdî, for which he had earlier taken out a licence as a precaution. 25 issues of Sirâdî were published, the venture finally collapsing when Tewfik was exiled to Rhodes in April 1873. It was in Rhodes that Tewfik composed his anthology, Namâne-i Edebîyet-i Ottomanîyye, and a collection of encyclopaedic articles, entitled Mâhiyye, of which the historical portions were later printed in the magazine Muharrîr (vii-viii; 1295/1878). After the accession of Murâd on 31 May 1876, Tewfik returned to Istanbul and resumed his journalistic activity which continued under the new reign of Śāhāb al-Ḥamîd. When the latter had Kemâl exiled to

Midilli and Diyāʾ Paşa to Adana, Tewfik sought release from official pressure by making a journey to Vienna in 1877 on publishing business. In 1880 he obtained from the Minister of Education Mînûf Paşa the licence to publish the magazine Mîdîmûa-i Ebu 'l-Dîyā', which soon became an organ of the Taṣâvîrî "progressives". His annual calendars, called first Reşîb-i Mafrîj, then Newâlî Mafrîj, had a brisk sale. In 1882 he regained control of his printing-press and named it Matbâ-a-i Ebu 'l-Dîyā'. A flood of publications followed, the printing-press producing on an average one fascicle every five days. There included a series of short biographies, entitled Kutubkânâ-i meşhârî and modelled on the French La vie des hommes illustres, the hundred or so thicker volumes of the Kutubkânâ-i Ebu 'l-Dîyâ', modelled this time on the German Universal Bibliothek and written either by Tewfik himself or by other Taṣâvîrî intellectuals, as well as various magazines. Before long, however, the authorities began to interfere: in 1888 the publication of Nâmîk Kemâl’s 'Othmanîlar Diemîyyetî was stopped after the first fascicle had sold 6,000 copies. When the authorities demanded that pamphlets and magazines should be submitted for censorship before publication, Tewfik closed down his Mîdîmûa-i Ebu 'l-Dîyâ'. He was arrested twice, in 1891 when he was Director of the School of Arts and Crafts, and in 1893 when he was a member of the Court of First Instance of the Council of State, each time on trumped-up charges. Book censorship was relaxed in 1897 when Zâhid Paşa became Minister of Education, and Tewfik once again brought out his Mîdîmûa, which survived until 1900 when Tewfik was arrested and exiled to Konya, where he stayed for almost nine years, returning only after the Young Turk Revolution as parliamentary deputy for Antalya. In 1909 he brought out the new Taṣâvîr-i Es'hâr in which he described himself as an "independent and moderate progressive". He spent the remaining four years of his life in political discussions and polemics both in that newspaper and in the Mîdîmûa-i Ebu 'l-Dîyâ', which he also republished. The Taṣâvîr-i Es’hâr was closed down for a time, but allowed to re-appear on 25 January 1913 when Mahmûd Shewk Paşa
succeeded Kâmil Paşa as Grand Vizier. Tewfik died two days later having just delivered to his newspaper an article entitled "New Arrests" on the Government's new measures.

The importance of Ebu 'l-Diyâ Tewfik lies not so much in the literary quality of his writings (although he was a good stylist and helped in the development of simple and clear Turkish prose) as in his tireless work as a popularizer, journalist and above all publisher and printer. He was a good stylist and helped in the development of the first illustrated printed texts in Turkey. He was also the first to use Kufic type face. His memoirs about his journalistic articles are of simple and clear Turkish prose (and not so much contradictory, as in his tireless work as a popularizer, journalist and above all publisher and printer. He first to use Kufic type face. His memoirs about his journalist articles

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best biography is that by Ihsan Sungur in Aylık Anıskoldesi, ix, 266-9, see also Merhem Dâvâ Tewfik Bey, in Therwet-i Funun, no. 28; articles in Burşal Tâhir, 'Othmanîl müâdılîfûrî ve I. Alkeddîn, Meşhur Adamlar Anıskoldedisi and references in Ahmed Mîdâh, Menvâ, Istanbul 1935/36, 72 ff.; Berket-zâde I. Hakkî, Yâd-i Mâdi, Istanbul 1934/1935, 55, 73 ff., 141; Ali Ekrem, Nâmê Kemal, Istanbul 1930, 58, 78; Halîd Ziya Usâkgîlî, Kârî Yîl, Istanbul 1936, ii, 35, 74, 119; Fu'âd Köprûlî, Ebu 'l-Diyâ Tewfîk Bey: olûmî mûnâsibetî ve in Therwet-i Funûn (No. 1140, 23 March 1931); Iâ, s.v.

I. A. (Fevziye Abdullah)

ECIA [see istiqâ].

ECONOMY [see Tâdîrîl-anma].

ECSTASY [see Şâhî, also Darvêş, Dîhêş].

EDEBIYAT-I DJEDIDÉ, "new literature", the name given to a Turkish literary movement associated with the review Therwet-i Funûn [q.v.] during the years 1895-1901—that is, during the editorship of Tewfik Fikret [q.v.]. See further Turkish literature, and the articles on the individual authors.

(ED.)

EDESSA [see al-Ruha].

EDHEM, ÇERKES [see Çerkes, Edhem].

EDHEM, KHallî [see Edhem, Khâlî Edhem].

EDIRNE, Adrianopolis—a city lying at the confluence of the Tundja and Arâ and the Merîç (Maritsa); the capital of the Ottomans after Burûs (Brusa), and now the administrative centre of the vilayet (province) of the same name and, traditionally, the centre of Turkish (now Eastern Turkish, Thracian (Trakya or Paşağel). Its historical importance derives from the fact that it lies on the main road from Asia Minor to the Balkans, where it is the first important staging point after Istanbul. It guards the eastern entrance to the natural corridor between the Rhodope mountains to the south-west and the Istrîncja mountains to the north-east. It also dominates traffic down the valleys of the Tundja and the Merîç and used to be the starting point of important river traffic down the Merîç to the Aegean. In later times the main weight of traffic was transferred to the railway passing through Edirne on its way to Istanbul. Edirne is particularly rich in Ottoman architectural monuments. Its importance, diminished by the transfer of the capital to Istanbul, received a great blow when the city was captured by the Russians in 1829. Since the Balkan Wars it has been a Turkish frontier city, which fell briefly under Bulgarian occupation in 1913 and was occupied by the Greeks between 1920 and 1922. The population of Edirne, which exceeded 50,000 in the middle of the 19th century, fell to 57,000 at the beginning of the present century (of whom 47,000 are Turks, some 20,000 Greeks, some 15,000 Jews, 4,000 Armenians and 2,000 Bulgarians), then again to 34,528 at the census of 1927 and, finally, to 29,400 in 1945, since when it has been rising. The population is now largely Turkish, with a small Jewish community.

The city is built inside a bend of the Tundja, just before its junction with the Merîç, on gently rising ground reaching a height of 75 metres on the hillock on which the great Selimiye mosque is built, and some 100 metres further to the east. The part of the city built on the lower slopes has often been flooded, sometimes catastrophically. The city consists of two main parts, Kâl's-îdîsh, in the western part of the river curve, the district surrounded by the walls, which have now almost completely disappeared, and rebuilt on a geometric pattern after being devastated by fire at the end of the last century, and Kâl's-îdîsh to the east. It is the latter which is the centre of the modern city.

The name of the city is given in old Ottoman sources as Edirnis, Edrune, Edrinhali, Endriye, as well as Edirne or Edrine, the latter form being used in the fethime sent by Murâd I the IIlkhânid sultan Uways Khân. Historical documents also use honorific names, such as Dâr al-Nazwr wa'l-Maymana (Abode of Divinely-Alr oned Victory and of Felicity), Dâr al-Saltana (Abode of the Sultanate) etc.

The city is believed to have been first settled by Thracian tribes, from whom it was captured by the Macedonians and named Orestea (or Orestias). It was rebuilt by the Emperor Hadrian in the 2nd century and named after him Hadrianopolis, Adrianopolis. Adrianopolis witnessed the victory of Constantine over Licinius in 323, the defeat of Valens by the Goths in 378; it was besieged by the Avars in 586, captured by the Bulgars in 914, besieged again by the Penegeins in 1049 and 1078. At the battle of Adrianople the last Emperor of Byzantium Baldwin was defeated and captured by the Bulgars who joined with the Greeks in resisting Catholic encroachment. The Byzantine Greeks then held the city against the Bulgarians. Turks from Asia Minor appeared on the scene in 1324-3 when Aydun-oglu Umûr Bey fought as an ally of Cantacuzenus against John Palaeologus, defended Dimetoka [q.v.] against the "prince" (tekhâr) of Edirne and is said to have killed the latter (see Mükrimîn Hallî, Dursâtâmâne-i Ensûri, Istanbul 1929, introduction 43-6). In 1354/1355 the Ottoman prince Sulayman Paşa joined the forces of Cantacuzenus in Edirne after defeating an army of Bulgars and Serbians. Three years before the final conquest of Edirne, the Ottoman Orkhan Bey advised Sulayman Paşa to keep a close eye on the castle of Edirne. The conquest was accomplished under Murât I by Lala Shâhîn Paşa, who defeated the tekhâr of Edirne at Sâkîl-Dere, to the south-east of the city. It is believed that on the banks of the Tundja and in Ramadân 763/July 1362 the inhabitants of the town surrendered on condition of being allowed to live there freely. Although Murât I left the administration of Edirne to Lala Shâhîn Paşa, pressure was to hold his court at Bursa or Dimetoka, the city of Edirne became almost immediately the forward base of
Ottoman expansion in Europe. It was from Edirne, furthermore that Yıldırım Bayezid set out to besiege Constantinople. After Bayezid's later defeat in the battle of Ankara, Süleyman the Magnificent transferred the treasury from Bursa to Edirne where he ascended the throne. He later lost the city to Mūsâ Celebi, who also ruled from Edirne and minted money there in his name. After his defeat and death, Sultan Mehmed I spent most of his eight-year rule in Edirne and died there, being buried like his predecessors in Bursa. It was in Edirne in 825/1422 that the Pretender Mustafâ was executed after his defeat by Murâd II. The latter's reign saw an increase in the prosperity of Edirne and its environs and the building of the town of Uzun-Köprü (Dîsr-i Eргene).

It was at Edirne that Murâd II received foreign ambassadors, it is from there that he directed his conquests, and it was also on the island on the Tungja that the circumcision-feasts of his sons ʿAlî al-Dîn and Mehmed were celebrated with magnificent pomp. His reign witnessed also a mutiny of the Janissaries at Edirne on the pretext of the fire in the city, a mutiny which was pacified by an increase in the soldiers' pay. Murâd II died in Edirne and was succeeded by Mehemed II who, however, did not return to the city until he decided to lay siege to Constantinople. The plans of the siege were worked out in Edirne, and the siege guns tested in its environs. After the conquest Mehmed II again held court in Edirne where he organized in the spring of 861/1457 magnificent circumcision celebrations, lasting two months, for the princes Bâyezîd and Mustafâ. Selim I also held court in Edirne, the city being left to the care of princes when the Sultan campaigned. The prosperity of Edirne continued to grow in the 16th and the 17th century; Süleymân the Magnificent often stayed there, while the city's greatest mosque was built under his successor. The tranquillity of the city was, however, disturbed by mutinies in 994/1586 and 1003/1595. From the time of Ahmed I, Edirne became famous for its royal hunting parties, royal celebrations and entertainments in and around the city, retaining particular brilliance under Mehmed IV (1481 — 1507). After the life of the city began to be affected by the successive defeats suffered by Ottoman arms. In 1115/1703, at the famous "Edirne incident", Mustafâ II who held his court in Edirne was deposed in favour of Ahmed III. The latter name of Palace of Khadija Sultan. In the later 19th century a military lycée was built on the site of the old palace.

The famous "Edirne incident", Mustafâ II who held his court in Edirne was deposed in favour of Ahmed III by malcontents from Istanbul. The subsequent decline of the city was hastened by the fire of 1155/1745 in which some 60 quarters were burnt down and by the earthquake of 1164/1751. In 1801 Edirne witnessed a mutiny of Albanian troops against Selim III's reforms. A second "Edirne incident" occurred in 1806 for the same reasons. On the other hands the abolition of the Janissaries occasioned only minor difficulties in Edirne. In the Russian-Ottoman war of 1878-9 Edirne was occupied by the Russians and this occupation deeply affected the local Muslim population. Muslims started emigrating from Edirne, their place being taken by Christians coming in from the surrounding villages. To raise the Muslims' morale Mahmûd II visited Edirne for some ten days, ordered a large bridge to be built on the Meriç (this, however, was only completed in 1842 in the reign of ʿAbd al-Medîd) and had commemorative coins struck. More devastations were caused by the Russian occupation of Edirne in 1878-9, and by the hostilities in the Balkan wars and following the First World War.

Monuments: Of the castle of Edirne, four of whose towers and nine of whose gates we know by name, only one tower, the Şâihat Kulesi (Clock Tower), originally Büyük Kule (the Great Tower), remains in existence, the other towers having been destroyed in a late 19th century addition. Greek inscriptions in the names of John V and Michael Palaeologus have disappeared.

Palaces: 1. Eski Sarây (the Old Palace). After the conquest of Edirne, Murâd I found the Tekfûr's palace in the castle inadequate, and built a new palace outside the castle, where he moved in 767/1365-6. Ewliya Celebi says that this was near the Sultan Selim mosque in the quarter of Kâvak Meydanı (the square) and that it was later used as a barracks for "adjemî-ogluans. During the Hungarian expeditions of Süleyman the Magnificent the old palace could accommodate 6,000 pages, while accommodation for 40,000 Janissaries was provided near by. Ewliya Celebi (iii, 456) says that the palace did not have its own gardens, that it was surrounded by high walls, measuring some 5,000 paces in circumference, that it was rectangular in shape and that it had a gate known as bâb-i humâyûn. Although the importance of the old palace diminished after the building of the Sultan Selim mosque, it was still used for the education of il-ogluans, the palace organization remaining unchanged from before the conquest of Istanbul. In 1068/1655 Sultan Mehmed IV allocated the old palace to his daughter Khaḍîja b. Musâ and Musâ Pasha, hence the later name of Palace of Khaḍîja Sultan. In the later 19th century a military lycée was built on the site of the old palace.

2. Sarây-i Djedîd-i ʿAmîre (the New Imperial Palace), built on an island on the Tungja and on adjoining meadows by Murâd II in 854/1450, partly with marble brought from some ruins near Salonica. Construction of the palace was continued the following year by Mehemed II who also had thousands of trees planted on the island, which he joined by a bridge to the main palace buildings to the west. Another bridge, this time between the palace and the main city, was built by Süleymân the Magnificent, under whose direction important additions were made to the palace. More pavilions were added in subsequent reigns until the palace grew to twice its size under Mehemed II. At the end of the 11th/17th century it contained 38 pavilions, 8 meşgîds, 17 large gates, 14 baths and 5 courts. Some six to ten thousand people lived within the confines of the palace. Dissolution was gradual: there were many attempts at restoration in the 18th century, but in 1827 an official survey said that most buildings were either completely in ruins or half-ruined. Much damage was caused to the palace by the Russian occupation of 1829, Russian troops camping in the palace gardens. More attempts at restoration followed, but the second Russian occupation sounded the death knell of the palace. The Ottomans themselves set fire to ammunition dumps in the palace before evacuating the city, and after returning they quarried the remaining buildings for stone.

Mosques: The first Friday prayers were said in Edirne in a converted church inside the castle, known afterwards as the Halâbiye, after its first mûderris, Sirâdî al-Dîn Muḥammed b. ʿUmar Halabi, a teacher of Mehemed the Conqueror, and also as Celebi Dîmî. Ruined in an earthquake in the 18th century and later repaired, it survived until the end of the 19th century. Another church in the castle was converted into a mosque under the name of Kilise Dîmî, but this was pulled down by Mehemed II and replaced by one with six
domes which disappeared in the second half of the 18th century. The oldest surviving mosque is that of Yıldırım, built in 801/1399, on the foundations of a church raised in the Fourth Crusade, so that the mihrab is built into a side wall. During their occupation of 1878 the Russians stripped the inside of the mosque of its tiles and of the two linked marble rings which had given the mosque the name of Küçüklı Dâimi (Ear-ring mosque). Another old mosque, the Eski Dâimi (or Old Mosque par excellence) was started in 804/1402 by Emir Süleymanı (hence the name of Süleymâniye given it by Mehemmed I, a name which was later changed into Ulû Dâimi, or Great Mosque, before the present one of Eski Dâimi or Dâimi 'Atîk was finally adopted) and completed in 816/1413 under Mehemmed I (Pl. X). The interior is square, 9 domes being supported by four columns. An inscription on the western gate, gives the name of the architect as Hadjdil Salâ (hence the name of the silver mines at Karatova in Serbia. Later allocated for the upkeep of this mosque the revenues. Another formerly rich mosque, the Dar medrese, was originally a harem, on the gate of the Üc-sherefeli Dâimi (Three-Balconied Mosque) started in 847/1447-8 and finished in 857/1447-8 (Pl. X). Ewliya Celebi says that it was built at the cost of 10,000 purses, being the proceeds of the booty captured at the conquest of İzmir. This mosque has also been known as the Murâdiye, Yeni Dâimi (New Mosque) and Dâimi-i Keblîr (Great Mosque). The building is rectangular, a great dome being held up by six columns, there being four medium-sized and four other small domes at the sides of the main one. Four of the columns (at either side of the main gate and the mihrâb) are built into the walls. The harem (sacred enclosure, i.e., court-yard), paved with marble, is regarded as the first harem of a mosque built by the Ottomans. The cloisters on the four sides of the harem are made up of 21 domed vaults, supported by 18 columns. The three-balconied minaret is known as the first Ottoman minaret of this kind. There is also one minaret with two balconies and others with one balcony. Murâd II first allocated for the upkeep of this mosque the revenues of the silver mines at Karatova in Serbia. Later Rûstem Pasha transferred these mines to the Treasury, allowing the mosque to draw money instead from the wakf of Beyazed II. An important event in the history of the mosque was the public condemnation in it by Fakhr al-Din Adjemi of the hurâfî followers of Fadl Allah Tahrîrî, who were believed to enjoy the support of the Sultan Murâd II and the Conqueror. Beyazed II built on the banks of the Tundja a mosque, baths, a hospital, a medrese and an almshouse (Pl. XI). A chronogram on the mosque gate yields the date 893/1488. The building was financed with the booty captured at Ak-Kerman.

The mosque of Süleymanı I, which was allowed an independent course, as in the case of the mosque of Sultan Selim (Selimîye Dâimi), which is the glory of Edirne and the last royal mosque in the city (Pl. XI). Built between 972/1564-5 and 982/1574-5 according to the chronogram on the gate of the harem, it cost, Ewliya Celebi tells us, 27,760 purses obtained from the booty captured in Cyprus. The great dome of the mosque, which rests on 8 columns, is 6 cubits higher than that of Saint Sophia in Istanbul. The mu'adhdhin's gallery under the great dome is supported by 12 marble columns, two metres high; under it there is a small fountain. The mosque library is on the right, and the royal gallery on the left. This mabûf, which rests on four marble pillars, used to be decorated by tiles, which were taken away by the Russians in 1878. The building is surrounded by cloisters, in which 18 domes are supported by 16 large pillars brought from the Kapî-Dağ peninsula and from ruins in Syria (according to Ewliya Celebi, also from Athens). Four three-balconied minarets stand at the four corners of the mosque, which have often been repaired. As for the mosque itself, it was repaired after the earthquake of 1752 and also in 1808, 1884, and in recent years. The Sultan Selim mosque forms an architectural whole with the adjacent medrese, Dâr Mürûd (Kurî's reciters' quarters), school and clock-house. The miiderris of the Selimîye medrese was considered the chief miiderris of the city. The medrese was subsequently used as a military detention centre and is now a museum of antiquities, while the Dâr al-kure of harem (Kurî's reciters' quarters), school and clock-house. The miiderris of the medrese was considered the chief miiderris of the city. The medrese was subsequently used as a military detention centre and is now a museum of antiquities, while the Dâr al-kure houses an ethnographic museum. The library was later enriched by many wakf books, but some valuable books were lost during the Bulgarian occupation.

Edirne was an important centre of Islamic learning, which was allowed an independent course, as in Istanbul and Bursa. Apart from those already mentioned, there were important medreses in the courtyard of the Üç-şerefi Dâimi (founded by Alaeddin Keyhüsrev Pasha), founded in the same place by Mehemmed I. These medreses, built in the classical Ottoman style, are...
today ruined, but could still be restored. Many markets were also built in Edirne, largely as a source of revenue for the upkeep of the pious foundations of the city. The first of these is the covered market of Mehmed I (14 domes, 4 gates), which was a 

wald of the Eski Dzami. The covered market built by Murad II, known as the Old Market, fell into ruin in the second half of the 17th/18th century. Murad III had a market built by Sinan, and known as Arasta (73 arches, 124 shops), to provide revenue for the Selimiye mosque. Sinan also built a market with six gates in Eminiz Ali Pasha, the city. The town also contained a large number of khans. Of these Sinan built the Large and the Small khans of Rustem Paşa and also the Tak Khan built for Sokollu. Another Khan which is still in existence is that built in the beginning of the 11th/17th century by Ekmekzade Ahmed Paşa. At the beginning of the 10th/16th century there were in all 16 khans and markets in Edirne. Later the number increased, French and English merchants also having their places of work. The trades practised in Edirne included dyeing, tanning, soap-making, distillation of attar of roses, carriage-building etc. Edirne was also famous for its own style of book-binding. The city’s water supply was ensured by the Khassee Sultan aqueduct built in 937/1530. There were also some 300 public fountains, most of which have now disappeared. Apart from the place bridges, there were in Edirne four bridges over the Tundja and one over the Meric, the oldest being the bridge of Ghazi Miñâl, built in 823/1420.

At first the administration of Edirne was in the hands of a bâdi and of a su-bashi (who was probably the same person as the agâh of Janissaries mentioned by Pococke). After the conquest of Istanbul the bostandzh-bashi was made responsible for the administration. The bâdi of Edirne, who had a daily allowance of 300 aspers at the beginning of the 10th/16th century, could expect promotion to Istanbul, and had, according to Ewliya Celebi, 45 deputees (nâqib). He was appointed and dismissed by the central government. One interesting local official was the Chief Gardener (khan melik-i vezir-i bégân-i bégân), responsible for the care of private gardens and orchards in the city. The first of these is described by George Keppel, Narrative of a journey across the Balcans, London 1728, ed. Ch. Schefer, Paris 1881; E. Chishull, Travels in Turkey, London 1747; Letters of Lady Wortley Montague, letters 25-34. The decay of the city in the beginning of the 19th century is described by George Keppel, Narrative of a journey across the Balkains, London 1831, and by Molilke, Briefe über Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei, 150 ff.; Nicolas de Nicolay, Navigations ..., gives types of the inhabitants in the 10th/16th century. Views and plans of the mosques and other buildings are given by C. Sayger and A. Desarnod, Album d’un voyage en Turquie en 1829-1830, Paris n.d., fol., Thomas Allom and Robert Walsh, Constantinople, ii, 73, and by G. Gurlitt, Die Bauten Adria-

nepoleis, in Orientalisches Archiv, i, p. i and ii (cf. G. Jacob in Ist., iii (1912), 358-68). Works in Turkish include: the Selânames of the vilayet of Edirne; Rifat ‘Othmân, Edirne Rehnumâsî, Edirne 1335/1920; Oktay Aslanpaşa, Edirnedde Osmanlî devir abideleri, Istanbul 1949; M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, XIV-XVI asrârda Edirne ve Paşa lâlât, Istanbul 1952; idem, "Edirne" in IA. (M. TAYYIB GÖKBİLGIN)

EDREMIT, town of western Turkey, situated 8 km. from the head of the Gulf of Edremit (on the site of Homer’s Thebe) on the lower slopes of Pasja-
dag (a spur of Mt. Ida) overlooking the fertile alluvial plain to the south (39° 35’ N., 27° 02’ E.). The ancient Adramyttion was on the coast at Karataş (4 km. west of Burhaniye [formerly Kemére] and 13 km. south-west of Edremit), where remains of quays, etc., are to be found. The evidence of coins indicates that the city must have had its present site (not as Kiepert suggested) under the Commens but much earlier, perhaps in the 2nd century A.D. (W. Ruge, in Pauly-Wissowa, art. Thebe, col. 1597). Turkish attacks began at the end of the 11th century: in 1093 Adramyttion was entirely destroyed by Tsachas (Çaka), operating from his base at Smyrna, and re-built by Alexius’ general Philokales (Alexiades, ed. B. Leib, iii, 149); and towards 1150 Manuel I strengthened its fortifications against the Turkish danger (Nicetas Choniates, Bonn ed., 1914). In 1265 Michael Palaeologus ceded Smyrna to the Genoese, he granted them also extensive privileges in Adramyttion (W. Heyd, Hist. du commerce du Levant, i, 429), and early in the next century a Genoese garrison was defending the city against the Turks (Fachymeres, Bonn ed., ii, 58). Soon afterwards Edremit fell into the hands of the Karasi [q.v.] dynasty, to be occupied, along with their other territories, by the Ottomans in the reign of Orhan (Ahşâhpasazâde, ed. Giese, 41; Ahşâhpasazâde’s date, 735/1334-5, is too early, by ten years or more). For five centuries Edremit was administered as a bâdi of the sanjak of Karasi (for administrative changes 1841-1923 see IA, vi, 334).

Now the centre of a haza of the vilayet of Balikesir, it has a thriving olive-oil industry (population [1950] 12,700).
Eski Di铵, tic-sherefeli Di铵, entr閑 et cour.

(B. Unsal, Turkish Islamic Architecture, Londres 1959-)

Úچ-sherefeli Di铵, entr閑 et cour.

(B. Unsal, Turkish Islamic Architecture, Londres 1959- )
Mosquée de Bâyêzîd II et hôpital.

Selîmiyye Djâmi'.

(B. Ünsal, Turkish Islamic Architecture, Lonâres 1959).
EFENDI, an Ottoman title of Greek origin, from αὐθέντης, Lord, Master, (cf. authentic), probably via by a Byzantine colloquial vocative form, asfendi (G. Meyer, Türkische Studien, i, in SBAR Wien (1893), 37; K. Foy in MSOS, ii (1898), 44 n. 3; Pschari, 408). The term was already in use in Turkish Anatolia in the 13th and 14th centuries. Efikí indicates that the daughter of Djalá al-Din Rúmi was known as Efendipoulo—the master's daughter (Cl. Huart, Les saints des derviches tournours, Paris 1922, ii, 429; on the later Karaiti family name Afendopoulo or Efendipoulo see Z. Ankori, Karaites in Byzantium, New York-Jerusalem 1959, 199-200). Ibn Bātūţa found that the brother of the ruler of Kastamoun was called Efendi (Voyages, ii, 345; Eng. trans. Sir Hamilton Gibb, The travels of Ibn Batutta, ii, Cambridge 1962, 463). This title was also used under the Ottomans (see, for example, ʻAshāpāshāzade, chapter 46, where Kara Rūstem addresses the Kāḏḏarisher Dandardin Ḳ̣hālī as Efendi), and in a number of terms issued in Greek from the chancery of Mehemmed the Conqueror the Sultan himself is called Ḳ̣ḏārisher Efendim—perhaps the original of Grand Signor (Hammer-Purgstall, Histoire, ii, 523; F. Babinger-F. Döger, Mehmēd’s II. frühester Staatsatrat (1445), in Orientalia Christiana Periodica, xv (1949), 234; A. Bombaci, Nuovi furmān ghanī di Maometto II, in BZ, xlvii (1954), 298-319; cf. Deny, Sommare, 183). In the late 17th century this title was not uncommon for Muslims to speak of the Prophet as Efendimiz—our master; but in the 19th century, it followed a somewhat different line of development, and came to designate the secular, literate townspeople, usually dressed in European style, as against the lower classes on the one hand, and the men of religion on the other. This European style, as against the lower classes on the one hand, and the men of religion on the other. This distinction between efendi and bey in Turkey finally came to be one between religious and secular, the former term being used primarily for men of religion or for the religious education, the latter for military and then also for civilian laymen. The title efendi was finally abolished in Turkey, together with other Ottoman ranks and titles, in 1934. In the form efendim (also Beye hendim and Hamsefendim)—sir, madam—it remains in common use as a form of address for both men and women.

In the Arab countries formerly under Ottoman rule, where the title Efendi came into general use in the 19th century, it followed a somewhat different line of development, and came to designate the secular, literate townspeople, usually dressed in European style, as against the lower classes on the one hand, and the men of religion on the other. This in contrast with the Turkish practice, which tended to apply the title more especially to men of religion. After becoming a rough equivalent of Mr. or Miss, the title Efendi is now dispersed among the various Arab lands, being replaced for the most part by Sayyid.


(John Lewis, Efleḵ, the Turkish form of the word Wallach, originally applied by Germanic tribes to Latin populations. The Slavs, the Byzantines and, later, the Ottomans used it to denote the Balkan Humani-ans and those north of the Danube. It is probable that it lost its ethnic meaning in certain parts of
the peninsula, and was applied simply to a pastoral population. Under the Turks, the Wallachians who were incorporated in the organization of the voivode [q.v.] provided light cavalry units.

The first mention of Rumanian political institutions south of the Carpathians occurs in the diploma granted by the king of Hungary to the Knights Hospitallers (1247). In 1330, Basarab reigned over the whole territory lying between the Danube and the Carpathians (Tara Românească) as an independent sovereign, after the victory over the Hungarian king Charles Robert. The dynasty founded by Basarab bore his name, which is of Kuman origin. Under his son Nicolaé Alexandru, the orthodox Rumanian Church was raised to metropolitan status. The first contact of Wallachia with the Ottomans took place in 1368 in the reign of Vladislav (1364-74 or 5). The reign of Mircea the Old (1358-1418) is memorable for a long series of struggles against Bâyezîd I. In 1391 Firuz Beg attacked Vidin and crossed the Danube into Wallachia. Enough booty was taken to provide endowments for charitable institutions in Bursa. In 1393 Mircea the Old lost Silistria. In the years that followed, war was waged between Wallachia and the Ottomans, and the monarch was temporarily replaced by a certain Vlad who recognized Ottoman suzerainty and, in 1394, paid tribute for the first time. After the battle of Varna, the resistance of Wallachia was only intensified by the sons of Bâyezîd I over the succession to the throne. The entry of Wallachia into the Turkish orbit gave rise to two political currents. In the struggle against Islam, some of the Boyars sought aid from the Magyar kingdom, and later from the royal houses of Austria or Russia; but rather than endure the war which this policy provoked, the others preferred to recognize Ottoman suzerainty. The whole course of Rumanian history was profoundly influenced by this conflict. In the 15th century Vlad the Devil (1436-49) struggled against the Turks, but in the end accepted their authority, thereby provoking a Hungarian campaign in the course of which he met his death. His son Vlad the Impaler (1456-62, 1476) fought against Mehemmed II without success. In the period of the Potocki princes (1527-92) the Turks were incorporated in the organization of the Ottoman Empire, as well as by printing religious books. It was at Bucharest that one of the oldest books in the Turkish language was printed in 1701.

The country received its first constitution in 1834; and this was replaced by a more liberal fundamental law in the anti-Russian revolutionary outburst of 1848. The Porte, urged on by St. Petersburg, quenched the revolution in blood. The Treaty of Paris (1856) was the origin of the union of Wallachia and Moldavia in a single state under prince Alexandru Ion Cuza (1859). As a result of the Peace of Berlin (1878), Rumania was recognized as an independent state.

The entry of Wallachia into the Ottoman system brought profound changes in its social and economic structure. The country lost the right to maintain commercial relations with other countries, and was compelled to provide Constantinople with a part of its supplies of cereals and live-stock. It must be emphasized that, despite the bonds of suzerainty, the Turks never had the right to establish themselves in Wallachia. This country played an important part in upholding eastern Christianity by large donations to the Orthodox Church. The intermingling of Rumanians with the Ottoman empire, as well as by printing religious books. It was at Bucharest that one of the oldest books in the Turkish language was printed in 1701.

EGÍR [see EGIN].

EGÍR (see EGIN). EGIN, now known as Kemâliye, a town in E. Anatolia on the right (west) bank of the Euphrates (Kara-Su), 40 kms. from ‘Arapkâr [q.v.], 130 kms. from El-Aziz and Malatya via ‘Arapkâr, and 150 kms. from Erzînjân [q.v.] (under which it comes administratively as the centre of a kâdd) from Erzindjan (under which it comes administratively as the centre of a kâdd) and 150 kms. from Erzînjân [q.v.] (under which it comes administratively as the centre of a kâdd) via the station of İilih on the Sivas [q.v.]–Erzurum [q.v.] railway. It is near the junction of the valley of the Euphrates narrowed by the outposts of the Monzur mountains of Dersim to the east and the Sarî-Çêkê mountains to the west. The valley which is situated here, at an altitude of 825 m. above sea level, is overlooked on the eastern side by a precipitous slope rising above it like a wall. The western slope is more gradual, rising like an amphitheatre round a small valley. It is here that Egin is built at an altitude of from 900 to 1000 metres. A spring higher up, known as Kâdd Gölü, waters the town’s gardens, feeds its fountains and turns its mills. It is said that the name Egin is derived from the Armenian word ագ (ahn), meaning “spring”, and that the town was founded in the 11th century by a group of Vaspurakan Armenians (see [q.v.]). In ancient times this district was ruled by local lords or changed hands in the wars between Rome and Persia (remains of Roman roads can still be seen). In Islamic times it was for short periods of time autonomous, before the foundation of the Saljûkî State and also after that State had become weaker. After the invasion of Tûmîr [q.v.], Egin was annexed to the Ottoman Empire in the reign of Sulṭân Mehmed I [q.v.]. It was for a long time attached to the liwâd of ‘Arapkâr in the eyvêt of Sivas [q.v.]. In the 19th century it passed into the vilayêt of Khârâbût [q.v.] and then into that of Mâ’mûret-ul-Azîz. After the foundation of the Turkish Republic the name of Egin was changed into Kemâliye after Mustafa Kemâl Pâsha (Atatîrkûr). The kâdd of Kemâliye formed part successively of the vilayêts of El-Azîz, Malatya and Erzînjân.

The Djîhân-nâmê, the Seyhâh-nâmê of Ewliyâ Çelebi [q.v.] and other 17th century sources mention Egin as a place of gardens and orchards producing an abundance of fruit. Ewliyâ Çelebi says that although Egin formed a kâdd of the eyvêt of Sivas, its taxes were collected by the mahkâtîl of Malatya. He adds that the castle of Egin had been surrendered to Sulṭân Mehmed I under a treaty and that the 300 Christians living there were immune from taxation. According to him, there were in Egin some 10,000 well-built houses with earth roofs. Sources in the first half of the 19th century praise the beauty of the town, whose houses were surrounded by greenery. Moltke, who visited Egin in April 1839, describes it as one of the most beautiful towns in Asia which he had seen, comparable to Amasya [q.v.]. Although he found Amasya a more pleasant and original place, he thought Egin more impressive and beautiful and its river more important. Although Moltke mentions Egin as a largely Armenian centre, Texier, as well as sources belonging to the second half of the 19th century, state that the Armenians were never in the majority there. According to Texier there were 2,000 Muslim households and only some 700 Armenian households in the town. Towards the end of the 19th century Yorke estimated the population of Egin at 15,000 and Cunet at 19,000, of whom some 12,000 were Turks and 7,000 Armenians. The Muslims of Egin were engaged in agriculture and particularly in cattle-breeding, as is the case today, while the Armenians were engaged in commerce and crafts. According to Ewliyâ Çelebi, the town was famous for its bows, bow-makers occupying most of the bazaar. In more recent times the town produced fine cotton goods, embroidered silks, embroidered head-cloths, handkerchiefs and towels. Moltke mentions that many citizens of Egin settled in Istanbul, where they found employment as butchers, porters, grocers, builders, merchants and money-changers, returning to their birth-place in their old age and building fine houses there. Some citizens of Egin reached high rank in the service of the State, including that of Minister. This custom of seeking employment outside their birth-place was also shared by the citizens of ‘Arapkâr, as well as by people from neighbouring villages. Some Armenians from Egin emigrated to America, returning occasionally to their town in their old age. Cunet writing in 1890 says that while some such Armenians returned rich and made fine houses for themselves their descendants wasted the money they inherited. Local industry declined as a result of European competition and the town lost its prosperity. Egin was badly affected by the First World War. According to the first results of the 1945 census the population of Egin amounted to 3,500 while the whole kâdd, which covered an area of 1333 sq. kms. and included 34 villages, numbered 16,900 people.


EGÎR (Turk., Egin; Hung., Eger; Ger., Erlau; Lat. and It., Agria), an old Hungarian town, 110 kms. to the north-east of Buda, situated close to the massif of Bûk, i.e., to the eastern foot-hills of the Matra mountains, and on the Ipoly or River Eger, which flows into the Tisza (Théiss). Egin was subject to Ottoman rule from 1005/1596 to 1699/1687. The Ottomans, in 955/1552, captured Temesvár and Szolnok (important in the future as a base for
the concentration of the men and supplies needed for the conquest and thereafter for the retention of Egrí) and then laid siege to Egrí itself, but in vain, all their assaults failing before the desperate resistance of the Christian garrison under Stephen Dobó (Ramaďán-Shawwál 999/September-October 1552).

Egrí was not in fact to come into Muslim hands until the long war of 1001-15/1593-1660 between the Austrian Habsburgs and the Ottomans. The first years of this war brought such disaster to the Ottoman cause that Sultan Mehemmed III (1003-12/1595-1603) was induced to take the field in person for the campaign of 1004-5/16/56. Near Szalánszéken the Sultan held a council of war, at which the decision was reached to make the capture of Egrí the main objective of the campaign (one of the Christian sources—Decsi, Commentarii, 252—notes that the “Begus Szolnokienisii”, i.e., the Sangaji Beg of Szolnok, in the spring of 1004/1596 (“sub idem ferme veris initium”), had reconnoitred and raided in force the lands around Egrí—a forerunner of the fate soon to befall the town). The decision of the Sultan and of the council of war rested on two considerations: that possession of Egrí would enable the Ottomans to threaten the narrow corridor of land through which ran the lines of communication between Austria and Transylvania, then in alliance with the Emperor against the Sultan, and that control of Egrí might bring under Ottoman dominion the mines located in the mountainous region to the north of the town (cf. Pečewi, ii, 191; Na'im, i, 146; HâgâdiMel KHALFA, i, 71; Decsi, Commentarii, 267; Hurnuzački, ii/2, 216. Marsigli, Danubius Pannonico-Mysicus, iii/2, Amsterdam 1726, 19 ff. contains a “Mappa Mineralogicalca”, which shows the mines existing in his own time to the north of Egrí). Egrí fell to the Ottomans after a siege of three weeks (28 Muharram-19 Şafar 1005/21 September-12 October 1596). Once the fortress was in their hands, the Ottomans began to repair forthwith the damage that it had suffered in the course of the siege, but their continued possession of Egrí was in fact ensured to them only by their defeat of the Imperialists in the great battle of Haci Ovasí (Mezo-Cserhát) fought not far from Egrí in Rabl (cf. also Giambattista Vico, Scriiti storici, ed. F. Nicolini, Barì 1939, index: 454) Français Forgacsii de Gymnes Pannomicii ... Narratio Historica, auctore M. Iansionisco (i.e., Decsi, Commentarii, 267; “De Expugnatione Agriae, et Fraelio ibidem ad Kerestamunt ... Narratio Historica, auctore M. Iansionisco”); Nicolai Istianscki Pannoni Historiarum De Rebus Ungarici Libri xxxix, Cologne 1622, 337 ff. and 693 ff.; Joh. Baptisstä Vici De Rebus Gestis Antonii Carapachi Liibri ii, Naples 1716, ii, 179 ff., 218 ff., 244 ff. (cf. also Giambattista Vico, Scriiti storici, ed. F. Nicolini, Barì 1939, index: 454) Français Forgacsii de Gymnes Pannomicii ... Narratio Historica Sui Temporis Commentarii, Possoni et Cassoviae 1788, 69 ff.; S. Katona, Historia Critica Regum Hungariae, Stirpis Austriacae, xxii, Buda 1794, 311 ff. and xxvii, Buda 1794, 307 ff.; Baronjaii Decsi János Magyar Historiája 1592-1598 (= Magyar Történelmi Emlekek, Oszt. 2: Írók, Két, ed. F. Toldy), Pest 1866, 212, 215 ff.; István Szilágyi, Commentario della Guerra di Transilvania, Venice 1566, 221 ff. (= Commentarii, ed. L. Gáldi, Budapest 1940, 221 ff.); G. Fantuzzi, Memorie della Vita dei Generale Co: Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, Bologna 1770, 64 ff.; Autobiografia di Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli, ed. E. Lovarini, Bologna 1930, 84 ff.; H. Marcaldi, A Parisi Nellitali Konvürdőbl, in Magyar Történelmi Tár (A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Történelmi Bizottsága, Folyam 2, Köt. 11, Budapest 1877, 83 ff. (op. cit., 113-22 = Narrazione de capitanio Claudio Cogonara de Parma della perdita d’Agria ... alli 13. ottobre 1596); Hieronymus Ortelius, Chronologia oder Historische beschreibung aller Krieger emporgenommen ... in Ober und Unter Ungern auch Sibenbürgen, Nürnberg 1602, 225 ff. and 1011 ff.; Shakespeare’s Europe. Unpublished chapters of Fynes Moryson’s itinerary, ed. C. Hughes, London 1903, 44 ff.; Purchas His Pilgrîmes, viii, Glasgow 1905, 304 ff., passim; Ferdiá ’al-al-Salâfîn, İstanbul 1264-5, ii, 2 ff. (a fehérnámé on the Ottoman conquest of Egrí in 1005/1596. British Museum Cotton Ms. Nero B.XI, 225 f. contains an Ital. trans. of the fehérnámé. English translation (from the Italian) in Sir Henry Ellis, Original letters illustrative of English history, 3rd Series, iii, London 1846, 140 ff.;
by the 12th century currently used for the town; a of the narrow strait separating Chalkis from the ponte', the regular Western name for both town and produced from the ace. [si£ TOP] "EypiTCOv 'Negro-supposed connexion with the bridge over the strait chief town, the classical Chalkis. Originally the name the theme of Hellas. At the partition of the Empire 1957), and by the beginning of the Ottoman- of Umur Pasha of Aydin (see P. Lemerle, Leveltdri KQzlemenyek, i, Cassel 1887, Bibliotheca Historico-Militaris, 169 ff., passim; pa...
fell into the hands of the Saldjiiks. After the dissolution of the Rum Saldjuk Empire, Egridir became the capital of the Turkish principality of the Hamid-oghlu. One of the first rulers of this dynasty, Falak al-Din Dündur at the end of the 15th century, gave the town the name Felek-bâr or Felekabâd (Abu'l-Fida', Ta'ahir, 379; translation ii, 2, 134). In 783 or 784/towards 1281 A.D., the last Hamid-oghlu, Hüseyin Beg, sold his rights to the Ottoman Murâd I. Timur conquered both the town and the fortified island Nis-Adaš on his march through Anatolia (according to Şâhâb on 17 Şâhâb 805/11 March 1403, according to Şâhar al-Din on 17 Râdiâb/10 February). He left them to the Kara-mânis, whom he had restored, but they, in turn, had to cede them, together with the region of Hamid-eli, to the Ottomans in 1425. It now became a liwa in the eyalet of Anadolu. Later on, in the 19th century, Hamid-eli, or Isbarta, as it was temporarily known, became a sandjak of the vilayet of Konya.

The most notable building is the citadel, probably built by Keykubad I, at the tip of the peninsula of Egridir. It is separated from the town itself by a wall, and there is an inner wall protecting the innermost part of the citadel, which lies on the tip of the peninsula (where there are further fortifications, including two towers which lean against the inner wall of the citadel). The citadel, and the town, destroyed, were still intact in the 18th century (see Voyage du Sieur Paul Lucas fait en 1714 . . . . . , Amsterdam 1720).

There is a mosque, the Ulu Djami', with wooden buttresses, near the gate of the citadel in the outer town; its minaret stands on the actual gate of the citadel. Opposite the mosque, there is the Tasl al-Madrasa, a court madrasa with an aynân and a beautiful Saldjkuk doorway dated Shawwâl 635/May-June 1238 (RCEA, xi, 96, no. 4148); the aynân is dated 701/1301-2 (ibid., 227, no. 5138).

Bibliography: Kâtîb Celebi, Dîvân­nâmesi, 640; I. H. Uzunçarşı, Anadolu beylükleri, 15; F. Sarre, Reise in Kleinasien, 1855, 142 ff.; IA, iv, 199-201 (Besim Darakt).

(E. H. Mördtmann-[Fr. Taeschner])

EGYPT [see MUSIR]

EKREM BEY, Reşâd-üâzâde Mahîmd (1847-1914), Turkish writer, poet and critic, one of the leading personalities in the victory of the modern school of poetry over traditional divân-poetry. Born in Vanîkoy, a suburb of Istanbul on the Bosphorus, he was the son of Reşâd-ü Efendi, director of the Government Press, and a poet and scholar of some distinction. He attended various schools until the age of fifteen and, like most of his contemporaries, continued his education as an apprentice clerk in the chancellery of the Foreign Ministry (where he met Nâmil Kemâl) and various other government offices. Subsequently he became a senior official of the Council of State (Şârâ-yi Devlet) and taught literature at the Galatasaray Lycée and the Imperial School of Political Science (Mûhiyye), two of the few leading institutions where the Turkish intelligentsia and ruling classes were educated, and exercised immense influence on the formation of the literary taste of the young generation. After the restoration of the Constitution in 1908 he became, for a short time, Minister of Wakfs and later Minister of Education in the Kâmil Paşa cabinet, but soon resigned as he disagreed with the policy of massive purges in the civil service. He was made a senator in December 1908 and remained so until his death. Ekrem Bey began by writing poems in the divân tradition until he came under the influence of the modernist Tâfâwyn school, particularly of Nâmil Kemâl and 'Âbd al-Hâqq Hamîd. Then gradually he developed a personality of his own and influenced even Hamîd's later work. His poetry is romantic, often over-sentimental and melancholy bordering sometimes on the junkârre (junkâr), constantly elaborating one of the three themes: nature, love and particularly death, helped in this by tragic circumstances in his life (he lost three children at a young age).

Although himself a poet of limited inspiration and not a very skilful versifier, he sincerely believed in a thorough revolution in the form and content of the Turkish arts, and became the pioneer fighter of modern Turkish poetry against the traditionalists headed by Mu'allim Nâdî. He was thus a link between the early modernists (Sîmsâ, Ziya (Diyâ) Paşa, Nâmil Kemâl, 'Âbd al-Hâqq Hamîd) and radical reformists of the Fikret school. The long and often bitter struggle, continued by the generation of Tevfîk Fikret (in the literary magazine Theresi-Fûnân where many young talents gathered first round Ekrem Bey), ended with the triumph of modernism during his lifetime, and Ekrem Bey's rôle in this, perhaps more as a critic and movement-leader than as a poet, is decisive. Hence the name Ustâd-â Ekrem given to him by his students and admirers. He was a friend and Art for Art's sake tendency of the Theresi-Fûnân school are also partly to be traced to Ekrem who was not as social or history-conscious as his predecessors.

Apart from articles and poems published in various reviews of the period and some booklets of minor importance, he is the author of Verse: (I) Nâmâs- seher (1871) and (II) Ya'dîghâr-i sebab (1873); (III) Zemâze in three parts (1885), the third of which contains his celebrated poem Yağmûrîhka 'or mazzarîl 'âlemî, considered his masterpiece; (IV) Nâfîls (1886) a collection of verse translations from the French romantics and La Fontaine; (V) Pejmûrdes (1894). Prose: (I) Muntahhabât meydân-ârisî (1873) a collection of his early writings, articles and translations, in the tradition of the old flowery style; (II) Mes Prisons Terdümess (1874), translation from the French of Silvio Pellico's Le mes prisonni, equally in the old fashioned ornate prose which was severely criticized by Nâmil Kemâl; (III) Nîdîjîd Ekrem (1900), in two volumes, interspersed with verse, some in syllabic metre. Into this book dedicated to his beloved son Nîdîjû, who died very young, the unhappy father put, in all detail, everything he remembered about him. It is on the whole written in a spontaneous and unadorned style and contains some of his best prose; (IV) Tezkeress (1858) contains his later, simpler and more personal prose; (V) Atala (1872), a translation, in bombastic and old fashioned style, of Chateaubriand's novel; (VI) Mukâsin Bey (1859), a rather mediocre sentimental novel; (VII) 'Araba sevâdî (1859, published 1896 and 1940), a much appreciated novel of emotional satire, in the manner of Turkish novels which attack and ridicule the aping of Western customs by snobs (cf. Ahmed Mîdhat's Felsefîn Bey ile Kâthîm Efendi (1875), Huseyn Rahîmîn Şîhî (1897) and Şîhîşerî (1900)); (VIII) Şemsâs (1856), a short narrative about the life and sudden death of a four year old peasant girl, adopted by the poet's family; (IX) Tâlim-î Edebiyâtî (1882), a book of arts poétique with examples, composed of his lectures at the Mûhiyye and first mimeographed in 1879, is his most important work, which revolutionized taste and literary theories and standards of the time. Contrary to tradition he gave in this book

Bibliography: Djihdnnumd, Katib Celebi, RCEA, xi, 96, no. 4148; the aynân is dated 701/1301-2 (ibid., 227, no. 5138).
many examples from contemporary writers and poets and made the new school popular among the majority of the educated youth; (X) Tahhir-i əshən (1886), literary criticism. Drama: (I) "Afşe Anı̄lisk" (1870), (III) 1928, after restoring the walls of 1265/1848. (III) Wuslat (1874) inspired by Nāmāl Kemāl's Zavilli Cöyür, (IV) Cih bim əş ərəfi, a comedy adapted from a tale of the Alif nəkdr wah-nəhər, published posthumously (1914 and 1941).

**Bibliography:** Ruschen Esgref, Divyarlar ki, Istanbul 1828, passim; İsməyi Habib, "Elbistan (Pləstantia) was in the hand of the Crusaders.**

**Elbasan (T. el-basam [fortress] which subdues the land),** town of central Albania (41° 06' N., 20° 06' E.), on the site of the ancient Scampis on the Via Egnatia, a strategic position controlling the fertile valley of the Shkumbi (anc. Genysos), which here emerges from the mountains. The fortress, round which the town grew up, was built with great speed at the command of Mejemmed II while Krujë (Kroya [q.v.]) was being unsuccessfully besieged in the summer of 1466, as a base for future operations against Iskandar Beg [q.v.; it resisted a siege in the following spring. At first administered as part of the sanjak of Öğür (Tursun, TOEM ilämme, 135), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa.

With the consolidation of the Ottoman hold on N. Albania and the Adriatic coast, the fortress rapidly lost its military importance (it was dismantled in 1870), but as a place of pilgrimage by the Muslims it continued to be revered (asbub al-kahf) until the 20th century. In 1920-1944, Elbasan belonged to the Albanian part of the Ottoman Empire as an independent (müssel mem) kâşâ in the iläm (region) of Elbasan, however, as the supposed place of rest of the Seven Sleepers (əşdb al-kahf) it was also revered as a place of pilgrimage by the Muslims (see F. Babinger, Die Ortlichkeit der Siebenschläferlegende in muslimischer Schau, in Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Kl. der Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Year 1957, no. 6, 1-9). Elbasan, however, developed as the political centre.

In the years between 1097 and 1105, Elbistan (Plantania) was in the hand of the Crusaders. Subsequently it changed hands several times, belonging in turn to the Crusaders of Antioch, the Dânămehdids of Siwâs and the Sâlîd-iks of Konya, finally remaining in the hands of these last in 1201. During the Anatolian (Kayseri) campaign in 675/1277, the Mamlûk Sultan Al-Zahir Baybars gained a great victory near Elbistan over the Mongol army of the Ilhân Abâlkâ in 1264/1847, it was also revered as a place of pilgrimage by the Muslims (see F. Babinger, Die Ortlichkeit der Siebenschläferlegende in muslimischer Schau, in Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Kl. der Österr. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Year 1957, no. 6, 1-9). Elbasan, however, developed as the political centre.

In the years between 1097 and 1105, Elbistan (Plantaia) was in the hand of the Crusaders. Subsequently it changed hands several times, belonging in turn to the Crusaders of Antioch, the Dânâmehdids of Siwâs and the Sâlîd-iks of Konya, finally remaining in the hands of these last in 1201. During the Anatolian (Kayseri) campaign in 675/1277, the Mamlûk Sultan Al-Zahir Baybars gained a great victory near Elbistan over the Mongol army of the Ilhân Abâlkâ in 1264/1847, it was assigned to the sanjak of Maraş in the wilâyet of Aleppô as an ordinary kâşâ. The most notable monument in Elbasan is the Ulu Dâji, which, according to an inscription on the gateway, was built in 659/1261 (CREA, x, 132, no. 4199) by the amîr Mubâriz al-Dîn Əfaw, but was later restored in the Ottoman style. On the way to Durazzo and Tirana, it is, after Tirana, the chief town of central Albania, with some 15,000 inhabitants.

**Bibliography:** F. Babinger, Die Gründung von Elbasan, in MSOS, xxxiv (1931), 94-103, plan, photograph, inscriptions; H. Inalcik, Hicrl 835 (1931), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa. With the consolidation of the Ottoman hold on N. Albania and the Adriatic coast, the fortress rapidly lost its military importance (it was dismantled in 1870), but as a base for future operations against Iskandar Beg [q.v.; it resisted a siege in the following spring. At first administered as part of the sanjak of Öğür (Tursun, TOEM ilämme, 135), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa.

With the consolidation of the Ottoman hold on N. Albania and the Adriatic coast, the fortress rapidly lost its military importance (it was dismantled in 1870), but as a base for future operations against Iskandar Beg [q.v.; it resisted a siege in the following spring. At first administered as part of the sanjak of Öğür (Tursun, TOEM ilämme, 135), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa.

With the consolidation of the Ottoman hold on N. Albania and the Adriatic coast, the fortress rapidly lost its military importance (it was dismantled in 1870), but as a base for future operations against Iskandar Beg [q.v.; it resisted a siege in the following spring. At first administered as part of the sanjak of Öğür (Tursun, TOEM ilämme, 135), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa.

With the consolidation of the Ottoman hold on N. Albania and the Adriatic coast, the fortress rapidly lost its military importance (it was dismantled in 1870), but as a base for future operations against Iskandar Beg [q.v.; it resisted a siege in the following spring. At first administered as part of the sanjak of Öğür (Tursun, TOEM ilämme, 135), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa.

With the consolidation of the Ottoman hold on N. Albania and the Adriatic coast, the fortress rapidly lost its military importance (it was dismantled in 1870), but as a base for future operations against Iskandar Beg [q.v.; it resisted a siege in the following spring. At first administered as part of the sanjak of Öğür (Tursun, TOEM ilämme, 135), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa.

With the consolidation of the Ottoman hold on N. Albania and the Adriatic coast, the fortress rapidly lost its military importance (it was dismantled in 1870), but as a base for future operations against Iskandar Beg [q.v.; it resisted a siege in the following spring. At first administered as part of the sanjak of Öğür (Tursun, TOEM ilämme, 135), within a few years Elbasan was made the chief-lieu of a separate sanjak of Rumili, having (ca. 926-1520) four kâşâ: Elbasan, Çermeni, Ishqabat and Draça (Durazzo). In the later years of the Empire it formed part of the wilâyet of Yanya, and finally of İskôdrowa.
ELÇİ, a Turkish word meaning envoy, from el or il, country, people, or state, with the occupational suffix -çi, to denote the ruler of a land or people; its normal meaning, however, since early times, has been that of envoy or messenger, usually in a diplomatic, sometimes, in mystical literature, in a figurative religious sense. In Ottoman Turkish it became the normal word for an ambassador, together with the more formal Arabic term sefîr. From an early date the Ottoman sultans exchanged occasional diplomatic missions, for courtesy or negotiation, with other Muslim rulers (in Anatolia, Egypt, Morocco, Persia, India, Central Asia, etc.) and also sent a number of missions to various European capitals. From the 16th century, in accordance with the growing European practice of continuous diplomacy through resident embassies, European states established permanent missions in Istanbul. The Ottoman government, however, made no attempt to respond to this practice until the end of the 18th century, preferring to rely, for contact with the European powers, on the foreign missions in Istanbul, and on occasional special embassies despatched to one or another European capital for some immediate and limited purpose. It was the custom for such envoys, in addition to their official reports, to write a general history of their travels and experiences. A number of these accounts have survived in part or in full, and some of them have been published. In 1792 Selim III decided to establish permanent resident embassies in Europe. The first was opened in London in 1793 (on the reasons for this choice see Djiedet, Ta’rîhî, vi, 257-60), and was followed by others in Vienna, Berlin, and Paris. This first experiment gradually petered out, the embassies, left in charge of Greek officials, being finally closed on the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence in 1821. A new start was made in the eighteen-thirties with the opening of permanent embassies in London, Paris and Vienna and a legation in Berlin, and the despatch of envoys extraordinary (fawk al-selîret) to Tehran and St. Petersburg. These were followed by further resident missions in Europe, in Austria (Tehran embassy 1849) and America (Washington legation 1857), and the organization of a foreign ministry. In earlier times envoys were usually chosen from among the bureaucratic and ulumî classes. A number of these accounts have survived in part or in full, and some of them have been published. In 1792 Selim III decided to establish permanent resident embassies in Europe. The first was opened in London in 1793 (on the reasons for this choice see Djiedet, Ta’rîhî, vi, 257-60), and was followed by others in Vienna, Berlin, and Paris. This first experiment gradually petered out, the embassies, left in charge of Greek officials, being finally closed on the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence in 1821. A new start was made in the eighteen-thirties with the opening of permanent embassies in London, Paris and Vienna and a legation in Berlin, and the despatch of envoys extraordinary (fawk al-selîret) to Tehran and St. Petersburg. These were followed by further resident missions in Europe, in Austria (Tehran embassy 1849) and America (Washington legation 1857), and the organization of a foreign ministry. In earlier times envoys were usually chosen from among the bureaucratic and ulumî classes. At first there was some uncertainty about grades and ranks; in the 19th century the European terminology of ambassador, minister plenipotentiary, and chargé d'affaires for heads of missions, was adopted. The first was rendered büyüük eller or sefîr-i hebîr, the second oria eller or simply sefîr, the third maslahat-gizî. Bibliography: Djiedet, Ta’rîhî, vi, 85-9, 128-30, 231-2; IA, article Elci (Mecudud Mansuroğlu); J. Hurewitz, Ottoman diplomacy and the European state system, in MEJ, (1961), 141-52 (reprinted in Belletrum, xxv (1961), 455-66). On European diplomats in Istanbul see B. Spuler, Die europäische Diplomatie in Konstantinopel bis zum Frieden von Beograd (1739), in Jahrb. f. Kultur u. Gesch. d. Slaven, n.s. xi (1935) and Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, i (1936), and Zarif Orung, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda nâmé ve hedîye getiren êşîrêê eşîre yapilan merasim, in Tarih vesikalan, i/6 (1942), 407-13. For lists of envoys sent to and from Istanbul until 1774, see Hammer-Purgstall, GOR, ii, 393-34 (Histoire, xvii, 134-68); Ottoman ambassadors from 1520/1834 onwards are listed in the Ottoman Foreign Office yearbooks (Sâhnâmâ-i neşrî-i hâdîyiyeyin, 1302 A.H., 178-95, and later editions). On the sefîrednames see Bursali Mehmed Tahir, 6ışmâlî mülî‘îfî, iii, 189-90; F. Taeschner in ZDMG, lxvii (1923), 73-8; Babinger, GOW, 323-32; B. Lewis, The Muslim discovery of Europe, in preparation. See further Kâşî, Ter-pîmân, Vâlâvâc, and, for a general survey of Muslim diplomacy and diplomatic practice, safîr. (B. Lewis)

ELDEM, KHALİL EDHEM, Turkish archeologist and historian, was born on 24 (?) June 1861 in Istanbul. He was the youngest son of the grand vizier Ibrahim Edhem Pasha [q.v.]. After completing his primary school course in Istanbul, he continued, from 1876, his secondary education in Berlin, and later studied chemistry and natural sciences in the University of Zurich and at the Polytechnic School of Vienna. In 1883 he received the Ph. D. degree from the University of Berne. Back in Istanbul he was appointed to an office in the Ministry of War and transferred later to the General Staff Administration of the Ottoman Empire. He found his vocation when he was nominated in 1892 as deputy administrator of the Imperial Museum, where his eldest brother 6ışmâl Hamdi Bey [q.v.] occupied the post of general director. Upon the death of his brother, he was charged on 28 February 1910 with the administration of the Imperial Museum, an important post which he held until his retirement, on 28 February 1931. His ability as administrator and scholar is shown in the organization of the Imperial Museum. He enlarged and classified the collections of the main Archeological Museum and founded in 1892, in a building in the Ancient Near Eastern Section of the Museum. He also organized the Topkapı Sarayı [q.v.] upon the opening of this palace as a museum under his administration. His publications cover the fields of archaeology, numismatics, sigillography, epigraphy and history (for his bibliography see Halil Edhem Hâsira Kitâbî, i, 299-302). His works on sigillography and epigraphy are the first studies in this disciplinary history of history published in Turkey. The book entitled Dâwel-i İslâmîyye, Istanbul 1927, a revised and enlarged translation of S. Lane-Poole’s Mohammedan dynasties, attests his wide knowledge of Islamic history. His scholarship won him a world-wide reputation: he was a member of national and foreign academies, honorary doctor of the Universities of Basle and Leipzig, and honorary professor of the University of Istanbul. He died 16 November 1938 in Istanbul, being a member of the Turkish Parliament. Bibliography: Halil Edhem Hâsira Kitâbî, ii, Ankara 1948; Arif Müfit Mansel, Halil Edhem Edehm, in Ülkü, xii, 383-6; Aziz Ogan, Bay Halil Edhem, in Yeni Türk, no. 73, 4-8; Ibrahim Alaettin Gövsa, Türk meşhûrlar ansiklopedisi, Istanbul 1946, 165-9. (E. Kurâñ)

ELEGEY [see MARIKIV].

ELEPHANT [see FEL].

ELEİPÔH [see AÎL],

ELİSIAH [see ILYÂS].

ELİTAŞ [see AIÂT].

ELİTE [see AL-ca-masa wîl-ÁMMâ].

ELİXİR [see AI-îKîN].

ELKASS MİRZA [see AI-KAS MİRZÂ].

ELMA DÂGHÎ, name of several ranges of mountains in Anatolia; 1) south-east of Ankara, 2) north-west of Elmalı (2905 m. [see 8,218 ft.]). (F. TAESCHNER)
ELMALI — EMIN

ELMALI, earlier spelling Elmalu (Turkish = "Appletown"), a small town in south-western Anatolia, 36° 45' N., 29° 55' E., altitude 1150 m. (= 3,772 ft.), on a small plain, surrounded by high mountains (Elma Dağları 2505 m. (= 8,218 ft.) in the north, Bey Dağları 3086 m. (= 10,124 ft.) in the south-east), in the vicinity of the small lake Kara-Göl. This lake flows into a cave, Elmali Dündeni. Elmali is capital of a kaza in the vilâyet of Antalya, and has 4,967 inhabitants (1950); the kaza has 23,993 inhabitants.

Elmali, in the ancient region of Lycia, is a pretty little town among the mountains (Elma Dağları 2505 m. (= 8,218 ft.) in the north, Bey Dağları 3086 m. (= 10,124 ft.) in the south-east), in the vicinity of the small lake Kara-Göl. This lake flows into a cave, Elmali Dündeni. Elmali is capital of a kaza in the vilâyet of Antalya, and has 4,967 inhabitants (1950); the kaza has 23,993 inhabitants.

Elmali was the capital of the Turcoman principality of Tekke [q.v.], which was acquired in 830/942 by Murâd II, and henceforth became a liwâ of the eyâlet of Anadolu. The main centre of the liwâ of Tekke shifted to Antalya, and Elmali became a kâdâ. In the 19th century, it was a kâdâ of the sanâbî of Antalya (Adalia) in the vilâyet of Konya.

The so-called Tâbâkâdâ, woodcutters suspected of being Shia, have settled in the wooded surroundings of Elmali and they sell their wood in the entrance hall (reported by K. Erdmann).

In the north, Bey Dağları 3086 m. (= 10,124 ft.) are the highest peaks of Anadolu. The main centre of the liwâ of the Topkapi palace in Istanbul. The most important are a group of objects said to have belonged to the Prophet; they included his cloak (khîrîka-i sherîf [q.v.]), a prayer-rug, a flag, a bow, a staff, a pair of horseshoes, as well as a tooth, some hairs (see Lînyâ), and a stone bearing the Prophet's footprint. In addition there are weapons, utensils and garments said to have belonged to the ancient prophets, to the early Caliphs, and to various Companions, a key of the Ka'ba, and Kur'âns said to have been written by the Caliphs 'Uṯmân and 'Âli. Under the Sultans these relics were honoured in the annual ceremony of the Khîrîka-i sa'dâ'î, held on 15 Ramâdân.

Bibliography: For a detailed description, with illustrations, see Tahsin Öztürk, Hırka-Sâadel dârensî ve Emanet-i Muhaddese, Istanbul 1953; on the Muslim attitude to relics in general, see I. Goldziher, Muh. St., ii, 356-68, and the article Aṭhar. (Ed.)

EMBALMING [see Hînâta].

EMBLEM [see Îhîrâ].

EMESA [see Hîms].

EMIGRATION [see Îlîya, Hîdâra and Muhâdîrîn].

EMIN, from Arabic āmin [q.v.], faithful, trustworthy, an Ottoman administrative title usually translated intestine or commissioner. His function or office was called āmanî. The primary meaning of āmin, in Ottoman official usage, was a salaried officer appointed by or in the name of the Sultan, usually by bâdî, to administer, supervise or control a department, function or source of revenue. There were thus various kinds of stores and supplies, of mints, of mines, of customs-houses and other revenues, and of the tâbîr [q.v.], the preparation of the registers of land, tenure, population and revenue of the provinces and the distribution of fiëls (see Dâftar-i ẖârâ̄nî and Tâmârîn). In the words of Prof. Inalcik, "the āmanî of tâbîr required great knowledge, carried great responsibility, and at the same time was susceptible to corruption and abuse; usually influential beys and kâdis were appointed to it". In principle, the āmin was a salaried government commissioner, and not a tax-farmer, grantee, or lessee of any kind. His duty might be to represent the government in dealings with such persons, or himself to arrange for the collection of the revenues in question. When concerned with revenues, he was to have no financial interest in the proceeds, which he was required to remit in full to the treasury. The term āmin is also used of agents and commissioners appointed by authorities other than the Sultan—by the kâdis, for example, and even by the tax-farmers themselves, who appointed their own agents to look after their interests. At times, by abuse, the āmines themselves appear as tax-farmers.

In the capital, the title āmin was also borne by a number of high-ranking officers, in charge of certain departments and services. Such for example were the commissioners of the powder magazines (bâdîl-khâbân āminî), of the arsenal (târsânî [q.v.] āminî), and of the dâftar-i khâbân (defter āmin or defter-i khâbân āminî). The highest ranking holders of this title were the four emîns attested to the external services (bîrân [q.v.] of the palace: the city commissioner (Şehrî āminî [q.v.]), concerned with palace...
with Khartoum were cut after April 1883. The defeat of an Egyptian expeditionary force at Sha'kyakin (5 November 1883) was followed by the Mahdist conquest of the Bahr al-Ghazal [q.v.], the neighbouring province of Emin's. In May 1884, Emin received a letter from Karam Allâh Kurkurâshî, the Mahdist military governor of the Bahr al-Ghazal, demanding the surrender of his province. Emin's officers advised capitulation, and to gain time he sent a delegation to Karam Allâh, and moved his headquarters to Wadelai (Walad Lây) in April 1885. However, the Mahdist forces withdrew from the Equatorial Province. For over two years, Emin remained undisturbed, although with diminished and precarious authority. In March 1886, he received a despatch from Nûbûr Pangta, the Egyptian prime minister, dated 13 Shâbân 1302/27 May 1885, informing him of the abandonment of the Sudan, and authorizing him to withdraw with his men to Zanzibar. Meanwhile projects for relieving Emin were being mooted in Europe. An expedition was organized and partly financed by a British committee including persons interested in East African commerce. The Egyptian government also subsidized the project. The expedition was headed by H. M. Stanley, who was an agent of Leopold II of the Belgians. Taking the Congo route, Stanley met Emin by Lake Albert on 29 April 1888. Emin was most unwilling to leave his post, and Stanley put before him alternative proposals: that he should continue to administer the Equatorial Province on behalf of the Congo Free State, or that he should establish a station by Lake Victoria for the British East Africa Company. Emin rejected these proposals, and Stanley left to bring up the rest of his expedition. During his absence, mutiny broke out among some of Emin's troops, who were suspicious of recent developments, and unwilling to go to Egypt. Emin was held by the mutineers at Dufîle. Meanwhile, on 11 June 1888, a Mahdist expeditionary force under 'Umar Safîb had left Omdurman in steamers. This reached Lado on 11 October, and summoned Emin to surrender. The mutineers resisted the Mahdist forces, and on 16 November Emin was released. He withdrew to Lake Albert, where he was rejoined in January 1889 by Stanley. In April, Stanley began his march to the coast, unwillingly accompanied by Emin. Emin then entered the German service in East Africa. He led an expedition in what is now Tanganyika. Thence he entered the fringes of his old province, to try to attract some of his former followers. With his expedition reduced to desperate straits by smallpox, he endeavoured to reach the Congo, but was murdered by a tribal chief on or shortly after 23 October 1892.

**Bibliography:**

**EMIN, MEHMET, [see YURDAKUL, MEHMET EMİN].**

**EMİN PASA (Eduard Carl Oscar Theodor Schnitzer)** was born on 28 March 1840 at Oppeln in Prussian Silesia. He graduated in medicine at Berlin in 1864. He entered the Ottoman service as a medical officer in Albania in 1865, and assumed the name of Khâyr Allâh; later, in the Sudan, he became known as Mehmed Emin (Muhammad Amln, not al-?), who had previously entered the region in 1869. From 1869 to 1886, he was second in command of Emin's troops, who were suspicious of recent developments, and unwilling to go to Egypt. Emin was held by the mutineers at Dufîle. Meanwhile, on 11 June 1888, a Mahdist expeditionary force under 'Umar Safîb had left Omdurman in steamers. This reached Lado on 11 October, and summoned Emin to surrender. The mutineers resisted the Mahdist forces, and on 16 November Emin was released. He withdrew to Lake Albert, where he was rejoined in January 1889 by Stanley. In April, Stanley began his march to the coast, unwillingly accompanied by Emin. Emin then entered the German service in East Africa. He led an expedition in what is now Tanzania. His expedition was attacked by smallpox, he endeavoured to reach the Congo, but was murdered by a tribal chief on or shortly after 23 October 1892.

**Bibliography:**
Government archives (Cairint 3/14, 236); photostat in the School of Oriental and African Studies, London.

EMIR [see AMIR].

EMIR SULTAN, SAYYID SHAMS AL-DIN, PUBLISHED as EMIR Seyyid, or EMIR Sultan, the patron saint of Bursa (Brusa). He is supposed to have been a descendant of the 12th Imam, Muhammad al-Mahdi, and hence a Sayyid. His father, Sayyid 'Ali, known under the name of EMIR Külü, was a Sufi in Bugha. He himself, born in Bugha (in 720/1320), joined the Nūr-bakshiyah and built one of the Kubrawiyya in his early youth. Some Mendkib-nâmes assert that he was a follower of the Imamiyya. After his hajjī, EMIR Sultan spent some time in Medina, and then went to Anatolia via Karaman, Hamid-eli, Küttahya and Ine-Göl. Finally he reached Bursa, where he dwelt in a cell (sa'ama), and led a life of good works. Within a short time, he gained great fame, gathered disciples around him, and entered into contact with the 'ulema and Shaykh of Bursa. He was highly esteemed by Sultan Bayazid I Yildirim, and married his daughter, Khundi Sultan, by whom he had three children (a son and two daughters). He was asked to invest the sultan with his sword when the latter went into battle, and his admonitions decided the sultan to refrain from excessive drinking (cf. the anecdote in Ewliya Celebi, Narrative of Travels, ii, 45; also it is said that EMIR Sultan successfully restrained Bayezid from the illegal execution of Timur's ambassadors (Ali, Künk, v, 83 f.). EMIR Sultan was captured when Bursa was taken by one of Timur's scouting parties in 805/1402, and brought before Timur, who gave him the choice of accompanying him to Samarkand, but EMIR Sultan preferred to return to Bursa (Sa'd al-Din, i, 188 f.).

Legend does not mention this incident; it does, on the other hand, report that the departure of Timur's troops from Bursa was a miracle worked by the saint (Sa'd al-Din, ii, 427). When Murad II began his reign in 824/1421, he asked EMIR Sultan to intercede with his sword and the saint is also said to have accelerated the defeat of the 'False Musafat' (Mustafat Düzme, [q.v.], who contested Murad II's right to the throne, by the force of his prayers ('Ali, 195 f.; Leunclavius, Hist. Mus., 493 f.). In the next year, he, and following a 200 dervishes, took part in the siege of Constantinople. The fall of the city, which he prophesied, did not, however, occur. Kanano, a Byzantine who took part in the siege, gives a detailed and vivid description of the appearance of the Mir-Sayyid (Musağat-i Beyza), the 'Patriarch of the Turks', as he calls EMIR Sultan (ed. Bonn, 466 ff., 477 ff.); the Ottoman historians, on the other hand, do not mention this lack of success. EMIR Sultan died in 833/1429 in Bursa, as a result of the plague. Soon afterwards legends told of miracles (Mendkib) wrought by the saint.

A splendid mausoleum (which became one of the most visited places of pilgrimage in Turkey) was erected over the grave of EMIR Sultan at the eastern end of the town. The mosque attached to it was built in its present form by Selim III (inscription of 1239/1824).

Bibliography: Tashköprüzade, i, 76 f. (transl. O. Rescher, 30 f.); Sa'd al-Din, ii, 425-7; 'Ali, Künk, v, 112; Gelin, S. rivâ'd-i türfan, c, 797; Ewliya Celebi, Seyhânatnâme, ii, 47 ff.; Le Beau, Histoire du Bas-Empire, Paris 1836, xxi, 104 ff.; Hammer-Purgstall, i, 234 f., 431, 643 (references of the last two chiefly concern the role played by EMIR Sultan in the siege of Constantinople); further bibliography, especially hagiographic, from the Mendkibnâmes, see IY, iv, 261-3 (M. Cavid Baysun).

J. H. Mordtmann-[F. Taeschner]

EMPEDOCLES [see ANDREUS].

EMRELI (EMRÊLî, IMRÊLî or IMRÊLî), a semi-sedentary Turkmen tribe which since the 10th/16th century has dwelt in Khorasan, in the region of Guran. Driven back at the end of the 12th/18th century by the Tekkes (Tekins), the tribe emigrated northwards and, in two successive waves, settled down in Khârîz (region of Hudjalay on the Amân Kül canal), the first in 1803 and the second in 1827 when they submitted to the Khâns of Khiva. In 1873 (I. Ibrahimov, Nekotore zamecki o Khovanskhî Türkmenê i Kırısâ, in Voenn. Sbornik, xcviii (1874), no. 9, 133-51), they owned nearly 10,000 tents. At the present time the Emrels inhabit the Ilyall region, west of Tashjaw, between the Yomuds in the south and the Goklens and Cowdors in the north. An isolated settlement exists in the Ashkâbêd region (district of Kaakhkha).

Since the Russian conquest the Emrels have been sedentary, and are engaged in agriculture and sheep-rearing.

Detailed information on the history of the tribe in the 19th century is contained in the recent work by Yu. E. Bregel, Khorezmski Türkmen v XIX vek. (Moscow (Acad. of Sc., Institute of Asian Peoples) 1961.)

ENAMEL [see MAI].

ENDERUN (pers. Andarun, "inside"; turk. Enderun). The term Enderun (or Enderun-i Hümâyûn) was used to designate the "Inside" Service (as opposed to Bürün, [q.v.], the "Outside" Service) of the Imperial Household of the Ottoman Sultan: i.e., to denote the complex of officials engaged in the personal and private service of the Sultan—included therein was the system of Palace Schools—and placed under the control of the Chief of the White Eunuchs, the Bâb al-Safa'det Aghas (the Agha of the Gate of the Court). On the other hand, report that the departure of Timur's troops from Bursa was a miracle worked by the saint (Sa'd al-Din, ii, 427). When Murad II began his reign in 824/1421, he asked EMIR Sultan to intercede with his sword and the saint is also said to have accelerated the defeat of the 'False Musafat' (Mustafat Düzme, [q.v.], who contested Murad II's right to the throne, by the force of his prayers ('Ali, 195 f.; Leunclavius, Hist. Mus., 493 f.). In the next year, he, and following a 200 dervishes, took part in the siege of Constantinople. The fall of the city, which he prophesied, did not, however, occur. Kanano, a Byzantine who took part in the siege, gives a detailed and vivid description of the appearance of the Mir-Sayyid (Musağat-i Beyza), the 'Patriarch of the Turks', as he calls EMIR Sultan (ed. Bonn, 466 ff., 477 ff.); the Ottoman historians, on the other hand, do not mention this lack of success. EMIR Sultan died in 833/1429 in Bursa, as a result of the plague. Soon afterwards legends told of miracles (Mendkib) wrought by the saint.

A splendid mausoleum (which became one of the most visited places of pilgrimage in Turkey) was erected over the grave of EMIR Sultan at the eastern end of the town. The mosque attached to it was built in its present form by Selim III (inscription of 1239/1824).

Bibliography: Tashköprüzade, i, 76 f. (transl. O. Rescher, 30 f.); Sa'd al-Din, ii, 425-7; 'Ali, Künk, v, 112; Gelin, S. rivâ'd-i türfan, c, 797; Ewliya Celebi, Seyhânatnâme, ii, 47 ff.; Le Beau, Histoire du Bas-Empire, Paris 1836, xxi, 104 ff.; Hammer-Purgstall, i, 234 f., 431, 643 (references of the last two chiefly concern the role played by EMIR Sultan in the siege of Constantinople); further bibliography, especially hagiographic, from the Mendkibnâmes, see IY, iv, 261-3 (M. Cavid Baysun).

J. H. Mordtmann-[F. Taeschner]

V. J. PARRY

ENDEMİYE [see ANDÜMAN, DİAMYIVYA]

ENDIÜR [see ANKARA]

ENGÜRÜS [see MAKARİŞTAN and ÜNURDİŞ]

ENİF [see NIGİDEM]  

ENNAYER [see INNAYER]

ENOCH [see İBİR]

ENOS (also İNOS), Ottoman name for the classical Ainos, now Enez, town on the Aegean coast of Thrace (40° 43' N., 26° 03' E.) on the east bank of the estuary of the Merić (q.v., anc. Hebros). From classical times until the late century it was a prosperous harbour, on an important trade route from the upper Merić Valley and across the isthmus from the Black Sea, with valuable and much-coveted salt pans. With Lesbos (T. Midilli, q.v.) it passed to Turkey in 1456, when Mehmed II with the pretext to intervene: at his death of Palamede Gattelusi in 1455, family quarrels ensued, and the region was thenceforth a kada of the sandjak of Gallipoli. The silting of the river (q.v.) of the upper Merić, and the complaints of neighbouring Muslims that the Turks were encroaching on it, the construction of the railway (now barely navigable), the construction of the rail-

G. Hirschfeld; F. W. Hasluck, Beyond the Sublime Porte, New York 1931, 47 ff., passim; (listing various European accounts of the Seraglio); Gibb-Bowen, i/1, 72, 77 ff., 331 ff.; B. Lewis, Istanbul and the civilization of the Ottoman Empire, London 1963, 65 ff.

The family was from Manastir (Bitolj) in Macedonia, and moved there again when Enwer was a boy. After completing his secondary schooling there, Enwer entered the military academy (Mekteb-i Harbiyeye) in Istanbul, completing both the regular officers' course and the advanced general staff course. He graduated second in his class on 5 December 1902 (the first was his close friend and life-long associate Hafiz İsmail Hakkı Pasha, 1879-1915; see Muharrem Azimzade (Iskora), Erkinkahramiye mektubi. Tarihi, Istanbul 1930, 240) as a general staff captain and was posted to the Third Army in Macedonia. He spent the next three years in military operations against Macedonian guerrillas. In September 1906, he was assigned with the rank of major to Third Army headquarters in Mimana. There he joined, as member no. 12, the "Oğlan Mülten İtilâh we Terakkl Djejmîyiyeti, the conspiratorial nucleus of the Young Turk movement, and in the following years helped to spread its organization. When the Istanbul authorities launched an investigation into these secret activities, Enwer, who with a group of soldiers had ambushed one of the investigating officers, deemed it wise to refuse a call for promotion and reassignment to Istanbul; instead, in late June, 1908, he escaped with a group of followers into the Macedonian hills, an example soon followed by Bolaghâşî (senior captain) Ahmed Niyâzi of Resne and Eyüby Sabîr (Akgül) of Ohri. Their action proved to be the prelude to the Young Turk revolution of 24 July, 1908. At only 26 years of age, Enwer was widely acclaimed as the foremost hero of revolution and liberty.

While on liaison service with Austrian officers in Macedonia Enwer had studied German and military tactics. In 1909 he was posted as military attache" to Berlin where he deepened his lifelong admiration for German military power and efficiency. In 1909 he briefly returned to Turkey to participate in the action of the Holy Erciyes in suppressing the Istanbul mutiny of 13 April 1909 (the so-called Oktûbâr Mart wakâlas). In the autumn of 1911, he resigned his post in Berlin to volunteer for service in the Libyan war, where he fought with distinction. On 5 June 1912 he earned a double promotion to lieutenant-colonel. In September he also was appointed mutasarrif of the sandjak of Benghzâ. Back in Istanbul, he participated actively in the politics of the Society for Union and Progress (İttihad we Terakkl Djejmîyiyeti [q.v.]) and at its 1912 congress helped secure the post of secretary general for his contemporary Talat Pasha. On 23 January 1913 he led a raid on the Sublime Porte by a group of Unionist officers and soldiers who forced at gun point the resignation of the aging Grand Wezir Kâmil Paşa (through the excessive zeal of one of the group, Muştafa Neşib, the war minister Nâzım Paşa and two other persons were killed). The major aim of the participants in this "Sublime Porte Incident" (Rûbeysi' Âli wakâlas) was the energetic resumption of the First Balkan War after the truce at Cataldja (3 December 1912 to 30 January 1913), but instead the campaign of the late winter of 1913 resulted in the complete evacuation of Macedonia and most of Thrace. The coup brought to power a Unionist party cabinet under Mâhmut Shewket Pasha and its long-range effect was the conversion of the constitutional monarchy of 1908 into a partisan and military dictatorship, with only a semblance of parliamentary institutions, which was to last until the defeat of 1918. In the Second Balkan War Enwer was the chief of staff of the left wing, and as such was in the vanguard of the troops re-entering Erdirne on 22 July 1913.
(under the Sultan's nominal authority). He became a lieutenant-general in 1915 and a general (birinci ferik) in 1917. After the accession of Mehemed V Wahid al-Din Altunshah, he replaced in 1918 as head of the Army's General Staff (erkan-i barisuye reisi). His nearly five years in the War Office and at General Headquarters were characterized by intensive efforts to increase the efficiency of the armed forces. In his first few months in office, he presided over a purge in which the aging generals of the 'Abd al-Hamid period, who were held responsible for the disastrous Balkan War defeat, were put on the inactive list and replaced by energetic younger officers. Enwer is credited with introducing the practice of appointing officers to temporary higher rank so as to test their ability. He also personally designed a new military cap (known as the Enweriyye) and invented a simplified Arabic script, based on disconnected letters, which, however, found no wide acceptance. On 5 March 1914, Enwer married Emme Nadjjiye Sultan, a niece of the reigning monarch.

In the Ottoman diplomatic moves of the spring and summer of 1914, Enwer was the most consistent advocate of a close alliance with Germany and the Central Powers. After fruitless negotiations by Djemal Pasha in Paris and Tal'at in Bucharest, Enwer moved to Berlin to negotiate with the German Ambassador, Baron von Wangenheim, with the proposal of a secret offensive and defensive alliance. On the Ottoman side the ensuing negotiations were conducted mainly by Enwer himself and the Grand Vizier Sa'd al-Hashim Pasha with the knowledge of only a few of their colleagues; they were kept secret from the other ministers and also from the francophile Ottoman diplomat to Berlin, Sadyk ibn Mehemet Turan. After the German Admiral Souchon in mid-August had entered Ottoman waters and succeeded in bringing to the German Ambassador the German request for a defensive alliance, Enwer obtained the German authorization on 14 September to carry out an encirclement manoeuvre against the advancing Russian forces in the Sarikamış region, which had become untenable, and on 14 October, the Grand Vizier Tal'at Pasha resigned with his Unionist cabinet so as to facilitate the impending armistice negotiations. On 2 November 1918, Enwer, Tal'at, Djemal [qq.v.], Dr. Nâzım and other prominent Unionists assembled at night in the house of Enwer's aide-de-camp Kârlımı [Orbay] in Arnavutköy on the
Bosphorus, and boarded a German naval vessel that brought them to Odessa. Although Enwer had plans to go to the Caucasus (Ziya Şakir, 156 f.), he later joined with others in Berlin, and Enwer, Djemal, and Dr. Nazım. Enwer spent the winter of 1918-9 in Berlin. Since the Entente powers were demanding the extradition of the Young Turks, they lived semi-legally; Enwer himself adopted the name "(Professor) Ali Bey", which he later also used in Russia. Whereas Taš'at and other civil leaders centered their political activities on Berlin and Munich, Enwer and Djemal proceeded at different times to Russia and then Central Asia, where they were joined by Enwer's uncle Khalil (see below) and other former associates in a complex web of political manoeuvres. In April 1919, Enwer secured the services of a pilot and airplane and with false Russian identity papers set out for Moscow. When mechanical trouble forced the plane to land in Lithuania, Enwer was detained for several weeks until his friends in Berlin established his identity and secured his release. After several months in Berlin, where he visited the Bolshevik leader, the Young Turk Khalil stayed on in Austria. In August 1920, Enwer on second try did make his way to Moscow where he arrived early in 1920. He took up contact with the Soviet Foreign Office, with Lenin, with a Turkish nationalist delegation under Bekir Sâmi which was then in Moscow, and, by correspondence, with Mustâfa Kemal. With the encouragement of the Soviet authorities, he proclaimed the formation of a "Union of Islamic Revolutionary Societies" (İslâm İktidâl Diyetleri Ittihatî) and of an affiliated People's Councils Party (Khalk Şhîrâlar Fîrçasî), the former intended as a Muslim revolutionary international, the latter as its Turkish affiliate. On 1-9 September 1920 he attended the Soviet-sponsored Congress of the Peoples of the East at Baku with the title of Delegate of the Revolutionary Societies of Libya, Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco (chosen perhaps because of his war record in Cyrenaica in 1911-2); a Kemalist Turkish delegation under İbrahim Tâlib (Öngören) also was present. In October 1920, Enwer was back in Berlin where he lived in a villa in the fashionable Grunewald section. He was confident that the Soviets would support nationalist movements in Turkey and other border states. To this end he asked Khalîl to secure approval from the Soviet Foreign Office for a plan whereby two cavalry divisions, to be formed among Ottoman war prisoners and Muslim residents of the Caucasian region, would, under Enwer's command, join the Anatolian resistance movement. Enwer himself, meanwhile, was trying to purchase arms in Berlin. That he had hopes of taking over the supreme command in Anatolia is indicated by Khalîl's statement to Karakhan, Soviet Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs, that "Mustâfa Kemal Paşa would not be in favour of creating divisiveness and is accustomed to obeying you [i.e., Enwer]"—an interpretation rather strikingly at variance with Kemal's record of near-insubordination to Enwer during the World War. (From Khalîl's letter to Enwer, 4 November 1920, quoted by Cebesoy, 165). Enwer's plans, however, were rejected by Karakhan. After Taš'at Pasha's assassination (15 March 1921), Enwer was the most prominent surviving Union and Progress leader in exile. At its 1921 annual meetings held in Berlin and Rome, the Union of Islamic Revolutionary Societies adopted a set of resolutions according to which the affiliated People's Councils Party was to be the legal successor of the Union and Peoples Society in Turkey; the Revolutionary Union itself was to work in close conjunction with the Third International and to secure further Soviet aid for the Nationalist struggle in Anatolia. (See Cebesoy, 224 f., who does not, however, give any exact date for the meetings). In Moscow, Enwer had several conversations with 'Ali Fu'âd [Cebesoy], the newly appointed Kemâliî ambassador (their first meeting occurred on 26 February 1921) and with Cîerîn, both of whom tried to dissuade him from interfering with the Anatolian movement; a protocol to this effect was drawn up by 'Ali Fu'âd, Enwer, and Dr. Nazım at one of these meetings. On 16 July 1921 Enwer sent a lengthy letter to Mustâfa Kemal complaining of groundless suspicions and assuring Kemal that he (Enwer) was content to support the Anatolian movement from outside. But the moves of Major Na'îm Djewdâ, whom Enwer sent from Russia to Anatolia with quantities of propaganda material for the People's Councils Party and who was arrested by the Kemalists at the Black Sea town of Amasra, indicated that he was pursuing his former plans. On 30 July, at a time when the Greek offensive toward Ankara was in full swing, Enwer proceeded from Moscow to Batumi where he gathered with other Unionists awaiting an opportunity to enter Anatolia. Close by, the Trabzon Defence of Rights Society was openly supporting Enwer, and in the Ankara Assembly a group of about forty ex-Unionists are said to have been working secretly to replace Kemâliî with Enwer. On 5 September, a congress of the "Union and Progress (People's Councils) Party" was held at Batumi which issued an appeal to the Ankara Assembly to abandon its hostility toward the Union and Progress exiles. Meanwhile, Kemal's victory at the Sakarya (2-13 September) consolidated his political position and by November his authority was restored in Trabzon. Deserting the Anatolian plan, Enwer left Batumi by way of Tbilisi, Baku, 4Ashkhabad, and Merv, and arrived in Bukhâra in October 1921 accompanied by Kushdubashhâde Hâjîdîjî Sâmi of the former Special Organization and others. He seems to have given the impression to Soviet authorities that he would rally Muslims of various parts of Central Asia in a struggle against the British; yet he soon was engaged in efforts to mobilize various Özbek factions into common resistance against Soviet rule and penetration of Türkistan. The major political groupings that he encountered in Özbekistan were (1) the Young Bukhara party under 4Othmân Khodîa, which in a revolution with Soviet support in September 1920 had deposed the Emir of Bukhâra, 4Abd al-Sâ'îd Mir 4Alîm forcing him into exile in Kâbul and (2) the tribesmen of the area who were generally loyal to the Emir, formed armed bands known as Basmadjîs, (i.e., Raiders), and fought both the Republicans and the Soviets. Enwer was welcomed by 4Othmân Khodîa's representatives, and took up close contact with Ahmed ZekiWelîfî [Togan], the exiled Bashkir leader, who was then trying to rally various Özbek factions against the Soviets. On 8 November Enwer left Bukhâra with thirty armed followers on the pretext of a hunting trip but actually so as to join the Basmadjîs. He proceeded to Şhîrâbâd and thence eastward
along the Afghan frontier, being joined by local armed groups along the way. In the vicinity of Dushanbe (later Stalinabad), he made contact with Ibrâhîm Lâkî, known as the Basmâdî leader most staunchly loyal to the Emir. Lâkî, who disapproved of Young Turk revolutionaries as much as he did of Young Russian revolutionaries, was a rather successful resistance to Italian penetration of the hinterland. In January 1918, he became commander of the Sixth Army of the Ottoman Army in Irâq, and in one of the more spectacular Ottoman victories, at Câseghe, he meted out and retired to the Caucasus area and occupied Baku in September. Following the armistice, he was interned at Batumi and escaped early in 1919 (see Taşkınpaşa, Istanbul, 4 February 1919). After only a few weeks in Istanbul he was again arrested and jailed in the Bekirâgha prison on charges of maltreatment of Armenians and others during the war. Once again he escaped (8 August 1919) making his way to Anatolia. Tentative plans to have him take a part in military operation in Anatolia (e.g., command of the Izmir front) were abandoned because of the political strain they would have placed on relations between Enwer and the Bolsheviks. In February 1921 he was interned in Moscow, where he participated intensively in the political negotiations between Enwer and the Bolsheviks. In February 1921 he was in Trabzon to try to build up the Peoples’ Councils Party, Enwer’s political organization in Anatolia. In 1922 he was expelled from Trabzon by the Kemalist lists and went to Berlin. After the nationalist victory he returned to Istanbul. His expulsion from the army, decreed by the Istanbul authorities on 16 February 1920, was set aside; instead he was retired in 1923 and took no further part in political and military affairs. Under the law of 1934 he took the family name of Kut after his victory at Câseghe.
half-brother). Toward the end of the World War he was in charge of guerrilla forces in the Caucasus. He hesitated to heed the advice of the Young Turks to organize the 1914 Ottoman revolution and instead stopped in Erzurum early in 1919. By January 1920 he was organizing guerrilla forces in Daghestan. Like Khalil, he returned eventually to private life in Istanbul. He was killed in an explosion of his munitions factory in Sütülpçe on 2 March 1949.

Enwer's younger sister Medihha Killigil (b. 1899) was married to Hiiveyda Mayatepek, a Turkish career diplomat and currently (May 1963) Ambassador to Copenhagen; and one son, Ali Enver.


ERDEL or ERDELSTAN, from the Turkish Erdel (Hungarian Erdély or Erdély, Latin Erdel) is a region in the middle of the 8th/14th century. In 769/1367, Denes (Dennis), who had become the vassal of the Hungarian king, was appointed as the first governor of Erdel. The prince of Erdel was nominated by the local Diet, the Sultan confirming the choice by sending him a special haráz (for the order of precedence as between the vassals). The first fixed at 10,000 ducats, was raised to 15,000 (pishkesh). The prince of Erdel, John Zapolyai ("Sapolyayi Yanosh" in Pecevi, i, 108), who, after the battle of Mohács, proclaimed himself King of Hungary at Istolni Belgrad (now in Hungary, Székesfehérvár, Ger. Stuhliwiesen) in 1526. Challenged, however, by the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, Zapolyai fled to Poland, sending an ambassador to Istanbul to obtain the Sultan's support. This was granted in change for a recognition of Ottoman suzerainty, Zapolyai swearing allegiance to the Sultan in person during the Vienna campaign (Perfidün Bey, ii, 570; ᾳλ, ᾳοκ αλ-αλβπβαίη, i, 277). Ottoman supremacy was confirmed in the treaty of 948/1544, which preserved protection and payment of a tribute, which was first fixed at 10,000 ducats, was raised to 15,000, between 983/1575 and 1010/1601, was then remitted for ten years and later still fixed again at 10,000. In the second half of the 11th/17th century it was again raised first to 15,000 and then to 40,000 gold coins (altin, altum). It was also customary to give an annual present (pişkesh) of 10,000 to 60,000 coins. The prince of Erdel was nominated by the local Diet, the Sultan confirming the choice by sending him a captured horse, a standard, a sword and a robe of honour (for the order of precedence as between the prince of Erdel and the voivodes of Erdel and Bohgánd, see Nathnidi al-wazāʿid, i, 137). There were also cases of the Porte rejecting a nomination or dismissing a prince, as in 1022/1613 with Gábor Bátory and in 1067/1657 with George Rakoczi II. During the Budin campaign, the boy was shown to Süleyman the Magnificent who granted him a sandjak in the vilayet of Erdel, with the promise of a kingdom later (cf. ᾳλ, ᾳοκ αλ-αλβπβαίη, i, 277). Ottoman supremacy was confirmed in the treaty of 948/1544, which preserved protection and payment of a tribute, which was first fixed at 10,000 ducats, was raised to 15,000, between 983/1575 and 1010/1601, was then remitted for ten years and later still fixed again at 10,000.

The princes' foreign policy had to conform to the Ottoman army of King Yanosh of the vilayet of Engur (i.e., of the Hungarians), who is described as having been formerly the Bey of Erdel (cf. Perfidün Bey, Münkâdî, and ed., Istanbul 1375, i, 275). The variant Erdil-Stan occurs also in later sources (Na'ìmâ, i, loc. var.; Ewliya Celebi, Sezâbat-name, i, 181; Mustafâ Nûrî Paşa, Nâtâ'dâj al-wazâ'iât, ii, 72). Geographically speaking, Erdel is a basin surrounded by the Carpathians and the Transylvanian Alps on three sides, and separated from the Hungarian plain by the Erchegyseg (Rom. Munții Apuseni) mountains. Ottoman Erdel often exceeded, however, these geographical limits at the expense of neighbouring countries. Erdel can be subdivided into three main areas: the Erdel plain, higher and more broken than the Hungarian plain and crossed by the river Muregh and its tributaries; the country of the Selkets in the east, and, finally, the area of the southern Carpathians.

The first contact of the Ottomans with Erdel occurred in the middle of the 8th/14th century. In 709/1307, Dennes (Dennis), who had become voevoda (prince) of Erdel after being ban (lord) of Vidin, fought the Ottoman bey of Erdel, John Zapolyai, and being played by the Hungarian prince of Erdel, John Zapolyai ("Sapolyayi Yanosh" in Pecevi, i, 108), who, after the battle of Mohács, proclaimed himself King of Hungary at Istolni Belgrad (now in Hungary, Székesfehérvár, Ger. Stuhliwiesen) in 1526. Challenged, however, by the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, Zapolyai fled to Poland, sending an ambassador to Istanbul to obtain the Sultan's support. This was granted in change for a recognition of Ottoman suzerainty, Zapolyai swearing allegiance to the Sultan in person during the Vienna campaign (Perfidün Bey, ii, 570; ᾳλ, ᾳοκ αλ-αλβπβαίη, i, 277). Ottoman supremacy was confirmed in the treaty of 948/1544, which preserved protection and payment of a tribute, which was first fixed at 10,000 ducats, was raised to 15,000, between 983/1575 and 1010/1601, was then remitted for ten years and later still fixed again at 10,000.

In the second half of the 11th/17th century it was again raised first to 15,000 and then to 40,000 gold coins (altin, altum). It was also customary to give an annual present (pişkesh) of 10,000 to 60,000 coins. The prince of Erdel was nominated by the local Diet, the Sultan confirming the choice by sending him a captured horse, a standard, a sword and a robe of honour (for the order of precedence as between the prince of Erdel and the voivodes of Erdel and Bohgánd, see Nathnidi al-wazâ'iât, i, 137). There were also cases of the Porte rejecting a nomination or dismissing a prince, as in 1022/1613 with Gábor Bátory and in 1067/1657 with George Rakoczi II. During the Budin campaign, the boy was shown to Süleyman the Magnificent who granted him a sandjak in the vilayet of Erdel, with the promise of a kingdom later (cf. ᾳλ, ᾳοκ αλ-αλβπβαίη, i, 277). Ottoman supremacy was confirmed in the treaty of 948/1544, which preserved protection and payment of a tribute, which was first fixed at 10,000 ducats, was raised to 15,000, between 983/1575 and 1010/1601, was then remitted for ten years and later still fixed again at 10,000.

In the second half of the 11th/17th century it was again raised first to 15,000 and then to 40,000 gold coins (altin, altum). It was also customary to give an annual present (pişkesh) of 10,000 to 60,000 coins. The prince of Erdel was nominated by the local Diet, the Sultan confirming the choice by sending him a captured horse, a standard, a sword and a robe of honour (for the order of precedence as between the prince of Erdel and the voivodes of Erdel and Bohgánd, see Nathnidi al-wazâ'iât, i, 137). There were also cases of the Porte rejecting a nomination or dismissing a prince, as in 1022/1613 with Gábor Bátory and in 1067/1657 with George Rakoczi II. The princes' foreign policy had to conform to the Porte's wishes, but they were free in their internal affairs. They were represented at the Porte first by special envoys, the first permanent agent (başba kahyâst = kadihüdâst) (in Erdel documents kapi-şâha), being appointed in 967/1560. This agent represented both the Bey of Erdel and the three local millets (Hungarians, Germans and Selkets, the Wallachian being played by the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria). His residence was in the Balat quarter of Istanbul, in a street known today as Macalar Yokuşu ("Hunga-
During John Sigismund's minority, the Diet agreed to the pretended monarch, friar George Martinuzzi-Utyeszenic (Utešenić) (in ‘Ali, f. 287, ‘brata’, i.e., "brother"). who, however, handed over Erdel to the Habsburgs in 1551. The beylerbey of Rûm-âli Mehmed Paşa Sokollu thereupon led an army into Erdel (‘Ali, f. 287). Martinuzzi made his peace with the Ottomans, but was then attacked by the Austrian General Castaldo and killed in 1552. A second army was sent to the Banat under Kara Ahmed Paşa who captured Temesvár (Timișoara). Castaldo withdrew from Erdel in 1553, the country being for a time ruled by voevodas on behalf of the Habsburgs, until in 1556 the Diet invited back the Queen Mother Isabella and John Sigismund, who, coming from Poland, established their seat of government in the Belgrade of Erdel (Erdel Belgrad, Rum. Alba Julia, Hung. Gyulafehervár, Ger. Karlsruhe). John Sigismund ruled alone from 1559 to 1571 both over Erdel and over the northern districts of Hungary in constant competition with the Habsburgs. Although by the agreement of Satmar in 1564 he recognized Emperor Ferdinand as King of Hungary, peace was not long preserved, John appealing to the Sultan for help (cf. Pecewi, i, 412), and the latter responding by undertaking a second expedition in 1561. John's reign witnessed also the revolt of the Sekels and the suppression of their traditional privileges in 1562 and the proclamation of religious toleration in Erdel by the Diet's decisions of 1564 and 1571. His successor Stephen Bâthory (1571-6) managed to preserve a precarious balance between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, by recognizing the Emperor Maximilian as King of Hungary and thus becoming his vassal by the treaty of Speyer in 1571, while continuing payment of tribute to the Porte. In 1576 he was elected King of Poland by the efforts of the Porte and of the Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa (see Ahmed Rečik, Sokollu Mehmed Paşa ve Lehistan itibâbâbâlı, in TOEM, 6th year, 664 H.), Erdel being governed until 1581 by his brother Christ-opher Bâthory and then for 15 years (1582-97) by his son Sigismund Bâthory. The latter wavered in his loyalty to the Porte, entering the Holy League in 1593 and executing the leaders of the pro-Turkish party in 1594 at a time when he pretended to be getting ready to join the Ottoman army under Köşçe Sinân Paşa. He incited the voevodas of Bogdân and Eflâk against the Ottomans and defeated in 1600/1599 the Ottoman army sent to suppress their rebellion. After the severe defeat suffered by the Imperialist forces at the battle of Mező-Keresztes in the following year, he withdrew from Erdel, relinquishing the rule to his cousin Cardinal Andreas Bâthory, who had been brought up at the Polish court and was, therefore, pro-Ottoman. The latter was, however, defeated by the rebellious voevodas of Eflâk, Mihâil (Michael), who was in turn killed by the Austrians. The latter then occupied the country, foiling an attempt by Sigismund Bâthory to re-establish his rule. In 1603 a Sekel nobleman, Székely Mózes, made an unsuccessful attempt to outst the Austrians with Ottoman support. An Erdel nobleman, Stephen Bocskay, who had fled to the Ottomans (see Naţma, i, 386) was more successful, and by the treaty of Vienna in 1606, the Emperor Rudolf recognized him as prince of Erdel. His death was followed by a period of disorders which included the tyrannical rule of Gábor Bâthory (1608-13), known in Ottoman sources as the "mad king". The beylerbeyi of Kanlî, Iskender Paşa, succeeded in deposing him and in getting the diet at Kolovjâr to elect in his place Gábor Bethlen, whose rule marks the golden age of the principality of Erdel. His death in 1629 was followed by a short interregnum, his policy of safeguarding local autonomy through cooperation with the Ottomans being re-established by George Rákoczî I (1630-48). In 1646/1636 the Ottomans made an unsuccessful attempt to unseat him in favour of Gábor Bethlen's brother, Stephen Bethlen. George Rákoczî I was succeeded by his son George II (1648-57, 1658, 1659-60), whose unsuccessful attempt to gain the crown of Poland against the wishes of the Porte led eventually to his death, Erdel being occupied by Ottoman troops. One of the prisoners taken by the Ottomans in Kolovjâr was the young Hungarian who later embraced Islam and became known as Ibrâhîm Müteferrika [q.v.]. Ottoman supremacy in Erdel was re-established in the Köprülü period, the principality being governed from 1672-3/1662 to 1710/1700 by the Ottoman envoys of Oskar Bethlen and the suppression of their traditional privileges in 1712 and the proclamation of religious toleration in Erdel by the Diet's decisions of 1712 and 1721. His successor Stephen Bâthory (1721-7) managed to preserve a precarious balance between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, by recognizing the Emperor Joseph II as King of Hungary and thus becoming his vassal by the treaty of Passarowitz he and his Hungarian companions had to withdraw and were settled at Tekirdag (Rodosto in Thrace) (cf. Râghîd, iv, v, passim; Ahmed Rečik, Memâliḳ-ı Oltâmâniyyeddâ Râkoçî ve tevâbî, Istanbul 1338; M. Tayyîb Gökîbîlgîn, Râkoçî Ferenc II ve tevâbîinde dair yeni vesikalar, in Belleten, v, 20, 1941). A similarly unsuccessful attempt was made by the Ottomans to make use of him in their war with Austria in 1727/1715, but, after the treaty of Passarowicz he and his Hungarian companions had to withdraw and were settled at Tekirdag (Rodosto in Thrace) (cf. Rashid, iv, v, passim; Ahmed Rečik, Memâliḳ-ı Oltâmâniyyeddâ Râkoçî ve tevâbî, Istanbul 1338; M. Tayyîb Gökîbîlgîn, Râkoçî Ferenc II ve tevâbîinde dair yeni vesikalar, in Belleten, v, 20, 1941). A similarly unsuccessful attempt was made by the Ottomans to make use of the latter's son Joseph, all Ottoman designs on Erdel being finally abandoned with the peace of Belgrade in 1712/1729. The main events in the post-Ottoman history of Erdel are the submission of a large number of local Rumanian Orthodox to the Pope (the Union of 1700), the Rumanian peasant rising of 1784, the decision of the Diet in 1848 to merge with Hungary and finally the accession of Erdel to Rumania under the treaty of Traros in 1920.

Bibliography: A. Centorio degli Hortensi, Commentarii della guerra di Transilvania, Venice 1566; C. Spontone, Historia della Transilvania, Venice 1638; Regni Hungarici Historia ... a Nicolao Isthuenio, Coloniae Agrippinae 1724; G. Kraus, Siebenburgeniche Chronik (Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., Fontes Rerum Austriacaem, Abh. I, Bde iii-iv), Vienna 1862-4; ed. S. Szilágyi, Monumenta comitatal regni Transylvaniae. Erdelii országgyûlész emlékek, i-xxii, Budapest 1876-98 (MCRT); idem, Transylvania et bellum boreo-orientale, Budapest 1890-1; Humuzaki, Documento privitolare la istoria Românilor, i-xxiii, Bucharas, from 1887 with supplements; A. Szâlády and Al. Szâlágyi, Törökkönyjavori államokmányai, Buda-pest 1896, i-xxii; Monumenta Transilvaniae Historica, Sect. ii, ”Scriptoria”, ed. A. Veress, Basta György hadestor Seveledés és Italai (1597-1607) [Monu-
menta Hungariae historica. Diplomataria, vols. xxxiv and xxxvii, Budapest 1909-14; ed. idem, *Fontes rerum Transsilvanicarum*, i-iii, Budapest 1913; idem, *Documenta privatae historiae Turcicae*: *Moldavien* (Hrsg. T. Romanděnski), Budapest 1929-38, i-xii; R. Goos, *Österreichische Staatsverträge. Fürstentum Siebenbürgen* (1526-1600), Vienna 1911; E. G. Müller, *Die Türkenterritorien in Siebenbürgen* ([Südosteuropäische Forschungs-Institut, Sekt. Hermannstadt, Deutsche Abteilung ii]), Hermannstadt 1923; G. Bascapè, *Le relazioni fra l’Italia e la Transilvania nel secolo XVI*, Rome 1931. Other sources have been cited in the course of the article. For further studies see bibliography in IA, s.v.

(A. Decker and M. Tayyib Gökbilgin)

**ERDIŞ** (see ARDIŞ.)

**ERDIYAS** (or ERĐIJYES) **DAGHÍ** (modern spelling Erciye), the Argaeus Mons of antiquity, referred to by Hamd Allah Mustawfl (Nuzha, 98, 181) as Arđşt-ış, the highest mountain in Central Anatolia. It is an extinct volcano, with a height of 3,916 m. (= 12,847 ft.), which rises rather suddenly from the surrounding plain of an average height of 1,000 m. (= 3,280 ft.). It is some 20 km. (12 1/4 m.) to the south of the town of Kayseri, almost precisely 38° 30’ N., 35° 30’ E., and covers an area of roughly 45 km. (28 m.) from east to west and 35 km. (21 1/4 m.) from north to south. Certain early sources say it was still active in antiquity. Today, the Erciyas-Dagh is completely barren and permanently covered with snow. In it there rises the Deli-Su, which flows into the Kara-Su, a tributary of the Lower Ceyhan, ca. 730 B.C.), the modern Bor.

South of Erciye, where the river emerges from a ravine in the Taurus, near Izvır, there is a famous late Hittite rock carving, depicting the river-god dispensing corn and grapes, and being worshipped by the king of Tyana (Assyr. Urballa, Hitt. Varpalawa, ca. 730 B.C.), the modern Bor.

In Byzantine times, Eregli was a frontier fortification on the way from Iconium to Cilicia. It was conquered several times by the Arabs, most notably by Harun al-Rashid in Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 909/10 Sept.-Oct. 806 (Tabarî, iii, 799 ff. = Theophanes, loc. cit.), but remained Byzantine until the Seldjuk Turks conquered it (supposedly in 484/1091, see Ewliyâ Celebi, iii, 28). After the collapse of the Rum-Seldjuk empire, the town came under the rule of the Karamâns, immediately, together with the other Karaman regions, it came under Ottoman rule in 871/1465.

The Ulu Dâmûl is a rather remarkable mosque with a flat roof. The Dîhanûmûl claims that it was founded by the Karamân-çligî Ibrâhîm (but the Medâsk al-hadîd attributes its foundation to the Seldjuk Kâlid-Arslan). The Türbe Dâmî is a small mosque with an estrade built onto it, containing the grave of Şihâb al-Dîn Subbarwardî Maktûl which is also mentioned in the Dîhanûmûl) is also worthy of note. There is also a large bâhn in the town, supposed to have been built by Sinân for Rûstem Pasha in the 15th century.

Eregli is a half on the pilgrimage route, and since 1908 it has become an important station on the Bagdad Railway from Konya.

**ERELI**, Turkish adaptation of the place-name Heraclea, given to a number of places in Turkey, of which the most important are:

1) Karadeniz Ereğli (Eregli on the Black Sea), Heraclea Pontica, hence formerly (as in Dîhanûmûl, 633) known as Benderegî: a small town on the coast of the Black Sea, 41° 17’ N.,

31° 25’ E., in the region of the coalfields formerly named after it, but now called after Zonguldak.

The hâza, now in the vilayet of Zonguldak, was once in the sandik (or barâdî) of Bolu. This used to belong to the eyâlet of Anadolû, and in the 19th century to the vilayet of Kastamonu. The place has 8,815 inhabitants (1960) and the district 67,661.

**Bibliography:** Paulys-Wissowa, 8, 433; V. Cuinet, *La Turquie d’Asie*, iv, 512.

2) Konya (formerly Karamân) Ereğli, on the ‘Harkîlî-î Cûstîn in Theophanes, i, 482 (ed. de Boor), § 702 ‘Harkîlî-î Cûstîn’ of Michael Attaliata, 136 (ed. Bonn), the Hıraklya of the Arabs, Erâkîlya of Ibn Bibî (transl. Duda, 19, 238 f.), in Turkish occasionally in the more archaic form Hırâkîya or Hırâkîlya, Receli or Rechâia to the Crusaders (Tomaschek, *Zur historischen Topographie von Kleinasiis*, 84, 88, 92), Aracle in Bertrand de la Broquière (ed. Ch. Schefer, 104 f.): a town in south-western Anatolia, near the central chain of the Taurus, from which rivers flow in a northerly direction into the Ereğli plain. These rivers make the town an oasis of vegetation, but disappear further on into marshy ground. The position of the town is 37° 30’ N., 34° 5’ E. It is the capital of a hâza in the vilayet of Konya and has 32,057 inhabitants; the district has 46,524 (1960).

Opposite Eregli, where the river emerges from a ravine in the Taurus, near Izvır, there is a famous late Hittite rock carving, depicting the river-god dispensing corn and grapes, and being worshipped by the king of Tyana (Assyr. Urballa, Hitt. Varpalawa, ca. 730 B.C.), the modern Bor.
common among the Oyghur after the spread of Buddhism (communication from L. Bazin); this was of course no bar to the family becoming Muslim, like all the Mongols and Turks in the Ilkhanid state. Eretna, who was probably an officer in the service of Cihan/Cuban [see Čoban], settled in Asia Minor as a follower of the latter's son, Timūrtāḫ, was appointed governor by the Ilgān Abū Sa'id, and went into hiding during his master's revolt; after Timūrtāḫ had been compelled to flee to Egypt, where he was to meet his death (727/1326), Eretna was invested with the succession to the rebel, under the general suzerainty of Hasan the Elder, the master of Adharbāyjān. When, after the disorders which followed the death of Abū Sa'id, this Hasan was defeated by Hasan the Younger, son of Timūrtāḫ, Eretna sought and obtained the protection of the Mamlûk Sultan al-Nāṣir Muhammad (738/1337), and in 744/1343 defeated Hasan the Younger who had become master of Adharbāyjān, which certainly helped his prestige. After this he appears as an independent sovereign over all those territories of central Asia Minor which the Turkoman principalities that arose after the breakdown of the Saljuqid-Mongol régime had not divided among themselves; that is, in a more or less stable form, the provinces of Nigde, Aksaray, Ankara, Develi Karaβaš, Derende, AmASYA, Tokāt, Mervâs, Samsun, Erzincan, Bismil, Karaβaš, with first Siwâš and later Kayseri as capital. He called himselfultan, with the lakab 'Alla' al-Dîn, and struck coins in his own name. He knew Arabic, scholars call him a scholar, and his people, appreciative of an administration which maintained some order in a troubled world, called him, it is said, Kûse Peygamber, "the Prophet with the Scanty Beard". He died in 753/1352, leaving his principality to his son Ghīyâth al-Dîn Muhammâd (Mehmed) who, maintaining the Mamlûk alliance, successfully withstood the revolt of his brother Dîyâfar.

The begs, however, were here as everywhere undisciplined, and in 760/1365 Mehmed fell victim to an attack fomented by them; under his son 'Alla' al-Dîn 'All Beg, who is said to have cared only for pleasure, the begs of AmASYA, Tokāt, Şarkaş, Karaβaš, and later especially Siwâš, acted like autonomous or rebel lords, while the Karamânids and the Ottomans stripped the Eretnid principality of its western possessions, and the Ak-koyunlu of some of its eastern dependencies. In effect, government was now exercised by the kâdi Burhân al-Dîn [q.v.], son and grandson of the 'Abîs of Kayseri, who had already been influential under the previous princes. 'All was killed in 782/1380 in a campaign against the rebel begs; Burhân al-Dîn, during a struggle by rival claimants, eliminated the young heir Muhammâd (Mehmed) II, and proclaimed himself sultan directly, thus putting an end to the dynasty.

It is unfortunate that the state of the documentation allows us to form no precise idea of the Eretnid régime. At the most some inferences can be drawn from comparisons between descriptions (Ibn Baštûta, al-Umarî) dating from the dawn of the dynasty, and a chronicle (the Bezm u recâm) and travellers' accounts (Schliitberger, Clavijo) of ten or twenty years after its end. The originality of the system of government, the effective reality of which requires examination, lies in the fact that here, from the Mongol régime to the Ottoman conquest, there was no interlude of government by Turkoman dynasties as in all the surrounding territories. The Turkoman element in the central provinces was apparently less strong than the surviving Mongol tribes, and the towns seem to have enjoyed a certain prosperity. The culture of the aristocracy, and commerce also, were perhaps directed more than in the previous period towards the Arabic-speaking Syro-Egyptian domain, without however destroying the interest in Persian culture. The contrasts must not, however, be made too much of; in the Eretnid domain, as in the neighbouring small states, there developed the institution and power of the urban aibâ, the influence of the aristocratic (Mewlewl) and popular religious orders, literature in Turkish in the form of translations from Persian (Yûsûf Medâd of Siwâš), learned poetry (that of Burhân al-Dîn, with which in part the Eretnid period must be credited), and popular heroic romances (the second Dânishmandnâmâ, at Tokât, an adaptation of a Saljuqid original); the few extant specimens of art in the Eretnid regions call for no particular remark. It does not appear that the reign of Burhân al-Dîn, who was himself of Turkish birth, broke with the Eretnid traditions.

**Bibliography:** The only mediaeval author to give a general résumé of the history of the Eretnid dynasty is Ibn Khalîdîn, v, 538 ff., whose information on their relations with the Mamlûks is confirmed by the Mamlûk historians down to al-'Aynî. On the beginnings of the régime, valuable details are given by Ibn Baštûta, ii, 246 ff. (Gibb, ii, 433 ff.), and by Şihâb al-Dîn al-Umarî, ed. Taeschner, 25 et passim, and Eflâkî, ed. T. Yaziçî, Ankara 1959-61, ii, 978, = tr. Huart, ii, 415 (last chapter), and by the Şâfîî Tabâkî of al-Subkî. For the end of the régime, from the point of view of Burhân al-Dîn, see the history of the latter, under the title Bezm u recâm, by 'Azîz b. Ardashîr Astârâbâdî, [ed. Kilîsî Rifat], Istanbul 1928 (analysis and commentary by H. H. Giesecke, Das Werk des . . ., 1940), and, for the eastern frontier, the history of the Ak-Koyunlu expansion composed under the title of Kitâb-ı Divârâbrikîyâ of Abû Bakr Tîhrânî (2nd half of the 9th/10th century) and recently published by Faruk Sümer (i, Ankara 1962); see also the Persian (Hâfiz Abûrî, ed. F. Carême, Rome, 1841, with a general history; there are many mentions of the Eretnids in the historical romance of Şîkârî [ed. M. Mes'ûd Koman, 1946], devoted to the Karamânids; the Trebizond, Genoese and Armenian sources should also be examined.—A good inventory of the coins appears in the catalogue of the numismatic collections of the Istanbul Museum by Ahmed Tewîbî, iv, 346 ff.; the epigraphic material of the Eretnid regions is collected in vol. xv of RCEA, based especially on the researches of İsmâîl Hakki [Uzunçarşîli] (Siwâš Şehrî, Kayseri Şehrî, etc.), and Max van Berchem and Khalîl Edhem, CIA, iii, 40 ff. For the archaeology see also A. Gabriel, Monuments turcs d'Anatolie, 2 vols.—Here as elsewhere there is the possibility of extracting further information from later Ottoman texts, where traces of earlier institutions may be preserved; there are also waûkîyyes which might be published and exploited. Besides the tables of Khalîl Edhem, Dâwel-i İslâmîyye, and Zambaur, 155, the only modern general exposé is that of I. H. Uzunçarşîli, Anadolu beysikleri, chap. xv, based largely on Ahmed Tewîbî, Beni Eretna, in TOEM, v (1330), 13-22, and reappearing in the same author's résumés in IA and in Osmanlı
ERGANI (Argani, sometimes Argani, in European sources ARGHANA until recent times), called for a time 'Qołmnimiyāya (Osmaniye), situated on the highroad from Diyar-Bakr to Harput. 18 kms. to the north-west, on the river Tigris, lies the mining town of Ergani-Ma'dēn(i), which is the centre of a kaza of the vilâyet of Elazığ (El-Aziz) called after Ergani. Although the two towns lie apart, they are confused in some sources.

The name 'Qołmnimiyāya given to Ergani had to be abandoned because it gave rise to confusion with the town of 'Qołmnimiyāya (Osmaniye) in Diibel Bereket to the east of Adana [g.v.]. The town of Ergani is situated at an altitude of 1000 metres on the steep south-east slope, overlooking a deep gully (Hügüt Deresi), in a limestone mountain rising to a height of 1526 metres, 10 kilometres from the right bank of the Tigris. Below the town lie fields and gardens, while above on the slopes overlooking Ergani lies the old town. A near-by hill is called after Nabi Dhu 'l-Kifl [g.v.], who is reported to be buried there. The station of Ergani on the Diyar-Bakr—Malatya railway line lies in a valley, 6.5 kms. south of the present town of Ergani.

The town of Ergani, called Argani in Armenian sources, may have inherited the site of Arkania mentioned in cuneiform writings. It is also not impossible that this was also the site of one of the cities of Arsinia mentioned in the Peutinger Table. In Islamic times the fate of Ergani was linked with that of Diyar-Bakr (for history, see DIYAR-BAKR). After the victory of Caldiran [g.v.] won by Selim I in 920/1514, and through the services of İdris Bidilis, Ergani became a sandjak attached to the eyâlet of Diyar-Bakr, the district of Diyar-Bakr having been conquered for the Ottomans by Bilykil Mehmed Pasha. Cuinet, writing towards the end of the 19th century, gives the population of the town of Ergani as more than 6,000. It was at that time that the centre of the sandjak of Ergani was transferred to the township of Ma'den, in view of the importance of the copper mines there. After the foundation of the Turkish Republic, the bâbâ of Ma'den was attached to the vilâyet of El-Aziz, and that of Ergani (Osmaniye) was left in the vilâyet of Diyar-Bakr. The kaza of Ergani covers an area of 1955 sq. kms. and includes 68 villages. According to the results of the 1960 census, the population of the district amounted to 28,095 and that of the township of Diyar-Bakr. The district of Diyar-Bakr for A.H. 1319, 19; Ewliya Celebi, Seyhûddinname, Istanbul A.H. 1314, iv, 22; K. Kitter, Erdkunde, v, 701, 801, 913; xi, 14 ff.; E. Reclus, Nouvelle geographie universelle, ix, 418; Olivier, Voyage en Perse fait dans les années 1807, 1808 et 1809; H. von Molte, Briefe über Zustände und Begebenheiten in der Türkei, index; J. Brant in JRGS, London 1836; C. Sandrerecki, Reise nach Musul und durch Kurdistan und Urmia, Stuttgart 1837, i, 161 ff.; H. F. B. Lynch, Armenia. Travels and studies, London 1901, ii, 438; G. L. Bell, J. Ruskin to Amurath to Amurath, London 1936, 328 ff.; Vital Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, Paris 1891, ii, 475 ff.; Vivien de Saint Martin, Nouv. Dict. de Géog. Universelle, suppl. i; E. Banse, Die Türkei, Brunswick 1915, 226; H. Hübschmann, Indogermanische Forschungen, xvi, 193 ff.; Streck, ZA, xii, 97; W. W. Smyth, Geological features of the country round the mines of the Taurus, in Quarterly Journal (1844), 330-40; E. Coulant, Notes sur les mines de cuivre d'Arghana, in Annales des Mines, 11th series, ii, 1912, 281-93; R. Pilz, Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Kupfererzlagerstätten in der Gegend von Argana Maden, in Zeitschr. für prakt. Geologie, xi-xii (1917); F. Behrend, Die Kupfererzlager- stätte Argana Maden in Kurdistan, ibid., xxviii (1925), 1-22; E. Chaput, Voyages d'études géologiques et géomorphologiques en Turquie, Paris 1935, 142 ff.; V. Kovenko, Guleman-Ergani maden meteorolojik bölgesi, in Maden Tesisleri ve Arama Enstitüsü Mecmuası, 1944, 11-31, 29 ff.; Şh. Sâmî, Kâmas al-âlam, s.v. (BEŞİM DAKRÖT)

Ergenekon, the name of a plain surrounded by mountains, mentioned in the legend of the origin of the Mongols.

An associated legend in the Chinese Chronicle of Pei-shih (ed. in about 629) explains the origins of the T'u-chiieh warriors who further explored the area of the Western Sea, Hsi-hai. They were massacred by a neighbouring people. Only a young boy survived,
although wounded. A she-wolf who protected and fed him became pregnant by him. She led him through the massacre and, following a narrow track, they took refuge in a plain surrounded by mountains, called Ergenekon. There they multiplied and when, four hundred years later, Ergenekon became too small for them, they contrived to make their way out by causing part of a mountain-side to crumble away by means of a huge fire, on the advice of a black-smith.

The day consequently became a festival and its anniversary was celebrated by the Mongol sovereigns.


ERGIN, OSMAN (OZM N NORT) Turkish scholar and publicist, was born in 1883 in Imrin, a village (now a district centre) in the vilayet of Malatya. His father Hâdidil Ali, of a family of humble farmers, tried his fortune in trade and after many journeys, including one in Rumelia, settled in Istanbul, where he opened a coffee-house. The little Osman, who had memorized the Kur'an in the Şehzade mosque. This type of training, which was very erudite. His life-long research in the subjects and his biographical and bibliographical monographs, some still unpublished, he was the author of the following major works:

1) Medjidije-i Umr-i Belysye, 5 volumes, Istanbul 1390-2 (1930-8), the first of which is a richly documented historical introduction to municipal institutions in Islam and in Turkey, particularly the city of Istanbul, a standard reference book on the subject; the other volumes contain a collection of laws, bye-laws, regulations, Council of State decisions, etc. concerning municipal administrative matters.

2) Türkiye maarif tarihi, 5 volumes, Istanbul 1939-43 (a promised sixth volume did not appear). Originally planned as a “History of schools and other educational and scholarly institutions of Istanbul”, it was developed later into a history of education in Turkey. This pioneer work, which is a mine of information, remains, in spite of some technical shortcomings, the only comprehensive work of reference on the subject. The history and development of all types of schools in Turkey are elaborately discussed: medreses, the palace school, military schools, old and new style technical and professional schools, semi-educational institutions and their auxiliaries in the Ottoman Empire, European types of schools of all grades, private, foreign and minority schools, universities and various institutions of higher education, etc., are amply treated. Special emphasis is given to the detailed and comparative analysis of the evolution of syllabuses in the many types of school. Many of the controversial educational problems arising from social change in Turkey are discussed at length and the book abounds in anecdotes and personal notes which make it extremely interesting reading.

3) Istanbul seheri robber, Istanbul 1934, is the outcome of his long research preparatory to the first modern census of the city of Istanbul in 1927 (as part of the first general census in Turkey). This is the best detailed topographical study of Istanbul with street names and thirty-eight maps.

4) Türkiye de şehircilik tarihi inkisafi, Istanbul 1936, a survey of most of the problems discussed in the Meşgell-i Umr-i Beledisyey.

Bibliography: A. Süheyl Ünver, Osman Ergin, câlisma hayat ve eserleri, in Belleten, xxvii 101 (1962), 163-79, with a bibliography including his unpublished works and a list of his articles in the journal of the municipality of Istanbul (Istanbul Şehremenci (Belediye) Meclisleri) from 1924 to 1936; Orhan Durusoy, Osman Ergin biyografyası ve ilmî tarihî tarihi, 1, Osman Ergin (Istanbul Universitesi Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü nesriyatından, sayı 52), Istanbul 1958; Bedi N. Şehsvuroğlu, Osman Ergin‘in biyografyası, in the same publication. (FAHRI İZ)

ERGIRI (ARGIRI, ERGERI), Ottoman name of Argyrokastro, Alb. Gjonokaster, principal town of Albanian Epirus (40° 13’ N., 20° 13’ E.) near the foot of the eastern slopes of the Mali Gjere; overlooking the wide and fertile valley of the Drin, a tributary of the Voutsa (Vijose), it controls the route from Valona into Northern Greece. The town, near the site of the ancient Hadrianopolis, probably takes its name from that of an Illyrian tribe. The district came under Ottoman control in the reign of Bayezid I. In the defter of 835/1431 ‘Argiri-ı aşır’ (its district being called wildiyet-i Zenbiş, i.e., of the Zenbissi family) appears as the chef-lieu of the sandjak of ‘Arvanya’; later (certainly by 912/1506) it formed part of the sandjak of Avlonya; in the last years of the Empire it was again a sandjak, belonging to the wildiyet of Yanya. Ewliya (1670) describes a thriving, solidly-built town, with a predominantly Muslim population. Gjonokaster, now extending into the valley (present pop. ca. 12,000), is dominated by the mediaeval (Venetian?) castle, reconstructed by 4Ali Pasha of Tepedelen [q.v.]; many of its old houses
survive, built in the characteristic fortress-like style which impressed Ewliya.

**Bibliography:**

(V. L. MÉNAGE)

**ERITREA**, a territory with a sizeable Muslim population in North-East Africa, bordering on the Red Sea, since 1952 federated with Ethiopia, since 1962 fully integrated in the Ethiopian Empire.

(i) Geographically, historically, and ethnically Eritrea has generally formed part of a larger unit which will be treated under **AL-HABASH**. In the following, special emphasis will be placed on such features and Islamic manifestations as are peculiar to Eritrea in the narrow sense. 'Eritrea' (from *Mare Erythraeum*) was so named by the Italians in 1890 to describe their growing possessions (initiated in 1886 by the purchase of the port of Assab [q.v.]) on the Red Sea coast, the *Bab-El-Mandeb* ('sea country') or *Mareb Mellash* ('beyond the river Mareb') of the Abyssinians.

In the north and west Eritrea's triangular shape (enclosing nearly 50,000 square miles of extremely variegated country) borders upon the Sudan, in the east on the Red Sea, in the south-east corner upon French Somaliland whence the old frontier with Ethiopia proceeds in a north-westerly direction along the Dankali depression and then following the Mareb-Belesa line. The physical configuration of the country is marked by the vast central mountain massif (6500-8000 feet above sea-level) extending economically or politically viable. The large Muslim minority enjoys reasonable religious and political rights. The population of the port of Massawa (and to a much lesser extent of Arkiko and Assab) is cosmopolitan and includes tribesmen from the hills, Danakil, Sudanese, Arabs, Indians and groups of Turkish descent. The unifying factor is Islam. The people of the barren Dahlak [q.v.] islands off the Massawa coast were among the first in East Africa to be converted to Islam, and many tomestones in Kufic characters bear witness to this early Muslim connexion.

(ii) Population: With the exception of the Diabart [q.v.], the vast majority of Muslim Eritreans live mainly in the highlands and north. Their number reaches about half a million in a total population of approx. 1,100,000, among whom the monophysite Christian element wields most of the political power. While the Christians and Diabart, concentrated in the densely populated central highlands, speak Tigryna (see below), the vast majority of the Muslims, sedentary or nomadic in the sparsely inhabited lowlands, use Tigre (see below) and, to a very limited extent, Arabic. They are the descendants of Bedja [q.v.] or other Cushitic tribes and early South-Arabian immigrants. The Banû Âmir [q.v.] or Beni Amer are the largest tribal federation, numbering about 60,000 (with an additional 30,000 in the Sudan) and occupying a considerable portion of Western Eritrea. They owe allegiance to a paramount chief, the Diga Diga [q.v.], and acknowledge the religious leadership of the Mirgiani family. In the northern hills the Habab, Ad Tekles, and Ad Temariam form the tribal federation of Bet Asgede. The Ad Shaylîs have their encampments between the Habab and the Ad Tekles; they claim descent from a Meccan family, but most of these tribal memories are incapable of proof. The Bilen (or Bogos) in the Keren area consist of two large tribes (Bet Tarke and Bet Takwe). The Saho live along the eastern escarpment and the foothills leading to the tribal Confederacy of the Danakil who inhabit the vast arid depression behind the Red Sea coast, one of the hottest and most barren regions in the world. The population of the port of Massawa (and to a much lesser extent of Arkiko and Assab) is cosmopolitan and includes tribesmen from the hills, Danakil, Sudanese, Arabs, Indians and groups of Turkish descent. The unifying factor is Islam. The people of the barren Dahlak [q.v.] islands off the Massawa coast were among the first in East Africa to be converted to Islam, and many tomestones in Kufic characters bear witness to this early Muslim connexion.

(iii) Eritrea's history is so entwined with that of Ethiopia and South Arabia, on the one hand, and the Sudan, on the other, that it is difficult to disentangle the few independent facets of its past. South Arabian immigrants settled along that part of the western Red Sea coast which is now Eritrea. From here they subsequently penetrated into the interior and established the Aksumite Kingdom which has left so many traces within the soil of Eritrea. Later, Eritrea became the base from which the Aksumite hegemony over a large strip of the coast of south-west Arabia was launched. Here also was the avenue through which contacts, hostile as well as cultural, with Meroe and its civilization flowed. As Ethiopia's traditional maritime province and only outlet to the sea, Eritrea became the spring-board of both Muslim and Christian political ambitions first asserted themselves. A plan to do away with Eritrea as an artificial political entity (by incorporating the Muslim West with the Sudan and the Christian centre with Ethiopia) finally came to grief when the United Nations decided (1950) to constitute Eritrea as an autonomous federal unit under the sovereignty of the Ethiopian crown. This uneasy arrangement gradually led to Eritrea's full absorption, for no constitutional safeguards could make the territory economically or politically viable. The large Muslim minority enjoys reasonable religious and political expression in the Christian Empire.

(iv) Languages: Tigryna and Tigre are both successor languages of Semitic Ethiopic (Ge'ez); the former is spoken by the Diabart of the highlands, while the latter is the principal tongue of the Muslims in the western and eastern lowlands and the northern hills. In the Kassala province of the Sudan Tigre is called *Al-Kharj*; tribal distinctions within Tigre have not yet been fully worked out. Tigre cannot boast any written literature and it is
losing some ground in favour of Arabic, which among Muslims and traders enjoys a cachet which it does not possess. The decision of the Eritrean government, in 1952, declaring Tigrinya and Arabic the official languages of Eritrea (although most Tigre-speakers know little or no Arabic) was a political and prestige resolution—not a linguistic judgement. The two main non-Semitic languages spoken by the Muslims of Eritrea are Bedawiyte and Bilin. (v) Religion: Islam has been a force in Eritrea-Absiyinia ever since Muhammad sent some of his earliest followers to seek refuge with the Negus. Throughout the Middle Ages Muslim pressure from the Red Sea compelled Abyssyinians to fight for their own form of Christianity. But in Eritrea as well as Ethiopia, though nearly half the population are Muslims, Islam has not succeeded in piercing the defensive armour of monophysitism and in transforming its essential fabric. On the contrary, the Djasart have been so completely assimilated to the cultural, linguistic, and national pattern of traditional Absiyinia that their religion seems strangely disembodied. Islam is, however, still making progress among the Cushitic and Nilotic peoples in the lowland areas, but none among the highland population. The universal call of Islam has a special attraction in all those regions where the particularistic and national monopolistic Christianity has no genuine application.


ERIWAN [see REWIN]

ERENAK or ERMENAK, the ancient Germanicopolis in Isauria (see Pauly-Wissowa, vi, 1958), a small town in southern Anatolia, 36° 35' N., 32° 10' E., in the western Taurus mountains, at an altitude of ca. 1200 m. (3937 ft.), above the

confluence of two of the source-rivers of the Göküs, the Kalkbadnos of antiquity. It is the capital of a kaza in the vilayet of Konya, formerly in the sanjuban of I. in the vilayet of Adana. In 1960, it had 7,536 inhabitants and the district 36,380. Mediaeval Oriental writers put Ermenak two days' journey south of Lārend (the modern Karamān), and three days' journey east of Aţā'iyya (the modern Alanya). Its grotto with a spring was particularly famous.

Ermenak originally belonged to the kingdom of Lesser Armenia. It was conquered by the Rūm-Subagšak Sultan in 914, and then by the Al-Din Keykubād I in 625/1228. Later it became the seat of the Turkish dynasty of Karamān. After the collapse of the Rūm-Saljuk empire, the Karamānids set out from there to take possession of the southern part, with Lārend (subsequently Karamān) and Konya. Under Mehemmed II, Ermenak and the principality of Karamān came under Ottoman rule.

There are some remarkable buildings in Ermenak, dating from Karamān times. Of these, the most important is the Ulu Djamā', which was built by Māhmūd Beg b. Karamān in 702/1302-3 (cf. RECA, xii, Cairo 1944, 239, no. 5154). It is a simple building with three parallel vaults, thus built on the plan of the Umayyad mosque in Damascus.


ERSOY [see MEMMET AKIF ERSOY]

ERTOGHRUL (T. er ‘male’, toğrul ‘kite’.—1. According to tradition, the name of the ‘father of Oghmān (s.v.), the founder of the Ottoman dynasty; but it appears in no source, Byzantine or Islamic, before the end of the 14th century, when it is mentioned frequently and it appears in Timur (Ferddin, Munke d, i, 127) and in the Dāhī al-shifā (sub anno 699) of al-Dijzarī (s.v.). The traditions presented in the 9th/15th century Ottoman works, largely legendary in tone, fall into two main groups: (a) Ertogrul, together with Gündüz Alp and Gök Alp, accompanied Sultan Ṭal‘al Al-Din of Konya to Sultān Oyuqî (near Eskihisehr), performed great feats of arms thereabouts and, after Ṭal‘al Al-Din had returned to deal with a Tatar attack, conquered the district around Sogûd (s.v.) (Ahmedi, Islkender-nâme, ed. N. S. Banarû, in Tarihiyet Mecmuası, vi (1936-9), 113 f. and cf. 75-7): echoes of this tradition are given by Yazzifî oglu Alî (M. T. Houtsoum, Recueil, iii, 217-8), with the addition of the claim that Ertogrul and his associates belonged to the clan of the Kayl (s.v.). The related fuller version in Şihhurullah’s Bahsol-Æawirîkh (ed. Th. Seif, in MOG, ii (1923-6), 76-8) adds that Ertogrul had come into Rûm from the east with 340 followers after the Mongol invasions and settled first at Karadja-dagh (south of Ankara), that he captured Kärdaja-hîşar (20 km. south-west of Eskihisehr), and died at the age of 93; Karaman Mehemmed Paşa gives a similar account (tr. M. E. Khañl (Younq), ZÖKM, no. 792, 1921). A statement of this tradition Gûndüz is said to be not the asso-
ciate but the father of Ertoghrul (K. Mehemmed Pasha, and cf. Neshri, ed. Taeschner, i, 21-2, and cf. Leunclavius, Annales, etc.]. Leunclavius, [see Biledjik]. In the later years of the Ottoman Empire, Ertogrul was the name given to a sandjak of the vilayet of Bursa, which was the site of the battle of Malazgirt in 1071 (see Biledjik). According to Armenian sources, Erzincan dates back to before the Christian era, though detailed information does not appear before Saldırga times. The town was in the region over which Muslims and Byzantines fought, and had changed hands several times prior to the battle of Malazgirt (1071). After this, it came under the rule of the Saldırga amir Mengüçük, and remained in the hands of his successors until 625/1228, when the Rūm-Saldırga Sultan Ala al-Din Keykūbād I forced the last of the Mengüçükidīs Ala al-Din Dāwūdshāh, to hand it over. Keykūbād rebuilt the town and its walls (Hamdallah Mustawfī, Nusha, 95, top). On 28 Ramadan 627/10 August 1230 the Khwārizmshāh Dājal al-Din suffered a defeat at the hands of the Rūm-Saldırga Ala al-Din Keykūbād I, an ally of the Ayyūbid al-Āshraf, near Yassı-Cimen in the vicinity of Erzincan (Die Seltsuchungsgeschichte des Ibn Bīlī, transl. H. W. Duda, Copenhagen 1959, 166 ff., in particular 171). In 640/1243, Erzincan was taken by the Mongols, who broke into Anatolia from the direction of Erzurum. Thenceforth it belonged to that part of Anatolia which was administered by the İkhanī governors. According to Ibn Battīta (ii, 293 f.; Eng. tr. H. A. R. Gibb, ii, 436 f.), the town was largely populated by Armenians in his day, though there were also some Turkish-speaking Muslims. He also mentions the industriousness of the inhabitants of the town (engaged in textiles and copperwork). There was also a branch of the Aghī [q.v.] order.

After the collapse of the Mongol Empire of the İkhāns, Erzincan first belonged to the amir Ertugrul [see ERZURUM], then to the kǎbīr Bûrān al-Dīn; subsequently, Bāyazīd I incorporated it into the Ottoman Empire for a short time. After his defeat by Timūr near Ankara in 804/1402, the town passed to the Karakoyunlu and the Ak-koyunlu. There are two funerary monuments in the shape of rams (as they are frequently found in cemeteries of eastern Anatolia) which bear witness to their rule. These have been erected in an attractive garden near the main road (concerning this, cf. Strzygowski’s work on Armenia, and also Hamit Koşay, Les statues de bîliers et de moutons dans les cimetières historiques de l’Anatolie orientale, 1er Congrès international des arts turcs, Ankara 1959, 58-60). After the victory of Mehemmed II over Sultan Hasan near Tercan (Otluk Beli), the town belonged to local rulers for a time. During Selim I’s campaign against Shah Ismā’īl in 920/1514, Erzincan and its district were finally incorporated in the Ottoman Empire as a livadı (sandıq) of the eyalet (later vilayet) of Erzurum. In the 17th century, Erzincan played a part in the Djaļâł [q.v. in Supplement] rising. During the 19th century it was the seat of a lodge of the reformed Nakşbandī order, headed by Fehmi Efendi [q.v.]. In the First World War, Erzincan was occupied by Russian forces on 24 July 1916, but evacuated again after 18 months, on 26 February 1918.

Erzincan has frequently suffered destruction by earthquakes; the last of these was in 1939. Consequently, nothing remains of its historical buildings. The Ulu Dīamlı, which dated from Saldırga times, and the Kırshunlu Dīamlı and the Tekes Dīamlı, which dated from the time of Sultan Süleymān, used to be noteworthy. Thanks to the fertility of the surrounding country, the town has always been able to recover. Today its main exports are horticultural. From a military point of view, it is...
a main centre of the defence of Turkey's eastern frontier.

Bibliography: in addition to references in the text: Vahbit, Muşâhid-i, i, 205; Abu 'l-Fâlîd, Ta'kwûm, 392 f.; Dimâghî, 226; Ewîlyâ Celebi, Seyyâhatname-i, ii, 379 (Travelers, ii, 202); Kâtîb Celebi, Dihiânûnûn, 423 f.; Le Strange, 118; K. Ritter, Erdhûrvnde, x, 745; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, i, 210 f.; Samy Bey Frascher, Kûmûz al-lîdâm, 827; Ali Kemâl, Erzincan, Istanbul 1932; IA, s.v. (Besim Darクト).

ERZURUM — one of the principal cities in eastern Turkey, today the chief town of the province of Erzurum with a population of 91,196 (1960 census).

Situated between the Karasu and Aras valleys which formed the main thoroughfare between Turkey and Iran for caravans and armies, Erzurum has been an important commercial and military centre in the area since antiquity. It was the ancient Karin, also known as Karin Kâlıkâ in Armenian, from which Kâlkâla or Kâlî in the Arabic sources (cf. Ibn Hawkal, i, 343; Ibn al-Fakhîth, Abhâr al-balûdân, Leiden 1885, 295) must have been derived. Under the Romans it was fortified and called Theodosiopolis in 415 A.D. The name of Erzurum comes from Arzan-i Rûm, Arzan-i Rûm or Arzi Rûm (see the Saljukid coins in I. Ghâlib, Ta'kwûm-î meşkûdât-i Seljûkıyé, Istanbul 1930, nos. 10, 147, 152). Arzan (Erzen) was a nearby commercial centre, the population of which took refuge in Kâlıkâla upon its destruction by the Saljukids in 440/1048 or 441/1049 (see ARZAN).

First taken by the Arabs under Caliph 'Uthâmân after 63/653, it was possessed by Byzantines and Arabs (Byzantine in 66/686, Arab in 81/700, Byzantines again in 127/754 for a short time and then Arab again until 338/949 when the Byzantines took it, to hold it until the Saljukid conquest). The native Armenian princes in the area played an important part in all these changes. With its strong walls, Kâlî made a base for the Arabs from which to control the area and organize ghûz raids into Byzantine Anatolia. In 153/770-2 the local Armenian dynasts organized a large-scale insurrection against the Arabs and came to lay siege to Kâlî (Ghévond, Histi des guerres et des conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie, trans. Chahazaryan, Paris 1856, 136-43; Ya'kîbî, ii, 447).

Under the Byzantines the chief city of the 'theme' of Theodosiopolis, it withstood the Saljukid onslant until 753/1352 when Amir Ahmad took it, and it was then made the capital of the Turkish principality of the Saltukids (see SALTUK-OGLU). In 997/1201 it came under the Saltukids of Anatolia and was made the seat of a malîkî prince, possessing the province as his appanage. The city under its new name of Arzan-i Rûm became one of the most prosperous commercial centres in Anatolia (cf. Ya'kût, Muşâhid-i balûdân, s.v. Arzan) and it's important monuments belong to this period: the Ulu-djami (Great Mosque) of Kâlî Kâtûn (Cittë-minnâ) built in 651/1253, and the mausoleums of the Saltukids.

In 639/1242 the Mongols under Bayduj took it. Remaining a part of Seljukid territory under Mongol suzerainty, the province of Arzani-Rûm paid a large annual tribute to the Mongol treasury, 222,000 dinâr in 736/1335 (Z. V. Togan, Mogollar dernde Anadolu'nun ihtisât variyeti, iTHITM, i, 1932).

After the dissolution of the Ilkhanid empire in Iran, Erzurum was occupied by the rival Mongol amis successively, the Cobändan Shaykh Hasan in 741/1340, Muhammed b. Ertina about 761/1360. Then the city became part of the rising Türkmen states in eastern Anatolia, first of the Kara-koûyunlu (q.v.) from 787/1385, and then of the Ak-koûyunlu (q.v.) from 869/1465. Taken by Shah Isma'il from the latter in 908/1502, it was conquered by the Ottoman Sultan Selim I following his victory at Çâldîrân in 920/1514. It was made in 941/1534 the chief city of a new Beglerbegiïk comprising the sandjaks of Erzurum, Şêbein Kebûr, Kâhî, Kûfîs, Yûkûr-Fasûn, Malazgîr, Tekênam, Kûfûzan, Işirî, Torum, Nûmârî and Vâmînîkîrân. The tax regulations of the time of Uzun Hasan (q.v.) preserved after the Ottoman conquest, were later in 926/1520 and in 947/1540 modified and replaced by the typical Ottoman kanûn (cf. O. L. Barkan, Kamûniar, 63; W. Ginz, Das Steuerwesen Ostanatoliens, 13. und 16. Jahrhundert, in ZDMG, c, 1950, 177-201).

Under the Ottomans the city benefited from the active caravan trade between Iran and Bursa (for a description of it in 1050/1640 see Ewîlyâ Celebi, Seyyâhatname-i, Istanbul 1314/1896, 203-19). Erzurum became also the chief Ottoman military base during the wars against Iran and Georgia in the 10th/16th and 11th/17th centuries. In 1031/1622, upon the murder of 'Ogînî II, Abaza Mehmêd Paşa, beglerbegi of Erzurum, supported by the population and the Djalâli (q.v. in Supplement) groups, rose up against the central government then under Janissary control. Enchanted in Erzurum, Mehmêd defied imperial armies sent against him until Muhammed 1058/1648.

During the Ottoman-Russian wars the Russians occupied Erzurum temporarily in September 1829, in 1878 and in February 1916. On 23 July 1919 the first national congress under Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) was held in Erzurum. Today it is the most important city in eastern Turkey with the headquarters of the Third Army and the Atatürk University which was opened on 17 November 1958. The city was linked with the country's railway system in 1904.

Bibliography: Le Strange, 117-8; E. Honigmann, Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071, (Corpus Bruxellense Hist. Byz. iii), Brussels 1935; A. A. Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arables, French ed. H. Grégoire and M. Canard, 2 vols. (Corpus Bruxellense Hist. Byz. i, ii/2), Brussels 1935-50; St. Martin, Mémôres sur l'Arménie, Paris 1818; Şerif Beygu, Erzurum tarihi, ancîlars ve küdîbelîri, Istanbul 1936; M. Nüsret, Ta'vrîkkî-î Erzurum, Istanbul 1338 A. H.; Vehbi Kocâgûney, Erzurum kalesi ve savaslar, Istanbul 1942; C. Dursunolu, Millî Mucadelede Erzurum, Ankara 1946; E. Z. Karal, Zaman Paşann Hayratlar, in Belleten, iv/16 (1940), 473-94; Sûlnâmeh of the wilayaet of Erzurum; Erzurum Halkvî Mezmûs; IA, Erzurum (by Besim Darクト, M. Halî Yînanc, H. Ilalokî, (Halîl Ilalokî), ESD'AD EFENDI, AHMED (1937/1420-1315/ 1514), Ottomanc Shaykh al-Islâm, son of the Shaykh al-Islâm Mehmed Mehmed Sâhid Efendî (q.v.). After being kâdî successively of İzmir (from 1184/1770), Bursa (from 1192/1778) and Istanbul (1201/1782), he held office for a short time (1204/1790-1206/1791) as kâdîkash of Anadolu. One of the prominent personalities consulted by Selim III (q.v.) on the reforms necessary in state affairs, he made proposals particularly for the
improvement of military efficiency. As a known advocate of reform, he twice held office as kadi'asker of Rûmeli (from Radjab 1210/February 1794 and Radjab 1213/December 1796), and in 1218/1219 he was made Shaykh al-Islâm. When in 1221/1806 the attempt was made to apply the Nişâm-i devâtî [g.v.] in Rûmeli, Es'ad Efendi issued a fatwâ censuring those who resisted it, but upon the Sultan's abandoning the attempt to enforce the reform he was relieved of office at his own request (1 Radjab 1221/14 September 1806). The influence of the Shaykh Ibrâhîm Idrîsî and the 'ulema' saved his life during the rebellion of Kâbiîk Mustâfâ [g.v.]. When Mustâfâ Pasha Bayrâkdâr [g.v.] came to power, Es'ad Efendi was again appointed Shaykh al-Islâm (22 Dümâdâ II 1223/15 August 1808) and took part in the discussions which bore fruit in the Sened-i ittifâk [see (art. durrûr, ii)]. When Mustâfâ Pasha fell, Es'ad Efendi was again saved by the 'ulema'; dismissed on 3 Shawwâl 1223/22 August 1808, he was set on his own protection to his argâlî at Ma'nîs. He was later permitted to return to Istanbul and died, on 10 Muharrâm 1230/23 December 1814, in his yâlî at Kanîliçe.

Bibliography: Wâsit, Tarîkîh, Istanbul 1219, ii, 151; 'Asim, Tarîkîh, Istanbul n.d., i, 119, ii, 257; Şâhîn-zâde, Tarîkîh, Istanbul 1290, i, 45, 72, 139-46; Drewet, Tarîkîh, Istanbul 1309, iv-ix (index); Mehemmed Mânhî, Daawâhi-i mâgâhî-kî khârî dha'îiyî (MS); Süleyman Fâ'îk, Daawâhi-i mâgâhî-kî khârî dha'îiyî (MS); Ahmed Rifât, Daawâh al-mâgâhîk, Istanbul (lith., n.d.), 100, 119; Hüseyn Aywansârî, Hadîkat al-gûvwîmî, Istanbul 1281, i, 123; 'Umiyye sâlihîmîsî, Istanbul 1334, 570; IA, s.v. (of which the above is an abridgement). (M. Münnir Axtêpe)

ES'AD EFENDI, MEHMET (1069/1658-1166/1753), Ottoman Shaykh al-Islâm, son of the Shaykh al-Islâm 'Abî Is'hâk Is'mâ'îl Efendi and brother of the Shaykh al-Islâm Is'hâk Efendi, after holding various posts as midîrîs was appointed kadi' of Selânik (Bâle) in 1064/1657 (son of the brother of the Sultan Othmân II). During his seven years in office he showed himself to be a distinguished musician. His best-known works are (1) Lajîqâl-i ûsûrîî, a dictionary of Turkish (printed Istanbul 1216), and (2) Atriîb al-âkhîr fî lâdîkhir 'urâfâlî al-adâwîr (also called Têhkhîrîî hîârânendê-gânî), containing the biographies of 100 musicians (poor edition in Mekteb, 3rd year, Istanbul 1311, nos. 1-7 and 10). For details of his other works (poems, tâhirî) see IA.
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ESCAF EFENDI. MEHEMMED — ESHKINDJI
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(M. Münir Aktepe)

ESCAF EFENDI, ŞAHİP AYLAŞ-SHEVKI-ZÂDE SERV- YID MEHEMMED (1204/1789-1264/1848), Ottoman official historiographer (wa'âbân-u naşvî) and scholar, was left in strained circumstances by his father's accidental death (Deär, cf. H. Inalcik, 125). After holding various clerical posts, in Safar 1241/October 1825 he succeeded Şahîd-zâde 'Abîtullah Efendi (q.v.) as wa'âbân-u naşvî, a post he held until his death. His work immediately afterwards (3 Safar 1264/10 January 1848) was for two years a member of the Medjlis-i ahkâm-i 'âmil-i 'âli (q.v.) in Istanbul, and was appointed editor of the official gazette Takwim al-wakdâ (see art. Divân, col. 465b) when it first appeared in 1247/1831. In September 1243 he was appointed 'âbât of Istanbul, and in 1245-6 was sent as special envoy to Persia, to congratulate Muhammad Şâh on his accession. A long illness interrupted his career, but after the Takwim-i tawdrikh, an uncompleted translation of the Mirâtât al-adawr, Istanbul 1277, 13; Djemal al-Dîn, Dawhat al-mash'dikh, Istanbul 1308, ii, 57 ff.; Fatih, Tuhfet, Istanbul 1271, 13; Diemäl-dîn, 'Âyne-i serefî, Istanbul 1314, 79 ff.; İbnülmalek Muhammed Kemal, Şan 'âşir türk şâ'îrleri, Istanbul 1314, ii, 321 ff.; Sadeeddin Nûzhet Ergun, Türk şâ'îrleri, Istanbul 1944, iii, 1235; Takvim-i wa'dahâ, years 1247-64; Babinger, 354-5; U. Heyd, The Ottoman 'ulema and westernisation in the time of Selim II and Mahomed II, in Scripta Hierosolymitana, vi, Studies in Islamic history and civilization, Jerusalem 1961, 63 ff.; IA, s.v. (of which the above is an abridgement).

(M. Münir Aktepe)

ESAME [see YENI ÇERI].

ESCHATOLOGY [see KİYÂMA].

ESHÂM [see AŞHAM].

EŞHKINDJI, also ĝeshkindji, means in Turkish 'one who rushes, goes on an expedition' (ĝeshk is defined by Mehmed Kâzâhkar [Duvin låğišt al-Tûrkh, 1, 100; — Besim Atalay's T. tr., i, 100] as 'long journey', and ĝeshkandji as 'galloping courier'; cf. also Tanskansiyeye tarama söslûkû, ed. Türk Dil Kurumu, i-iv, s.v.; the verb ĝeshke, to go on an expedition, was later replaced in Ottoman Turkish by müxâsem, Ar. mułâṣama.)

As a term in the Ottoman army ĝeshkandji meant in general a soldier who joined the army on an expedition. Thus ĝeshkandji timariots (see TİMÂR) who joined the army were distinguished from ka'bâ-eri or mustâbâhîs, those who stayed in the fortresses as garrison (cf. Sâret-i Defter-i Sancak-i Arnavud, ed. H. Inalcik, Ankara 1954, 108, 109).

As a special term ĝeshkandji designated auxiliary soldiers whose expenses were provided by the people of reşâd (q.v.) status as against giбелîs equipped by the şâgarî (q.v.). The obligation was in return for the tax exemptions made on agricultural lands which were considered in principle as under proprietorship (cf. H. Inalcik, Şefan Duvân'dan Osmanlı imparatorluğu'na, in Fuat Körprüsî Armagam, Istanbul 1953, 134, note 122). In the organizations of yarsîcî, şânlâbî, yaya, müzellên, Tatar and the like, each group of 10, 24, 25, or 30 persons was to furnish the expenses of an ĝeshkandji each year. Three or five among them were appointed ĝeshkandji, which three each year was called ġesâli. Each year the yamaḳs, assistants. Each year an ĝeshkandji collected in turn, be-newbet, a certain sum called kârâli (usually 50 akçe per person) from the yamaḳs and joined the Sultan's army on an expedition (under Bâyezîd Î ģerâli was collected only when an expedition occurred). In return the ĝeshkandji and the yamaḳs, as well as the expropriated from taxes and taxes on their çiftlik [q.v.] entirely or partly (cf. Kâneûn-ûme Sultan Mehmed des Eroberers, ed. Fr. Kraelitz, in MOG, i (1921-2), 25, 28; T. Gökbilgin, Rûmî'îde Yüriikler, Tatolar ve Eвлад-i Eflafî, Istanbul 1957, 244-6). The voymaks and Eflakks can be considered also as ĝeshkandji organizations (cf. H. Inalcik, Ibid., 241). Even the dogâncîs [q.v.] in some areas, who were organized in the same manner, were to furnish ĝeshkandji.
Another category of eshkindjis was provided by the possessors of wakfs and mulks. Increasingly in need of new sources of income, the Ottoman emperors in the 9th century ordered in Bagdad in December 1476 that these wakfs and mulks of certain types were to furnish eshkindjis for the army (cf. Fatih devrinde Karakayd’ Evleleti vakfaslar fihristi, ed. F. N. Uzlu, Ankara 1958, facsimile 3). The measure was applied extensively in the empire, especially in central and northern Anatolia, and resulted in the widespread discontent in the last years of his reign (cf. IA, s.v. Mehmed III, O. L. Barkan, Malikhane-Divan sistemi, in THITM, ii (1932-9), 119-84). It was assumed that such wakfs and mulks, mostly of pre-Ottoman times, were valid only by the approval of the Ottoman Sultan. In most cases he did not confirm them, on the grounds that they did not meet the conditions required; he then made most of them state-owned lands granted as timar (q.v.) or else required their possessors, in return for the taxes and dues, to equip eshkindjis for the army. Such wakfs and mulks were known as eshkindjis. Under Bayezid II, who followed a more tolerant policy, timars of this kind too were made eshkindjis. But later records in the defters [see DAFTAR-I KHAKANI] show that these were again made timars.

An eshkindji of the Yürük organization was equipped with a lance, bow and arrows, a sword and a shield, and every ten eshkindjis had one horse for joint use and a tent (cf. Kannonme Sultan Mehmeds Des Eroberers, 28).

Eshkindjis from the different groups made up a large part of the Ottoman army in the 9th/15th century, especially under Mehmeden II. But from the mid 10th/16th century, when the Ottoman army had to consist mainly of infantry with fire-arms, the eshkindjis and the various organizations to which they belonged lost their importance and gradually disappeared. (Hajil Inalcik)

ESHERFOGHU RUMI [see Supplement].

ESKI BABA [see BABA ESKE].

ESKI SARAY [see saray].

ESKİŞEHİR (modern spelling Eskişehir), a town in the eastern part of Central Anatolia, 39° 47’ N., 30° 33’ E., altitude 792 m. (= 2,597 ft.), on the river Porsuk, a tributary of the Sakarya; it is the most important railway repair workshops in Turkey. The Kurshunlu Daimi (921/1515) was erected by a certain Muwafaith Pasha, and is the most notable building of the town. Beside it there is an extensive factory, laid out in two parts (khan and bedesten). The ‘Ala’i al-Din mosque, which dates from Saldırgan times, has been completely renovated; but on the base of its minaret there is an inscription by Djadja Beg of the year 666(?)/1268 (RCEA, xii, Cairo 1943, 3, no. 4596) which refers to its erection. In 1927 there was still a small bridge, which apparently dated from Saldırgan times, over the Sari Su, which flows into the Porsuk. This bridge could, however, no longer be found in 1955. It is probable that it was removed when the industrial buildings were extended.

Bibliography: Pauly-Wissowa, v, 1577 f. (concerning Dorylaion); Ewliya Celebi, Seyyedat-name, iii, 12; Kâtib Celebi, Uthman, 641 f.; Mehemmed Edlb, Menâsk, 28 f.; Ch. Texier, Asie Mineure, 408 ff.; Sâmi Bey Fraschery, Kâmas al-aldâm, iii, 938; IA, s.v. (Besim Darkot), where further bibliography can be found.

J. H. Mordtmann-[Fr. Taeschner]

ESNE [see isne].

ESOTERICS [see tahr].

ESPIONAGE [see gazis].

ESSENCE [see şahik].

ESZÉK (Esseg), until 1919 a town in Hungary (Slavonia) on the right bank of the Drave, not far from its junction with the Danube, and since 1919 in Yugoslavia. The name of the town is in Serbo-Croat Osijek, in Hungarian Eszék and in German Esseg; in Turkish it was written as ğesk (Ösek).

During the first decisive phase of the Turkish-Hungarian wars the town is mentioned for the first time in connexion with events relating to Turkish history. After the Turks had overrun Sirmium (Hung. Szeremseg), the then commander of the Hungarian army, Paul Tomori, wanted to bring the Turks to a halt on the Drave. The forces of Sultan Sulayman, however, gained possession of Eszék easily, built a bridge over the Drave, crossed the river and advanced on Mohács (932/1526).

The passage over the Drave near Eszék was, for
a century and a half, an important halting-place for Turkish armies on the march into Hungary.

In the course of his later campaigns (1529, 1534, 1547, 1554) Sultan Süleyman, tinny of the Danube, caused a bridge of boats to be built nearby (cf. J. Thöry, Török Történetírők, Istvánffy, in I, 328, 331, 351 and II, 103, 107). He had a permanent bridge erected over the Drave only on the occasion of his last campaign against Széth in 974/1566.

As we know from later accounts in particular, the permanent bridge over the Drave itself rested on boats, while its prolongation on the left bank of the Drave consisted of a marshland some 8000 paces broad and was laid on piles (Ewliya Celebi, vi. 187). On both sides of the bridge there were parapets (körbuluk); in the middle, 'lay-bys', i.e. towers (baste), had been constructed, so that here the pedestrian might rest without impeding the flow of traffic. There was room for two wagons side by side on the main road of the bridge. A horseman needed one and a half hours to cross the bridge. In western sources, too, the bridge at Esztergom is mentioned as a remarkable piece of construction work. H. Otten-dorff (Vienna, Heeres-archiv, Kartenabteilung K. VII, K. I) offers a description similar to the one given above. A portion of his travel narrative From Buda to Belgrad in the year 1663 has been published in Hungarian translation (Budaról Belgrádás 1663, 1851). There are available a comprehensive study of the bridge: P. Z. Szabó, Az eszéki hid [The bridge of Esztergom], Majorossy Imre-Mázeum értesítője, Péc 1941.

Bridgeheads were built on both banks of the river to protect the bridge, on the northern bank beyond the marshland near Dárda and on the southern bank not far from the Drave near Esztergom. The defences at Dárda consisted only of palisades; the defences near Esztergom were constructed of brick, but were, however, only weakly fortified. The Turks feared no attack on these defences, for they lay 200-300 km inside the Ottoman frontiers. All the greater, therefore, was their surprise at the onslaught of Nicholas Zrínyi, the poet, who, in the winter of 1664, invading the Turkish frontier fortresses, pushed forward as far as Esztergom and on 2 January set the bridge in flames. It was, however, rebuilt by the Turks. The bridge at Esztergom was once more burnt down in 1685 by General Lesley and in 1687 was seized definitively from the Turks by the Imperialists.

From the diffuse information of Ewliya Celebi (vi, 175 ff.) the following data can be gathered: Ösek, a voivodaci in the sandjak of Poljega, a kâği with a stipend of 150 akçe. The defences consist of an inner and an outer fortress (i.e. kaša and orta kışâr); outside the outer fortifications lies the town (tarog). Ewliya Celebi does not mention the fortress as being an especially strong one; on the other hand he writes appreciatively of the religious buildings (above all the gâmi of Kâsim Pasha and Muştafa Pasha) and of the tekke and the other hâvat (medrese, sebil, and hamâm). He draws particular attention to the much frequented trade fair (panavyr) held once a year and to the covered market built by İbrâhîm Pasha of Kanizsa. The speech of the inhabitants, according to Ewliya Celebi, was Hungarian, but according to Ottendorff it was Russian.

(L. Fekete)

ESZTERGOM (Gran), a fortress town in Hungary situated on the right bank of the Danube about 80 km. to the north-east of Budapest, in the Turkish period the name and chief town of a sandjak.

The place-name Esztergom is said to be of Frankish origin (osterrinac = eastern fortress). The site, named Gran in German, is called Strigium in Latin, Ostrihom in Slovenian and Esztergom or Eszter on in Hungarian, while in Turkish such forms as Ece-Alem, Ayse-Alem, Areslem etc. are known.

Gran, in the time of the Arpad dynasty, was on a number of occasions the royal residence: the founder of the Hungarian Kingdom, Stephen I (St. Stephen), was born—and it was at the same time the seat of the Archbishop of Hungary (the head of the ten bishoprics established by Stephen I) and from about 1200 A.D. his own exclusive possession.

After the conquest of Buda (948/1543) Gran entered the pages of Turkish history. In order to safeguard Buda, now a frontier fortress, Sultan Süleyman ordered his forces to conquer Gran, which fell into Turkish hands after a siege lasting barely two weeks (950/1543). Detailed Turkish sources on this siege are Djalilzâde Mustafa (translated, from the Vienna Ms., by J. Thöry in Török Történetírők, Istvánffy, Budapest 1896, ii, 244 ff.) and Sinân Çavuş (ibid., ii, 325 ff.).

A fruitless attempt was made in 1002/1594 to wrest Gran from the Turks by a fighting against the place, on the Hungarian side, the distinguished Hungarian lyric poet B. Balassi. The assault on Gran in 1003/1595 was, however, successful; after the food and water of the defenders of the fortress had become exhausted, the Turkish garrison mutinied and the commander of the besieging troops, Nicholas Pâfî (called Mîkîloş, Hung. Miklós) in Ewliya Celebi, vi, 291, was able to gain possession of the fortress by capitulation. The Turks tried on several occasions to win back the fortress; eventually the Grand Vizier Lâlâ Mehemmed Pasha, who ten years before "had given over the fortress into the keeping of Mîkîloş" (Ewliya Celebi, vi, 291), recovered it in 1605, likewise by capitulation. The history of these sieges is recorded, on the Turkish side, in Pécwel (ii, 175 ff. and 301 ff.), who was present on both occasions at the negotiations over the two-fold surrender of the fortress, and—leaving out of account some statements of little value—in Ewliya Celebi (vi, 237 ff.); and on the Hungarian side, in N. Istvánffy (Historiarum de Rebus Ungaricis libri xxxiv, Colonge 1622). More modern studies by J. Thöry and G. Gömöry are in Haditörténeti Közlemények [Communications of the Hungarian History] (Budapest 1889 and 1892).

Thereafter the Turks remained until 1094/1683 undisturbed in their possession of the fortress. Gran, in the autumn of 1683, passed without serious fighting and by agreement into the hands of the Imperialists; Turkish attempts to reconquer it were unsuccessful. Gran, i.e. Esztergom, has in Turkish a proverbial fame (the newspaper Yeni Sabah). On 30 April 1935, carried on the front page a picture of a fortress with the superscription "Estergon kašel" and near it, in a caption, the words referring to the still firmly established Menderes régime: Menderes Estergon kalesidir—"Menderes is [strong as] the fortress of Estergon!"), but it is difficult to state on what events connected with Gran this fame is based.

The mukâta'a deyters of Gran for some ten years between the dates 973/1566 and 991/1582 are extant (Vienna, Flügel Catalogue, no. 1359); in them are recorded the following topographical names relating to the town of Gran: Kahî-i Bâlî, Kalâ-i Zîr, Iskîe-i Bâlî, Iskîe-i Zîr, Ilîjiâ, Varosh-i Kebrî and Varosh-i Şaghr (or Varosh-i Buzurg and Varosh-i Kâbek); these deyters, moreover, record the personnel of three Muslim mosques in the upper fortress, in the main town and in the suburb Tîşer.
delen as receiving salaries from the state. Ewliya Celebi (vi, 272-2), in connexion with his visit to
Gran in 1074/1663, offers information about several Muslim families, and also tells us in some
cases who founded them.
To the fortress of Gran belonged, on the left bank of the Danube, the bridge-head of Digi
derelen Parkani ("Liver-piercer", "Liver-piercing Fort")—whence the later Hungarian name of the
place: Párkány), the point of departure for the subsequent geographical extension of this sandjak.
According to Ewliya Celebi (vi, 273) it was Lala Mehmed Pasha who ordered the building of the
outer defence work of Gran on the right bank of the Danube, i.e., of the mountain fort of Szenttamas;
he is also said to have given to it the name of Tepedelen, "Head-piercer" (a locality of this name
There is extant also a Turkish survey of the houses in Gran, dating from about 1570 (Vienna,
Kraft Catalogue, ccc). In this survey Muslim
and, in lesser number, Orthodox (Pravoslav) are shown as house-holders; there are no Hungarians
amongst them. It seems that Hungarians, at that
time, cannot have been living in Gran.
The sandjak of Estergom was established after
the conquest of the fortress in 950/1543. At
first it consisted essentially of some 30 villages
on the right bank of the Danube, but, growing
outward from the bridge-head of Digi
derelen on the left bank of the river, it became extended later, thanks to the unwearying expansionist
activities of the Sandjak Begs, far to the west and north, so that the chief town of the sandjak, Gran, came
to be situated on the inner border of the actual
administrative area (other examples exist in
Hungary of such an expansion, as, for example, the
sandjaks of Szolnok (Solnok), Istulni Belgrad and
Szigtvár (Ségeth), in each of which the chief place,
after which the sandjak was named, found itself eventually
on the inner border of the actual area
administered from it). The "financial frontier" and
territorial administration thus brought into being
did not receive recognition from the Austrians, now
growing stronger, or from the Hungarian kingdom,
with the result that numerous villages paid taxes
to two masters—a situation which, from the end
of the 16th century, gave occasion for countless
disputes.
Several tax registers (tabrīr) of the sandjak are
preserved at Istanbul and one also, dating from 1570,
at Berlin (Berlin, Prussian State Library, Pet. II,
Nachtr. I). The tax register preserved at Berlin is
available in Hungarian (L. Fekete, Az Estergomi
standárok 1570. évi adóösszeösszeadás [The tax register
of the sandjak of Gran for 1570]. Budapest 1943).
According to this register there belonged to the
sandjak 12 "varoși", i.e., towns, 365 villages (karye)
and 93 abandoned farms, i.e., pusztas (meszérő) with
a total of 4206 households (mhane). A number of
the villages paid taxes to two masters and so it
came about that Nikolaus Olah, the Archbishop of
Gran, caused to be built, around 1580 and near the
locality known as Nyárhíd, with a view to the
hindering of the further advance of the Turks, a
fortress (Újvár, later Ersekújvár, Germ. Neuhausel),
the site of which lay more or less in the centre of the
Turkish sandjak. After the conquest of the
Neuhausel by the Turks in 1574/1663 most of the villages of the
sandjak of Gran were in the time of Sultan Ahmed I
(1012-26/1603-17), and was there married to the
court jeweller, Ewliya's father. Ewliya says that his

EVIDENCE [see BAYYINA].
EVORA [see YABURA].
EWLIYA CELEBI [see VÁBURA].
EWLIYA ÇELEBI D. DERWISH MEHMET ZILLI,
which he adopted in veneration of his teacher
the court-imam Ewliya Meḥmed Efendi. His father
is the chief jeweller to the court
(Sarā'ī 'Amīrī baḥshuyummuṣuṣ, sar-sargārān), Derwīsh Meḥmed
Zilli (cf. i, 218 [here and below the Istanbul edition
is referred to; see below]), who died Dju̇mādā II
1058/June-July 1648 (cf. ii, 458), according to
Ewliya's autobiography aged 127 (lunar) years; he is said
to have taken part in the (last) campaigns of the
sultan Sulejmān Kānānī and to have served and
undertaken works of craftsmanship for the later
sultans also (cf. i, 218; iv, 102; vi, 267; x, 298).
Ewliya's father must have been a merry and also a
poetically talented man, since on this account he
was allowed to enjoy the favour of the court.
The family tree which Ewliya claims on his father's side
is contradictory and improbable (cf. i, 424-5; iii, 444;
v, 226; x, 915). His paternal ancestors probably
came from Kütahya; the family seems to have
remained in Istanbul after the conquest of
Constantinople in 827/1425, but to have retained
the house in Kütahya and to have had also a house in
Bursa, in the İne Bey quarter, and at Manisa, an
estate in Sandıklı, four shops in the Unkapani
quarter of Istanbul as well as two houses there, and
a vineyard in Kadıköy near Istanbul (cf. i, 471; vi,
146; ix, 51). This gives some idea of Ewliya's
economic circumstances, which—though in addition to his
shrewdness in making himself useful to the
dignitaries—made it possible for him to follow his
Wanderlust. Ewliya's mother was from the Caucasus;
she came to the sūdān in the time of Sultan Ahmed I
(1012-26/1603-17), and was there married to the
court jeweller, Ewliya's father. Ewliya says that his
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EWWLIYA CELEBI

he mentions is 1 Dijumada I 1087/12 July 1766, although he knows of events which took place in 1093/1682 (cf. x, 1048) and later (cf. biographical details discussed above). He seems to have spent the last year of his life in Istanbul editing his book, his last task which had some literary value. He piecemeal at various times and required a final redaction which Ewliya, as the ms show, never fully accomplished.

Ewliya Celebi is an imaginative writer with a marked penchant for the wonderful and the adventurous. He prefers legends to bare historical fact, indulges freely in exaggeration, and at times does not eschew bragging or anecdotes designed for comic effect. His Seyahatname thus appears in the first place as a work of 17th century light literature, which satisfied the need of the Turkish intellectuals of his time for entertainment and instruction, and which, thanks to the use at times of a traditional Turkish narrative technique and of the colloquial Turkish of the 17th century, with occasional borrowings of phrases and expressions from the ornate style, was intelligible to a wide circle; this obvious purpose of the work explains Ewliya's lack of concern for historical truth. He also occasionally describes journeys which he himself manifestly cannot have undertaken. His literary ambition often drives him to record things and occurrences as though he had seen or experienced them himself, whereas a close examination reveals that he knows of them only from hearsay or that he is indebted to literary sources which he does not cite.

In spite of these reservations, the Seyahatname offers a wealth of information on cultural, historical, and geographical sources which will be especially valuable once the philological groundwork is done and the necessary criticism of content applied. The charm of the work lies not least in the fact that it reflects the mental approach of the 17th century Ottoman intellectual in its attitudes to the non-Muslim Occident, and throws some light on the administration and internal organization of the Ottoman empire of that time.

Cavid Baysun, to whom we owe the most comprehensive study to date of Ewliya Celebi's life and work (see below), has declared that one of the most pressing needs of the preparation of a new critical edition of the Seyahatname, and that only this would make possible the effective use of the information that it contains. Baysun's suggestions have been in part taken up in the admirable detailed researches of Meşkûre Eren (see below), limited to the first book of the Seyahatname. On the basis of her findings from the ms, Dr. Eren demonstrates Ewliya's method of working, and points to the many blank and unfinished passages in the Seyahatname, which suggest that the author intended to expand the work further and to give it a final redaction which he did not however complete; she also proves that Ewliya made abundant use of literary sources for his descriptions and even for the chronograms which he quotes. Dr. Eren classifies these literary sources (all with reference to book i of the Seyahatname), identifies those named in the work by Ewliya; (2) those which Ewliya has used but not cited. In this group fall: (2) Ah, Kunh al-akhbar (cf. Babinger, GOW, 122 ff.); Ibrahim Pasha, Tarih (cf. Babinger, 192 ff.); Newwizade Aṭṭâʾī, Hādāʾik al-habibi fī takmilat al-Shahābī (cf. Babinger, 171 ff.); Sād, Tadhkira al-bunyān (cf. Babinger, 137 ff.); Awli, Divanı (al-khadîyât, in the Turkish translation of Djelalzade Şâlih (cf. Ms Istanbul
Topkapısayar, Revan Koskii no. 1085, 6g3a); Basırı, Lafaṭi (quoted in the Tedhkire of Khnallīzāde Ḥasan Celebi, Ms Istanbul, Üniversite Kütüphanesi, T.Y. 2525, 74a); and chronogram verses from various poets cited by Eren (100-14); (3) those which Ewliya cited, but has not used.

Mss of the Seyḥabatname.

Istanbul: Pertev Pasa collection nos. 458-62; Topkapısayar, Bagdat Koskii nos. 300-4; Beşir Ağă nos. 448-52 (copy of 1158 [= 1745]). These mss include all ten books of the work. Also Topkapısayar, Bagdat Koskii nos. 304 (i, ii), 305 (iii, iv), 306 (ix), 307 (vi), 308 (vii, viii); Topkapısayar, Revan Koskii nos. 366/1457-369/1460 (vi, vii, viii, ix); Hamiṣiye no. 963 (x); Halis Efendi no. 2750 (i), ibid. 2750 mukerrer (i), iv; Üniversite Kütüphanesi no. 2371 (i, ii, copy of 1170 [= 1756-7]), 593 (i, ii, copy of 1155 [= 1742-3]); Yıldız, Tarih Kısımlı, no. 48 (x). Vienna: Nationalbibliothek H.O. 193 (iv, cf. G. Flügel, Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der kaiserlich-königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien, Vienna 1865-7, ii, 433, no. 228; Cod. mixt 1382 (i). London: Royal Asiatic Society nos. 22-3 (i, ii, iii, iv). Manchester: Univ. Libr., Lindsay collection no. 142 (iii). Basle: R. Tschudi collection (i, ii, iii). Munich: Bayer. Staatsbibliothek (?), Th. Menzel collection (i, ii, iii, iv).

Printed versions of the Seyḥabatname.

Poor edition of extracts from Bk.i, with foreword, under the title of Münkteğab-i Ewliya Celebi, Istanbul 1258 (150 pp.), 1262 (143 pp.); Bülak 1264 (140 pp.); Istanbul, ca. 1890 (104 pp., quarto). Integral edition: i-vi, Istanbul 1314-8 (Ikdam Press); i-vi, Istanbul, ca. 1890 (104 pp., quarto). Istanbul: Pertev Pasa collection nos. 458-62; Besir Aga nos. 448-52 (copy of 1158 [= 1745]).

Evrenos, (Ghazi Evrenos) makes his appearance in history after the emirate of Karasi had been occupied by the Ottomans (after 735/1334-5). Ghazi Evrenos was the descendent of Evrenos, who was the father of Cemal-oghullari, the four houses of which are mentioned by the Ottomans historians also refer to his great generosity; he devoted a large part of his wealth to charitable foundations. Together with the Malkodi-oghullari, the Turakhan-oghullari, the Malkoçi-oghullari and the Tårkhân-oghullari, the descendants of Evrenos constitute the four ancient families of the Ottoman warrior nobility.

Bibliography (in addition to works quoted above): Ashikpashažade, ed. Ali, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 60, 61, 63 (= Osmanlı Tarikileri, i, Istanbul 1946, 125-8, 130-2, 135); Nejri, edd. Unat and Köyem, i and ii, passim; Die altsarmenischen anonymen Chroniken, tr. F. Giese, 25, 30, 31, 34, 35, 68, 70; Chaiozidynes, Bonn ed., 79-90, 97-9, 175, 181; Ducas, Bonn ed., 50; Phrantzes, Bonn ed., 62-3, 83; Epiroteika, Bonn ed., 234, 235; Hamid Wehbi, Ghazi Evrenos Beg, Meğhikir-i İslam, Istanbul 1301-2, 801-40; Ofomân Ferid, Evrenos Beg Khañeddnina Evliyâ-ı Vardar, which was called “Evrenos Beg yores”; cf. Evliya Celebi, ix, 47. In the time of Murad I, Evrenos had already become one of the greatest feudatories of the Ottoman empire. The extent of the lands belonging to him had become legendary (Ali, Künk, v, 75; Beausejour, Tableau du commerce de la Grèce, i, 111 ff.). The Ottoman historians also refer to his great generosity; he devoted a large part of his wealth to charitable foundations. Together with the Malkoçi-oghullari, the Malkoçi-oghullari and the Tårkhân-oghullari, the descendants of Evrenos constitute the four ancient families of the Ottoman warrior nobility.

Tableau du commerce de la Grèce, tr. F. Giese, 25, 30, 31, 34, 35, 68, 70; Chaiozidynes, Bonn ed., 79-90, 97-9, 175, 181; Ducas, Bonn ed., 50; Phrantzes, Bonn ed., 62-3, 83; Epiroteika, Bonn ed., 234, 235; Hamid Wehbi, Ghazi Evrenos Beg, Meğhikir-i İslam, Istanbul 1301-2, 801-40; Ofomân Ferid, Evrenos Beg Khañeddnina Evliyâ-ı Vardar, which was called “Evrenos Beg yores”; cf. Evliya Celebi, ix, 47. In the time of Murad I, Evrenos had already become one of the greatest feudatories of the Ottoman empire. The extent of the lands belonging to him had become legendary (Ali, Künk, v, 75; Beausejour, Tableau du commerce de la Grèce, i, 111 ff.). The Ottoman historians also refer to his great generosity; he devoted a large part of his wealth to charitable foundations. Together with the Malkoçi-oghullari, the Malkoçi-oghullari and the Tårkhân-oghullari, the descendants of Evrenos constitute the four ancient families of the Ottoman warrior nobility.

whom married the Grand Vizier Candarli Khalil Pasha and became the mother of Bayezid II's father, and became the mother of Bayezid II's father, and became the mother of Bayezid II's

son. Two of his sons became famous in history; Ali and Isla. Ali was at first head of the akbindjis under the command of his father, then sandjak-begi. During the interregnum he adopted the cause of Mūsā Celebi, and was sent by him to join his father who was living in retirement at Yeniğen-i Vardar, but on the advice of Evrenos he went into the service of Mehmed Celebi. When Mehmed died, the sons of Evrenos, like the other begs of Rûmeli, joined the cause of the pretender known as Mustafa Düzme [q.v.]; but at Ulubâd they forsook him and went over to Murâd II. They were pardoned, and the sultan confirmed their possession of the fief granted to Evrenos by Murâd I. In 833/1430, when Murâd II was storming Salonika, Ali Beg won distinction by inciting the assailants with promises of booty. In 838/1434-5 he headed a raid into Albania and returned laden with booty. In 1437 he was sent with the akbindjis to make a reconnaissance raid in Hungary; he came back after a month, loaded with spoils, and advised the sultan to invade the country. In 845/1441 he led siege to Belgrade, but the akbindjis were defeated by the Hungarians and the Turks had to withdraw. During the revolt of the Albanians under the leadership of George Castrioti, Iskender Beg (1443-58) [q.v.], he several times commanded the Turkish forces sent against the rebel. In 866/1462 he took part with his two sons Ahmed and Evrenos in the campaign in Wallachia, in which they several times played a great part in the rise of the Ottoman empire, remained, throughout the course of history, one of the most prominent by reason both of the strategic and administrative division under a beglerbegi [q.v.]. In this sense it was officially used after the Mamluks, the two sons of Ali Evrenos-oghlu, Shems al-Din Ahmed and Evrenos, were present with their father

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II

Berat. In 867/1463 he was involved in the incidents in the Morea which led to the Turco-Venetian war. In 884/1479, together with Ali and Iskender Mkhâl-oghlu and Bali Malköö-oghlu, he led the raid into Transylvania which ended in the massacre of the Turks who, too avid for loot, allowed themselves to be taken unawares and were crushed by the volvode Stephen Bathori. He died after this date; his tomb is at Yenidie-i Vardar.

The two sons of Ali Evrenos-oghlu, Shems al-Din Ahmed and Evrenos, were present with their father on the campaign in Wallachia in 866/1462; Evrenos was sent on a raid to the frontier of Moldavia; the former, whose name occurs in numerous archive-documents, was in 890/1486 beg of the sandjak of Trikika, and then of Semendria; in 883/1478 he took part in the siege of Shkodra in Albania and was afterwards appointed head of the garrison left in the fort. A year before his death (903/1498), he established a waqf of which his son Mūsā was put in trust; his other two sons, Isla and Süleyman, had died in 893/1488 at the battle of Agha-Cayril, against the Mamlûks.

Other descendants of Evrenos are recorded at the beginning of the 9th/16th century, notably Mīhâmmed, son of Isla b. Evrenos, sandjak-begi of Elbasan, who captured Durazzo in 907/1502; and Yûsuf, grandson of Mâdâr-Shâh b. Evrenos, who was present on Selim I's Egyptian campaign. The Evrenos family, who won their fame by their raids in Rûmeli, lost their importance as military leaders after the middle of the 16th century. This family, which played a great part in the rise of the Ottoman empire, remained, throughout the course of history, on the most prominent by reason both of the strategic and administrative division under a beglerbegi [q.v.], governor-general. In this sense it was officially used after
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EYALET, from the Arabic iyyâl, "management, administration, exercise of power" (cf. Turkish translation of Fürûzâbâdî's Kûmûs by Şaşm, Istanbul 1250/ 1834, iii, 135); in the Ottoman empire the largest administrative division under a beglerbegi [q.v.], governor-general. In this sense it was officially used after
1000/1591. The assumption that under Murad III the empire was divided up into eydlets (M. d’Ohsson, Tableau gêne“ral de l’empire ottoman, vii, 277) must be an error since the term does not occur in the documents of the period. Instead we always find be~lerbegilik and wilayet (wilaya). Beli$erglik was then the proper term for this administrative division, while wilayet designated any governorship, large or small (cf. Sûre$-i Deft$-i San$âhi$-i Aramâ, ed. H. Inalcik, Ankara 1954, index; U. Heyd, Ottoman documents on Palestine, Oxford 1960, 277). As a term designating the territory of a beliger$eglik, eydlet must have been adopted by 1000/1591, while be$ler$eglik continued to be used rather for the office of a be$ler$egi.

In early Ottoman history the be$ler$egi was the commander-in-chief of the provincial forces, in particular timariots, and as such the institution was directly connected with that of the be$ler$egi, commander-in-chief, found with the Sel$d$ukids and Il$hâ$ns (cf. F. Köprülü, Bitânas mis$ses$ellerinin Osman$-man mi$sses$ellerine tespî, in THITM, i (1931), 190-5 [Ital. tr. Alcune osservazioni . . . , Rome 1944]; I. H. Uzunçarşılı, Osman$-man devleti $eh$îd$-în$ên medhal, Istanbul 1941, 59-60, 108). Ork$han during his father’s reign, ’Alâ’ al-Dîn Pasha his brother and Sûleymân Pasha his son during Or$han’s reign, were contemporaries of be$ler$egi (cf. article Dulkadîrlar, in TDK, iii/52 (1949), 35). But Murâd I (922) made Shâhîn, his lâlâ [q.v.], beliger$egi (under the Sel$d$ukids some beli$erges$egi bore the title of lâlâ, or the synonymous alâbeg). In a passage in Rûhî’s chronicle lâlâ emek means to appoint be$ler$egi, and set out for his historic conquests in Thrace. The conquered lands there were put under lâlâ Shâhîn’s military responsibility while Ewr$enos [q.v.] was made lâlâ [q.v.] begi over the irregular ghâzî forces on the marches (Neghrî, Gîhânmîsû, i, ed. Fr. Taeschner, Leipzig 1951, 54; Ör$ü$î, Tewârî$kh-î Alî ‘Oth$man, ed. Fr. Babinger, Hanover 1925, 20, 92). Thus the Ottoman be$ler$egi became be$ler$egi of Rumeli, and the rivalry between him and the sâ$di-begi became an important factor of Ottoman history down to Mehe$med II’s time (cf. H. Inalcik, Osman$-man devleti de Alî ’Oth$man, Istanbul 1958). But the be$ler$egi of Rumeli was still the only be$ler$egi, the actual commander-in-chief of the Ottoman army. In the period between 728/1325 and 729/1326 the vizier Cândarî Khêtîr al-Dîn was made at the same time the commander-in-chief, with the title of pasha, of all the forces in Rumeli [q.v.] while the Sultan himself had to stay in Anatolia. Thus the growing responsibilities in Rumeli and Anatolia, the two parts of the empire divided by the Straits (of which the Ottomans were not in complete control until the time of Mehemmed II), led to the creation of the two bé$ler$begeliks of Rumeli and Anadolu (Anatolia), which thereafter formed the backbone of the empire. In 795/1393 when Bâyazîd I had to leave Anatolia for Rumeli he appointed Kara Timur$tagh bé$ler$egi of Anadolu in Ankara (Neghrî, 86). In his father’s time Bâyazîd himself had been a governor on this udî area in Kütâ$yâ$ha. But the bé$ler$egi of Rumeli preserved his position of primacy in the state by being always considered as the first among the be$ler$egi, having the exclusive right to sit with the viziers at Dîwân [q.v.] meetings etc. (cf. Kânûnîne-î Alî ‘Oth$man, Mehemmed the Conqueror’s code of laws, ed. M. 3$rî, suppl. of TOEM, 1330/1912, 13; Sûleymân I confirmed these provisions in Muharrâm 942/July 1555, see Fehrîn, Mün$â$ha’dâl$-î Sâl$â$în, Istanbul 1274, 305; cf. also Kânûnî-î Mîr$-î Mîrûn, in MTM, i (1331), 527). Mahmûd Pasha under Mehemmed II and Ibrahim Pasha under Sûleymân I both held the offices of Grand Vizier and begler$egi of Rumeli at the same time.

It appears that further be$ler$begeliks in Anatolia were founded subsequently according to the traditional pattern.

The farthest udî wilayet in Anatolia, which became the nuclei of the new be$ler$begeliks, continued to be assigned to the Ottoman royal princes. The third be$ler$egi, that of Rûm in the Amasya-Tokat region, developed from an udî under the royal princes whose lâlâs, responsible for the actual administration, bore the title of pasha and be$ler$egi from Bâyazîd I’s time (cf. H. Hûsûn el-Dîn, Amâ$sa ta$rî$ghî, iii, Istanbul 1927, 157-91). Timur’s invasion and later on Shâshruk$h’s threats (cf. article Murad II, in IA) made this region vitally important for the Ottomans, and the new conquests in Dîn$ak and Trebizond were incorporated into it. Also put under a royal prince with his lâlâs after its conquest in 873/1468 (cf. article Mehemmed II in IA) the ‘udî wilayet of Karaman (cf. Fâtih devîrîn Karaman eyle$ti vâ$flar$-î fîhr$î$stî, ed. F. N. Uzûluk, Ankara 1958, fac. 2) developed into a be$ler$egi later on (in 922/1526 Khi$$rew Pasha was the be$ler$egi). The development of the udî wilayet of Bosna into a be$ler$egi in Rumeli took more than a century from 867/1463 until 915/1508 (the period is examined in detail in the monograph by H. Sabanovic, Bosanski Pa$aluk, Sarajevo 1959). With some variation dependent on the particular conditions of the udî sand$ja$qs and further conquests (cf. L. Bekete, Osman$-man Tür$kleri ve Macarlar, in Belleten, xiii/52 (1949), 679-83), the Ottomans maintained the pre-conquest boundaries, especially in the first ‘udî wilayet stage (cf. H. Sabanovic, op. cit., 1-55; H. Inalcik, Sûre$-i Deft$-i . . . , 33, 55, 75). Later on in reorganizing them as sand$ja$qs [q.v.] and be$ler$begeliks they acted more freely and fixed the boundaries according to the situation.

The conquests under Selim I were organized first as the wilayet of ’Alâ’ al-Dawla (conquered in 921/1515), the wilayet of ’Arab which included Syria, Palestine, Egypt and the Hidjaz, and the wilayet of Diyar-Bakr (conquered in 923/1517, first survey in 924/1518, cf. Barkan, Kanûnlar, 145 and article Diyar$-bekir in IA). In an Ottoman record of 926/1520 (cf. O. L. Barkan, H. 933-934 mül$î$zûn a$a will bû$tu$ne $orne$vi, in Ist. Ünv. İktisat Fakül$tesi Mem$mu$z, xvi/1-4 (1953-4), 303-7) we then find the wilayets of Rumeli with 30 sand$ja$qs, Anadolu with 20 sand$ja$qs, Karaman with 8 sand$ja$qs, Rûm (Amasya-Tokat) with 5 sand$ja$qs, ’Arab with 15 sand$ja$qs, Diyr$-Bakr with 9 sand$ja$qs (the names of the sand$ja$qs are given). In addition 28 Kurdish dî$me$’s$ta$ts in south-eastern Anatolia were mentioned as li$wads (sand$ja$qs). In the first years of the reign of Sûleymân I events forced him to reorganize the wilayet of ’Arab into the be$ler$begeliks of Haleb (Aleppo), Shâm (Damascus) and Egypt (cf. Gibb-Bowen, i/i, 200-34; B. Lewis, Notes and documents from the Turkish Archives, Jerusalem 1952; S. J. Shaw, The financial and administrative organisation and development of Ottoman Egypt, Princeton 1962, 1-19). The wilayet of ’Alâ’ al-Dawla too was put under an Ottoman be$ler$egi in 928/1522 (cf. article Dulkadîrlar, in IA). In 940/1533 Sûleymân I also created the be$ler$begi of Djeza’ir (Algeria) with the appointment of Khêtîr al-Dîn Kapudân Pasha [q.v.]. The development of the sea udî into a be$ler$egi was
precipitated by Andrea Doria's capture of Koron and the crusading activities of Charles V in the Mediterranean. In the western reports of about 941/1534 (Rambert, A. Gritti in A. H. Lybyer, Theeyelet of the Ottoman Empire in the time of Sultan Selim the Magnificent, Cambridge, Mass., 1913, 255-61, 270-1) the beglerbegis in the Ottoman empire are listed as follows: Djezzâir under the name of the beglerbegis of the sea, Rumeli, Anadolu, Karaman, Amasya-Tokat, Ḍâlâ al-Dawla, Dîyar Bâkr, Şâ姆 and Egypt.

Further conquests under Süleyman I gave rise to the new beglerbegis: Ağbâr-ı Alemdar and Baghdad in 941/1534, Van in Râdjab 955/August 1548, Erzurum in 941/1534, Akça-kaḷ'ıa in Georgia in Şâbān 956/September 1549 (cf. Feridûn, op. cit., i, 586, 604, 606) in Asia; Budân in Dâmâdâr 948/August 1541, Temeshâvar in 959/1552 in Europe (cf. Fekete, op. cit.). Thus in appointing beglerbegis on the spot immediately after the conquest Süleyman I made an innovation.

In 976/1568 when a large scale expedition was planned in the Volga basin the sandjak of Kefe (Caffa) in the beglerbegis of Rumeli was raised to a beglerbegi (cf. H. Inalcik, Osmanlı-Rus rekabetinin menşesi, in Belleten, xii/4 (1948), 375 = The origin of the Ottoman-Russian rivalry... , in Ann. de l'Un. d'Ankara, i (1946-7), 75). As, after its conquest, Crete had been assigned to the Lekfokhs (Nicoya) was made the centre of a beglerbegi in 979/1571, and, the sandjaks of Ḍâlâ-ı Alemdar, Şarsûs, Iezel, Sis and Târâbulus-Şâm (Syrian Tripoli) were attached to it.

Of many beglerbegis created during the occupation of the Caucasian lands between 986/1578 and 999/1590 (cf. B. Kütükoğlu, Osmanlı-Iran siyâslî mânâsâbâtleri, Istanbul 1962) only those of Çálido and Kars (created in 988/1585) remained after the Persian war. (For the Persian war under ʿAbbâs I q.v.).

In the list of ʿAyn-i ʿAll of 1018/1609 (Kâzım-ı ʿAli-i ʿOthmân, Istanbul 1280) are mentioned thirty-two eyalets in the empire. Twenty-three of them were regular Ottoman eyalets subject to the timâr system. These were: Rumeli, Anadolu, Karaman, Budân, Temeshâvar, Bosna, Djezzâr-i Bâkr-i Seffâ (q.v. KLâh), Dhuţâklâdîriye (formerly ʿAlâ al-Dawla or Marâşh), Dîyarbâkîr, Rûm (Amasya-Tokat or Sivas), Erzurum, Şâm, Târâbulus-Şâm, Şâple, Raḵkâ, Kars, Çálido, Trabzon, Kefe, Mosul, Van, Şehrizâr. Nine eyalets were with sâlyâne (q.v.), that is, to say the tax revenues were not distributed as timârs but collected directly for the Sultan's treasury; the beglerbegi, soldiers and all the other functionaries were assigned salaries from the annual tax collection of the eyalet. The eyalets with sâlyâne were: Mişr (Egypt), Baghdaḏ, Yemen, Ḥâbeṣh (Eritrea), Baṣra, Laḥṣâ, Djezzâr-i Ḥârāb (Algeria), Târâbulus-Şâm (Tripoliânia), Tînûs (Tunis). (See further MÜSTÊHENİ EYALETLERİ.)

In the list given by Koçi Beg about 1640 (Risâle, ed. A. K. Aksi, Istanbul 1939, 99-102) the only difference is that the eyalet of Şîrîn which had been created by then primarily with the purpose of stopping the continuing Cossack attacks on the Black Sea coasts. It included the sandjaks on the western coasts of the Black Sea and the Danube. In both lists the eyalets of Kâzım-ı Šârî (Kanîzsa) and Egri (Eger) are missing though these were created after their conquest in 1004/1596 (cf. Fekete, op. cit., 681). In Kâthl Cevlî's Dîyâkâmümâ (ed. İbrâhîm Mişril, İstanbul 1945, 145/1732, and trans. J. von Hammer, Rumeli und Bosna, Vienna 1812) we find the same eyalets with the differences that Marâşh for Dhuţâklâdîriye, Sivas for Rûm, Konya for Karaman are mentioned, and the eyalet of Adana is added.

The term of eyalet for beglerbegi disappeared by the end of the 18th century. Proceeding from various documents in its general meaning (cf. Feridûn, i, 614). Also in the new period the important eyalets were assigned to beglerbegis of the rank of vizier, with three tughâs (cf. Gibb-Bowen, i/i, 139-41), who had some authority over the neighbouring beglerbegis of two tughâs. Also now the general tendency was to create smaller beglerbegis which were required to cope with certain military situations. Such was the case with the small beglerbegis set up in Georgia and Ağbâr-ı Alemdar after 986/1578. In Syria a fourth eyalet, that of Șâyâdâ, was created in 1023/1614 for the better control of the area (cf. U. Heyd, op. cit., 45-8).

An eyalet was composed of sandjaks (lînâs) under sandjak-begis and, as a sandjak was always the basic administrative unit, the beglerbegi himself was at the head of a sandjak called șâğa sandjâkgâ. It included certain centrally located towns and districts in each sandjak as his kâdî (see TİMÂR).

The main responsibilities of a beglerbegi were summarized in berdâs (diplomas) of assignment (see for example the berdâ of ʿĪsâ Beg in Feridûn, i, 269; for its date cf. H. Inalcîk, Fâṭîh devri, Ankara 1954, 77; also see RMTM, 1-2, i, 527-8). Representing the executive power of the Sultan on all matters (umâr-i siyâset) in the eyalet and called in this capacity wâld of it, he enforced the kâdî's decisions and the Sultan's orders. He was also entitled to give decisions in the diwan under him (beglerbegî siyâslî) on matters concerning the persons of 'askerî (see 'ASKARî) status. But the beglerbegi with the rank of vizier had larger and more absolute powers (cf. RMTM, i, 528). The beglerbegi's main administrative responsibility was to maintain public security, and pursue those who broke the law and opposed the Sultan's orders (for their ceremonial privileges see RMTM, i, 527-8). It should be emphasized that the kâdî and mül defterdâr (see DÂFTARDÂR) in an eyalet were independent of the beglerbegis in their decisions, and, could apply directly to the central government. Also the ağhas of the Janissary garrisons in the main cities were independent of the beglerbegis, who could never enter the fortresses under the Janissaries' guardianship. These restrictions and frequent changes of their posts were obviously designed to prevent beglerbegis from becoming too independent.

The Beglerbegî-evlâdeti was essentially based on the tîmâr system and a beglerbegi was responsible primarily for the army of timarîPlâhîns in his eyalet. Under his command it was the largest military unit in the imperial army. It was the beglerbegi's responsibility to bring it to the Sultan's army in perfect condition. The appointment and promotions of the sipahîs depended on him. He was entitled to grant timârs up to a certain amount (cf. ʿAyn-i ʿAll, op. cit., 61-81). Two high officials, the deffet-defterdâs and timâr-defterdâs under him, were responsible for these affairs. The copies of the timâr and muflâşaf defters, basic record-books of timârs drawn up for each sandjak, were sent by the Sultan to the eyalets (H. Inalcîk, Sûret-i Defter, xxi; Heyd, op. cit., 48).

But in the period of decline when the central authority weakened the whole system deteriorated. In some distant eyalets the Janissaries obtained a large number of tughâs and landed estates, and in the case in the North African provinces and Baghdaḏ. In Egypt, however, it was the Mamlûk beg who
finally seized the actual control (cf. Shaw, op. cit., 184-5, 316). In the eyalets of Eastern Anatolia the Janis- saries' attempt to seize power failed before the violent reaction of the provincial forces and the Dulkadirli (see Supplement, s.v.) under Abaza Mehmed Pasha [q.v.]. But it was the disorganization of the timar system that brought about fundamental changes in the eyalets. Now an important part of the tax revenues was not distributed as timars, but reserved directly for the Sultan's treasury, and farmed out to the tax-farmers; it then became a widespread practice to assign governorships with the governor himself farming the taxes, a practice applied previously in some distant eyalets like Egypt. Thus on his appointment the governor guaranteed to deliver to the treasury a certain amount of money as the province's tax revenue. Also governors in general were encouraged by the Sultan to maintain forces at their own expense. It was principally these developments that prepared the way for the emergence of autonomous eyalets in the 12th/13th century. In the same period local magnates called a'yans [q.v.] acquired power in the eyalets, since the governors were actually power- less without their cooperation. Despite the Sultan's efforts to reserve the rank of pasha for his own men, some of these a'yans managed to obtain governorships and even to found real provincial dynasties not only in the remotest provinces but also in Anatolia and Rumelii [see DEREBEY].

In 1227/1812 Mahmud II [q.v.] opened war against the pasha and a'yans of this type to re-establish the authority of the central government in the provinces, and after 1241/1826 reorganized them as mumkiyyet (mumkiyya) giving the mumkis large powers in military as well as financial affairs with a view to organizing the new army (cf. Lütfl, Ta'rikh, v, 107, 172). With the proclamation of the Taşşmâd [q.v.] in 1255/1839 financial affairs in the eyalets were made the exclusive responsibility of the muhasısls, and later on important changes under Western influence were introduced in the provincial administration: administrative councils were set up in the provinces sharing the governors' responsibilities, and most of the eyalets were reduced in size (see especially the sâlimânes [state year books] published since 1263/1849). The eyalet system was finally replaced by that of vilayet [q.v.] in 1281/1864.

(HALİL İNALÇIK)

**EYÜL** (see TA'KIRLİ)

**EYMRİ (EYMİR)**, name of an Oğuz tribe (boy). They are mentioned in a legendary account of the pagan Oğuz as being the only tribe of the Üc-ök group from whom sprang rules, but the historical references to them so far known go back only to the 10th/16th century, when they formed part of Türkmen federations in the Ottoman Empire, in Persia, and south-east of the Caspian Sea.

(1) The Eymir of the Ottoman domains were in two main branches, the one living among the Türk- men of Aleppo, the other with the Dulkadirli confederation (ulus). The former consisted, in the reign of Süleyman I, of four clans (oymak); later in the 10th/16th century their numbers increased, to form 11 clans. At this period another clan of this branch was found among the Veni-er tribesfolk south of Sivas. After the second siege of Vienna (1683), the Eymir, like other Türkmen groups, were required to serve in the war with Austria. A little later an unsuccessful attempt was made to settle a large group of the Türkmen of Aleppo, the Eymir among them, in the Hamâ-Hims region; their population is recorded in the 12th/18th century as 500 tents. The Eymir living among the Dulkadirli were much more numerous, those of the Mar'âş region alone comprising, in the third decade of the 10th/16th century, 49 clans. Like the other groups constituting the Dulkadirli confederation, these Eymir were half-settled, engaging in agriculture in their winter camping-grounds and growing rice. During the 11th/ 17th century they became completely settled in the Mar'âş-Aynâtâb region. Some scattered clans of this group were then living in other areas occupied by the Dulkadirli confederation—in the sandjak of Kars (Kadirlî) and Bozok, among the Boz-ulus, and in Persia.

Small communities named Eymürülü and Eymürüler were found in the regions of Söğüt, Aydın and Adana, but they took their name probably not from the tribe but from individuals (Eymir/Imir was a common personal name in the 13th/15th and 16th centuries). 'Eymir' or 'Eymür' is a common village-name in central and western Turkey, particularly around Sivas, whence it appears that this tribe formed an important element among the Turkish immigrants into Anatolia.

(2) The Eymir of Persia belonged to the Dhu 'l-Kadr confederation, dwelling in Fars, which was one of the seven great Kızıl-baş tribes upon which depended the power of the Safawid dynasty. The Dhu 'l-Kadr tribe was a branch of the Dhu 'l-Kadr/ Dulkadirli confederation of Anatolia, from whence it had migrated to Persia.

(3) Eymir were found in the 10th/16th century also among the Sayân Khandu Türkmen dwelling along the rivers Atrak and Djurdjan north of Astarâbâd. Upon their submission to Shah 'Abbâs, their chief 'All Yâr was appointed governor of Astarâbâd, with the title of Khan; after his death in about 1605/1596, his son Muhammed Yâr succeeded him. A remnant of these Eymir, numbering some 200 households, is still living in this region.


(FARUK SUMER)

**EYÜB** [see İSTANBUL]

**ZEKIEL** [see HIZKIL]

**EZELI** [see AZALI]

**EYRA** [see IDRIS, 'UZAYR].
FADAK, an ancient small town in the northern Hijaz, near Khaybar and, according to Yâkût, two or three days' journey from Medina. This place-name having disappeared, Hâfiz Wabba in his Digerat al-'Arab (Cairo 1936, 15) identified the ancient Fadak with the modern village of al-Huwayyit (pron. Howeyat), situated on the edge of the harrâ of Khaybar. Inhabited, like Khaybar, by a colony of Jewish agriculturists, Fadak produced dates and cereals; handicrafts also flourished, with the weaving of blankets with palm-leaf borders.

Fadak owes its fame in the history of Islam to the fact that it was the object of an agreement and a particular decision by the Prophet, and that it gave rise to a disagreement between Fatîma and Abû Bakr, the consequences of which were to last more than two centuries. When, in 5/627, Muhammad took his well-known measures against the Banû Qurayza (q.v.), the Jews of Khaybar and the neighbourhood became alarmed and secretly attempted to form a league in the expectation of an attack; a hâyy of the Banû Sa'd living in the vicinity then offered them help, but Muhammad sent about a hundred men commanded by 'Ali against this hâyy in Shabân 6/December 627-January 628; the expedition was reduced to a raid. In the following year, Muhammad marched against Khaybar, and the Jews of Fadak, frightened by the news of his victories, agreed to hold discussions with a view to concluding an agreement with the Prophet's envoy, Mubahyaisa b. Mas'ûd al-Ansârî, even going so far as to propose giving up all their possessions provided that Muhammad allowed them to depart. An initial agreement was followed by a second pact granted by Muhammad, sometimes overlooked by the sources (e.g. the K. al-Khandaj); they were to remain in Fadak while giving up half their lands and half the produce of the oasis; on this point al-Baladhuri (Fathî, 29) is explicit: `âlî miaf al-ard bi-turbatâhâ (the emendation suggested in the Glossary, bi-

FAMILY [see HIKAYA, KIŠSA, MATHAL].

FADA'IL [see FADILA].

FADAK, 20th letter of the Arabic alphabet, transcribed /; numerical value 80, as in the Syriac (and Canaanite) alphabet [see ABDJAD].

Definition: fricative, labio-dental, unvoiced; according to the Arabic grammatical tradition: riqqa, ḥaṭāyīya (or ḥaṭāhīya), mahmûsa; f is a continuation of a p in ancient Semitic and common Semitic. For the phonological oppositions of the phoneme f, see J. Cantinoue, Ésquisse, in BSL (no. 126), 94, 2; for the incompatibilities, ibid., 134.

Modifications: some examples exist of the passage of f to ðh, as in the doublet: nukât and nukhât "tumour on a camel's jaw" (a less frequent passage than the reverse: ðh > f); see al-Kâllî, Alâ, ii, 34-5, Ibn Dînân's critique, Sîrân sindâ', i, 250-1. This passage probably explains the existence of ðhâm "mouth" (nomad) > ðumm (sedentary), in modern Syro-Lebanese dialects, side by side with ðumûm (the expected form) in central Syria (see A. Barthélyen, Dict. Ar.-Fr., 93 and 622).

(H. FLEISCH)
based on the valuation of their property. This fact confirms that the former were regarded simply as usufructuaries, so that the share-cropping agreement with them could thus be broken without compensation, whereas the rights of ownership of the latter to one half of the oasis were recognised. Even after the expulsion of the Jews, Umar used different methods for Khaybar and for Fadak: to the Muslims who had received from Muhammad a share in the produce from Khaybar (or to their heirs), he gave ownership of the land (rakabat al-ard, says al-Kubi, ii, 573); as regards Fadak, he did not change the system, and his immediate predecessors followed his example. However, this assertion by the majority of the sources is explained by a note which ıyakt has preserved for us and Ibn Katir has clarified with some details: when the Muslims, thanks to their conquests, had attained widespread prosperity, Umar, guided by his ıgithab, assigned Fadak to al-Abbas and ıAli; these two men quarrelled bitterly, each maintaining his own right of possession, and ıUmar left them to sort out the matter themselves; it seems that they partitioned the oasis—subsequently, however, there is no further mention of the rights of al-Abbas and his descendants to Fadak—and that one condition had been imposed by ıUmar, namely that Fadak had to remain a ısadaka in the caliph's view, ıAli and al-Abbas had naturally been the ard's usufuctuaries, so that the share-cropping agreement could thus be broken without compensation of a charitable foundation. It is to be assumed, however, that since the Prophet had used the revenues of Fadak also to meet the needs of his family, ıAli, and the ıAlids after him, put the same interpretation upon the way in which the ısadaka should be administered; thus is to be explained their persistence in claiming possession of the oasis, and the promptness with which the caliphs dismissed them of it as soon as they went into opposition (see below). In later times it was not clearly understood what had happened; the uncertainty of the information is explained by ıYakt, according to whom the disagreement over the question of Fadak sprang from political passions; and further evidence of this is to be found in the Kithab al-Abdsyyah of al-Djahiz (see Ibn ıAbi ıHaddad, Sharı al-kubiya, iv, 98; Rasdil, ed. Sandubl, 300). Ibn Katir (ıBidayya, iv, 203) confirms and explains the above account. According to some ıhadiths (e.g. al-Bukhari, ed. Krehl, ii, 272 f.), ıUmar assigned to ıAli and to al-Abbas the ısadaka which the Prophet possessed at Medina, but retained Fadak and Khaybar. In any case, the change in the situation at Fadak took place after the expulsion of the Jews, for the government then had to look for the most convenient means of exploiting the land thus vacated. It was Mu'awiyah who brought the oasis under private ownership by giving it as an ıfida to Marwan b. al-Hakam; however, he took it away from him during the years when he was in disgrace (from about 48/668 to 54/674), and others then vainly coveted it, since it produced an annual revenue of approximately 10,000 dinars (Ibn Sa'd, v, 286), Marwan, in his turn, gave it to his sons ıAbd al-ıAziz and ıAbd al-Malik. When ıUmar II came to the throne, the whole property of Fadak was in his possession, since a share of it had been given him by his father ıAbd al-ıAziz, and he had gained possession of the shares belonging to al-Walid and Sulayman, ıAbd al-Malik's heirs. He was thus able to proclaim in a speech in the mosque that he had restored Fadak to its original purpose, and that the difficulties encountered by the rulers who respected the ısharla when, for political motives, they proposed to modify a situation established by the Prophet and his immediate successors.

To conclude, the question of Fadak is interesting from the legal point of view (it proves that, from the earliest times of Islam, there was a very precise conception regarding the difference between private and collective property and an awareness of the duties and rights relating to each; it is moreover an example of the difficulties encountered by the rulers who respected the ısharla when, for political motives, they proposed to modify a situation established by the Prophet and his immediate successors.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, i, ii, 28, 65, iii, 183, ii, 65, 80, 82, 86, 97, ii, 85-7, iii, 14, iv, 11, 83 f., V, 286 f., VIII, 18; Ibn Hanbal, Musnad, Cairo 1373/1954, i, 9, 14, 25, 55, 58, 60, 78, etc. Baladhuri, Futuh, 20, 29-33; idem, Ansdb, ed. M. Hamid Allah, Cairo 1959, i, 59, 78 f.; Abu Yusuf, K. al-Ijrad, trans. Fagnan, 78 f.

This is a translation of the FADAK — FADIL BEY page of the document. The text provides historical and cultural information about Fadak, a series of stanzas in the tradition of the Shehr-english [q.v.]. It discusses the dancing-boys of Istanbul, their history, and their significance.

The text also mentions Casablanca, a port in Morocco, and the activities of Spanish companies in the region. It notes the introduction of a fair number of industries and the increase in tonnage from 1952 to 1958. The population of Casablanca is also discussed, with a focus on the residents of the Kasbah neighbour of al-Mansuriyya. The text mentions the use of the anchorage in the 14th and 15th centuries.
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Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iv, 220-42; F. Edhem and
I. Stchoukine, Les manuscrits orientaux illustrts
de la Bibliotheque de V University de Stamboul,
Paris 1933, no. 17; IA, iv, 529-31, by Ali Canib
Yon tern.
(J. H. MORDTMANN*)
MUSTAFA FApIL PASHA, MISIRLI, Ottoman
statesman, was born 2 February 1830 in Cairo,
the youngest son of Ibrahim Pasha and grandson
of Muhammad CA1I Pasha, wall of Egypt. After his
education in Cairo, he went in 1262/1846 to Istanbul,
where he was attached to the office of the Grand
Vizier. He advanced in government service and was
nominated vizier in Shacban 1274/March-April 1858.
On 19 November 1862 he became Minister of Education and was transferred on 12 January 1863 to
the ministry of Finance, a post he held until March
1864, when he resigned. On 5 November 1865 he was
appointed president of the Medjlis-i khazd^in, from
which he was dismissed on 16 February 1866. Being
exiled from the Ottoman Empire, he left Istanbul,
4 April 1866, and went to Paris. His exile was probably due to his criticism of the policy of Fu'ad
Pasha [q.v.], who favoured Ismacll Pasha, the wall
of Egypt. Ismacll Pasha sought to restrict the
succession to the hereditary governorship to his own
descendants, thus depriving his brother Mustafa
Fadil Pasha of his right to succeed. Mustafa
Fadil Pasha took the leadership of Ottoman
liberalism by publishing on 24 March 1867 in the
French newspaper Libertd a letter addressed to the
Sultan cAbd al-cAz!z, in which he advised the Sultan
to accept a Constitution for the Empire (for the text
of this letter see Orient, no. 5 [icr Trimestre 1958],
29-38). He invited the Young Ottomans [see YEN:
C
OTHMANL!LAR] to join him in Europe and helped
them in their press campaign against the autocratic
government in Turkey. But he profited from the
official visit of the Sultan to Western capitals to
regain favour and returned on 20 September 1867 to
Istanbul. He was nominated, on 25 July 1869, a
member of the Medjlis-i Wdld and became for the
second time, in Muharram 12877April 1870, Minister
of Finance. He was dismissed from this post on
18 December. He occupied from October 1871 to
January 1872 the ministry of Justice. He died on
2 December 1875 in Istanbul and was buried at
Eyyub, the holy quarter of the city. His remains
were moved to Egypt on 25 June 1929. He was an
intelligent and able statesman and succeeded in
negotiating the sixth forei&n Joan of the Ottoman
Empire in 1863 during his first term as Minister of
Finance. The conditions of this loan were reasonable.
His ambition caused him to behave in an opportunist way: he used the Young Ottomans as a tool in
his intrigues to become wall of Egypt. He spent unsuccessfully extraordinary sums in this aim. Nevertheless he patronized such writers as Shinasi [q.v.]
and artists as Zeka°I Dede [q.v.]. He founded in
1870 the first club in Istanbul: this End/[umen-i
Vlfet lasted just over a year.
Bibliography: Mehmed Zeki Pakalin, Tanzimat maliye nazirlan, Istanbul 1939-40, ii, 3-65;
Marcel Colombe, Une lettre d'un prince egyptien
du XIX* siecle au sultan ottoman Abd al-Aziz, in
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Mardin, The Genesis of Young Ottoman thought,
Princeton, NJ. 1962, passim-, Sid[ill-i ^Othmdnl,
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FAplLA (Arab., pi. fadd*il) an excellence or
excellent quality, a high degree in (or of) excellence.
The plural fadd^il indicates a definite category of
literature, related to but distinct from the so-called
"disputes for precedence". Fadd^il literature exposes
the excellences of things, individuals, groups,
places, regions and such for the purpose of a laudatio.
The polemical comparison or dialogue, characteristic
of the "disputes for precedence", is lacking.
Fadd^il literature, the opposite to which is
mathdlib literature, may be divided into various
branches:
K u r 5 a n . Fadd'il literature takes its point of
departure from the Kur5an. The praise of the Kur3an
preserves, modified for the conditions of Islam, the
custom of the pre-islamic Arabs to boast (mufdkhara)
of the nobility and exalted rank of their tribes (see
Goldziher, Muh. St. i, 51, 54 ff.). A comparison of
its fadd^il with others, despite the Arab fondness
for comparison, was impossible, for the Kur3an,
as the direct and unadulterated word of God, was
immeasurable, even in polemic against the A hi alKitdb (see Goldziher, ZDMG, xxxii(i878), 344 ff.;
M. Schreiner, ZDMG, xlii (1888), 593 f.). An enumeration of its excellences was furthermore to win
back to the study of the incomparable holy book
those Muslims who had occupied themselves all too
exclusively with profane science, such as that of the
maghdzi and the amthdl (see Goldziher, Muh. St., ii,
155; Abu cUbayd, K. al-Amthdl, beginning). The
nucleus of the fadd^il al-Kur^dn consists of sayings
derived from the Prophet, his Companions and their
descendents (sahdba, tdbi'un etc.) concerning the
excellences of the individual suras and verses and the
reward for those who occupy themselves with them.
There are also accounts providing information as to
when separate revelations were granted to Muhammad. Questions of Kur'anic readings are treated in
special chapters. The oldest preserved K. Fadd^il alKur^dn is very likely that of Abu cUbayd (died 224/
837; see Brockelmann, I, 106, and SI, i66ff.),see
Ahlwardt no. 451; A. Spitaler, in Documenta Islamica
Inedita (Festschrift R. Hartmann), Berlin 1952, 1-24.
The list in HadidjI Khalifa (under <Ilm Fadd^il alKur^dri) is incomplete (see Yakut, Irshdd, indexes;
Ibn Khayr, Fihrist, index; Brockelmann, index).
The large collections of traditions, such as Bukhari's
(died 256/870) Sahih (book 66), have a separate
chapter on the Fadd^il al-Kur^dn.
Companions of the Prophet. Among others
Wahb b. Wahb (d. 200/815) had already written a
K. Fadd^il al-Ansdr (Irshdd, vii, 233, 7), al-Shaficf
(d. 204/820) a K. Fadd^il Kuraysh wa 'l-Ansdr
(Irshdd, vi, 397, 17), and Ahmad b. Hanbal's (d. 24i/
855) K. Fadd^il al-Sahdba has been preserved
(Brockelmann, S I, 310, 312). The 62nd chapter of
Bujkhari's Sahih contains fadd^il ashdb al-nabi. The
"excellences" of the Companions of the Prophet
are for the most part concerned with the experiences which they shared with the Prophet.
Historically confirmed traditions, such as that
concerning Muhammad's hidjra in the company of
Abu Bakr, stand beside fantastic prophecies by
Muhammad about the destiny and future of his
Companions, and so forth.
Individuals. Al-Mada3inI (d. 225/840) wrote a
book about the fadd^il of Muhammad b. al-Hanafiyya,
Djacfar b. Abl Talib and al-Harith b. cAbd alMuttalib (Irshdd, v, 313, 9 ff.), and al-Tabarl (d. 3io/
923) one about those of Abu Bakr, cUmar, al-cAbbas


and 'Ali (Irshād, vi, 452, 18ff., 16). Ibn al-Kalbi's (d. 304/819) collected the faddā'il of Keys 'Ayyān (Irshād, vii, 251, 1), and al-Shu'ubī (ca. 200/815) those of Kināna and Rabī'a (Fiḥrist 105, 15 ff.; Irshād, vi, 16, 16 ff.). Elopement of a rather unusual nature, we have to be the case with Ahmad b. Abī Tāhir Ṭāfarī's (d. 280/893) K. Faddā'il al-'Arab lula 'L-'Adjam (Irshād, i, 155, 6), has not been clearly established.

Various. The faddā'il of the holy months (Ibn Abī Dūnyā, d. 281/894, Brockelmann, I, 160, S I, 247, and others) have been the subject of treatises, as have been those of prayers (Ahmad b. al-Husayn al-Bayhaḵi, d. 438/1066, Brockelmann I, 446 ff., S I, 619, and others), of the basma (al-Būnī, d. 622/1225, Brockelmann I, 655, and others), of the jihād (Ibn Shaddād, d. 632/1234, Brockelmann, S I, 550, and others), as well as the “excellences” of quite profane things which have been particularly collected: for example, shaving of the head (al-Šaymārī, d. 275/888; Irshād, vi, 402 and 403), the days of the week (al-Sīrāfī, d. 368/979; poem, Irshād, iii, 89, 5-11), the herb basil (Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Nūkātī, d. 382/992; Irshād, vi, 324, 16), archery (al-Jāshīs, d. 429/1037; Brockelmann, S I, 619; IC, xxxiv (1960), 195-218 and coffee (al-Ubūdī, d. 967/1559; Brockelmann II, 414 no. 9).


Faddā'il [see Figur].

Faddār [see al-Salāt].

Faddār-I Āṭī [see Faddār-Ī Šāṭī].

Faddāl, Bā, a family of madīkhīyān of Tarīm in Ḥadramawt claiming descent from the Saiid al-ashira clan of Madīkhī. The name Bā Faddāl seems to derive from an ancestor called al-fādh Faddāl b. Muhammad b. Umayyad, whose genealogy cannot be traced beyond that. They seem to have had supreme authority in religious matters in academic circles and at the Islamic court, especially during the reign of Caliph al-Ma'mūn (813-833). They were known for their contributions to the study of Hadith and for their leadership in the Islamic religious community. Their influence extended to various aspects of Islamic life, including poetry, scholarship, and politics. They also played a significant role in the preservation and transmission of Islamic teachings, especially the hadith literature. The Faddāl family's contributions to Islamic scholarship and jurisprudence have been widely acknowledged, and their name is synonymous with excellence in the Islamic sciences.
Tarim until superseded by the Bāʿawī sayyids around the 9th/15th century. They have long been prominent as şāfīs and fakīhs, jurists. In the 10th-11th/16th-17th centuries one branch existed in Aden. The most famous of this branch, and probably the founder, was Djamāl al-Dīn Muhammad b. Ṭāhir b. al-ʿAbd Allāh, born in Tarim, who attained prominence in Aden as teacher and mustaʿfī, and was later on by Sulṭān ʿAmīr b. Abī al-Wahhāb, the Ṭāhirī ruler of al-Yaman. He died in Aden in 903/1498.

Another branch, known as Bal Ḥāḍī, existed in Aden, of which the probable founder was ʿAbd Allāh b. Ṭāhir Ṭāhirī. The author of a number of manuals on şīrī and şīfīsm some of which gained circulation beyond his land and were commented upon by other authors (cf. Brockelmann II 386 and S II 1528). He also acted as arbitrator between the rulers of the region and exercised some public authority. He was succeeded by his son Ahmad, known as al-ṭāhirī, the martyr, because he was killed in al-Shīhr in a battle with the Portuguese in 929/1523. The family might then have moved back to Tarim, for a brother of Ahmad al-ṭāhirī, Hūsayn (d. 979/1572), was a prominent teacher, and Ahmad al-ṣāḥibī, of al-Shīhr in 919/1510, travelled as a student to Aden, Zabīl, Mecca and Medina and back to al-Shīhr and then to India and then back to Mecca, where he settled and traded in coffee and cloth between al-Mukhā and Mecca. He became a prominent and rather controversial şāfī and wrote some şīfī poetry. He died in Mecca in 1087/1677.

Of the Tarim branch Muhammad b. Ismāʿīl (d. 1006/1600) was a prominent teacher, and Ahmad b. Abī al-Walī b. Ṣālim, called al-Sūdī (d. 1044/1634) was a linguist and grammarian of some merit.

Shaykh Muhammad ʿAwād Bā ʿAbsād was the first example of the ʿIrākī secretaries of Christian origin who, during the 3rd/9th century, were to become numerous. He was held to have little competence in religious knowledge, but to be highly competent in the exploitation of landed property. As an expert in land taxes, he also played a part under the succeeding caliphs, particularly al-Walībī and al-Musṭāfīn. He died in 250/864, about 90 years old.

Bibliography: Tabari, index; D. Sourdrel, Le vizirat ʿabsāside, Damascus 1959-60, i, 246-53 and index. (D. SOURDEL)
During the short reign of al-Amin (193-8/809-14), al-Fadl remained as before the caliph's most intimate adviser, playing a particularly important part in the episodes of the struggle with al-Ma'mūn. But he only retained any general control over the administration, nor was he responsible for the jurisdiction of the mażālīm.

On the arrival of al-Ma'mūn's troops he went into hiding, reappearing when the inhabitants of Baghdaḏ, in revolt against the rule of the caliph in Marw who had chosen an 'Alīd as his heir, brought Ibrahim b. al-Mahdī (201/816-7) to power. He subsequently gained al-Ma'mūn's confidence. The latter, having reached Baghdaḏ, and died in 207/822-3 or 208/823-4. Al-Fadl b. al-Rabīʿ thus seems to have been an intriguer of mediocre personality and limited ability. As chamberlain he succeeded by means of adroit manoeuvres in replacing the Baramika and, in exalting himself to the highest government office, manoeuvred in replacing the Baramika and, in exalting himself to the highest government office, the vizierate. He then adopted the cause of al-Amin, in a weak character over whom he planned to exert great influence, but he was unsuccessful in meeting the situation created by the forceful opposition of al-Ma'mūn.

Bibliography: Tabarī, index; Dāhījīyārī, K. al-Wuzūrā, index; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat 'abdāzs, Damascus 1959-60, i, 183-94 and index.

(D. SOURDEL)

AL-FAḌL B. SAḤL B. ZADḤĀN_FARŪKH

Vizier to the ʿAbbāsids caliph al-Ma'mūn, had originally been in the service of the Barāmīka [q.v.]. His father, of Iranian origin and Zoroastrian by religion, had been converted to Islam and had entrusted the Barāmīka with his two sons, al-Fadl and al-Ḥasan [q.v.]. Al-Fadl, who immediately attracted attention on account of his intelligence, was taken into the service of Djaʿfar al-Barmakī, then tutor to prince al-Ma'mūn, and took over this position from him after the fall of the Barāmīka; it was in the presence of al-Ma'mūn that he is said to have been converted, in 190/806, at a time when the prince was holding power, deputising for his father who had gone to Anatolia.

From the end of the reign of al-Rašīd, al-Fadl was to demonstrate the influence that he held over al-Ma'mūn's mind and to give his pupil certain advice of great political significance, namely that he should accompany the caliph on the expedition which he had launched in 192/808 in the eastern provinces. On the death of al-Rašīd, which took place at Tūs in 193/809, al-Ma'mūn thus found himself in the centre of the province of which, under the terms of his father's will, he became autonomous governor. While his brother on being proclaimed caliph in Baghdaḏ had the whole of the expeditionary force brought back, he himself stayed on in Kūrāsān, though not without being exasperated by al-Amin's decision, which he held to be contrary to the last wishes of the dead sovereign. His adviser al-Fadl, urging patience, restored his equanimity.

Relations between the two brothers thus being strained and the situation having deteriorated to the point of civil war, al-Fadl, who had at his command a well-organized intelligence service in ʿIrāk, continued to give al-Ma'mūn helpful advice, promising to secure him the caliphate in the near future. In fact al-Ma'mūn was soon to overcome his brother after the siege of Baghdaḏ and to succeed him, without being the first to infringe the will of al-Raḥīd, which al-Amin had violated by putting forward his own son as heir. As soon as the first victory had been gained by al-Ma'mūn's forces over those of al-Amin, al-Ma'mūn was proclaimed caliph in the eastern provinces (196/812) and al-Fadl was made officially responsible for civil and military administration in the occupied territories from Hamadhān to the paróghīz and therefore responsible for the jurisdiction, nor was he responsible for the jurisdiction of the mażālīm.

On the arrival of al-Ma'mūn's troops he went into hiding, reappearing when the inhabitants of Baghdaḏ, in revolt against the rule of the caliph in Marw who had chosen an ʿAlīd as his heir, brought Ibrahim b. al-Mahdī (201/816-7) to power. He subsequently gained al-Ma'mūn's confidence. The latter, having reached Baghdaḏ, and died in 207/822-3 or 208/823-4. Al-Fadl b. al-Rabīʿ thus seems to have been an intriguer of mediocre personality and limited ability. As chamberlain he succeeded by means of adroit manoeuvres in replacing the Baramika and, in exalting himself to the highest government office, the vizierate. He then adopted the cause of al-Amin, in a weak character over whom he planned to exert great influence, but he was unsuccessful in meeting the situation created by the forceful opposition of al-Ma'mūn.

Bibliography: Tabarī, index; Dāhījīyārī, K. al-Wuzūrā, index; D. Sourdel, Le vizirat 'abdāzs, Damascus 1959-60, i, 183-94 and index.

(D. SOURDEL)
the cultural field, he was particularly in favour of an orientation of policy by the caliph which would have pleased many of the Iranian multitude, and it was no doubt for that reason that he was soon stopped by the Arab and Ḣakīth aristocracy.


**AL-FADL B. SAHL B. ZADHANFAROKH — FADL ALLĀH**

During the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, in the first years of the domination of the Barāmikā (q.v.). As tutor to the crown prince al-Ahmūn, on whose behalf he caused the customary oath of loyalty to be sworn by the notables, he was particularly distinguished by the benevolence he showed towards the inhabitants of the eastern provinces and by his policy of conciliation with regard to the 'Ālīs, perhaps going so far as to support the establishment of an independent Zaydi State in Daylam. His ambiguous attitude won him public execration by the caliph in 183/799 and partly explains the disgrace of the family. Imprisoned at the same time as his father in 187/803, he died at al-Rakkā in 193/808, at the age of 45.


**FADL ALLĀH**, a family of Mamlūk state officials who traced their descent from the Caliph 'Umar I, hence their nisba al-Umari, al-'Adawi al-Kurashi. The family received its name from its founder Fadl Allah b. Moqāllāt b. Da'īyūn, who was living in al-Karak (Transjordan) in 645/1247. Shārāf al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahḥāb, a son of Fadl Allah, held office as kātīb al-sīr (head of the chancery) in Damascus, and was transferred to the same office in Cairo by the Sultan al-Ashraf Khalīl in 692/1293. 'Abd al-Wahḥāb continued to head the central chancery of the Mamlūk his brother 'Abd al-Wahḥāb, served for a time in Hims, then returned to Damascus. Summoned to Cairo in 692/1292 to act for his brother who had fallen ill, he returned to Damascus as kātīb al-sīr, and remained in that office until he was replaced by his brother in 711/1311. After staying out of office for some years, he re-entered the public service in Damascus as a court clerk (muṣawwī) fi l-dāṣīḥ and rose again to be kātīb al-sīr in 727/1327 or 728/1328. In 729/1329 he was appointed to head the central chancery in Cairo, and he died in this office.

Nothing is known about the progeny of Badr al-Dīn Muhammad I, if he had any. 'Abd al-Wahḥāb's son Šālāh al-Dīn 'Abd Allah (d. 719/1319) served as a Mamlūk ġūndī (soldier), and his grandson Nasīr al-Dīn Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah (704-6/1304-63) also entered the Mamlūk military service in Damascus and rose to be an āmir of 40 (āmir tablakhdīn). Nasīr al-Dīn Muhammad sired the undistinguished Abū Bakr. It was the progeny of Muhīl al-Dīn Yahyā which maintained a position of distinction for the family for two more generations.

Of Yahyā's three known sons, the most distinguished by far was Shīhāb al-Dīn Ahmad I (700-49/1301-49) (q.v.), author of *Masālik al-abqār fi mumālik al-umārī* and *Ta'rī̄ḥ bi l-musū'ilāt al-qāīfī*, and perhaps the most outstanding of all the Faḍl Allahīs (b. Ahmad) assisted his father in the Cairo chancery, and was later kātīb al-sīrī in Damascus. His brother 'Ālī al-Dīn 'Ali (729-6/1328-68), who also assisted his father in the Cairo chancery, succeeded his father as kātīb al-sīrī of Cairo (736-8, 743-6/1337-42, 1342-68) and died in that office, to be succeeded in turn by his son Badr al-Dīn Muhammad III (d. 796/1394). Badr al-Dīn Muhammad II (710-6/1310-45), a third son of Yahyā, and brother of Shīhāb al-Dīn Ahmad, also served as kātīb al-sīrī in Cairo (where he replaced his brother 'Ālī for a few months in 1342) and in Damascus (743-6/1342-5).

Apart from Badr al-Dīn Muhammad III, 'Ālī al-Dīn 'Ali had three sons. Shīhāb al-Dīn Ahmad II

**Bānū Fadl-Allāh al-Umari**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fadl-Allāh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ṣharāf al-Dīn 'Abd al-Wahḥāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šālāh al-Dīn 'Abd Allah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāṣir al-Dīn Muhammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khādżīdja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhīl al-Dīn Yahyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barād al-Dīn Muhammad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barād al-Dīn Muhammad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shīhāb al-Dīn Ahmad I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shīhāb al-Dīn Ahmad II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ālī al-Dīn Ahmad III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dājmāl al-Dīn 'Abd Allah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shīhāb al-Dīn Barād al-Dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāmza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

state until 711/1311, when he was transferred back to Damascus. There he died in office in 717/1317. 'Abd al-Wahḥāb b. Fadl Allāh was the first member of his family to hold a high position in the Mamlūk civil service. During his lifetime, and for nearly a century after his death, other members of his family distinguished themselves as Mamlūk state officials. Barād al-Dīn Muhammad I, a younger brother of 'Abd al-Wahḥāb, who died in 706/1306, was a chancery official in Damascus. A still younger brother, Muhīl al-Dīn Yahyā (645-738/1247-1337), began his career in the Damascus chancery under (d. 777/1375) acted as deputy kātīb al-sīrī for his father in Cairo, and died a young man. His brother Dājmāl al-Dīn 'Abd Allah (d. 821/1418) was an impoverished ġūndī. Equally undistinguished was his brother Hāmza (d. 796/1394), of whose career nothing is known.

The family of Faḍl Allāh had a family home in Cairo; but they regarded Damascus as their home town, and there had a family cemetery in which most of them were buried.

**Biography**: Brockelmann, SII, 141; al-Dīhahbī, *Duwal al-Islām*, Ḥaydarābād Deccan,
between Fadl Allah and 'Ali (Ist. Univ. Lib., MS Farsca 1043, 51a). The fact that the ninth ancestor in one list, the eighth in the other, is Muhammad al-Yamānī deserves attention in view of the fact that the Yemen is known to have been one of the most important centres of the Bātınīs from the latter part of the 3rd/9th century onwards (Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Daylamī, Kawdīd altabādī al-Muhammad, ed. R. Strothmann: Die Geheimlehre der Bātınīs: Dogmatik des Hauses Muhammad, Bibliotheca Islamica II, Istanbul 1938, Introduction vi-ix, 24-5, 95, 96).

One also finds scattered throughout both the Istiwdā-nama and the Khabā-nama information relating to the life of Fadl Allah and the places which he visited. According to the Istiwdā-nama (3b), being at one point—the date is not known—in Isfahān, he rejected the notion that the human soul becomes non-existent after death and the assertions of the Hurufis who denied the existence of the after-life. In the Khabā-nama also (3ob) he is said to have rejected such a claim in Isfahān. Again according to this latter book Fadl Allah embraced Sūfism at the age of eighteen. He was inspired with the ability to interpret dreams in 756/1355 (19a), in which year he was in a place named Tokdji in Isfahān; later he went to Tabriz, where the Djalālīrdī Sultan Uways b. Ḥasan (55a-55b). While in Tabriz, Fādλ Allah Sādī Ṣāykh Khwādja accepted his teachings (19a-b). In Tabriz he married a girl from Astarābād on the recommendation of his disciple Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥāshimi. He wrote a book on fikr for 'Izz al-Dīn Shāh Shujāī (d. 786/1384) and his name is recorded as Shihāb al-Dīn Fadl Allah and `Allī. He was arrested on the strength of a decree (hudjre) issued by Sultan Uways in 772/1370-1, at the age of thirty-two, and there went into retreat (35a-b). He also spent some time in Dāmghān (35b) and Bāb-e-Ḥeizā (47a). While in Shāmākh interpreting a dream of Kādī Bāyazīdl, he foretold his own martyrdom (49b). When he left the house of this kādī and was returning to his cell (ḥudīr), he was arrested on the strength of a decree from Astarābād and taken to the fortress of Allāndjāk (50a). He was imprisoned on the order of Mīrān Shāh (55a). Among those believing in him were important men; he even had a dervish cap conveying his blessing, to Sultan Uways (55b-56a). His followers are known as Darabgān-i hald-ḵhor ve rāst-guy (48a). A bayt in the Taeqīd-nama of `All al-Ḵālā, called the Hurufis "Ḵālifat Fadl Allah" and "Wuṣūl Allah", states that Fadl Allah was born in Astarābād (Ist. Univ. Lib., MS Farsca 1158, 3b).

There exist three chronograms giving the date of the death of Fadl Allah-i Ḥurūfī. In one of these the name is recorded as Shihāb al-Dīn Fadl Allah and his death as having occurred on a Friday in Dhu l-Kaʿda 796/October-November 1394, when he was fifty-six years of age (Millet Library, MS Ali Emiri, Farsca 1043, at the beginning). The second chronogram is in a 16th cent. mağāmī's belonging to the book-dealer Ṣeifī Valienki. Though the chronographic mīrād is known to all Ḥurūfīs and to all those connected in any way with the Ḥurūfīs (see, for example, Ahmad Rīfāʿ, Mīrād al-mahābīd fi daf al-mafāsid, Istanbul 1293, lithograph, 133, where there is also the genealogy of Fadl Allah, taken from a risāla), I have seen the whole of the chronogram only in this mağāmī's. The author of this chronogram is unknown, as is that of the first chronogram. In the first bayt Timur is mocked, in the fourth bayt the name of Mīrān Shāh is mentioned, and in the fifth bayt it is stated that Fadl Allah was put to death on "Thursday, the eve of Friday" the sixth of Dhu
In the first poem, which contains seven bayts, it is also stated that he died in Dhu-'l-Ka'da, but on a Friday. It is clear, however, from the specific method of the month that he was put to death after the afternoon prayer on Thursday, since, according to the custom of the holy law, Friday begins after that time. The year is stated in the sixth and last bayt in the form 796 (according to the conversion-tables, the first day of Dhu-'l-Ka'da 796 corresponds to Friday, 28 August 1394). But the new method of the month has been confirmed the day before by observation, in which case the sixth day of Dhu-'l-Ka'da would coincide with Thursday, 3 September 1394. The third chronogram is in a madājma containing the poems of Fadl Allāh, along with those of Sharīf and ʿAlī al-Aʿlā. In the fourth of the seven bayts in this chronogram it is stated that Fadl Allāh was fifty-six (Dīsū tār i si d u du) when he was put to death. The place of his martyrdom is specified in the last bayt as “Allāndjā” while the date is conveyed by the phrase Shahādd-i ʿighā-i a (Mīllet Library, MS Kenan Bey, Farsa 186, f. 149b).

In a risāla of Mir Fāḍīl is found the note: “The honoured resting-place of that most excellent Prophet (Ṣāḥib bayān) is at a town called Allāndjā, by Astarābād on the tār side of Tābrīz. ‘Alī al-Aʿlā is also buried there. The covering of (Fadl Allāh’s) tomb is black, that of ‘Alī al-Aʿlā’s green, and of the other’s red” (MS Allī Emīrī, Farsa 1393, f. 92b). In his risāla entitled Ṣalāt-nāma Shaykh Muhammad, who is known by the name Iṣkurt Dede and who is known to have met some of the disciples of Fadl Allāh, writes while discussing the rules governing the ḥaḍīrī that during the days when the Tāḡīlī thirty-three stones are thrown, twenty-one each day, at the Tower of Mīrān Shāh, opposite the Alindjak fortress, which is also called Sandjariyye, and that the ṭāwīf procession occurs in a place called “Mafrāt-gāh”; during the course of this discussion he states that Fadl Allāh was put to death in Allāndjā and that his grave is there (Mīllet Library, MS Kenan Bey, Farsa 1393, f. 92b).

To regard certain numbers as sacred and to assign various meanings to certain letters are ancient, magical practices; examples occur in both the Old and New-Testaments in appropriate places (293, 37a). One meets in the same book (293, 37a). The names of Madjd al-Dīn, Ishak, and Nasīmi (properly entitled Risdla-i ma’ddiyya) of the author of the Ma’ddiyya, Sayyid Sharīf, in his Risāla-i ma’ādīyya (properly entitled Bayān al-wādāb) lists the disciples of Fadl Allāh, with the note “whom I remember”, as follows: Amir Sayyid ʿAlī, Husayn Kīyā b. Ṭahābī, Ma’dīl al-Dīn, Māhmūd, Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥāshimī, Muḥammad Bāyāzīd, Tawakkūl b. Dārī, Abu ʾl-Ḥasan, Sayyid ʿĪsāb, Sayyid Nasīmī, Ḥasan b. Ḥaydār, Husayn Gharīz, Sulaymān.

Later he records that all of them, four hundred in number, were Sayyids, that they were in Fadl Allāh’s company day and night, and that they went with him wherever he went (134, 15a). Sayyid ʿAlī is the ʿAlī al-Aʿlā who, in the Istīd-l-nāma, is called Khaḥīfat Allāh and Wāṣī Allāh, and who is known to have been Fadl Allāh’s favourite disciple (2a, 11a, 29b, 37a). The names of Ma’dīl al-Dīn, ʿĪsāb, and Nasīmī occur in the same book (29a, 37a). One meets in the same Risāla such names as Darvīsh Bahā’ al-Dīn, Darvīsh ʿAlī, Muḥammad Nāṣīnī, Iṣā Bīṭilīs, Muḥammad Tir-ger, Tādī al-Dīn, Sayyid Muṣṭafār, and Ḥūsān al-Dīn Yazdūrdī (12a-b, 37a, 40a-b, 43a-b, 80a). Of these, the names of ʿAlī al-Aʿlā, Nasīnī, and ʿĪsāb are found in the Sa’dl-nāma of Iṣkurt Dede and are those of the author of the Ma’ādīyya, Sayyid Sharīf, and Dāwīdī. Besides these, the name of Mir Fāḍīl is mentioned, and he
is reported to have been the disciple of Khalifatul 'Atiyyah. It is also reported that Amir Ghayyath al-Din was the son of 'Ali al-Ala's sister, and that, in addition to the Khub-ndma, the Ishtih-jindan, which was the author of a risala named Turab-nama (5a), Djawidi, in a risala which he wrote in Shawwal 1000/July-August 1592, reveals that his personal name was 'Ali (Millet Library, MS Farsca 437). In view of the date in which he wrote his risala, this person must have been connected with one of the disciples of Faḍl Allah. In the Muhammad-nama of Sayyid al-Aṣā, one finds the following names: Sayyid Tājī al-Din Kehrā-ya Bayhaqi, one of the intendants of Faḍl Allah and known to the Hurufis as Sāhib Tāwil (see C. Huart, Textes persans relatifs à la secte des Houroufis, Leiden and London 1909, Gibb Memorial Series, 42); Mawla-'an Kamāl al-Dīn Hāshimī; ‘Ali Dāmmānī, who, it is reported, had formerly been one of the intendants of Sultan 'Uways and had been Wāl of Khorāsān; and Pir Ḥasan Dāmmānī (ibid., 42). Both in this book and in the Naum-nama, which is attributed to Faḍl Allah, other names are mentioned in a section devoted to statesmen; but it is impossible to determine definitely the degree of their relationships with Faḍl Allah (Wāgha-nama-i Gurgī, 36; examples from the text and translations into Persian, 336-46). Mir Fādill writes in a risala on the names of the disciples of Fādūl al-'Rū, 'Sayyid Abu 'l-Ḥākiyya, Kamāl al-Dīn Hāshimī Ġūmī (i.e., from Anatolia) and Kamāl al-Dīn Hāshimī Iṣfahānī, and says that they are “the four friends of the felicitous one” (“Sāhib Deoletīn īr yārdān”), thus testifying to a belief that Faḍl Allah had “four friends” corresponding to the “four friends” of the Prophet Muḥammad (Millet Library, MS Farsa 990, last folio).

The names of the sons, daughters, and grandchilden of Faḍl Allah are written in a different hand on the last folio of the Risāla-i ma'ādīya (6rb). Among these is the name of Amīr Nūr Allāh, who was arrested and put to the question along with the author of the Istawā-ndma, Ghayyath al-Dīn Muḥammad, after the attempt on the life of Shāh Rūkh. Among his sons there is one Salām Allāh, who was not of Dībāl, and another, who was appointed by Faḍl Allah in the last will and testament which he wrote before his arrest as the trustee and guardian for all his children. (Aḥmadbākī Gūlpinārī, Faḍl-Allāh Hurūfī'nīn Wasiyya-Ndma's veysa Waṣāyda's, in Şarkiyat mcmuna's, ii (1958), 54-62. There is a copy of this will also in Millet Library, MS Farsa 1009, 1b-9a, as well as an incomplete copy in the same section of the library, MS 933, 1048-b).

Works. Faḍl Allah's most famous work is the Dīwāndān-nāma. From the Khub-nāma one learns that this work became famous after Faḍl Allah's death (43a). The Istawā-ndma reveals that the Dīwāndān-nāma begins with the word “ibīddū” repeated six times (29b). There is a copy beginning with this word and written in the Gurgān dialect in Millet Library, Farsa, MS Kenan Bey 920. The Dīwāndān-nāma written in normal Persian and common in both public and private libraries must be a new redaction, separated into sections, and arranged by Faḍl Allah personally or by one of his disciples, made on the basis of this text. For a copy belonging to the period of Faḍl Allah but without a colophon see MS Fatih (Süleymaniye) 3726; another copy, written by Darwih 'Alī Sarhānī in 1283 (ABDULBAKI GOLPINARLI).
FADL-I Hakk — FADLAWAYH


FADL-I IMAM B. MUHAMMAD ARSHAD AL-‘UMARI AL-HARGAMI, B. MUHSIN SIYAD B. ‘ABD AL-WADID B. ‘ABD AL-MADID B. KADI SADR AL-DIN AL-HANAFI, was a contemporary of ‘Abd al-‘Aziz al-Dihlawi, and the first Indian Muslim scholar to have accepted the post of mufti and sadr al-sudur under the authority of the Saldjuks [q.v.], which Shahdjar described as “the Shiraz of India”, in the last quarter of the 12th/18th century. He completed his studies with ‘Abd al-Wadid Kirmami, a learned scholar of Khayrabad (cf. Rahmain ‘Ali, Tadhkira-i ‘ulamad-i Hind, Lucknow 1914, 236). One of his maternal uncles Mull‘a Abu ‘l-Wadid Hargamii was one of the compilers of al-Fatwat al-‘alamiriya [q.v.]. Speciality interested in rational sciences, he devoted his leisure hours to the teaching of logic and philosophy. He was so fond of his pupils that once he strongly upbraided his son Fadl-i Hakk for misbehaving towards a dull student. His grandson ‘Abd al-Hakk b. Fadl-i Hakk and has since been translated into Urdu: (ii) Ta’dil al-ash’al fi Sharh al-Musam (MS I.O.; Delhi-Arabic no. 13513), 1244/1829. He left behind three sons of whom Fadl-i Hakk [q.v.] gained very useful booklet on Persian infinitives for beginners of which chapter v, comprising short biographical notices of some of the leading ‘ulama’ and scholars of Awadh, has been published at Karachi under the title Taradgim al-fudal ‘i (1960), with English translation and notes by me (vii) Sadr al-sudur

FADLAWAYH, BANU, a Kurdish dynasty which ruled in Shabankara [q.v.] from 485/1095 to 718/1318-9. Very little is known about them except for the founder Idris, who dates from Fadlawayhis (in Ibn al-‘Ajrir, x, 48: Fadlun) and for members of the family during the Ilkhang period [q.v.]. Fadlawayhis, son of the chief ‘Ali b. al-Hasan b. Ayyub of the Kushid tribe Ramani in Shabankara, was originally a general (Sipah-Salur) under the Buwayhids [q.v.] and closely connected with their vizier Shahid b. Adil. When the latter was executed after a change of government, Fadlawayhis eliminated the last Buwayhid in 474/1085 and placed himself under the authority of the Saljuqs [q.v.]. Later, however, he fell out with Alp Arslan [q.v.] and was defeated by Nizam al-Mulk [q.v.] and finally taken prisoner and executed in 464/1071.

Reports of the Banu Fadlawayhis until the beginning of the 12th/18th century are vague. After 626/1227-8 Mu‘azzar al-Din Muhammad b. al-Mubarriz expanded his rule in the direction of Fars and the coast opposite Hormuz. He asserted himself against the atabeg of Fars, but fell during a siege of his own capital Tij by Hulagu [q.v.] in 658/1260. Until 664/1266 three rulers followed one another in rapid succession: Kutb al-Din, the brother (according to Zambaur the son) of Mu‘azzar al-Din (murdered 10 Dhu ‘1-Hijjah 659/5 November 1261); Nizam al-Din II, who fell in Rabii‘ II 663/February 1662; Nusrat al-Din Ibrahim, the brother of the latter, deposed Rabii‘ II 664/Jan.-Feb. 1266,
after which more peaceful conditions obtained. The brother of the last named, Djalal al-Din Tayyibshah, ruled for sixteen years under Mongol suzerainty until his execution on 10 Dijmâda I 688/16 August 1282. His brother Bahâ al-Dîn Ismâ'îl died a natural death in 688/1289-90. The cousins who succeeded, Ghîyâth al-Dîn b. Djalal al-Dîn and Nizâm al-Dîn III b. Bahâ al-Dîn, were quite powerless. In the year following the suppression of a revolt in 712/1312-3 a certain Ardaghîr, whose lineage is uncertain, succeeded to power. As early as Dhu l-Kharbiyya-March 1314 he was eliminated and his cousin, Ghiyâth al-Dîn b. Djalal al-Dîn Muhammad, and thus the dynasty of the Banû Fadlawayh came to an end.


On the 13th century: Wâsâfî, Ishâ, 1269/1852-3, 423-5; Mustawfi Kazwini, Târikh-i guzîda, i, 613 ff. (GMS, xiv); B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran, Berlin 1955, 146 ff.; E. de Zambaur, Manuel, Pyrmont 1955, 233 (genealogical table with considerable differences from Wâsâfî, whose version is the basis for the above article). See also Tâbrîzî, and its bibliography.

FADLLI (commonly written Fadlî), a tribal territory now one of the states of the Federation of South Arabia, area about 1600 square miles with an estimated population of 55,000. Its western bounds touch on the Aden Colony and then run northwest bordering on Lahij (`Abdali), Hawshabil and Lower Yâfiî tribes; in the northeast it is bounded by Awdhali and Dathina, in the east by the Arabian Sea. The country consists of two main parts: the lowlands of Abyan in the west, partly desert but containing the only fertile soil, with a mainly settled population; and the steppes and hilly parts in the east, with a mainly tribal population.

The territory was originally a confederation of tribes whose chieftain, a sulûn by title, of the Fadli tribe, lived in Shukra, the capital and a seaport. After the British occupied Aden, Fadlî remained hostile to them until 1865, after the Fadlis had attacked a caravan near Aden, the British attacked them by land and sea. In 1888 the Fadlî sulûn `Abdulrahman b. `Uthman signed a treaty accepting British protection; and in 1944 the Fadlî sulûn `Abd Allah b. `Uthman signed a treaty with the British whereby he accepted advice on the administration of his territory and the expenditure of his revenue. An executive acted for him in all matters in close cooperation with the British Political Officer in Abyan, and Zangîbîr (also written Zangîbîr) in Abyan became the administrative seat. In December 1962 Sultan `Abd Allah b. `Uthman was replaced as ruler by his na`b in Abyan the de facto ruler, Sultan Ahmad b. `Abd Allah. The sulûn is aided by a State Council, recently constituted, made up of thirteen members representing the tribes, the fishermen, the farmers and the traders. In June 1963 the State Council passed an ordinance providing for the election of 12 members, four from the settled areas in the west and eight from the tribal areas in the east, who, with five ex officio members and the members of the existing State Council will make a legislative body. In 1959 the Fadlî tribal territory was among the first territories of the Western Aden Protectorate to join in forming the Federation of Arab Amirates of the South, later called the Federa-

tion of South Arabia when Aden Colony joined it in 1962. The present Fadlî Sultan is a member of the Federal Supreme Council and holds a Federal ministerial post.

The economy depends chiefly on agriculture, which is centred in the Abyan delta formed by Wadl Banâ and Wâdî Hasan whose irrigation waters are shared by Fadlî and Lower Yâfiî growers under the control of the joint Abyan Board. The formation of the Board marked the settlement of the long standing dispute between the two territories over the leading channel, na`b, which the Fadlis had constructed in the last century to divert water to their land from Wadl Banâ in Lower Yâfiî territory. Cotton is the main cash crop, with the Fadlî production in 1963 nearing 5,000 tons. Other products are fruit and vegetables, to supply nearby Aden Colony, crops other than cotton, especially sorghum, and animal husbandry. There is also a fishing industry with good potential. The revenue of the state has reached £ 250,000 a year.

The state has two systems of courts, shari`a and Customary Law (urf); a Justice of the Peace system has also been introduced. There is also a State High Court with powers of appeal and with jurisdiction over some constitutional matters.

Education has progressed recently and there are 20 primary schools including two for girls, the first in the Federation outside Aden Colony.


FADLLI (commonly known as Kara Fadlî) (7-971/1563-4), Turkish poet, born in Istanbul, son of a saddler. Little is known of his early life. He does not seem to have had a regular education, but acquired knowledge in the company of learned people, particularly the poet Dhi`atî [q.v.], whose shop of geomancy had become a sort of a literary club for men of letters, where the old poet helped and encouraged young talents. On Dhi`atî’s suggestion he composed a kasîda on the occasion of the circumcision festivities of prince Mehmeh. When Dhi`atî had finished reading his poem on the same subject, he introduced to the Sultan, Süleyman the Magnificent, his young disciple who then recited it, which won him the favour of the court. Fadlî was made divân secretary to prince Mehmeh and, upon his death, to prince Musta`fâ. On the latter’s tragic end (960/1553) he wrote a long remembered elegy. He then entered the service of the crown prince Selîm who, upon succeeding to the throne, made him his chief secretary with a high fief. The poet died in Kütahya the following year.

Fadlî was a master of classical formal prose (ingâlî), but he is better known as a poet. Unlike most poets of the classical age, he does not seem to have collected his poems into a divân and his known poems are scattered in various medîawatîs. Some of his works, mentioned and praised in tedhîkîs (the mathnawîs Humâ Lewis and Lecky ed. An Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
esrār, and a collection of stories in prose, Nakhlistān) have not come down to us. Apart from his ṣaḥāla, ḥaṭāla, ṣaḥrūf, Fadli owes his fame to being one of the minor poets of the first half of the 5th century (A.D.) the distinction of first hunting with the cheetah, the animal does not appear to have been commonly


FAGHĪR or BAGHBUR, title of the Emperor of China in the Muslim sources. The Sanskrit bhagapatra and the Old Irranian baghagaputra, with which attempts have been made to connect this compound, are not attested, but a form ḍībghābur (|= ḍībghābur), signifying etymologically “son of God”, is attested in Parthian Pahlavi to designate Jesus, whence Sogdian baghbur, Arabicized as baghbar and faghfur; these forms were felt by the Arab authors as the translation of the Chinese T'ien ists “son of heaven” (cf. Relation de la Chine et de l'Inde, ed. and tr. J. Sauvaget, Paris 1948, 20; al-Masūdī, Mūṣīdī, ii, 306 (tr. Pellat, § 334); Fīhrīsī, 350 (Caired, ed., 491): baghbar = “son of heaven,” that is to say descended from the heavens; Ibn al-ʿArīfī, vii, 221). The form faghfur (faghfur in Marco Polo, ed. Yule-Cordier, ii, 145, ed. L. Hambis, Paris 1955, 194, to refer to the last emperor of the Sung dynasty), which has been borrowed by Persian (cf. Ferrand, in J.A., 1924/1, 243; idem, in BSOs, vi (1931), 359-39; S. Lévi, in J.A., 1934/1, 19), seems to be a more eastern form, although it is attested in al-Masūdī (Mūṣīdī, ii, 200 = tr. Pellat § 622); it is also mentioned in the text of the Etudāwa, p. 284, and an Arabic inscription in the cemetery of Zaytūn (Ts'iu-an-chou) dated 723/1323 (cf. G. Arnaiz and G. Ferrand, “porcelain”, and also Slav languages, through the T'oung-Pao, Pelliot, in T'oung-Pao, 1931, 458). This term has been modernized in Russian faghfur or baghbar, with which attempts have been made to connect this word make faghfur a region of China (cf. P. Pelliot, in T'oung-Pao, 1931, 458). This term has entered Modern Greek (faghfur) in the sense of “porcelain”; and also Slav languages, through the Russian faghfur (fagfur) (cf. B. Winter, in Kuban, i, 279; Lauffer, Beginnings of porcelain, 126).

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text: E. Blochet, Introduction à l'histoire des Mongols, GMS XIII, 76 n. 1; H. Cordier, in Mélanges H. Derembourg, 434; H. Yule and A. C. Burnell, Hoobson-Jobson, London 1903, s.v. Faghfur; G. Ferrand, Relations de voyages et textes géographiques de Paris 1913; 21; Maspero, La Chine antique, Paris 1927, 144; P. Pelliot, Notes on Marco Polo, ii, Paris 1963, s.v. faghfur, devotes a well-developed and documented study to this term.

FAGH FUR, in the sense of “porcelain” [see §1], FADH (Ar.), (e.m. fa'aha, pl. jahād, afadd, afhād, jadāha), is the name of the Cheetah (Urdu īdā < Sanskrit cītra, “spotted”), Acinonyx jubatus, also called “Hunting-leopard and Hunting-cat” (French: “guèpard”, Persian: “yāz”), the subspecies Acin. jub. venaticus being found from Balūstān to ʿIrāq and Jordan and the subspecies Acin. jub. hechi or gutatus in northern Africa, from the borders of the Sahara. The noun faʻā, the form to be preferred to fahād which was recommended by al-Kalīshī (ṣīb i al-ahādī, ii, 39 ff.), is connected with the root FHD which can equally well be supposed to be an Arabic corruption of the Greco-Latin term ἱάπος/παρδός, “panther”.

From remotest antiquity travellers in regions inhabited by cheetahs have not failed to observe this slender wild beast, asleep all day in the shade of a bush, hunting only at dawn or dusk, and, though with the tabby coat of a feline, claiming relationship with the canine family. Modern mammalogists in fact recognize it as a greyhound with the fur of a big cat from the form of the cranium, teeth like those of the canidae, non-retractile claws, its habit of running in strides, each step being a leap of five to six yards, and its peaceful nature; the cheetah does not experience the blind atavistic ferocity shown by the big felines at the sight of blood. It is not therefore surprising that the Mongols, Russians, Persians and Hindus who hunted because they needed food and consequently were close observers of wild animals should at a very early time have had the idea of taming the yards, and making use of its predatory instinct for catching hares and various ungulates with edible flesh; by so doing they gained the services of the swiftest of all quadrupeds, the cheetah having a speed of about eighty miles an hour for a distance of five or six hundred yards. It is probable that the Lakhmīd princes, vassals of the Sāsānids, tamed the cheetah in east Syria and ʿIrāq, the animal being fairly widespread in those countries; the strain from the Samāwā had the reputation, according to al-Māngī, of being superior to any other in the 14th century.

Although Arab tradition attributes to Kūlayb Wādī of the Nādīq (second half of the 9th century A.D.) the distinction of being the first to hunt with tame cheetahs, the animal does not appear to have been commonly
employed in hunting by the Arabs before the Islamic conquests. Pre-Islamic poets, to judge by such of their writings as survive, make no mention of them; instead, it must have been regarded, like the panther, as a dangerous wild animal best avoided. Although extant in the Hiḍjaz and the Yemen, the cheetah was never very numerous in Arabia, its elective biotope hardly going beyond the tropic of Cancer and being pre-eminently the dry Mediterranean steppe of grass- and bush-land found between the 25th and 35th parallels. The absence in ancient Arabic of any “collective noun” in mas'ūla among derivatives from the root FHD may to some measure corroborate, if not the ignorance of the Bedouins of pre-Islamic Arabia in respect of the cheetah, at least their confusion of this animal with the panther Leopard, Panthera pardus, (namir, nimr, arkat). This confusion, incidentally, has been perpetuated unfailingy even up to our own time in the works of many western writers since the introduction by the Crusaders in the 14th century of the cheetah to the courts of Sicily and Italy, and subsequently from there to the courts of France, Germany and England. The French name “guepard”, after the names “gopard” and “chat-pard” derived from the Italian “gatto-pardo”, has only lately, and correctly, been substituted for the incorrect middle-French appellation “leopard”, “leopard”, “léopard-chasseur”, just as the anglicized term “cheetah” has taken the place of the archaic Middle-English forms of “leopart”, “leparde”, “lebarde”, “libbard”, and “hunting-leopard”. Many also continue to make a serious error in confusing the cheetah with the Ounce or “Mountain Panther”, also called “Snow-leopard”, Felis uncia, a species of panther confined in the hilly mountainous central Asia, which only certain Mongolo-Altaic clans ventured to tame for hunting cervidae, and without any great success. The word Ounce, used for “Lonce” (from the Low German “Lonce” meaning “large”), has taken the place of the archaic Middle-English form of “lance”, “lance”, “leonce”, “lonce”, which of the Persian was actually the cheetah, and not an “unidentified” panther. By erroneous sources of later date, failed to realize that the yūdah of the Persians was actually the cheetah, and not an “unidentified” panther.

However that may be, it was not until the Muslim expansion towards the north-east took place in the 1st/2nd century that the Arabs could be seen to have familiarized themselves with this new auxiliary in their hunting expeditions, afterwards taking to it with passionate enthusiasm. Their interest in the cheetah was to be revealed by their concise aphorisms; they said, among other things, “sleepier than a cheetah” (ānsamūn min fahd), “heavier-headed than the cheetah” (aṭḥalūn ra’sūn min al-fahd), “a better purveyor than a cheetah” (aksabūn min fahd), “quicker off the mark than a cheetah” (aṭḥalwān min fahd), “angrier than a cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd), “bored with the cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd), “good enough to eat, but not a cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd), “bored with the cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd), “good enough to eat, but not a cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd), “bored with the cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd), “good enough to eat, but not a cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd), “bored with the cheetah” (aṭḥalūn min fahd). The vast expense entailed by the upkeep of a hunt with cheetahs, for which
a paid staff of experts was essential, precluded all but the rich from the privilege of this luxurious diversion; the less affluent contented themselves with flying and coursing sports. It is however surprising to note that the Maghrib and Muslim Spain took no interest in the cheetah and never trained it; no reference to it occurs in any of the great number of documents, both Arabic and European, from which we draw our knowledge of Western Islam. The cheetah is known throughout the pre-Saharan zone of the Maghrib, from Tunisia to the Moroccan borders, although it is becoming rare there, and the nomads of the region have always regarded it simply as a permanent danger to their flocks (see L. Lavauden, Les vertébrés du Sahara, Tunis 1926, 39-40; idem, Les grands animaux de chasse de l'Afrique française, in Faune des Colonies françaises, Paris 1934, no. 30, 366-7; idem, La chasse et la faune cynégétique en Tunisie, Tunis 1920, 9-10). The Touaregs for their part were pleased, when they capture the beast, either to sell it to Europeans or else to make beautiful saddle-cloths and food-bags (miruwat, pl. masuwid) from its skin, but they have never thought of training it; they are, however, aware of its elegance and power, often giving its name (in Tamahāqī amayās) to their children as a first-name (H. Lhotè, La chasse chez les Touaregs, Paris 1951, 129-30).

In contrast to the indifference shown by the Muslim West towards hunting with cheetahs, the East for its part has until our own time kept this ancient practice very much alive in ʿIrāk, ʿIrān and India; Persian tradition ascribes it to Chosroes Anūshirwān (531-79 A.D.), but in fact it goes back to remotest antiquity. The renowned poet Firdawṣī is somewhat nearer the truth when, in his Sīhāh Nāmā he names Tāhmūras, prince of the legendary dynasty of the ʿAfṣādān, as the inventor of the training of beasts of prey, in these lines: Siyāh-gāzh o āz dar miyān bargozāl I Bālā lāra bidwārdāzāk as daqīl o kīh ("He [Tāhmūras] chooses from them the wild beasts; the Caracal and the Cheetah. By artifice he took them from the desert and the mountains").

Muslim writers in the Middle Ages, naturalists like al-Kazwīnī (599-682/1203-83) in his K. ʿAḏḏīb al-māḥbūkātāl and al-Dāmīrī (742-807/1341-1405) in his K. Bayāṭ al-ḥayawān, encyclopaedists like al-ʿAḍhīb (d. 755/1351) in his K. al-Ḥayawān and al-Kalkashandī (d. 821/1418) or al-Fahd (d. 975-96); however, the anonymous author, in the Bāb sayd al-ḥadā (118 H.), puts forward his own personal remarks which are not lacking in interest. As for Usāma b. Munkīdī (d. 1188), he recalls his childhood days when at his father’s house there was a she-cheetah of unusual docility, living in freedom (musayyaba) and on perfectly good terms with the fowls and the numerous tame gazelles belonging to the house, although when hunting she displayed a relentless ferocity towards her quarry. From his “Hunting memories” it emerges that he himself took no interest in this sort of hunting. It was a very different matter with al-Mangīli, a famous Mamluk hunter, who in his treatise dated 773/1371 gives us the fruit of his great experience in the matter of cheetahs; it is certainly the most thorough study on this subject in Arabic that we possess. The works of al-ʿAṣirī (848/1444) and al-Fākīhī (d. 948/1544) of which L. Mercier made use (mss. Paris, B.N., no. 2831 and 2834) are merely repetitions of the earlier writings.

In the light of these texts it is easy to formulate an exact idea of the difficulties which mediaeval Islamic huntsmen had to overcome before being able to experience to the full the excitement engendered by the cheetah’s “career” (fahl, pl. al-fahlā). First it was necessary to find an animal in the prime of life (musīn), for the cheetah does not breed in captivity. As for Usāma b. Munkīdī (d. 1188), he himself took almost no interest in this method of hunting. In the light of these texts it is easy to formulate an exact idea of the difficulties which mediaeval Islamic huntsmen had to overcome before being able to experience to the full the excitement engendered by the cheetah’s “career” (fahl, pl. al-fahlā).
Certain tribes had specialized in this activity, like the Banu Kurra and the Banu Sulaym in Egypt, and made a profit from selling the animals they captured. The tactics most usually employed in catching the animal that was required, a female for preference, were “to recognize it by its footprints” (hibis al-akhdb), to “stalk its lair” (takrib ar-larin) with two or three men on horseback, in the heat of the day, to “start it” and to “trail its slot” (naqdasba) slowly, without pressing it too hard; soon the indolent creature lies down to resume its interrupted nap, but is started once again. This manoeuvre is repeated three or four times until the animal is forced by fatigue to “wait steady” (makbawuma) and to “face” (mu darada) its pursuers, if it is not falling asleep from exhaustion. One of the trackers (naqisidjarud) then dismounts, throws his burnous over it with a rapid dastab al-fahd ka-id, states: “... to recognize it by its footprints” (hifz al-arm). Certain trackers, who were “to recognize it by its footprints” (hifz al-arm) and “to stalk its lair” (tadjrld) the beast, used the daily feed (tum) only after that it is given a thick carpet (tidfisa) and watches it by the light of a lamp and prevents it from sleeping in the constant movement and the teasing by the children soon result in making it absolutely harmless. They even go so far as to make it walk through the markets, held firmly on a lead and carefully surrounded. In the evening it is taken to its room, a dark stable where it is fastened to a long chain (miqjar) which leaves its movements entirely free. For the first nights an ostler (sdj) watches it by the light of a lamp and prevents it from sleeping in the constant movement and the teasing by the children soon result in making it absolutely harmless. The Indians avoid this difficult initiation by conveying their cheetahs to the hunting-grounds in small, individual vehicles, shaped like cages and drawn by horses or oxen.

To convey the cheetah to the room set aside for it by its owner is a delicate operation to which the cheetah-keeper devotes particular care: he has to avoid any accident which might impair the animal’s fine condition. To do this, he puts it into a “street-jacket” (urtaf, ghtara, kays), a large bag, allowing it to pass its head through the opening and, to prevent it being frightened by anything nearby, he accustoms it to wear on its head a hood (bunuma), a leather visor shaped like a baby’s bonnet and tying under the chin; two porters then suffice to carry it safely to its destination when thus “hooded” (muqattt il-wardq).

On reaching its new home the cheetah, like sporting-birds, has to receive some “manning” (uns, ilf), training that will make it lose its savageness (ladgirid) completely. For this purpose the cheetah-keeper, leaving the hobbles on its feet, tethers it outside a house facing on to a busy street; the din, the constant movement and the teasing by the children soon result in making it absolutely harmless.

All this time and for the rest of its life it receives food only from the hand of its keeper, for it is by means of the daily feed (tum) that he begins the education (tadjrld) of his pupil. The art is not in teaching it to hunt, for it already has the instinct to do so, but instead in accustoming it to jump and ride pillow (isrididaf) on its trainer’s horse at any speed. For the first nights an ostler (sdj) watches it by the light of a lamp and prevents it from sleeping in the constant movement and the teasing by the children soon result in making it absolutely harmless. To convey the cheetah to the room set aside for it by its owner is a delicate operation to which the cheetah-keeper devotes particular care: he has to avoid any accident which might impair the animal’s fine condition. To do this, he puts it into a “street-jacket” (urtaf, ghtara, kays), a large bag, allowing it to pass its head through the opening and, to prevent it being frightened by anything nearby, he accustoms it to wear on its head a hood (bunuma), a leather visor shaped like a baby’s bonnet and tying under the chin; two porters then suffice to carry it safely to its destination when thus “hooded” (muqattt il-wardq).

On reaching its new home the cheetah, like sporting-birds, has to receive some “manning” (uns, ilf), training that will make it lose its savageness (ladgirid) completely. For this purpose the cheetah-keeper, leaving the hobbles on its feet, tethers it outside a house facing on to a busy street; the din, the constant movement and the teasing by the children soon result in making it absolutely harmless.

All this time and for the rest of its life it receives food only from the hand of its keeper, for it is by means of the daily feed (tum) that he begins the education (tadjrld) of his pupil. The art is not in teaching it to hunt, for it already has the instinct to do so, but instead in accustoming it to jump and ride pillow (isrididaf) on its trainer’s horse at any speed. The Indians avoid this difficult initiation by conveying their cheetahs to the hunting-grounds in small, individual vehicles, shaped like cages and drawn by horses or oxen.

To train it to ride pillow the cheetah-master installs in its neck a large “saddle” (miqhal al-dabbba) or a small platform (dakha, marhab) on trestles of adjustable height, and then having fastened a solid leather collar (bilida), fitted with a ring with swivel-pin (midrard), round the cheetah’s neck, he releases it from the chain and holds it by the leash with one hand; with the other he shakes the bowl with rings (kas’a) from which the animal feeds and places it on the raised platform, to start with a cubit and a half above the ground. Repeating this manoeuvre several times, he ends by ostentatiously throwing a piece of raw meat into the bowl standing on the platform, at the same time inviting the animal to jump up by pulling lightly at the leash. Egged on by hunger, the cheetah quickly understands that the rattle of rings on the bowl is the announcement of something good for it to eat and that it had to go up onto the platform to get it. In this way the copper or bronze bowl, with rings attached, now continually plays the part of the cheetah’s “reclaim”, like the sporting-bird’s lure. For this same purpose the Indians use a large iron ladle which is easier to handle on horseback than a bowl. By repeating this routine several times a day, each time increasing the height by several centimetres, the keeper accustoms the animal, in less than ten days, to come and look for its food at a height of more than three cubits above the ground, the average height of the crupper on a saddled
horse; he does not fail, each time, to give it confidence by patting its flanks. Finally he replaces the platform and brings it on a leash close to the horse; to begin with, he is careful to hound the cheetah before taking it outside, to prevent it being at all alarmed by the sight of the horse. As soon as he is in the saddle he pulls the leash with one hand and with the other makes a clinking sound with the bowl which is placed behind him on the pillion (rijāda) or "crupper-seat", fixed to the cantle of the saddle. The animal is attracted and nibly jumps up to eat the meat in the bowl; intent on its food, it pays no attention to the movement of the seat, the rider having meanwhile made his mount start to move. Patient and frequent repetitions of this manoeuvre quite soon allow the cheetah-keeper to ride at a trot, and then at a gallop, without disturbing its passenger which, being "harnessed" (resāk), sits firmly on its pillion, untied except for its slip which is knotted to the saddle-bow.

The "slipping on live" (īrād al-ţād ṭ-şāyād) of the cheetah is fairly rapid: some train-deer (kasīra, pl. khasāţir), hares or gazelle fawns (khāţif, pl. khasūţif) are easily caught and are slaughtered under the cheetah's feet so that it may lap the blood, quickly bringing out its hunting instincts. The skilful cheetah-keeper can even ensure that his beast only "sets upon" the gazelle bucks (fahl, pl. fuhūţ), the does (šuţ, pl. šanţ) in venery in East and West alike being always left free for breeding; whenever a doe is seized, the cheetah is deprived of its "right" by being immediately removed from its take, whilst it is allowed to "take its pleasure" (iğbāţ) on the bucks it has caught.

When a cheetah is judged to be "well-tried" (mukham), three days of hunting are possible. The first, a princely prerogative, is "hunting at force" (al-mukākāra, al-muwaqāţāka): the huntsmen, having reconnoitred the herd (sirb) from a distance, dislodge a buck and run it down until the "finish"; at the same time the cheetah is cast on the exhausted quarry and lays it low without difficulty or fatigue. These tactics entail long rides at random and require great endurance from riders and mounts alike. The second way is greatly relished for the thrilling spectacle that it offers, for it depends on the action of the cheetah alone: it is "stalking" (al-dāsīt); the cheetah which has been unhooded (makhūţ al-va'dal) "reconnoitres" (tasgawwuf) from a distance the gazelle as it is browsing and, at a sign from its keeper who has put it down on the ground, it sets off to try to take its quarry by surprise without being noticed. The cheetahs take cover in order to see without being seen, and tremble with delight at the cheetah's manoeuvres as, having made its way upwind (mustakbil al-rīh), it steals on and creeps up (da'alān, tasālūl) to the quarry, crouches down, remaining stock-still at the first alarm, and starts off again, one foot after another, taking advantage of every undulation of the ground, and so comes up quite close to the gazelle without having put it on its guard; the final charge is a matter of only a few seconds. As for the third way, it is by far the most commonly used by cheetah-keepers and gentlemen fahūţ (al-dūţ, al-dakhīb), for the small number of difficulty and fatigue that it entails: it is "trailing" (al-mukhāţāba, al-šīnāb); the huntsmen recognize a herd by its footprints and trail it upwind as far as its cover without alerting it. The cheetah, unhooded and "cast on the fur" unawares, is able to lay low several beasts before they have time to escape.

Whichever method of attack is adopted in the course of hunting, the cheetah-keeper cannot call for more than five or six "careers" (fahl, pl. atďb) from his cheetah since it makes the maximum effort in each career and thus rapidly becomes exhausted; for the same reason, it is only allowed to hunt on alternate days. Furthermore the cheetah-keeper must always cut the quarry's throat while the cheetah is still lying on it (tamahīdī), biting it hard in the nape of the neck or the throat, and must let it lap the blood caught in the bowl in order to remove it from its quarry and to take away the body. Nor will he neglect to hound the cheetah again as soon as it has remounted the pillion, so that it is not tempted to dash off after some game not intended for it, since it is only lawful to eat the flesh of a wild beast caught in this manner if the cheetah-keeper has pronounced "it is mine" involving the name of Allah (tasniya) at the moment when the beast of prey is deliberately let slip (īrsīl bi l-niyyā). The cheetah, being subject to laws of nature, becomes vexed and angry when it misses its quarry and turns a deaf ear when its master calls it in; only the clinking of its bowl makes it decide to go back. Although sensitive to reprimands, it is doubtful if this animal goes so far as to learn a lesson, as the legend has it, from a rebuke addressed in its presence but vicariously, to a dog that is in fact blameless.

The excitement of watching coursing with the cheetah has not escaped the inspiration of those Muslim poets who were responsive to subjects provided by the chase (tarādīsyyāt). Some accomplished masters of the urūjūs have left superb descriptions of the animal and its lightning charges, stressing the beauty of its tabby coat, its suppleness when creeping, its unparalleled speed and irresistible assault. Of the writings devoted to the cheetah, which are rarer than those describing hounds and sporting-birds, only those by poets of the ʿAbbāsid period have survived; we need note only such famous names as Abū Nuwās, al-Faḍl al-Raḵşāhi the rival of Abū Nuwās, Ibn al-Muṭṭāz, al-Nāšī, Ibn Abi Karīma the contemporary of al-Dāhīz, Ibn al-Muʿadhdhin and Ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥāfiz. The sport of hunting with cheetahs having remained a diversion for the rich in Islam, it is not surprising to find that only the court poets of caliphs and wealthy patrons have celebrated it in verse; popular poetry and Bedouin songs have scarcely touched on the subject.

Sāsānīd Persia gave the cheetah a certain place in its works of art; miniaturists represented it either realistically or else symbolically, by pair affronted or addorsed, on either side of the "tree of life" (ṭāmīm). The West eagerly borrowed this last motif in the illuminations of the main Middle Ages, as we can see in a frontispiece of the 11th century Byzantine of Lothair (Latin ms. Paris, B.N., no. 226, f° 75v).
according to A. Michel, *Histoire de VArt*, Paris 1905, I, 1st part, 400-4). The cheetah is also to be seen as an element of animal decoration in ceramics, tap-
stones and judges; in the Bucharest Museum there are two openwork clois-
notations which were discovered in ancient Potissa and are therefore known as the "Petrossa treasure"; each handle on these vases is made in the form of a cheetah supporting the vessel, the body made of gold and studded with garnets and turquoise (see A. Michel, op. cit., 413-4). Throughout Islam, the dominating influence of Sākādīd inspiration in the minor arts swept through all the Muslim terri-
tories and remained effective for several centuries; thus one frequently finds the "cheetah motif" in the works of art in metal or stone left by the artists of Fātimid Egypt and Muslim Spain. In this con-
nection one may wonder if the historians of Muslim art have occasionally been mistaken in regard to some of these decorations with animal figures, and have identified as lions what the artist intended as cheetahs. Finally, we may note that despite the renown it enjoyed among the great in the East, the cheetah never attained the heraldic eminence in the East, in the last it corresponds with *tabat, masikhka* (masyakha) or *mu'gidam* (this last word is also used in the west).

In the east, the best known of these works is *Mu'adin al-mufahras* of Ibn Ḥaḍjar al-Askalānī (d. 852/1449), still in manuscript (see Brockelmann, S II, 73), who adopts the same classification as Ibn Khayr (see infra). In the west, the *fahrasas* appear to be more numerous (Ibn Khayr and al-
Ru'ayni [see below] give quite a long list) and some still survive; three of them have already been published: a. Ibn Khayr al-Iṣbīlī (502-70/1108-76 [g.v.]), *Fahrasat mu rāshū w an 'an 'umaydul min al-
dawādīn al-muṣāmnī fī durūb al-'im wa-awdī al-
muṣārīf: Index librorum de diversis scientiarum or-
Ru'aynī al-Iṣbīlī (592-666/1195-1268), *Barnāmadāj* or K. al-
Tākrīd li-nubūḍāt al-mustafād min al-rūṣūm wa'āl-
isnad bi-lāhī* ḍamalat al-'im fī 'l-bīltī sa'īl ārak al-
tākrīd wa'āl-ṭībīlīdā, ed. Ibrahim Shabbūb, Damascus 1361/1942.

3 Abd al-'Azīz al-Ahwānī has examined the ms. still extant and incorporated the results of his research in an extremely well documented article, *Kutub barīmādī al-ṣūlāmī fī l-'Andalus, in RIMA, i/2* (1955), 91-120. According to this writer, it is possible to distinguish four categories of *fahrasa* or *barnāmadāj*: — I. Catalogue of writings, classified according to the branch of study to which they belong. Ibn Khayr observes the following order: Kur'ānic studies, *hadith, siyar* and genealogy, *fībāh*, grammar, lexicography, *adab*, poetry; he does no more than give the names of his masters, without any further observations. To this category belongs the *Barnāmadāj* of Ibn Mas'ūd al-Khushānī (d. 544/1149) of which only a few pages survive (al-Ahwānī, 99).

2 A list of masters, with note of the works studied under their direction. The *Ghunya* of bāhlī Ḥīyād (476-544/1083-1149 [g.v.] who adopts an alphabetical classification, belongs to this category,
as does the Fahrasa of Ibn 'Atiyya al-Muhāribi (d. 541/1146; see Pons Boigues, Ensayo ... cAlids and their partisans met their deaths at Fakhkh in a battle (yawm Fakhkh} on 8 Dhu '1-Hijjah 169/11 June 786.

Madrid 1898, 207; Brockelmann, S I, instead of Granada] of his death; ms. Escorial 1726), (ballut} sometimes not without indicating c

This genre, which appears to be a particular speciality of the Andalusians, should be associated with the transmission of hadīth, and indeed it was the traditionists and fukahd* who first gives the names and biographies of his masters according to the subjects in which they specialized: Kur'ān, hadīth, grammar, adab, poetry. — 3. A combination of the two classes as in the Barmumadī of Ibn Abī 'l-Rabī', and that of Muhammad b. Dībir al-Wādiyashi (d. 749/1348; see Brockelmann, S I, 311, and correct the date and place [Tunis instead of Granada] of his death; ms. Escorial 1726), who first gives the names and biographies of his masters, then the list of subjects and works studied under their direction. — 4. The addition of personal observations, narratives etc. by the author to the above list.

During the Almoravid period, in 528/1134, the Castilians crossed through the region of the Pedroches and reached the castle of al-Bakār, where they were routed by Tāshfīn b. 'Allī and compelled to retreat along the valley of the Guadiato. In the summer of 549/1155 Alfonso VII took Pedroche and Santa Euphemia, but Pedroche was immediately recaptured by the new Almohad governor of Cordova, Ibn Igtī who defeated the count left in command of Pedroche by Alfonso VII, took him prisoner when capturing the castle by storm, and sent him to Marrākush. For a considerable time Ghāfīk-Belalcazar remained in the hands of the Almohads for, although we do not know the date when the Fahs al-ballūt passed completely into the power of Castile, it is certain that in 580/1184 the caliph Yusuf b. 'Abd al-Mu'mīn b. 'Abd al-Mu'min, on his arrival at Seville to start the Santarem campaign, sent his general Muhammad b. Wānūdīn into exile at Ghāfīk, his conduct in action against the Castilians and Portuguese having been somewhat discrepant.

The counts of Sotomayor, when building their castle on the site of the abandoned fortress of Ghāfīk, erected a grand tower of extremely picturesque appearance which, standing out prominently in the restricted setting that it commanded, merited the name of Belalcazar; the old name of Ghāfīk fell into oblivion, although later it was felt desirable to give it a more Arabic etymology with the tortuous invention of Belalcazar.

The latter were, however, the “Martyrs”. The battle, which in the time of Snouck Hurgronje was known only to cultivated Meccans but of which the Shi'a has preserved vivid recollections, was the dramatic conclusion of an 'Alid revolt which began in Medina and which, though lasting less than forty days, was regarded, because of the final massacre, as the most serious of the revolts after that which culminated in Karbala. This revolt sprang from more or less long-standing causes in addition to its immediate cause. Al-Ya'qobî tells us that, after the elevation of al-Hadi to the caliphate, there was a renewal of the persecutions against the Shi'a, some of whom went to Medina to complain to the 'Alids in the town of the persecutions which had been suffered. But so short a time elapsed between that event and the revolt that, even if the information given by this author can be accepted, it is necessary to go further back to find the real causes of the occurrence. The revolt had connections with that of Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah al-Nafs al-Zakîyya [q.e.] and his brother Ibrâhîm [q.e.] in 145/762-3, for the 'Alids which revolted in 169 were closely related to the victims of 145; on the other hand, if we examine word by word the speech which the leader made to his followers, we see that it must have been the culmination of one of those movements of a social character to which the 'Abbâsid state from the time of al-Hadi was often subject. For their leader, the movement, the cause and the course of the insurrection, see AL-HUSAYN B. 'ALI SÁHIB FAKHKH:

here we mention only that after resisting for eleven days at Medina Hûsyan set out with his followers for Mecca, and the clash with the ‘Abbâsid forces took place on the day of the tarîsîyâ (8 Dhu 'l-Hijja 113/22 June 786) at the foot of the mountain of al-Bûrît at Fakhkh. Al-Husayan, the Sâhib Fakhkh as he is often called, having refused to accept a safe-conduct, fell in battle along with other 'Alids. For their three days' bodies were left unburied, an incident which provided the poets with a moving theme for their elegies. The 'Alid Idrîs b. 'Abd Allah b. al-Hasan succeeded in escaping; he took refuge in Egypt, and from there went to the far residence of the caliphs from 223 to 269/838-83, that is, until the beginning of the 'Abbâsid period (3rd/9th century). It is to the excavations at Sâmârâ, the residence of the caliphs from 223 to 269/838-83, that we owe our earliest and in any way precise knowledge of the wares. They seem already very varied and skilfully executed, so that we are led to believe that there had been earlier developments of which we know nothing. In addition to pottery with or without glaze, incised or stamped, there are three main types of wares represented at Sâmârâ; there is a white earthenware decorated with spots or pseudo-calligraphic motives in cobalt blue, an earthenware decorated in polychrome, obviously inspired by Chinese stonewares of the T'ang period (7th-8th centuries); and finally there is an earthenware known as lustre, characterized by its metallic lights. The decoration of this last type is achieved by means of an ochre mixed with powdered silver, or copper, which separates out in the firing and is deposited as a thin film on the surface of the tin glaze; the colour varies from pale gold to ruby red and the iridescence of these tones varies according to the fall of light. Other analogous and doubtless contemporary pieces have been found at Susa. At Baghûdâ, or at other centres in the 'Abbâsid empire, this ware, which in appearance rivalled the vessels in precious metals but was never hit by the same interdiction on the part of strict Muslims, seems to have been an item in the lively export trade across the Islamic world. Thus is it that a number of fragments have been dug up at Madînat al-Zahrâ', the royal city of the caliph of Cordova, thus also that the finest collection to come down to us (nearly 150 tiles sent from Western Asia was the birth place of Islamic pottery. Its ultimate ancestors were undoubtedly the glazed bricks of the Achaemenid palaces, and its more recent forrunners the Parthian and Sâsânid wares. Islamic pottery, however, is not known to us until the beginning of the 'Abbâsid period (3rd/9th century). It is to the excavations at Sâmârâ, the residence of the caliphs from 223 to 269/838-83, that we owe our earliest and in any way precise knowledge of the wares. They seem already very varied and skilfully executed, so that we are led to believe that there had been earlier developments of which we know nothing. In addition to pottery with or without glaze, incised or stamped, there are three main types of wares represented at Sâmârâ; there is a white earthenware decorated with spots or pseudo-calligraphic motives in cobalt blue, an earthenware decorated in polychrome, obviously inspired by Chinese stonewares of the T'ang period (7th-8th centuries); and finally there is an earthenware known as lustre, characterized by its metallic lights. The decoration of this last type is achieved by means of an ochre mixed with powdered silver, or copper, which separates out in the firing and is deposited as a thin film on the surface of the tin glaze; the colour varies from pale gold to ruby red and the iridescence of these tones varies according to the fall of light. Other analogous and doubtless contemporary pieces have been found at Susa. At Baghûdâ, or at other centres in the 'Abbâsid empire, this ware, which in appearance rivalled the vessels in precious metals but was never hit by the same interdiction on the part of strict Muslims, seems to have been an item in the lively export trade across the Islamic world. Thus is it that a number of fragments have been dug up at Madînat al-Zahrâ', the royal city of the caliph of Cordova, thus also that the finest collection to come down to us (nearly 150 tiles sent from Western Asia was the birth place of Islamic pottery. Its ultimate ancestors were undoubtedly the glazed bricks of the Achaemenid palaces, and its more recent forrunners the Parthian and Sâsânid wares. Islamic pottery, however, is not known to us until the beginning of the 'Abbâsid period (3rd/9th century). It is to the excavations at Sâmârâ, the residence of the caliphs from 223 to 269/838-83, that we owe our earliest and in any way precise knowledge of the wares. They seem already very varied and skilfully executed, so that we are led to believe that there had been earlier developments of which we know nothing. In addition to pottery with or without glaze, incised or stamped, there are three main types of wares represented at Sâmârâ; there is a white earthenware decorated with spots or pseudo-calligraphic motives in cobalt blue, an earthenware decorated in polychrome, obviously inspired by Chinese stonewares of the T'ang period (7th-8th centuries); and finally there is an earthenware known as lustre, characterized by its metallic lights. The decoration of this last type is achieved by means of an ochre mixed with powdered silver, or copper, which separates out in the firing and is deposited as a thin film on the surface of the tin glaze; the colour varies from pale gold to ruby red and the iridescence of these tones varies according to the fall of light. Other analogous and doubtless contemporary pieces have been found at Susa. At Baghûdâ, or at other centres in the 'Abbâsid empire, this ware, which in appearance rivalled the vessels in precious metals but was never hit by the same interdiction on the part of strict Muslims, seems to have been an item in the lively export trade across the Islamic world. Thus is it that a number of fragments have been dug up at Madînat al-Zahrâ', the royal city of the caliph of Cordova, thus also that the finest collection to come down to us (nearly 150 tiles sent from
Baghdād or manufactured there) appear in the surround of the mihrāb in the Great Mosque at Kayrawān. In Egypt the workshops of Fustāt were initiated into the technique of lustre decoration, where we shall meet this ware again.

Persia played a remarkable part in the development of ceramic wares at a very early date. She seems to have profited from foreign as well as from pre-Islamic traditions, as is evidenced by the ware called gabrī, after the name of "Guebres", adherents of Zoroastrianism, which Islam had not completely stamped out. The ornamentation of this ware, produced by means of larger or smaller scratches in the slip that covers the body under the transparent partly coloured glaze, consists of schematic representations, recalling the ancient culture of Persia, notably of fire altars, as well as figures of men and beasts, birds, lions and dragons depicted in a curiously stylized manner.

Of all the centres of ceramic production in Ḫūrāsān, the now ruined city of Rayy, in the vicinity of Tehran, seems the most ancient. It was extremely active until the 7th/13th century and, under the name of Rhages, is the best known to collectors. The wares show great diversity of both form and technique. Lustre wares, often of a greenish gold tone, are frequently represented. Apart from tiles, facing wall surfaces, cut in eight-pointed stars and in crosses with arms of equal length, Rayy also produced bottles and vases in the form of animals, or ornamented with wild beasts modelled in relief. The predilection displayed by the potters for the representation of living beings, and even their interpretation in the round, is a pronounced characteristic of Persian taste. Inside and on the rims of plates, on the swelling walls of bottles, as well as on wall tiles, mounted soldiers and hunters ride along, rulers and stumpy, doll-faced musicians sit, all bringing to mind the figures depicted in the miniatures of the period. These little figures, standing out against a white or pale blue ground, are dressed in delicately coloured cloths heightened with gold. Inscriptions in golden letters tell of the Iranian legends illustrated in this type of decoration.

Rayy was sacked by Cingiz Khatān's Mongols in 624/1227; yet although appallingly impoverished, her potters continued production, using the techniques with which they were familiar. Attributed to the small town of Kubāca, we find not only late survivals of Chinese influence, but also characteristics that foreshadow the Turkish pottery of Asia Minor. The painted decoration under the glaze, which is colourless or stained green or blue and is often crackled, consists of stylized flowers and animals, usually in silhouette, or turbaned personages against a green ground.

The arrival of the Mongols appears to have some connexion with the establishment of stores that were found in the ruins of Gurgān. The pieces, which were found intact, had been packed in large jars, or had been buried at the time of the invasion. The wares are dateable to the end of the 5th-6th/11th-12th century; some of them might be earlier. They include copper lustre wares with a cream or turquoise ground; there are some, too, that may have been imported from Sava.

Under Mongol domination, the ceramic industry remained vigorous, especially in the Persian area, at ʿĀmul and even more so at Sava and Kaḏān, as well as in the north-east at Samarkānd. Wares with geometric, floral and highly stylized animal decoration, cut through a slip dressing and tinged with green and manganese purple are believed to have been made at ʿĀmul in the 5th-7th/11th-13th centuries.

In the Mongol p-riod we find new centres of production, such as that at Sulṭānābād, springing up. Chinese influence asserts itself and is favoured by the new rulers of Iran, who brought in Chinese potters, just as they had introduced miniature painters in the 13th century. Chinese fashions were to persist into the ʿĀlīāf period, which followed that of the Mongols. The fabulous beasts of the Far East enliven the wares attributed to Kirman in the time of Shāh ʿAbbas 995-1037/1587-1628.

The excavations carried out by the Americans before and during the second World War have brought to light the existence of ceramic activity in Nishāpūr in Transoxiana, which must have achieved its apogee in the 2nd-5th/8th-11th centuries under the Sāmānids. The wares produced seem to be the earliest ones covered with a very thin dull glaze stained lemon yellow, green or brick red; they display a disorderly grouping of geometric motives, pseudo-calligraphic elements, flowers, animals and figures, perhaps derived from ancient Persia, enclosed by black lines.

In the wares of Dāghistān to the south-west of the Caspian, and in the dishes, somewhat arbitrarily attributed to the small town of Kūbdāz, we find not only late survivals of Chinese influence, but also characteristics that foreshadow the Turkish pottery of Asia Minor. The painted decoration under the glaze, which is colourless or stained green or blue and is often crackled, consists of stylized flowers and animals, usually in silhouette, or turbaned personages against a green ground.

Apart from pieces of such forms as vases and dishes, Persia produced an abundance of ceramics for architectural purposes, which make a glittering and colourful addition of great charm to the elegantly proportioned buildings. Combinations of brick and glazed tile, as well as polychrome tiles produced by setting mosaics in monochrome surfaces, make up geometric, calligraphic and floral decorations that have a place both on the inside and on the outside of architectural structures. On the outside these ceramics encase domes, tall minarets and porches, the colours most frequently occurring being dark and light blue; on the inside one is struck by the faience mīrābs, especially those made at Kaḏān, with their flat central panels flanked by pilasters and crowned with a Persian arch with straight members.

The settlement of the Saldjūk Turks in Asia Minor at first resulted in a considerable spread of Persian art. Konya, which became the capital of the Turkish kingdom of Rûm, and where the sultans established many foundations, had an influx of craftsmen, particularly of potters, from Khorāsān as the consequence of the Mongol invasion of their country. Dating from the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries are some fine wall facings for interiors made from bricks glazed on one side, or of tile mosaics, besides polychrome tiles.

The collapse of the sultanate of Konya at the beginning of the 8th/14th century brought the ceramic production of Anatolia to a standstill. But it was to have brilliant revival, thanks to the Ottoman Turks, who in 726/1326 made Bursa their capital. They endowed the city with fine buildings of which ceramic ornament is the most prominent feature, and of which the mosque and the turba are the most justly celebrated. Nevertheless Bursa was not the real centre of the industry; this was at Iznıkk, a town not far from the capital. It was to remain a flourishing centre for the production of Anatolian wares (from the end of the 8th/14th to the end of the 10th/16th century), in the course of which different stages in style and techni-
que are distinguishable. At the beginning of the 10th/16th century Persian influence was still very marked, but at the end of this century, which saw the polychrome wares of Iznik reach their apogee, the potters freed themselves from Iranian tradition and the wares began to acquire specifically Turkish characteristics. The decoration is painted on slip, and to the colours already in use (cobalt blue, turquoise and green from copper), are added a black equaling them in mastery. The posthumous glory of production and was replaced by Kutahya, which copied especially a greyish green Chinese celadon colour.

During the 11th/17th century Iznik ceased production and was replaced by Kütahya, which copied the techniques and styles of Iznik but without equaling them in mastery. The posthumous glory of Iznik reached even Istanbul, where the kilns known as Tekfur came into operation at the beginning of the 12th/18th century.

Attributed to Damascus are some very fine dishes, related to the Anatolian wares, but distinguished from them as much by the colours (lacking tomato red and using manganese purple and a green from chromium oxide), as by the drawing of the designs, which are less naturalistic, less sensitive and which give greater weight to the background.

The skills of the kiln and the crucible are very ancient in Egypt and it is known that making of glass was first practised there. In the lands of the Pharaohs the people also made pottery and understood the use of glaze. If lustre ware was not first invented there, as some people believe, at least it was made there at a very early date in imitation of that of Sicily. There are some pieces of lustre very similar to those from Sāmarrā, dated to the 3rd/9th century, that is the period of the Tūnimids, or even earlier. The decoration, drawn very boldly, introduces somewhat uncouth human figures and pseudo-calligraphic elements. These wares underwent a remarkable development in the course of the 5th/6th to 7th/8th centuries under the Fatimidids. The diversity of the wares of the period, and the visible attention of the artists, attests alongside a very free attitude to the orthodoxy prescriptions concerning images, a striving after that elegance which imbues all the arts of the Fatimid era. The surfaces, covered with a fine gold lustre, are enriched by the details within the field of the lustre itself being delicately traced out with a fine point. The repertory of ornament includes four-footed beasts, birds or fish, and also the human figure, the men wearing turbans and the women with their hair hanging down. The crucifix and representations of Christ with a halo lead one to believe in the existence of Coptic craftsmen.

The same period saw the flowering of a ware with carving decoration under a monochrome glaze, especially a greyish green Chinese celadon colour. The quantity of sherds thrown on the refuse heaps dating like the city from the 4th/10th century, have yielded a great quantity of pottery with decoration consisting of manganese brown painted lines and copper green for the coloured surfaces. These wares, dating like the city from the 4th/10th century, have parallels among the eastern Barbary examples of an appreciably later date. The Islamic ceramics of Sicily (6th/12th century) suggest further parallels of a similar kind. This appearance of family grouping and the relative homogeneity of the wares of Western Islam raises a problem that warrants some attention.

The excavations of Madinat al-Zahra² show that Spain was aware in the 4th/10th century of the lustre wares imported from the east; yet the Iberian peninsula had its own centres of production also. Malaga from the 7th/13th to 9th/15th century was just such a centre, at which were produced gold lustre dishes and large jars of the type of which the one known as the “Alhambra Jar” is the most famous.

The noble grace of form of these great pottery jars is echoed in the large vases, with impressed decoration, that seem to have the same origin and may perhaps be attributed to the same period. The paste is left unglazed, or is covered with a green enamelled glaze; the decoration, arranged in registers above another, comprises blind arcing, calligraphic forms, interlacing elements and sometimes animal forms. The same technique and a similar decor is found in the linings for wells and tanks such as those preserved in Andalusia and the Maghrib. A fine collection of these stoutly-made ceramic shafts, by which to draw water, has been

² Moorish Spain was, indeed, a producer of fine ceramic wares. The excavations at Madinat al-Zahra, the caliphate city near Cordova, have yielded a great quantity of pottery with decoration consisting of manganese brown painted lines and copper green for the coloured surfaces. These wares, dating like the city from the 4th/10th century, have parallels among the eastern Barbary examples of an appreciably later date. The Islamic ceramics of Sicily (6th/12th century) suggest further parallels of a similar kind. This appearance of family grouping and the relative homogeneity of the wares of Western Islam raises a problem that warrants some attention.

The excavations of Madinat al-Zahra show that Spain was aware in the 4th/10th century of the lustre wares imported from the east; yet the Iberian peninsula had its own centres of production also. Malaga from the 7th/13th to 9th/15th century was just such a centre, at which were produced gold lustre dishes and large jars of the type of which the one known as the “Alhambra Jar” is the most famous.

The noble grace of form of these great pottery jars is echoed in the large vases, with impressed decoration, that seem to have the same origin and may perhaps be attributed to the same period. The paste is left unglazed, or is covered with a green enamelled glaze; the decoration, arranged in registers above another, comprises blind arcing, calligraphic forms, interlacing elements and sometimes animal forms. The same technique and a similar decor is found in the linings for wells and tanks such as those preserved in Andalusia and the Maghrib. A fine collection of these stoutly-made ceramic shafts, by which to draw water, has been
found at Sidi Bāʿ Uṯmān to the north of Marrākush and perhaps dating from the 6th/12th century. At the beginning of the 6th/12th century Moorish Spain and the Maghrib gave ceramics an important rôle in architectural ornament. Glazed earthenware tiles, which we first encountered in Persia and then in eastern Barbary, are associated with the adornment of minarets and make up panels in rooms. The facility of the craftsmen, specialists in sallīḍī [q.v.], in cutting out shapes in monochrome tiles and assembling them to make geometric, calligraphic and floral decorations, is astonishing. They are equally skilled in a kind of ceramic čamplévé which consists of chiselling out the glaze with a graving tool, thus leaving the elements of decoration in reserve. Finally there is recourse to a closonné treatment, called in Spanish cuerdaseca, which, using similar interlacing geometrical motives, gives from a distance an impression as of inlay work. It is a very ancient technique, not without analogy with the glazed bricks of the Achaemenid palace at Susa. Each surface is enclosed by a black line, which has an important place in the composition and which serves to prevent contiguous colours spilling over into each other. Neither the potters of Sāmarrā nor those of Madinat al-Zahrāʾ passed over this technique; and it was practised in North Africa in the 5th-6th/11th-12th centuries, [q.v.], in which the black line is replaced by a thin line incised in the paste to separate the colours, was to become a special skill of the Spanish centres of production, notably of Seville. At the beginning of the 11th/17th century (1019-1610) the Spanish Moors took the technique with them when they were expelled to Tunisia.

Traditional methods of wall revetment prolonged the tradition of ceramic inlay, so the mudejar period saw the manufoctures of Manises take over the making of lustre ware from Malaga. In the same way the green and brown decorated wares of Paterna, in the region of Valencia, seem, in the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, a late legacy of the Andalusian Caliphate.

Ceramic art was still to survive, not without remarques with Africa. Morocco still has her cutters and assemblers of tile mosaics (sallīḍī), and the potters of Fez knew, until quite recent times, how to produce vessels with blue or polychrome decoration as well as dishes of an original kind. Turkish Algeria used to have a remarkable quantity of earthenware tiles, but they were almost entirely imports from Europe.

Tunisia, and especially Tunis, has not wholly forgotten the mediaeval ceramic arts. It is indeed likely that tin-glazed wares have never ceased to be made while there has been a use for them. The last few centuries have seen the production of vessels which preserve quite well the older colours, and panels decorated with blind arcing, vessels and covers, in which local traditions merge with contributions from the Levant.
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On the death of ʿAdud al-Dawla (372/982), Muʿayyid al-Dawla tried unsuccessfully to initiate a reconciliation with his brother, and died in his turn in 373. His vizier Ibn ʿAbbād (959) seems to have calculated that no adequate opposition would be put up against Fakhr al-Dawla, now the eldest member of the family, or that the sons of ʿAdud al-Dawla, the masters of ʿIrāk and Fārs, already had vizziers of their own and would not retain him (Ibn ʿAbbād) in his present position; he appealed boldly to Fakhr al-Dawla, the very man whom hitherto he had always opposed and who, travelling to Rayy with all haste, assumed power without difficulty, while the son of Muʿayyid al-Dawla, the governor of Ṣafāsān, submitted to him; naturally enough he retained the all-powerful Ibn ʿAbbād as vizier.

Despite the difference in temperament of these princes, this fact ensured a certain continuity in policy, and in particular Fakhr al-Dawla, despite the debt he owed to Kābūs, retained Diurdjān which Muʿayyid al-Dawla had annexed; in Ḵūraşān, the struggles between Tāgh, whom he supported and welcomed, and Ibn Simṛḏūr, his successor, allowed him on the other hand to combine gratitude with the continuation of an anti-Sāmānīd course of action. However, Muʿayyid al-Dawla had become a vassal, and Fakhr al-Dawla, the very man whom hitherto he had always opposed and who, travelling to Rayy with all haste, assumed power without difficulty, while the son of Muʿayyid al-Dawla, the governor of Ṣafāsān, submitted to him; naturally enough he retained the all-powerful Ibn ʿAbbād as vizier.

We know that the methods of adjudication of fiscal districts, in use at Rayy, helped to make Ibn ʿAbbād unpopular when he tried to introduce them in Ḵūrizān; there can be no doubt as to the general vigilance and regularity of the administration under this vizier, and certain minor innovations made by him are recorded in the Taʾrikh-i Kūm, written in the days of Fakhr al-Dawla, and later the Siyāsat-nāma of Niẓām al-Mulk, chap. 41. The geographer al- Ṭūsī, who also wrote during this reign (see especially 399-400), gives an impression of the prosperity of the country; apart from a mosque, Ravy is also indebted to him for a new citadel (perhaps Tabarak) (Yāḵūt, iii, 855).

Fakhr al-Dawla died in 387 (August 997) and, it is said, the Treasury key being in the possession of his son who was absent, there were no funds available to provide for a decent burial. Some weeks after his death Kābūs returned to Dīrdjān.

Fakhr al-Dawla, name of two Lebanese amirs of the Druze house of Maʿn (p.n.): Fakhr al-Din I, amir of the Shūf (north-east of Sidon) at the time of the Ottoman conquest of Syria, was among the chieftains who offered submission to the conquering Sultan Selim I in Damascus in 921/1516. The Sultan, impressed by his eloquence, is said to have sent him back with the title amīr al-barr (lord of the land), recognizing him as overlord of the chieftains of the Druze Mountain (the Ḥarb, the Dīrūd, and the Shūf). Fakhr al-Dawla I was assassinated in 951/1544 under obscure circumstances on the orders of the Pasha of Damascus, and was succeeded by his son Korkmaz.

Fakhr al-Din II, son and successor of Korkmaz, was born in c. 980/1572, and was only a boy when his father died in 993/1585. In the previous year a convoy bearing the annual tribute from Egypt was ambushed and robbed at the bay of ʿAkkār, to the north of Tripoli; and the enemies of the Maʿns in Lebanon, jealous of their rising power, accused Korkmaz of responsibility for the misdeed before the Ottomans. Consequently, Ottoman troops attacked and ravaged the Shūf, and Korkmaz died in flight. His fall was followed by civil war in the Druze Mountain between the Kayṣāl faction who supported the Maʿns, and the opposing Yamanis led by the house of ʿAlam al-Din. By 1000/1591 the Kayṣās had clearly gained the upper hand, and Fakhr al-Din II could effectively take over his father's position.

The first aim of the young amir was vengeance against Yūṣuf Sayfā, the powerful Kurdish chieftain of the Tripoli region in northern Lebanon who had been the chief instigator of the Ottoman attack on the Shūf in 1585. Shortly after Fakhr al-Din's
accession, in 1593, Yusuf Sayfā had considerably expanded his domain by absorbing the Maronite districts of Bsharri, Batroun, Diabāy and Kisrawān, and extending his hold southwards to include Beirut. Master of the whole of northern Lebanon and of Ṭākār, Yusuf Sayfā became the most powerful figure of the time in Syria, and his territory extended northwards to Lattakia and Hamā. However, in his struggle against the Sayfā, Fakhr al-Dīn had for allies the Maronites who, smarting under Sayfā oppression, were ambitious for the grand Druze amir as a possible deliverer. Fakhr al-Dīn encouraged the Maronites in this attitude, surrounded himself with Maronite advisers, and was soon dreaming of uniting the Druze and the Maronites of Lebanon under his own dynasty.

Fakhr al-Dīn’s first step was to make friends with Murād Pasha of Damascus, paying him a formal visit and obtaining from him possession of the port of Sīdīn, which he made his capital. While in Damascus Fakhr al-Dīn also started an intrigue against his enemies ʿAlī Harfūsh of Bālaib and Ǧībāl ʿAmīl and Mānsūr Fūrayyḥ of the Bīkā, both potential allies of Yusuf Sayfā. As a result both chieftains were seized and executed by Murād in the following year. Fakhr al-Dīn thereupon invaded and seized the Bīkā, making peace with Mūsā Harfūsh, ʿAlī’s successor, and securing the Druze Mountain against Beduin attack with the additional wealth accruing from the trade of Sīdīn, which he made his capital. While in Damascus, from 1023/1614, he made peace with his successor on the payment of ʿalām for the tribute; and in the following year a Maronite bishop was sent to Italy to represent the Druze amir at the court of Tuscany and at the Holy See.

Murād Pasha died in 1020/1611 and was succeeded by Fakhr al-Dīn’s bitter enemy Nāṣūḥ Pasha. Meanwhile, the growing relations between Fakhr al-Dīn and Tuscany had greatly increased the suspicions of the Porte. Nasuḥ Pasha’s suspicions were particularly aroused when Fakhr al-Dīn began to employ a standing army of mercenaries (the subkan—see SEGAB) instead of depending on the usual peasant levies, and when he began to show a keen interest in the sandjaks of Nablus and ʿAgālijīn, in Palestine and Transjordan, which controlled the road to Jerusalem. Attempts to appease the Grand Vizier with gifts proved useless. When Fakhr al-Dīn clashed with Ahmad Hāfīz Pasha of Damascus over the two sandjaks, Nāṣūḥ Pasha mobilized a powerful army for the command of Hāfīz. Expecting defeat, Fakhr al-Dīn handed over affairs to his brother Yūnūs with instructions to move the capital to Dayr al-Kamar in the Ṣūḥr, and himself took ship from Sīdīn and fled to Tuscany.

The self-imposed exile of Fakhr al-Dīn was a temporary retreat after a temporary reverse. In 1023/1614 Nāṣūḥ Pasha died. Hāfīz Pasha was shortly after recalled from Damascus, and Yūnūs Maʾn made peace with his successor on the payment on a large sum of money and a promise to dismantle the fortresses of Arrūn and Sūbāyba. Fakhr al-Dīn could now return to Lebanon, arriving back at Acre in 1027/1618.

In 1024/1615, during Fakhr al-Dīn’s absence, Yusuf Sayfā had sacked Dayr al-Kamar. This gave Fakhr al-Dīn an excuse, upon his return, to ally himself with ʿUmar Pasha of Tripoli, who wanted Sayfā to pay arrears of tribute. Fakhr al-Dīn successfully intervened against Sayfā on behalf of the Pasha, and in return received the districts of Djubayl and Batrun. A formal peace between the two chieftains was arranged in 1028/1619, Fakhr al-Dīn taking Sayfā’s daughter in marriage. In the same year Fakhr al-Dīn procured the tenure of the sandjaks of Ǧībāl and Lattakia, which had previously belonged to Sayfā. During the next five years fighting between the amir and his father-in-law continued, Fakhr al-Dīn meanwhile seizing the districts of Bsharri and Ṭākār, until Yusuf Sayfā died in 1033/1624. Three years later Fakhr al-Dīn completed his triumph by arranging for his son Husayn, a Sayfā on his mother’s side,
In the meantime, Fakhr al-Dīn had also obtained the titles to the sandiaks of Nābulus and 'Aqūlūn, and it was left to him to evict the occupants of these sandiaks. As he campaigned in Palestine for the purpose, Muṣṭafā Pāša of Damascus, incited by Kürd Ḥamza, formed a coalition against the amīr and advanced into the Bīṯā in 1032/1623. Fakhr al-Dīn rushed back and met him at 'Andjar, where Muṣṭafā Pāša was defeated in battle and taken prisoner, then honourably released. During the years that followed this victory Fakhr al-Dīn reached the height of his power; and by 1040/1631 his territory had come to extend westwards to Palmýra, and northwards almost to the borders of Anatolia.

Following 1040/1631, however, troubles began to come upon Fakhr al-Dīn thick and fast. While he campaigned in northern Syria Beduín chieftains revolted against him in Palestine and Transjordan; while in the Šīfā the Yamanī 'Alām al-Gīns, in alliance with the sons of Yūsūf Sayfayr, were creating unrest. By 1042/1633 civil war broke out in the Druze Mountain, and Fakhr al-Dīn’s firm allies the Kaysā Tanālūḳ [q.v.] were massacred by a man by the name of the ‘Alām al-Dīns. Meanwhile the Ottoman Government, under the vigorous Sultan Murād IV, was becoming concerned about Fakhr al-Dīn’s activities in northern Syria and the fortresses that were going up near the Anatolian border. Accordingly, the Grand Vizier Qādir, and Khaṣṣūl Pāša, instigated Mustafa Pasha of Damascus, incited by the amīr’s troops, commanded by his son ʿAlī, were defeated at Šubayba, and ʿAlī himself was killed. Before the resolute Ottoman attack Fakhr al-Dīn’s precariously balanced power collapsed within a few weeks. The amīr himself fled to a cave in the cliffs of Dżazzān, where he was discovered and captured by Kūṭūk Aḥmad, then sent in chains to Istanbul. There Fakhr al-Dīn was executed by strangling in 1045/1635, along with his sons. Only his youngest son, Ḥusayn, was spared, to become a prominent Ottoman courtier and an ambassador of the sultan to India. He was a friend of the historian Sharih al-Manarzade [q.v.], and is himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, himself a warm partisan of al-Ashʿar, his master in philosophy, and al-Kamal al-Dilli (al-Diaball?), whom he followed to Maragha, 1042/1635, conquered up to Cāfīgān in the south and made a bid for Lakhnawtī in the north-west, but failed in the latter venture. From 1032/1623 to 1033/1624 he ruled undisputedly at Sonargāwn, issued silver currency and assumed the titles of Yāmīn-ī Khaṭṭālī-Allāh and Nāṣir-ī Amīr al-Muḥimin. In 1031/1623 he succeeded at Sonargāwn by his son ʿIyyār al-Dīn Ghażī Shāh, who in 1032/1632 lost his kingdom to ʿIyyār al-Dīn Ilyās Shāh, the ruler of Lakhnawtī, the latter united the whole of Bengal under his authority. Ibn Battūta visited Sonargāwn when Fakhr al-Dīn was the ruler. He pays tribute to the king’s generosity towards the pirs, and speaks of the cheapness of commodities within the kingdom.

ing to Rayy, he entered into relations with Shihab al-Dîn al-Ghuri, Sultan of Ghazna, who heaped money and honours upon him. The same thing occurred to him in the Minâri, in the person of Muhammad b. Takaš, with whom he lived for some time in Khorásân. This prince showed him the greatest consideration and caused a madrasa to be built for him.

In 580/1184, while on his way to Transoxania in order to reach Bukhârâ, he stopped for some time at Sarâkhg where he was received with honour by the Shâh of Ghur and his company of disciples. He was sent on a mission, he settled down finally in Herât, where the Ghûrid Sultan of Ghazna, Ghiyâth al-Dîn, allowed him to open a school for the general public within the royal palace.

After a certain number of journeys which took him to Samarqand and as far as India (where perhaps he was sent on a mission), he settled down finally in Herât where he passed the greater part of his life. He was known there by the title of Shaykh al-Islâm. It is said that at this period, at the height of his glory, more than three hundred of his disciples or followers accompanied him when he moved from one place to another.

He was so poor at the outset of his career that his compatriots in Bukhârâ were obliged to make a collection in order to help him when he fell ill there; but later on he came into a vast fortune. He married two sons to the two daughters of an immensely rich doctor from Rayy and, on this man’s death, inherited part of his money.

His lively and penetrating intelligence, his prodigious memory (he is said to have learned the Shâmil of al-Djuwayni by heart in his youth), his methodical and clear mind, caused him to become a teacher celebrated throughout the whole region of Central Asia, from all parts of which people came to consult him on the most diverse questions. He was, moreover, an excellent preacher. Of medium height, well-built, heavy-bearded, endowed with a voice both powerful and warm, he inspired and enflamed his listeners to the point of tears and was himself deeply moved by emotion when he was preaching. His preaching converted many Karrâmis to Sunnism. Despite his strong grounding in philosophy and numerous controversies he was extremely pious (kîna min ahl al-dîn wa l-tasawwuf). In many of his treatises, he often meditated upon death and, according to Ibn al-Ansârî, 730), he also criticized Ashâ’î's zeal in the defence of Sunnism was an opponent of atomism (cf. K. al-Djâwhar al-fard, ii, 286, 392, 475, etc.; Lawdmi-al-bayyindt, xix (1937), 190). He points out Razi's frequent resort derives from the interpretation of the Timaeus" (Les "Controverses" de Fakhr al-Dîn Râzî, in BIE, xix (1937), 213-47).

For the influence of al-Razi’s ideas on a mind as uncompromising as that of Ibn Taymiyya, see the remarkable thesis of H. Kraus, Fakhr al-Dîn Râzî, in Isl., iii (1912), 213-47.

For the influence of al-Razi’s ideas on a mind as uncompromising as that of Ibn Taymiyya, see the remarkable thesis of H. Kraus, Fakhr al-Dîn Râzî, in Isl., iii (1912), 213-47.

These last, who accused him of corrupting Islam by preferring to its teaching that of Aristotle, Fârâbî and Avicenna. He was also reproached for reporting so much of the arguments of the adversaries of Islam, without being capable of refuting them convincingly.

In 606/1209, seriously ill and feeling the approach of death, he dictated his “Testament” to his disciple, Ibrâhîm b. Abî Bakr al-Iṣṭâhânî, on Sunday, 21 Muhârram/26 July. The text of this has been preserved by, among others, al-Subîkî and Ibn Abî Usaybî. It is a true profession of Sunni faith and a beautiful example of total resignation to the will of God. He commends his children to the Sultan and asks him, as well as his disciples, to bury him according to all the ordinances of Muslim law on the mountain of Mârâjân near Herât. Certain biographers of al-Râzî have held that he was poisoned by the Karrâmîs. In addition, Ibn al-Ṭabarî (Barbehraeus) and Ibn Abî Usaybî pass on a rumour according to which he was buried secretly within his house to prevent the crowd from ill-treating his remains. It is unlikely that either of these reports is true: al-Râzî’s tomb is still venerated at Herât. Although he was a convinced follower of al-ʾAshârî, al-Râzî showed himself, at least in his youthful works, to be an opponent of atomism (cf. K. al-Djâwhar al-fard, ii, 27). It is true that later on (cf. Mafâṣîth al-ṣâhil, 2, i, 5 and K. Lawdim al-bayyindt, 229; K. al-Arba’in ft usul al-dîn) he seems to have changed his views or at any rate to have shown less severity in his criticism of atomism. He dedicated his K. al-Djâwar al-sard (Ibn Abî Usaybî, ii, 30) to this subject and al-Ṭòstî gives a short analysis of it in his Shârî al-ʾIṣṭâhâl (ed. of Istanbul, 4). According to Khînsârî (Rawdât al-dîjanâmât, 730), he also criticized Ashâ’î’s doctrine of the divine attributes.

His profound knowledge of falsafa (he had studied al-Fârâbî and composed a commentary on the Iṣṭâhâl and the Ḭaṣūn al-ʾakhrîr of Ibn Sinâ), allowed him to make use of considerable portions of it in his dogmatic synthesis (cf., for example, the greater part of the Mabdhîth, which he inspired and enameled his listeners to the point of tears and was himself deeply moved by emotion when he was preaching. His preaching converted many Karrâmis to Sunnism. Despite his strong grounding in philosophy and numerous controversies he was extremely pious (kîna min ahl al-dîn wa l-tasawwuf). In many of his treatises, he often meditated upon death and, according to Ibn al-Ansârî, 730), he also criticized Ashâ’î’s doctrine of the divine attributes.

His profound knowledge of falsafa (he had studied al-Fârâbî and composed a commentary on the Iṣṭâhâl and the Ḭaṣūn al-ʾakhrîr of Ibn Sinâ), allowed him to make use of considerable portions of it in his dogmatic synthesis (cf., for example, the greater part of the Mabdhîth, which he inspired and enameled his listeners to the point of tears and was himself deeply moved by emotion when he was preaching. His preaching converted many Karrâmis to Sunnism. Despite his strong grounding in philosophy and numerous controversies he was extremely pious (kîna min ahl al-dîn wa l-tasawwuf). In many of his treatises, he often meditated upon death and, according to Ibn al-Ansârî, 730), he also criticized Ashâ’î’s doctrine of the divine attributes.

His profound knowledge of falsafa (he had studied al-Fârâbî and composed a commentary on the Iṣṭâhâl and the Ḭaṣūn al-ʾakhrîr of Ibn Sinâ), allowed him to make use of considerable portions of it in his dogmatic synthesis (cf., for example, the greater part of the Mabdhîth, which he inspired and enameled his listeners to the point of tears and was himself deeply moved by emotion when he was preaching. His preaching converted many Karrâmis to Sunnism. Despite his strong grounding in philosophy and numerous controversies he was extremely pious (kîna min ahl al-dîn wa l-tasawwuf). In many of his treatises, he often meditated upon death and, according to Ibn al-Ansârî, 730), he also criticized Ashâ’î’s doctrine of the divine attributes.

His profound knowledge of falsafa (he had studied al-Fârâbî and composed a commentary on the Iṣṭâhâl and the Ḭaṣūn al-ʾakhrîr of Ibn Sinâ), allowed him to make use of considerable portions of it in his dogmatic synthesis (cf., for example, the greater part of the Mabdhîth, which he inspired and enameled his listeners to the point of tears and was himself deeply moved by emotion when he was preaching. His preaching converted many Karrâmis to Sunnism. Despite his strong grounding in philosophy and numerous controversies he was extremely pious (kîna min ahl al-dîn wa l-tasawwuf). In many of his treatises, he often meditated upon death and, according to Ibn al-Ansârî, 730), he also criticized Ashâ’î’s doctrine of the divine attributes.

His profound knowledge of falsafa (he had studied al-Fârâbî and composed a commentary on the Iṣṭâhâl and the Ḭaṣūn al-ʾakhrîr of Ibn Sinâ), allowed him to make use of considerable portions of it in his dogmatic synthesis (cf., for example, the greater part of the Mabdhîth, which he inspired and enameled his listeners to the point of tears and was himself deeply moved by emotion when he was preaching. His preaching converted many Karrâmis to Sunnism. Despite his strong grounding in philosophy and numerous controversies he was extremely pious (kîna min ahl al-dîn wa l-tasawwuf). In many of his treatises, he often meditated upon death and, according to Ibn al-Ansârî, 730), he also criticized Ashâ’î’s doctrine of the divine attributes.
many points he was led to make some concessions to his doctrine of the Prophets. Furthermore, his political sociology remains incomprehensible enough unless we set to some dropping, a portion against the conception of sovereignty and the theory of the Caliphate defended by al-Razi. In short, it cannot be denied that Fakhr al-Din al-Razi led Ibn Taymiyya on towards a deeper personal understanding of philosophy and heresiography” (85). Ibn Taymiyya himself passed a severe enough judgment on al-Razi (cf. Bughyat al-murtad, Cairo 1390, Ri’d, Cairo 1390).

4. —Lubab al-I’gharat (Cairo 1326/1908; 2nd ed. Cairo 1355/1936, 136 pp.). A summary of Avicenna’s celebrated work, written after the commentary referred to last. It is concerned not with extracts from the work, but with a true digest of Avicenna’s thought. Al-Razi follows thus each nakdij of the logic and each namat of the physics and metaphysics.

5. —Mu’asalsal afkdr al-mutakhaddimin wa ‘l-mutad-‘alakhhijrmin min al-’ulam‘i wa ‘l-hukammi wa ‘l-mutakallimmin (a précis of ideas, scholars, philosophers and mutakallimun, ancient and modern). Although at the beginning al-Razi indicates the plan which he intends to follow, in the course of the book’s development this design is almost lost. Kaldm, he says, is divided into four parts which he calls “cornerstones” (arkhmin). He begins immediately with the first, the basic sciences, with others which are as follows: 2) being and its several modes; 3) rational theology (ilahiyyiyat); 4) the traditional questions (al-sami‘iyid). The preliminaries (1-32) go far beyond those of al-Diuwayni (in the Irshad) and of al-Ghazali (in the Ithistad). Three important questions are: a) the first ideas, where al-Razi speaks of perception, of judgment, and where he erects the divers theories concerning the innate or acquired character of the judgments; b) the characters of reasoning (akhim al-napar), including the setting out and proving of a dozen “theses”; c) apodictic proof (al-daili). It is in the second part that the sections are distinguished with less clarity. Al-Razi begins by speaking of the mul‘aimii (things known) where we can distinguish with some difficulty the second division into characters of existing beings; 2) the non-being (fi ‘l-ma’dum); 3) the negation of modes (abwdl) which are intermediary between being and non-being. Al-Razi next divides created beings into necessary and possible and goes on to examine the various arguments concerning these two categories, expounding and discussing in turn the theory of the mutakallimun and that of the falsafa. There follow thirty or so paragraphs whose contents are oddly enough assorted (on cold, softness, weight, movement, death, science, the senses, etc.), badly arranged paragraphs which are meant to link up probably with what immediately follows concerning the kinds and properties of accidents. Next the author studies bodies (ajismun), their constitution, properties and kinds. Finally, the last section of this part is dedicated to the general characteristics of being, the One and the Many, cause and effect, etc. The two last ruhms deal directly with kaldm. The third study, the Ilahiyyiyat, is a demonstration of the existence of the Necessary Being, of its attributes both positive and negative, of its acts, and of the relationship between divine and created acts. Then come some brief lines on the Divine Names. The fourth part, which is exclusively based on “Scripture”, comprises four sections: doctrine of the Prophets, eschatology, the “Statutes and Names” (the problem of faith), and finally, the imamate.

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II 48
The Cairo edition (the only one in existence; printed at al-Husayniyya, n.d.) has at the bottom of the pages the Ta'dib al-Muhasabat of Nasir al-Din al-Ma'ani al-Hasan, the "Principles of Razi and Tusi," Bonn 1910, and Die spekulative und positive Theologie des Islam nach Razi und ihre Kritik nach Tusi, Leipzig 1912), but "their value is diminished, if not indeed made doubtful, by the great number of errors in translation and arbitrary interpretations" (P. Kraus).

6. — al-Ma‘ālim fi usūl al-dīn. In his introduction to this work, al-Ra‘īz writes: "This is a compendium which deals with five kinds of sciences: dogmatics (usūl al-dīn), the methodology of law (usūl al-fikhr), fiqh, the principles on which differences of opinion are based (usūl al-mu‘tābāra fi l-‘ibādat, fi-siyās), the rules of controversy and of dialectics." Only the first of these five parts has been printed (on the margin of the Muhassal, see above, no. 5).

7. — Mafādi al-ghayb or K. al-Tafsir al-kabir (ed. Būlāq 1279-89, 6 vols.; Cairo 1310, 8 vols. (reprinted in 1924-27); 1327, 8 vols., with the commentary). This short work has been analysed by Kraus (who seems to have believed that it had never been published): Les controverses de Fakhr al-Din Ra‘īz, in BIE, xix (1937), 187-214. The full title, added by a later hand, is: "The controversies of Fakhr al-Din al-Ra‘īz which took place during his journey to Samarqand and then to India".

9. — Ḥikāyāt firāk al-Muslimin wa l-Mushrikin. In this little treatise, edited in 1938 by 'All Sānī al-Nashabār, al-Ra‘īz refers, in a manner very concise but at the same time precise and objective, to the majority of Muslim sects and to a number of the "sects" of the Zoroastrians, Jews and Christians. A special chapter is reserved to the philosophers. Al-Ra‘īz points out that he is the only one to regard the Sūfis as a sect.

10. — Al-Mabādī l-ma‘ārifiyya (Haydārābād 1342, 2 vols. of 726 and 550 pp. respectively). This is a work on "metaphysics and physics" (fi l-ilāhiyya wa l-fab‘āliyya) which, however, does not refer at all to the ‘ilm al-ma‘ārifiyya. The author does not fail to point out that he is the first to have conceived a work of this sort. At the beginning, he explains clearly the plan which he intends to follow in this work which consists of three "books". Knowledge being the more perfect as its object is more general, the author will dedicate the first book to the study of being and its properties, then to its correlative, non-being, then to essence, unity, and multiplicity. Having defined these general principles (al-umrūr al-‘imama), the author studies a certain number of logical problems, beginning with the concept of identity and of the possible, substance and accident. An introduction studies them in a general manner (25 chapters), then a first dibni consisting of five funūn is concerned with accident as follows: 1) quantity; 2) quality; 3) relative categories (al-mabādī l-ma‘ābīyya); 4) causes and effects; 5) movement and time (72 chapters). The second dibni is concerned with substance as follows: 1) bodies; 2) soul (l-ilāhiyya); 3) intelligence. Finally, the third book (li, 448-524) deals with "pure metaphysics" (fi l-ta‘lāhiyya l-ma‘ādī) and comprises four sections: 1) proof of the existence of the Necessary Being and of its transcendence; 2) its attributes; 3) its acts; 4) prophecy. This work is divided carefully into funūn, abāb, and ḥuṣūl, which call to mind Avicenna's Shifā‘. From him, whom he calls simply al-ra‘īz, and to whom he refers very frequently and sometimes quotes verbally, he borrows much important material, above all from the Shifā‘ (physics, metaphysics, de Coelo et Mundo), the Naḥṣ, and occasionally the Fakhārī (cf. ii, 342). He often accepts his data, but he does not hesitate to dispute freely certain of his principles, pointing out, sometimes with astonishment, what he calls contradictions in him. On the
subject of necessary emanation ("from one can come forth only one") and the theory of the active intellect (cf. ii), he disagrees completely with Avicenna. He represents the point of view which was expressed by al-Farabi, especially by his school and by his most famous disciple, Fakhr al-Din al-Razi (d. 755/1353), the prince of the Razi dynasty, where at first, as in the 13th/19th century, the school of al-Farabi was brought from Persia to Turkey in the 10th/16th century, and to the west, to the 11th/17th century, where at first, as in the west, light paper on a dark ground was always used. It is not possible to classify the forty questions as follows: 1) the signs of the temperaments; 2) the conditions special to the four ages; 3) the conditions special to the several states; 4) differences of character arising from the differences of countries, hot and cold climates, etc. Finally, the third dissertation is given up to the significance of numbers.

11. — Kitāb al-Fīrsad. This book on physiognomy has been edited (from the three manuscripts of Cambridge, the British Museum, and the Aya Sofia) by Youssouf Mourad (La physique, v. monisme arabe et le Kitāb al-fīrsad de Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, Paris 1936), with a long introduction and a French translation, notes and commentary. The work consists of three dissertations (mahālād). The first deals with the general principles of this science, the second is made up of four sections as follows: 1) the signs of the temperaments; 2) the conditions special to the four ages; 3) the conditions special to the several states; 4) differences of character arising from the differences of countries, hot and cold climates, etc. Finally, the third dissertation is given up to the significance of numbers.

12. — Kitāb al-Arba'īn fi usūl al-dīn (Ḥaydarābād 1353/1934, 500 pp.). This treatise on theology was written by al-Razi for his eldest son Muhammad. The plan of the questions with which it deals is not indicated by the author. It is nevertheless possible to classify the forty questions as follows: A. Beginning of the world in time (q. 1); the non-being is not a thing (q. 2). B. Existence of God (q. 3). C. Attributes of God (q. 4-40): God is eternal (q. 4), unlike everything which exists (q. 5). His essence is identical with His existence (q. 6). He does not exist in space (q. 7 and 8), it is impossible for His essence to enter anything (q. 9), it is impossible that He should be subject to accident (q. 10). He is all-powerful (q. 11), all-knowing (q. 12), possessed of will (q. 13), living (q. 14), He has knowledge and will (q. 15), He is hearing and seeing (q. 16), speaking (q. 17), everlast-
inger (q. 18), visible (q. 19); His essence can be known by man (q. 20); He is one (q. 21), creator of the acts of man (q. 22), and of all which exists (q. 23). He wills all things (q. 24); good and evil are determined by religious Law (q. 25); the actions of God are not identical (q. 26); the existence of atoms (q. 27), reality of the soul (q. 28), existence of the void (q. 29), impecableness of the Prophets (q. 30), comparison of angels and messengers (q. 31), the miracles of the saints (q. 34); reward and punishment (q. 35), non- eternal nature of the punishment of Muslim sinners (q. 36), the intercession of the Prophet (q. 37); whether proofs based on tradition produce certainty (q. 38), the imāmate (q. 39), methodology concerning rational proofs (q. 40). What is so striking in this treatise is the attitude of al-Razi towards atomism which here he seems to approve, whereas in the 11th/17th century, where at first, as in the east, light paper on a dark ground was always used. There are specimens of Fakhrl's work—he cut principally examples of calligraphy, flowers and gardens—in the album prepared for Murād III, now in the Vienna Hofbibliothek; for Ahmad I he cut out a Gulistān, which did not, however, survive his criticism; Murād IV on the other hand thought very highly of the artist. He is buried in Istanbul near the Edirne gate.

Bibliography: Ismā'īl Beliğ, Güldeste, Bursa 1302, 532-4; Habīb, Ḑu'll u Ḑu'llātān, Istanbul 1305, 261; J. von Karabacek, Zur orientalischen Altertumskunde, iv, 46 f., in SBAk. Wien, clxxi; G. Jacob, Die Herkunft der Silhouettenkunst aus Persien, Berlin 1913. (G. JACOB)

FAKHR AL-DIN AL-RAZI — FAKHR AL-DIN AL-RAZI


FAKHR AL-MULK [see ‘AMMAR, BAND].

FAKHR AL-MULK B. NĪẓĀM AL-MULK [see NEJĀMĪDS].

FAKHRĪ (d. ca. 1027/1618), a native of Bursa, the most celebrated silhouette-cutter in Turkey. This art (san'āt-i šaf) was brought from Persia to Turkey in the 10th/16th century, and to the west, in the 11th/17th century, where at first, as in the east, light paper on a dark ground was always used. There are specimens of Fakhrl's work—he cut principally examples of calligraphy, flowers and gardens—in the album prepared for Murād III, now in the Vienna Hofbibliothek; for Ahmed I he cut out a Gulistān, which did not, however, survive his criticism; Murād IV on the other hand thought very highly of the artist. He is buried in Istanbul near the Edirne gate.


FKHRI, SMS AL-DIN MUHAMMAD b. Fakhr al-Din Sa'dī Iṣfāhānī, an Iranian philologist, author of the Misṣārī-Dīmnāl wa-mujtāḥid Bū Iṣbāhī ("The bird-trap offered to Dīmānl and the key entrusted to Abū Iṣbāhī"), written in Iṣfāhān, after residing in Sīrāq, and dedicated in 1454/1934 to Dīmān al-Din Abū Iṣbāh Muhammad, the last prince of the Iṣbāhī dynasty (q.v.). The work consists of four sections: prosody (tarīd), knowledge of rhyme (kawsīfī), rhetorical devices (badad-r al-sandānī), a lexicon intermingled with verses in praise of the prince (German words arranged according to their final letter: they will be found in recent western dictionaries). Salemann, the editor of this lexicon, also adds a poem of 150 lines of verse, Ṭoḥāḥ al-balāh ("Hearts’ desire"), moral and mystical in content, its attribution to Fakhrl being questionable (the manuscript of the B.N., Paris, Cat. Blochet no. 158, 5°, used by Salemann, puts it only under the name Shams). In the preface to the Misṣārī, writing in a very careful and elaborate style, the author states that in 713/1313, while still a youth, he lived...
in Luristan in the company of writers and scholars and there composed a manual on versification ... to as Khatt', cf. R. B. Serjeant in BSOAS, xxv (1962), 246. His great ancestor was Muhammad b. Idris b. Muhammad became the technical term for a specialist (fakih) in its non-technical (shari'a [q.v.]) sense. His ancestor of Muhammad b. Zayn b. Muhammad b. Ahmad (d. 556/1162), after the town of Daw'an where he moved and where he died, and his brother Husayn b. Muhammad (d. 1040/1630) who was kadi in Tarim and got involved in disputes between members of the influential Aydars b. [q.v.] family. Husayn had two sons: Ahmad (d. 1052/1642) and 'Abd Allah, who travelled to India in his youth and settled in Kunur, where he married the daughter of his governor 'Abd al-Wahhab and gained public importance, although he mainly occupied himself with teaching. He seems to have studied mathematics while there and to have applied himself to the pursuit of alchemy. He died in Kunur. A nephew of Abu Bakr and Husayn, called Muhammad b. 'Umar b. Muhammad, settled in Kunur where he married the daughter of his governor 'Abd al-Majid and acquired some prominence, which he retained in the days of 'Abd al-Majid's brother and successor 'Abd al-Wahhab; but he fell upon bad days after the latter's death and moved to Haydarabād, where he died.

From (e) 'Ali was descended his great-grandson Ahmad b. 'Umar b. Muhammad b. 'Ali (d. 1181/17th century), whose studies took him to Mecca, Medina and Cairo; then he went back to Tarim where towards the end of his life he was twice kadi. From (d) 'Alawi were descended his son Muhammad b. Alawi (d. 924/1519 in Aden) and his great-grandson 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Alawi b. Ahmad b. Alawi (d. 1047/1637), a prominent sāfi, jurist and teacher. From (e) Zayn was descended 'Abd Allah b. Zayn b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayn, a teacher of al-Shilli, author of al-Maṣṣira al-rāwī, who later moved to India, studying and teaching, until he settled in Bījāpur, where he died. A chronicler called Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Tayyib Bā Fakih Bā al-Shilli, about whom no biographical details can be traced, was the author of a chronicle commonly referred to as Ta'rikh Bā Fakih al-Shilli (covering the 9th/10th century); cf. R. B. Serjeant in BSOAS, xii (1950), 292-5; xxv (1962), 245 f.

From (f) Fakih, Bā, a family of Bā 'Alawi sayyids of Tarim in Ḥaḍramawt descended from Muhammad b. 'Ali (d. 682/1245), called masul 'Ajydid or sāhib 'Ajydid, after 'Ajydid, now a suburb of Tarim, to which he moved from Tarim. His father, 'Ali b. Muhammad (d. 838/1434) was called sāhib al-banā'at, after an estate he had near Tarim which he developed as a plantation and which became a saccosant enclosure (kafta). The name Bā Fakih apparently refers to sāhib al-banā'at's great-grandfather, al-Fakih Ahmad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Ali b. Muhammad (d. 726/1326), whose great-grandfather was Muhammad sāhib Mirbāt (d. 556/1652), after the town of Mirbāt, then a prosperous town on the coast of Ḫūfar, where he moved from Tarim and where he later died and was buried. From sāhib Mirbāt are descended all the Bā 'Alawi sayyids of Ḥaḍramawt. Muhammad b. 'Ali, masul 'Ajydid, the ancestor of the Bā Fakih, is described in sayyids literature as a great sāfi, a description, however, which is lavishly used by sayyids writers about their ancestors. His descendants known to us were mainly sāfis, teachers and jurists. They are descended through his sons (a) 'Abd al-Rahmān, (b) 'Abd Allāh, (c) 'Ali, (d) Alawi and (e) Zayn.

Through (a) 'Abd al-Rahmān were descended his son Zayn (died in al-Ṣāir) and the latter's son 'Abd al-Rahmān (d. 1350/1934). Through (c) 'Ali were descended, from his great-grandson Muḥammad, Bā Bakr b. Muḥammad (d. 1005/1696), a prominent teacher and jurist, called sāhib Kaydān, after the town near Daw'an to which he moved and where he died, and his brother Husayn b. Muḥammad (d. 1040/1630) who was kadi in Tarim and got involved in disputes between members of the influential Aydars b. [q.v.] family. Husayn had two sons: Ahmad (d. 1052/1642) and 'Abd Allāh, who travelled to India in his youth and settled in Kunur, where he married the daughter of his governor 'Abd al-Wahhab and gained public importance, although he mainly occupied himself with teaching. He seems to have studied mathematics while there and to have applied himself to the pursuit of alchemy. He died in Kunur. A nephew of Abu Bakr and Husayn, called Muhammad b. 'Umar b. Muhammad, settled in Kunur where he married the daughter of his governor 'Abd al-Majid and acquired some prominence, which he retained in the days of 'Abd al-Majid's brother and successor 'Abd al-Wahhab; but he fell upon bad days after the latter's death and moved to Haydarabād, where he died. From (c) 'Ali was descended his great-grandson Ahmad b. 'Umar b. Muhammad b. 'Ali (d. 1181/17th century), whose studies took him to Mecca, Medina and Cairo; then he went back to Tarim where towards the end of his life he was twice kadi. From (d) 'Alawi were descended his son Muhammad b. Alawi (d. 924/1519 in Aden) and his great-grandson 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Alawi b. Ahmad b. Alawi (d. 1047/1637), a prominent sāfi, jurist and teacher. From (e) Zayn was descended 'Abd Allāh b. Zayn b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Zayn, a teacher of al-Shilli, author of al-Maṣṣira al-rāwī, who later moved to India, studying and teaching, until he settled in Bījāpur, where he died. A chronicler called Muhammad b. 'Umar al-Tayyib Bā Fakih Bā al-Shilli, about whom no biographical details can be traced, was the author of a chronicle commonly referred to as Ta'rikh Bā Fakih al-Shilli (covering the 9th/10th century); cf. R. B. Serjeant in BSOAS, xii (1950), 292-5; xxv (1962), 245 f.


Fakih, BAL, a family of Bā 'Alawi sayyids of Tarim in Ḥaḍramawt descended from al-Fakih Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Rahmān, called al-asābā, a prominent scholar who, after studying in his native Tarim, Aden, Ṣūbīd, Mecca and Medina, settled in Tarim, where he died in 917/1512. A kind of historical work by him was used as a source of the Ta'rikh Bā Fakih al-Shilli, where it is referred to as Ḫaffī; cf. R. B. Serjeant in BSOAS, xxv (1962), 246. His great ancestor was Muḥammad b. 'Ali b. Muḥammad
FAKIH, BAL — FAKIR

The Bal Fakih is a title given to Sahib Mirbat, commonly called al-ustadh al-atash wa l-fakih al-mukaddam (d. 653/1255). The Bal Fakhis also includes Al-Aska, who was a teacher and jurist. They were descendants of Al-Fakih Muhammad bin Bakr b. Husayn b. Zabud, which he left for Shihr, Aden, Mecca, Medina and Zabud in search of learning, and then went back to it where he became a prominent teacher. He left it later for Mecca, where he lived the last 14 years of his life and where he died in 974/1567. His son All, a fakir, died in Mecca in 1021/1612. The latter had two sons, Muhammad, who attained wealth and public importance in Mecca, where he died in 1066/1656, and Abd Allah, a fakh, who died in Mecca in 1590-1640.

From (b) Abd al-Rahman and (c) Ahmad were descended his son Abu Muhammad (d. 1007/1598) and his two grandsons by his son Husayn, Abu Abd al-Rahman, who was twice kadi of Tarim and got involved together with Husayn b. Abu Bakr b. Husayn b. Abu al-Rahman, who travelled to India where he finally settled in Badjapur enjoying the patronage of his ruler Mahmud i Abd Shah until his death there in 1074/1663.

Of (c) Ahmad's descendants we know of a grandson called Ahmad b. Abu al-Rahman b. Ahmad who was born in Tarim, where he studied and then became a teacher and jurist. He was a contemporary and friend of al-Shilli, author of al-Masbik al-Rawl. Bibliography: as for Fakih, B.; add R. B. Jeaneetz, The Sayyids of Hadramaut, London 1957, 14, 19 and 25.

AL-FAKIH, Abu 'Abd Allah Muhammad b. Ishak b. al-Azwar, 3rd/9th-century historian of Mecca. No information on him was available to later Muslim scholars, or is to us, except what can be learned from his History of Mecca, of which the second half is preserved in a single manuscript in Leiden (cod. or. 463). A small portion of the work has been edited by F. Wustenfeld, Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, Leipzig 1857-61, ii, 3-51. Al-Fakih was alive and, it seems, quite young during the judgment of Abu al-Rahman b. Yazid b. Muhammad b. Hanzala b. Muhammad which came to an end in or shortly before 238/852-3 (Wustenfeld, ii, 43 f.; Waki, Akhbar al-Kudai, i, 268 f.): his birth may thus be placed around 225/840, and this agrees with the fact that some of his authorities died in the early 240s. He was in contact with the leading scholars of Mecca. He completed his work between 272/885-6, a date he himself mentions, and the end of 275/1450 when Abu al-Aziz b. Abu Allah al-Hahimi, who is referred to as being still alive, died (Wustenfeld, ii, 12; Tariikh Bagdadd, x, 451 f.; or, if the passages cited refer to different men, at the latest 279/892). He left a son, Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allah, who is briefly noticed in al-Fasi, Jbd.

His work is referred to as Akhbar Makka or (in the Leiden ms.) Tariikh Makka, but Fikrist 159 calls it Kitab Makka and Akhbar Maka fi 'l-Thaluthiya wa l-Islam. Its size was more than twice that of the earlier History of Mecca by al-Azraki (q.v.). It shares with the latter the arrangement and, to a large degree, the material but must be considered an independent scholarly achievement. The insads prove that al-Fakih collected his material on his own; certain historical statements and descriptions of architectural features and the like noted by insads agree literally with al-Azraki and, therefore, may have been taken over from his work without acknowledgement. The fact that al-Fakih makes no mention of al-Azraki and even appears to suppress references to his family may have its reason in some personal enmity between him and the Azrakis and their circle, or the latter may have refused him permission to make use of the material in their possession; at any rate, it does not mean that al-Fakih was out to conceal an alleged improper use of al-Azraki's work, which would, anyhow, have been impossible.

Bibliography: Wustenfeld, op. cit., i, xxiv-xxv; Brockelmann, i, 143.

The word fakir has four different connotations—etymologically, Kur'anic, mystical and popular. Etymologically it means (a) one whose backbone is broken (see Kur'an, lxxxvii, 25); (b) poor or destitute; (c) canal, aqueduct or mouth of a canal; (d) hollow dug for planting or watering palm-trees. When used in the sense of a pauper its plural form is fubur, but when used in the sense of an aqueduct, fubur is its plural form.

The word fakir or (fudur) occurs 12 times in the Kur'an. It is sometimes used as opposed to ghani (one who is self-sufficient and independent, see xxxv, 16) and is sometimes conjoined with the term miskin to indicate two distinct types of needy persons (ix, 60). According to Imam al-Shafi'i, a fakir is one who neither owns anything nor engages himself in any avocation; a miskin, on the contrary, is one who owns something though it is barely sufficient for his immediate needs. He cites in support of his view the parable of Khidr and Moses in which the sailor of a boat is called a miskin (xviii, 79). Imam Abu Hanifa held the other view. According to him a fakir is one who owns something while a miskin is one who owns nothing. The supporters of this view say that the sailor in the parable was not the owner of the boat though it were on hire. Reconciling all these differences Ibn al-'Arabi says that these terms are interchangeable and synonymous. According to some commentators the word fubud in ii, 273 refers to the abd al-suuffa (q.v.) who lived in the mosque of the Prophet and devoted all their time to prayers and meditation.

In mystic terminology fakir means a person who 'lives for the Lord alone'. As Shibli says: Al-fakir man la yastaaghni bi-shay, dun Allah (a fakir does not rest content with anything except God.) Total rejection of private property ('adam tamalluk) and resignation to the will of God (taawukul) were considered essential for a fakir who aspired for gnosis (ma'mar).

In popular parlance the term fakir is used for a poor man, a pauper or a beggar. Its use in the English language dates from 1608; see Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. Fakir, and H. Yule and A. C. Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, London 1903, s.v. Fakeer.

Bibliography: Zamalshari, Kitab al-Fakik, Haydarabad, ii, 1434; LA, vii, 3, 473-5; Shams al-Din Ahmad, Istiha'da'i l-Sufsya, Lucknow 1904, 32-5; 'Abd al-Baki, Al-Muna al-Madana fi muhkum al-safsaf wa 'l-Madina, 1344/1310, 37-8; Bux, Al-Din Mahmud, Misbah al-khidaya wa misbath al-kifaya, ed. Djalal al-Din Humay, 1365, 375-9; Shihab al-Din Suhrawardi, 'Awadri al-ma'mar,
FAKIR Muhammad KHAN, an Urdu writer (FAKr) is a taqhallus, nom de plume. He is chiefly known as the author of a translation of the Amurad-i Subhadr of Husayn Wâziq Kashîfî (q.v.), an adaptation in elaborate Persian prose of the stories from Kâtla us-Dimma (q.v.). The title of the Urdu translation by Fakir Muhammad Khan, for whom he appears to have been helped by the celebrated Urdu poet Mir Hasan (d. 1200/1786), is Bustân-i hikmat (Garden of wisdom). This first edition is a lithograph, Lucknow 1845. As a lyric poet, Fakir belongs to the Lucknow school and to the sîsâla (poetic school) of the famous Nâsîkh (d. 1225/1809).


(A. BAUSANI)

FAKIRI, Kalkandelenli, Turkish poet of the mid-10th/16th century. Very little is known about his life. From the scanty information provided by tekhârî-writers, we learn only that he was from Kalkandelen (Tatova) near Üsküb (Shopje); of a modest family and a modest education. His life was unambitious and died young, while still a student. Fakirî is the author of a shahrêngiz, a sâhab-nâmê and a number of ghâzâls scattered in medîmnu’as and nasîre collections, all of which are of rather mediocre quality. He owes his reputation to his original Risâl-i ta’rifât (Book of Definitions) written in 947/1534 in the tradition and style of shahrêngiz. This is a collection of short definitions (in 156 fâsh) of various officials, artisans and types of the Ottoman Empire, and one of the rare examples of social satire in Turkish literature. In every “definition” of three couplets, the characteristics of the type are given in a concise, often colourful description, a vivid and informative parade of the famous and infamous.

After the customary introduction in praise of God, the Prophet and the first four Caliphs and homage to the reigning Sultan, Suleyman the Magnificent, Fakirî begins his definitions with the highest ranking official, the vizier, and proceeds to other ranks and classes. The vizier is “the aid of religion and the State, he is the orderer of the country”. The kadîr’ashers are not liked by the kadîls as “they give life to some by distributing largesse and take the life of others”, the defterdîrs turn some people’s business into gold, and dismiss and deceive others, the bêys and âqâs “lead always a pleasant life, they stage stately divânns where notables foregather; some, by their justice, make the country prosperous, some, by their tyranny, destroy the world”.

Further he describes in short but accurate terms the functions of the solah, sîlêh-dar,î, tawâsh, nabl, yenîcîler, mevâli, etc., and passes critical judgment on members of various professions: mûdérîs “the heirs to the science of the Prophet”, the “insatiable” mu’âlînd, “the corrupt” nâhî, etc. The joy of the mansûb (the newly-appointed official) and the sorrow of the ma’sûli (the dismissed one), the ranges of expectation of the müsilîm (the probationary), the difference between the true devout shaykh and the hypocritical false one, the insincere preacher, wâzi, with an eye to profit are concisely portrayed. The parade continues with the imâm, mûlîd, hâf, hâtî, the poet, the lover, the gentleman, the beauty, the lady’s man, the rival, etc. The arts, crafts and professions are represented by the porter, physician, barber, acrobat, musician, dancer, merchant, tailor, town-crier, cobbler, saddler, butcher, blacksmith, etc. Then come characters: the hypocrite, intriguer, liar, idiot, etc. Further come definitions of some national types: Persian, Arab, Fellâb. Fakirî’s uncompromising definition of “Turk” (faṣl 80) “with a fur on his shoulder and a bûrk on his head, ignorant of religion and sect” confirms the fact that in the period of the Empire this term meant “uneducated peasant, country boor” as opposed to the cosmopolitans, the Rûmî, who are “refined and educated, but some think of themselves as writers, some as poets, yet when they gather to talk they do nothing but backbite one another”.

Fakirî is strongly critical in his definition of sipâhî, âsad, subhâshî, a’ses, mübesseb, kâtibyet, ‘âmâmî, mülewyetî, etc., and popular complaints about bribery, abuses, tyranny, cruelty, injustices of the types are reflected in these definitions. An edition of the Risâl-i ta’rifât is in preparation.


FA’L, tira and sadîr are terms which merge into one another and together correspond to and express adequately the concept of “omu” and of olaîev. Fâl, a term peculiar to Arabic and equivalent to the Hebrew nekâshîm and the Syriac nêkbi, originally meant natural omen, cledonism. It appears in various forms, ranging from simple sneezing (al-Dâshîl, Musâtarafs, trans. Rat, ii 182), certain peculiarieties of persons and things that one encounters (al-Nuwaytî, Nihâya, 133 f., trans. in Arabicîa, viii:1 (1961), 3-7), to the interpretation of the names of persons and places which presents itself spontaneously to the sight, hearing and mind of man. On this last point, the sîrâ, tradition (hadît) and Muslim chronicles give ample evidence depicting this tendency of the Arab mind to draw omens from all kinds of physical movement, all kinds of chance happenings, from all kinds of words heard and all attitudes observed. “After all, the whole of good manners has grown out of fa’l” (Doutté, Magie et religion, 354). To this must be added the predominant role among all Semites, and the Arabs in particular, of ephemerism and antiaphorism (see infra).

This tendency of the Arab mind reveals itself clearly in the conduct, practice and recommendations of the Prophet. The sîra is full of incidents where the Prophet “drew omens from the names of the regions and tribes through which he travelled on his raids” (Ibn Hîgânî, 434). Furthermore, he made a considerable number of changes in proper names, with the double design of efficacing all traces of Arab paganisms from Muslim terminology (cf. Wellhausen, Restî, 8 f.), and even more of removing from any shocking or unsuitable names of followers which he must hear around him, all baleful influences which might emanate from their meanings. It was for this reason that he changed Kalîl into Kağîr, 95 into ‘Uthîr (Ibn Hîgânî, 434), and thus also that he gave the future Medina the name of Tayyyiba in place of Yathrib, whose root
contained the idea of "calumny" (Mardsid al-ittild*, ed. Juynboll, i, 2). He changed the name of Zayd al-Khattab (cf. al-Djahiz, Hayawan, iii, 140). "In the Dahiliyya, Sulaymân b. Sârad was called Yasâr (as a euphemism for 'leij'); the Prophet called him Sulaymân" (Ibn al-Abîr, Usd, i, 357). "Sahl used to be called Hazn but the Prophet renamed him Sahl" (ibid. 380; cf. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, Ṭabd, i, 226), and so on (cf. ibid. ii, 301; al-Bakri, Muʾjam, ed. Wüstenfeld, 313, 359; Goldzéher, in ZDMG, lii (1897), 326 f.). As a whole, the Christian names were not only a sign of the individual's name but also from his appearance. The Prophet was imitated in this respect by his Companions, especially ʿUmar b. al-Khattâb (cf. Ibn Kuttayba, ʿUyân, ed. Brockelmann, ii, 148 f.; Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, Ṭabd, i, 225; al-Ṭabarî, xv, 2609, etc.). On the other hand, omens were not only drawn from the individual's name but also from his appearance. The Prophet wrote to his officials: "When you send me a courier, see that he has a beautiful name and a handsome face" (Ibn Kuttayba, i.; Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, loc. cit. cf. Aḥaqqî, ii, 20; xvii, 35). In North Africa, even a man's social position could become a factor from which omens could be drawn; thus to encounter a šarif was a matter of happy omen, while to meet a Jew or a blacksmith was unlucky (Doutte, op. cit., 362). A whale would rise, and the Prophet was considered to have a baleful influence (cf. the family of Baṣṣâṣ, who gave bad advice to the Taghibh, Hamâsa, 254, 1, 5, in Freytag, Einleistung, 162). Certain individuals are referred to as maghâm (cf. al-Djahiz, Hayawan, vii, 150 f.); their company augured ill.

Because of this, choice of names was important to parents for their children and to masters for their slaves. With regard to this, the Arabs followed a definite ruling, "Someone asked a Bedouin: 'Why do you give your children the worst of names such as Khilāf and Dhīb, and to your slaves the best such as Marzūk and Rabâb?' He replied: 'It is because the names of our children are destined for our enemies, and those of our slaves for ourselves'. He meant to say that the children are a shield against the enemy and enemies in their bosoms; it is for this reason that the children are a shield against the enemy and enemies in their bosoms, and that the worst of names such as Khilāf and Dhīb are destined for our enemies, and the best such as Marzūk and Rabâb for ourselves."

This process of interpretation was expanded from personal names to the names of precious stones, of fruits and flowers, and even to the words of songs. Thus gold (dhahab) means 'departure', onyx (dji≥a) sadness and melancholy (al-Tifaṣṣî, i, 14); a lemon (utruṣṣi) presages hypocrisY because of the fact that the exterior of the fruit does not resemble the interior (al-Djahiz, Hayawan, iii, 142; Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, Ṭabd, i, 226); the quince (saffardâj) signifies a journey because its name contains the word safar (Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, loc. cit.; cf. ZDMG, lxvi (1913), 275 ff., and lxviii (1924), 275 ff.). Lilac (sasām) brings misfortune because its name contains the word sâ (Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, loc. cit.), and misfortune which will last for a year because its name is made up of sâ and sana (cf. Flügel, Loosbücher, 27); basil (rībān) is at the same time of good and evil omen because on the one hand its name includes the word ra, and on the other hand it has a bitter taste, even though it pleases the eye and the nose (al-Djahiz, Hayawan, iii, 142). As for the evil presentiments aroused by the contents of a phrase or a song, there are many examples of these in the Arab chronicles (cf. al-Djahiz, loc. cit., 139; al-Masʿūdî, al-Murdiy, iv, 426 ff.; vii, 269 ff.; al-Bagdîhi, ii, 154). These facts are generally classified under the name of ṿifā.

According to ʿAbd al-Qâdir Khâlîfah, Kasîf, ed. Flügel, iv, 646 f., ṿifā is an approval of a man's intentions and thence an encouragement to his carrying them out, while ṿifā or ṿiṣāra or ṿario, e.g. Kâmâs, i, 93) is a disapproval and in consequence an obstruction, a postponement until later. This opposition which in the end established itself between two concepts which were originally complementary, seems to have developed from the attitude which Tradition ascribed to the Prophet concerning this predominant variety of ṿifā. ṿifā (ḥawṣq) is in effect a technique whose origin is pastoral and nomadic; Arabia was therefore a very propitious region for its development, as Cicero had already commented: "Arabes (et Phryges et Cilices), quod pastu pecudum maxime utuntur, campos et montes bieme et aestate pergrantes, propretia facilius canvim ant avium et volatus notaventur" (De divinatione, i, 41; cf. i, 1 and ii, 93-5). Its technical character made it the prerogative of a privileged class of men, which in an organized and developed society enjoyed the status of priesthood. In the short-lived and nomadic civilizations of Bedouin Arabia, the existence of a divination, as we have it here, must be explained by a kind of borrowing. The procedure of ṿifā is at the same time of good and evil omen because on the one hand its name contains the word ra which is regarded as that part of it which comes true: "asdāḥ Ṽifâ Ṽifâ al-ʿaṭāwā" (Ibn Kutayba, ʿUyân, ii, 146). Another ṿifâh even seems to give ṿifā a wider meaning, including Ṽifâ al-ʿaṭāwā itself which is regarded as that part of it which comes true: "asdāḥ Ṽifâ Ṽifâ al-ʿaṭāwā". Ibn al-ʿAbîr, Usd, i, 314 and ii, 79). In the same way, there are examples which give Ṽifâ the meaning of evil omen (cf. al-Nuwayt, Nihâya, iii, 138; Ibn Durayd, Ḥtbâkh, 4).

This confusion reveals the existence of a primitive foundation which was not entirely submerged by the powerful wave of puritanism which swept over Arabia in the first two centuries of the Hiḍjra. It appears from all this that ūifâ, which was originally no more than the observation and interpretation of the flight, cries and perching activities of certain birds used in divination, became the equivalent of the male omiari of the Latins and the λεκτόμια and διαμαντία of the Greeks. From this was derived a whole literature, essen-
tially of poetry and proverbs, created to dissuade man from following the ideas inspired in him by fira, and to which all men are subject. The Prophet is reported to have said: "There are three dangers which no-one escapes: fira, suspicion and jealousy". When asked what remedy there is for this, he replied: "If (on your way) you think you have seen an evil omen (fayyarta), do not turn back; if you suspect, do not execute; if you are envious, do not commit an injustice" (Ibn Kutayba, *Uyun*, ii, 8; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, *Tadk, i*, 226). Quotations from poetry on this subject are very numerous (cf. especially al-Buhturi, 'Abelq., nos. 596-7, 731; al-Bayhakhi, Mahasin, 368 and Ps.-Djahiz, Mahasin, 68 f.; al-Djihiz, *Hayawun*, iii, 138, 139, 160; Ibn Kutayba, *Uyun*, ed. Cairo, ii, 145 f.).

It is worth remembering that when it means presaging evil, fira does not strictly apply only to *signa ex avibus* but also to all other kinds of evil omen (cf. Ibn Kutayba, *Uyun*, ii, 147; al-Djihiz, *Hayawun*, iii, 240; al-Masudi, *Murud*i, vi, 426 ff., 432 f., vii, 269 ff.; Aghasi, i, 184; al-Tabar, 3/364 f., etc.).

But the primitive meaning of fira seems to be better preserved in zadjr, which is often used as its equivalent, although originally this term designated a technique belonging to fira. Indeed, if fira is the observation and interpretation of the spontaneous flight and cries of birds, zadjr consists on the contrary of the deliberate instigation of these flights and cries; it belongs to the category of *auspicia impetratia*, in contrast to *auspicia oblatia*. Apart from the meaning of zadjrara (to arouse, chase someone with cries, make fly, draw omens, practise divination), Arab tradition still preserves some accounts of the existence of this practice (cf. *Arabica*, viii/1 (1961), 50 f.).

But in the same way as fa'il and fira, zadjr soon began to lose its primitive meaning and specific character and came to stand for evil omen or divination in general. Indeed sometimes there is a kind of zadjr which is confused with khitha (cf. al-NuwayrI, Nihaya, iii, 135-9). This leads us to believe that zadjr was, as in Assyria and Babylonia, the prerogative of the soothsayer who, especially in Arabia, combined various functions and acted as a guardian of institutions in a nomadic society which lacked the formal legal protection enjoyed by the Christian and Jewish faiths.

Thus in a passage from Ps.-Djihiz, Arab zadjr includes the interpretation of the cooing of doves, the cries of birds, the sudden appearance of an animal crossing from right to left or from left to right, the rustling of leaves, the sigh of the wind and other similar portents (Ifris, ed. Nicolausse, 23).

Zadjr is also referred to as a *syafa* (q.v.) which applies to various procedures of divination. As for the birds whose flight and cries form the object of fa'il, fira and zadjr, they are of many kinds, but the bird of divination most regarded by the Arabs is the crow (Corvus capensis Lichtenst., Corvus umbrinus Rüppel, and perhaps also Corvus agricola Tristram which exists in Palestine). Nevertheless, these three procedures do not limit themselves to birds, for any animal is capable of furnishing an omen (on the crow and other birds, animals and insects of divination, cf. *Arabica*, viii/5 (1961), 30-58).

The direction of a bird’s flight, or an animal’s steps, plays a very important part in the application of the three procedures. Technical terms designate the various directions: sanah (that which travels from right to left), barih (that which travels from left to right), djiboth (that which comes from front), ba’id or bharif (that which comes from behind). As a general rule, the left is of evil omen (al-Tibriz,

in Abū Tammān, Ḥamāsa, ed. Freytag, i, 165), therefore *"al-sanah is desired by the Arabs and al-barih is dreaded"* (al-Masudi, *Murud*i, ii, 340). Thus it is the way of euphemism that Arabs call the left side *al-barîd* and the left hand *al-arad* (comp. the Greek eunymonos), whereas in fact they signify “difficulty” to them, whence the name of al-‘asrād, also used for the left hand (cf. al-Djihiz, *Hayawun*, v, 150).

In other respects too, euphemism and antiphasis play an important part in fa'il, "The desire to hear from the mouth of others a word of happy omen, the fear of hearing some unlucky expression, is moreover found in Islam in all ages and all countries" (W. Marcais, *Euphémisme*, 421). A whole vocabulary has been created in order to avoid certain expressions whose meanings suggest evil omens. Hence the blind is called “seeing”, baṣīr (cf. other euphemisms for blind and ref. in Fischer, in *ZDMG*, lxi (1907), 425 sqq.), smallpox is described as “blessed”, musḥabrah, as also are syphilis, plague and insanity (cf. Greek *Iphigos*, the Italian *il benedetto*). It is because of fira, al-Djihiz tells us (Hayawun, iii, 136), that the Arabs call someone who has been bitten by a snake “safe and sound” (salim), call the desert the “refuge” (mafdāsa); it is for the same reason that they name the blind, for kunya, Abū Baṣīr and the negro Abu ‘I-Baydr (white). Such examples are innumerable (cf. W. Marcais and Fischer, *op. cit.*, Wellhausen, *Reste*, 200 ff.).

For astrological fa'il, see *Nudr*, and for the fa'il by drawing lots, see *Kura*. For books of divination, see *Fal-Nama*.


**FAL-NAMA**, book of divination. In the Muslim East (especially in Iranian and Turkish countries), in order to know if not the future, at least the signs or circumstances that are auspicious for some decision, recourse is still sometimes made to certain procedures (cf. Massé, *Croyances*, ch. XI: divination), among others to two kinds of books: 1. collections of poems (diwan of Hāfiz); 2. special works (*fāl-nāma*). Consulting the diwan, an act within the reach of everyone, consists in opening the book at random and interpreting the text which first strikes the eye (for details, see Massé, *op. cit.*, 244-5); and in particular E. G. Browne, iii, 315-9; also Binning, i, 220. As for the fal-nama, some are tables of divination, used in the manner of the above-named diwan (cf. the *sortes Virgilianeae*; and for the diwan of Hāfiz, the description of this table in Browne, iii, 312-5); others are booklets containing quadrangular or circular tables (dā’irā), preceded by an explanatory text, in which the divisions of the page (būrj) contain letters and words arranged in eastern abjad (q.v.) order. The *fāl-nāma* which has always been the most authoritative (taking prece-
dence even over the one attributed to 'Ali is that of Dja'far which is attributed to the imam Dja'far al-Sadik (q.v., see also garm); and Dja'far al-Sadik is also, according to M. Donaldson, The Shi'ite religion, ch. XII). The essence of this booklet is as follows (according to the manuscript in the B.N., Paris, Suppl. persan, no. 77): "Fäl-näma of his holiness the imam Dja'far Sadik. If anyone wishes to consult the omens, he must make his abscissae, recite the fikâna once, the sūra of the Ashâdi three times, the Kûr'ânic Throne verse once, and then he taps the fikâna under his arm (fol. 40), while keeping his eyes closed, on one of the page divisions containing the letters (for example, the letter nûn); each division of the second table contains one of these letters accompanied by a word (e.g., nûn — al-kayl); then follows a list of these words, each incorporated in a phrase linking it to a sign of the zodiac (e.g., "Al-kayl: your fâl is fortunate; but refer to the Ram (hamal) which will elucidate it", etc.); next comes a list of these signs with reference to the planets (e.g., "Sun: good tidings, O ye who seek fâl! God has opened the gates of his clemency for you; He will give you your daily bread, multiply your powers, watch over your concerns; your children shall repay you; it will be propitious for you to build, to buy horses and arms, to marry and to travel; in the event of a parent or a friend being absent, it will give peace; if ill, it will assist you to recover; if old, it will offer you to perform your almsgiving; then God will certainly provide"), these replies, which are all of the same order, justify the Persian proverb "It is the fâl of the imam Dja'far which cannot do harm" (Dehkhodâ, Amthâl u-hikam, s.v. Fâl, and the following proverbs). Sometimes the first table of the fäl-näma is composed not of letters of the alphabet but of figures; in this case the procedure is as follows (beginning of the Fäl-näma manuscript in the B.N., Paris, Suppl. persan 1872, fol. 62 v.): "Hear ye, this is the fäl-näma which his holiness Dja'far Sadik has learnt from the august divine Word. Whoever has a transaction, dispute or a certain desire and wishes to know what is good, what is evil and what the outcome, must stand face to face with a partner who must act exactly as he does and place his hand under his arm, and then, bringing out their hands, both must show what number of fingers each has chosen; the man concerned must add up the total, and then consult whichever page division contains this number; he must read the sacred verse of the Kûr'ân inscribed in the circular table of the fäl-näma; having thus recognized the good and evil features of his plan, let him not deviate from it!" (after which he will proceed as above). Another fäl-näma, less well-known and more literary, the versified answers of which are often of a disturbing precision, is that of Shaykh Baha al-Sadik (d. 1030/1621; see also garm); this fäl-näma deviates from it" (after which he will proceed as above). Another fäl-näma, less well-known and more literary, the versified answers of which are often of a disturbing precision, is that of Shaykh Baha al-Sadik (d. 1030/1621; see also garm); this fäl-näma deviates from it. In addition to these methods, Chardin and other travellers (cf. Massé, op. cit., 247) noted three others based on dice (this practice has not entirely disappeared); in these cases, recourse is made to a specialist known as fâl-bin or fâl-gir (augur) who shakes and then throws the dice (in Persian, rami, divination by dice, practised by the rammâl); Arabic words distorted from their original meaning); this rami is related to the sorts of classical antiquity (cf. Fontenelle, Histoire des oracles, ch. XVIII).

The fäl-näma of Dja'far was translated into Turkish; also there exists in this language (and in Persian) a series of minor works dealing with divination by the lines of the hand, coffee-grounds, beans and chick-peas, stars, molten lead, omantoscopy, omens drawn from the quivering of parts of the body, bruises and wounds.


FÄL-NÄMA — FALAK
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FALAK, Sphere, in particular the Celestial Sphere.

a. Etymology and semantic evolution. The word fâlak (pl. aflâk) occurs already in the Kûrîân with the specific significance "celestial sphere" (xxi, 34 "it is He who has created night and the Sun, and the Moon, each of which moves in its own sphere"; similarly xxxvi, 40). Etymologically and semantically it has a long history: it can be traced back to Semitic origins, where the stem bala (st. *pîlak) already has the meaning "to be round" or also "to turn around". In Akk. it appears as pilakku, which denotes the whorl of the spindle as well as the double-edged axe (to be distinguished from the single-edged axe, Akk. paššu, paššu > Sury. pustâ, Aram. passâ > probably Ar. ja'a; cf. H. Zimmern, Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss, Leipzig 1914, 12). The double significance is readily explained by the resemblance of the whorl with the head of the double-axe, both being round and pierced so as to be mounted on the spindle, or else on the handle. The Akk. word is found again in Sury. pelbâ, "(double-) axe" and, with its other meaning, in Heb. ydl, "spindle". The original Sumero-Akk. form is best preserved in the Talmudic yeldeq, "whorl" (also "spindle") used apparently indiscriminately with yâd and yeldeq = Ar. fâlakâ, of which the abstract technical term falâk, "(celestial) sphere", is of course a later derivative. The question may be left open whether also Ar. falaka and faladjâ, which have both
The meaning "to cleave", are derived from the same stem.

On the other hand, the occurrence of the term *Falak* (cf. E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire dymo-

logique de la langue grecque*, Heidelberg and Paris, 1923, 793, s.v. *Falaka*) in a great many (Eastern and Western) Indo-European languages, in all cases with the meaning "to plait", "to pleat", "to coil", "to twist", "to fold", etc., strongly supports the assumption of a common origin of the Semero-Akk. and the Indo-Europ. words, but seems to exclude the etymology of Gr. *Falak* (and Skr. *parapak*; see below) the possibility of a direct loan. Thus we have the various genuine Greek words for (hair-) curl, curl, and similar round objects: *πλέκτι*, *πλεκτήν*, *πλέκος, πλέκαμος, πλέγμα* etc., while the representat-

ive of the second significance: *πλέκως, double-

axe*, alone clearly betrays its Akk. origin. (Against this, cf. Walther Wüst, *Ag. *Falaka* — *Asi, Beil.* Eine palagnostische Studie, in *Suomalainen Tiede-
akatemian Toimitus*., Helsinki 1956).

In Greek texts dealing with astronomical subjects, derivatives of *πλέκος* are not too common, though they do occur occasionally, e.g., *Timaeus* 36 D: δε δε [μουχ] ει μεσον προ τον ενσαυγον ουδοραν παντε 

δυτικατεα ή αυτον ευδερε περηκα-

λυφοςα, αυτη εινα ευτε στρεφομενη, though here the idea of roundness inheres in the word *πλεκτον* rather than *πλεκτι αθεα* (*twisted* or "plaited through"). In *The Myth of Er*, however, *Republic* X, 616 B-617 D), which adumbrates the later elaborate theory of material spheres revolving inside one another, the word used for the (hollow) whorls, *σπόντυλος* (*σπόντυλος, vertebrä*) of larger mammals suffices to show that they are the ideal prototype of the pierced whorl. Lat. *vertebra*, Eng. *whorl* (or *sekid*), Ger. *Wirbel* and *Wirbel*, all stress the idea of turning or whirling round (vertice, *wirbeln*, etc.; conversely, the Arabic word for the vertebrä, *fibra*, emphasizes the other characteristic of the object, viz., its being pierced (modifär or *muflabär*). The Gr. word *σφιχα*, finally, which later (Eudoxus, Aristotle, Ptolemy, etc.) became the generally accepted technical term, equally reflects the idea of "turning round", since it is obviously akin to *σφαίρα* (*σφερα*— justification, "spiral". It is this word which we find generally rendered by the Ar. *falak*.

b. Definitions. *Falak* thus corresponds with Gr. *σφαίρα* and Lat. *sphaera* or *orbis*, while *dāvira* can be equated with Gr. *χώκος* and Lat. *cirricula*. Authors writing in any one of the three languages, however, seldom aim at a perfect consistency in the use of these terms. According to al-Birûnî (al-

*Kâmán al-Masádî, i., Hyderabad-Dn. 1954, 54-5*), *dāvira* and *falak* are two terms that denote the same thing and are interchangeable; but sometimes *falak* refers to the globe (kura), in particular when it is moveable (muharakri). *Falak*, thus, does not apply to the motionless (globe); and it is called "falak" only on account of its similarity with the whorl of the rotating spindle (*sāl wadāj al-taqšíth bi-falakat al-miţqal al-dāvira*). According to Ibn al-Haytham’s *Fi hay‘at al-falām (Ms. Kastamonu no. 2298, fol. 6r 11 H.), the term *falak* "applies to any round quantity of a globular body or surface or of the surface (area) or the circumference of a circle; the body surrounding the world, which turns about the centre (viz., the Earth), is called in particular *falak*, and this *falak* is divided into many parts, but first and foremost into seven parts, which are spherical bodies (i.e., shells) contiguous with one another in such a way that each one of them surrounds the next one, the concave surface of the surrounding [spherical shell] touching the convex surface of the one surrounded by it. The centre of all of these spheres is the centre of the world, and each one of them individually is also called *falak*".


μενον*, *circulus aequinoctialis* (the celestial equator, not the terrestrial, which is called *καθή τασιωά*); al-f. al-bhâridî = *εκεντρος, excentricus*; al-f. al-mâdîl = *ο παρακλίσιον* (the circles parallel to the equator)); al-f. al-muṣṭaḥîn = η *δρόθη σφιχα, sphaera recta* (the celestial sphere as appearing to the inhabi-

tants of the equatorial region, where the celestial equator passes through the zenith).

c. History. There can hardly be a doubt that the conception of a universe consisting of concentric spheres, in which the celestial bodies are carried around at various distances from the Earth, is very old. The correct interpretation is a tablet in the Hilprecht Collection at Jena dating from the Cassite period, but copied probably from a much older original (1st Babylonian Dynasty), see F. Thureau-Dangin, *La tablette astronomique de Nippur*, in *Revue d’Ass.*, xxviii, 85-8. According to O. Neugebauer, *The exact sciences in antiquity*, Copenhagen 1957, 100. "This text and a few similar fragments seem to indicate something like a universe of 8 different spheres, beginning with the sphere of the moon. This model obviously belongs to a rather early stage of development of which no traces have been found preserved in the later mathematical astronomy, which seems to operate without any underlying physical model. It must be empha-

sized, however, that the interpretation of this Nippur text and its parallels is far from secure".

While later Babylonian (Seleucid) astronomy thus no longer shows any trace of such a conception, it reappears, in Greece, in the astronomical and cosmological speculations of Plato (*Myth of Er*, see above, and *Tim.* 36 C-D) and of the late Pythagoreans (Philolaos). The former of these two "models" (the Platonic "whorls") leaves out of account the planets’ standstills and retrogradations; the latter, which replaces the hypothetical "central fire" in the centre of circular motion, is capable of explaining them at least in part, owing to the fact that the Earth, too, is
regarded as a planet revolving about the central fire. The first elaborate geometrical model, operating, for each one of the planets, with a set of homocentric (geocentric) spheres revolving about different poles inside one another, was devised by Eudoxus. His model, improved by Callippus, was wrought into a comprehensive (physical) system by Aristotle (Metaph. 8, 1073 b 38-1074 a 17), whose aim was to represent and to explain the celestial motions as a whole, from the fixed stars down to the Moon, by the combination of acting and reacting ("unrolling") spheres. This physical model, because of its incapability to account for the varying brilliancy of the planets (above all Venus and Mars, see Simplicius, Comm. on De caelo, ed. Heiberg (Berlin, 1894), 504) was later replaced by a new purely geometrical model, based mainly on two theorems of Apollonius (ca. 200 B.C.), in which an eccentric deferent carries around the centre of an epicycle in the circumference of which the planet revolves. This device, which is the governing principle of planetary motion in Ptolemy's Almagest, takes into account only the planes (inclined to one another as well as to the ecliptic) of the deferent and of the epicycle, expressly renouncing any attempt at a physical interpretation. In the Hypotheses, however, composed after the completion of the Almagest, Ptolemy interprets the circular motions as sections through globes of spherical shells contiguous with one another in such a way that the outer limit of one planetary sphere coincides, without leaving any void, with the inner limit of the next one, counting from the Earth outwards (see Hypotheses, Book II, 6, in Cl. Ptolemaei Opera II, Opera astron. minora, ed. Heiberg, Leipzig 1907; the text of Book II, preserved only in Arabic, is not complete and contains errors). In II, 4, Ptolemy states that it is not necessary to assume complete spheres since it suffices (in accordance with the Creator's principle of economy) to postulate, for each one of the planets, the existence of "sawn pieces" or "disks" (Ar. mawdj_uuddt, prob. = Gr. πρόκλητα) comprised between two circles parallel to and equidistant from the equator of a sphere, in which the wheel is anchored, whereas the planetary motion is contained. For this reason, Ptolemy's Hypotheses, otherwise called K. al-Ilṭisās, are often quoted by Islamic authors under the title K. al-Mangūrāt (see W. Hartner, Mediaeval views on cosmic dimensions and Ptolemy's Kitāb al-Mangūrāt, in Mélanges Alexandre Koyré, Paris, to appear in 1963 or 1964).

It is, however, the complete, contiguous, spheres, not the spherical prisms (mangūrāt) that prevail in Islamic astronomy, starting at the latest by the time of, and with, al-Farghani (II. ca. 830 A.D.), whose Elements of Astrology were among the first works translated into Latin and served to transmit the late Greek and Islamic views on the structure and the dimensions of the universe to the Latin Middle Ages (Dante, Regimontanus, etc.). It was not before the end of the 16th century that Tycho Brahe, on the basis of new observations, demonstrated the untenability of the system of contiguous solid spheres (see W. Hartner, Tycho Brahe et Albumasar, in La science au seizième siècle, Paris 1960, 135-67). Bibliography (apart from the references given above): K. Kohl, Über den Aufbau der Welt nach Ibn al-Hasām, in Sitzungsberichte d. Physik. Med. Sozietät in Erlangen, I/IV (1922-3), Erlangen 1925, 1829. It seems then more probable to regard it as a piece of squared wood (i.e., not unworked wood). Certain Greek scholars have also considered a Greek etymology (Μεγάλη Ελληνική Γραμματική, Athens 1933, s.v.). This etymology seems to be ruled out by the fact that there is no evidence either of the object or the word before the time of the Turkish conquest. The etymology of the word clearly poses a problem. An Arabic derivation from the root FLK, which means to cleave or split, suggests itself at first. The classical Arabic dictionaries (LA, TA, etc.) all givejalakjalaka as meaning khashaba, a piece of squared wood (i.e., not unworked wood).
the Semitic, but also from the Turkish and Iranian angles.


**AL-FALAKI, MAHMUD PASHA,** was born in 1230/1815 at al-Hissa (province of al-Gharbiyya), and received his early schooling in Alexandria. He subsequently attended, firstly as a pupil, and then as an officer-instructor, the polytechnic school at Bülâk (Muhandishânine) founded by Muhammad Ali. In 1850-1 he was sent to Paris, to specialize in astronomy and geodesy. He returned to Cairo in 1859. Afterwards he directed the team which, on the orders of the Khedive Sa'âd, mapped Egypt. He completed, and the section on Lower Egypt in print. The Egyptian government at the Geographical Congress in Paris (1875) and Venice (1881). A high proficiency in ten sciences, he knew the mystery of the heavens, says Khâkânî.


**FALASIFA.** pl. of *falâsîf*, formed from the Greek ϕαλάσιφος. By its origin this word primarily denotes *the philosophi*, namely, the Muslims who professed the *falsafah* and the beginning of wisdom (*ikhmâa*), then Thales, Anaxagoras, Anaximenes, Empedocles, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Plutarch, Xenophanes, Zeno the elder, Democritus, the philosophers of the Academy, Heraclitus, Epicurus, Homer (the poet whose wisdom inspired Greece for the Greeks, poetry preceded philosophy), how Hippocrates, Euclid, Ptolemy, Chryssippus and Zeno, Aristotle (whose philosophy is described according to Themistius), Porphyry, Plotinus (al-shaykh al-'aynâni), Theophrastus, Proclus and Alexander of Aphrodisias. The doctrines attributed to these thinkers are often incorrect or anachronistic, perhaps under the influence of the systematization of Aristotle and the Egyptians. Thus, the list of the seven Sages is named. The list is somewhat long; we may mention al-Kindî, Hunayn b. Ishâk, Abu ’l-Farajî al-Mufassîr, Tâbit b. Kurra, al-Nisâbirî, Ibn Miskawayh, al-Fârâbî, etc. But, he writes, the true representative of the *falâsîf* (al-damât al-bawm) is Ibn Snâî, and it is his philosophy alone that he expounds. From this point of view the Muslim *falsafa* appeared merely as the successors of the Greeks: “They followed Aristotle in all he thought . . . except for unimportant expressions on which they adopted the views of Plato and the earlier philosophers”. This judgment needs to be radically revised.

a). The word *falsâsâ* has retained in Arabic the general sense of the Greek equivalent. It is thus synonymous with *shâkâni* or *'ulamâ*; this is the meaning it has in al-Djâbi (K. al-Bayawân, introd.) where *falâsîf* 'al-'ulamâ' al-bâghar is compared with *hâshâd al-riyâl al-ra'î*, in a passage in which human reason and skill, which in the signs of nature discern the wisdom of God, are compared with animals’ instinct, the immediate expression of this wisdom. b). If the general idea of wisdom (which occurs both in the Kur’ân and in the Greek philosophical tradition) remains attached to the term *falsâsâ*, there is justification for describing as *falsâsâ* those Muslim theologians who gave a place to human reason and ra’î. Indeed, from the very start of *Mu’tazili* thinking there can be discerned, in the...
exposition of problems and in methods of reasoning, a Greek influence, transmitted indirectly by the Christian philosophers of Syria (John of Damascus, Theodore Abu Kurra). Later, the influence of Greece is even more positive. Al-Ghazali, despite his opposition to the falsafa, the influence of Greece is even more positive. Al-Bakillānī's theory of simple substances (atoms) and accidents, the Mu'tazilī doctrines concerning essence and existence, or the knowledge that God has of created things before and after their creation, derive among other things from pure philosophy. Moreover the falsafa properly speaking are acquainted with these theological schools and sometimes refer to them in the construction of their own. As for the absolute distinction between them cannot be made.

c) As for the falsafa in the restricted sense of the word, it is not possible to give a clear-cut, exclusive definition. In general, they are the successors of Neo-Platonism, which is itself an eclecticism in which are combined Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, Pythagorean and many other kinds of ideas. This Neo-Platonism had been sufficiently flexible to integrate Alexandria, as P. Duhem has shown. In this multiplicity of influences, that of Aristotle is distinguished by the part played by his logic. Seen from this point of view, falsafa was a consequence of the translation of Greek writings, and certain translators were themselves the first falsāsfas. Orientalists, following Renan, have regarded falsafa as a sect, and this is the opinion of Muslims in general. But if there is a common body of doctrine and strong resemblances, the originality of each thinker and the existence of different tendencies must not be denied.

The sources of the falsāsfa are no doubt essentially Greek—Plato, Aristotle and the commentators, especially Alexander and Theophrastus. But we must also observe the influence of scientific thought, particularly of Galen, the scholar and philosopher, and also that of an intellectualist mysticism deriving from Plotinus, and combining theological and cosmological ideas of gnostic type, the theology and angelology of Proclus, the Theology of the pseudo-Aristotle, doctrines of Hermetic origin. All the gnostics of the Alexandrian period, which even then were tinged with Iranianism, find an echo in Arabo-Muslim thought. The Sabaean, with their astrology that was at once scientific and religious, and with their conception of an intermediate world of spirits (cf. the exposé of al-Shahrastānī), played a large part. In this situation, Persian-inspired dualism was able to infiltrate without difficulty, either directly or through the Shi'i sects, especially Ismā'īlism. From the theoretical aspect, it is difficult entirely to isolate falsāfa esoteric mysticisms such as Suhrawardī's whose speculative thinking is Peripatetic and who speaks of light as Aristotle speaks of substance. The thinking of the falsāsfa is thus very complex; Ibn Sīnā, a scholar and the disciple of Galen, a logician and follower of Aristotle, a Neo-Platonist, exponent of a mysticism that gave rise to that of Suhrawardī, illustrates in a single harmonious entity the complexity of falsāfa.

But this description is only entirely true of the first falsāsfa, al-Kindī and in particular, al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā. What characterizes them is their belief, deriving from Greek electicism, in the harmony in the thinking between the "two sages", Plato and Aristotle (cf. the treatise of al-Fārābī on this subject). Reason, the instrument of truth, can produce only a single system. Instead of the falsāsfa concentrated on defining and developing this single system which came to them from Greece, they do indeed form a single school or sect. But al-Ghazālī, under the inspiration of al-Dīwānī, denounces this mistake: reason is not the supreme arbiter (ḥakam); there are as many divergencies (ḥikāyā) between philosophers as between theologians. He thus marks the beginning of a second period which is characterized by a better knowledge of Aristotle's works and exemplified in the West by Ibn Bājadija and, more particularly, by Ibn Rushd upon whom al-Ghazālī was not without influence in spite of their obvious differences, and who reacted against Arab Neo-Platonism. In the East, Fākhr al-Dīn and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī returned to Ibn Sīnā's doctrine on various important points, while also observing the influences of Aḥmad ibn Sīnā's theology with it, in the case of the former, or of mystical esoterism in the case of the latter.

Finally, side by side with this main stream (Ibn Sīnā, al-Ghazālī, and then Ibn Rushd in the West, al-Rāzī in the East), a further, and Neo-Pythagorean, stream must be pointed out, represented by the Ḥuwān al-Ṣā'ī whose esoteric and mystical character is more clearly marked. They, as other philosophers or theologians of having only partially observed the rhythms of the universe, are not consonant with Wisdom that should go only in multiples of two (matter and form, substance and accident, etc.), or of three (the three dimensions, the three modes of existence—necessary, possible and impossible, etc.), or of four, five, six, seven (doctrines of the septimanians), etc. The Pythagoreans (al-huḵumāt al-fīṭḥāqāฏiyān) "accept the right of everything which has a right"; since the number includes everything, measures and balances everything, so their thought takes everything exactly into account. In their eyes, Pythagoras was a sage adoring the single God; they connected him with the philosophers of Harrān.

How are the falsāsfa as a whole to be characterized?

a) By their vocabulary. It is composed of ʾisīlādāl words that are Arabic or calques from the Greek which have assumed a technical meaning. For the expression of the truth, strictly orthodox theology only allows words of divine origin (texts from the Qur'an and from Tradition). However, a large proportion of this vocabulary has been accepted by the mutakallīmān. The distinguishing feature of the falsāsfa is therefore merely the more systematic and independent use which they make of this conventional vocabulary.

b) By logic. As with Aristotle, logic became a true organon (ālā). It shows from what known starting-point one can reach a certain unknown point, and by what course. It is based on the study of concepts and categories, judgment, syllogism and induction. This analytical and constructive use of logic to discover the structure of truth is not accepted by strict theologians. Al-Ghazālī, however, recognizes that it has a certain value, although not
absolute. On the other hand the *falasifa*, indirectly following Aristotle, have taken account, in their studies of concept and judgment, of principles enunciated by the Arab grammarians. With logic can be connected the division of the sciences, inspired by the Greeks but varying according to the authors (*Ikhwan al-Ṣafā*; al-Fārābī: *Iḥṣāʿ al-sulām*; Ibn Sīna: *Aḥṣām al-sulām al-ṣāhiyya*). Its basis is the tripartite division into sciences theoretical, practical and creative.

d). By their study of natural science. The *falasifa* were all scholars, sometimes of originality. They integrated astronomy, physics, chemistry and medicine with their general metaphysics which was the source of their fundamental concepts. Nevertheless a spirit of experiment, not unrelated to the Muslim tendency to attach value to the experience of the senses, is clearly revealed.

d). By metaphysics. Here the divergences between authors are more marked. But for all of them, metaphysics is a theory of being, built on the distinction between the necessary and the possible (being necessary in itself, being necessary through another or possible) or the eternal and the contingent. The pure being of all matter is at once the intellect, the agent which intellectualizes, and intelligible. The interplay of these ideas explains the constitution of medicine with their general metaphysics which was the source of their fundamental concepts. Nevertheless a spirit of experiment, not unrelated to the Muslim tendency to attach value to the experience of the senses, is clearly revealed.

Thus the *falasifa* often break away from orthodox Islam, but thanks to *tawīl* they could still believe that they were in harmony with the Qurʾān, from which they quoted unfaithfully. But they quoted it purely as evidence, without incorporating it in the body of their argumentation. Thus the theologians, so far as they depart from the revealed texts, are opposed to them. This is how Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī speaks of the *Ikhwan al-Ṣafā* (*K. al-ʾImām*, 17th Night). According to them, the Law has been profaned by foolish ignorance and confounded by error. It must be purified by philosophy. By harmonizing Greek philosophy and Arab law, perfection is reached. But their *Epistles* are no more than “ramblings” consisting of “scraps strung together in a kind of patch-work”. They have “woven a philosophy in secret” out of the science of the stars and spheres, the *Almagest*, the knowledge of the great and works of nature, music, logic. Now there is no question of these sciences in the Revelation. The Muslim community is divided into sects, but none of them has had recourse to the *falasifa*. “What is the relation between religion and philosophy? (ayna *ī-l-dīn min al-falāsafa*)”, between what is derived from a heavenborn revelation and what is derived from fallible personal opinion? The prophet is superior to the philosopher. As for reason, it does not pertain in its entirety to any one man, but to mankind as a whole. And al-Tawhīdī proclaims the ambition of philosophers: their wish is, not to cure men of their maladies, the task to which the prophets confine themselves, but rather to preserve the health of those who possess it. They aspire to the most exalted happiness and to a dignity, thanks to which man becomes worthy of the divine life. But in that case, what purpose would the Revelation serve?

For al-Ghazālī (*Munkhīb; Māsālīd*), certain parts
of philosophy are without danger to the faith, provided that good is made of them: these are sciences which, if not forgotten that the only causality is that of God. The useful sciences such as medicine are the 'ulûm al-dînîyya, and ought to be studied, at least by some (fard kifaya) for the general good, since life in this world contains the germ of the future life and it must not be neglected (cf. ʾIsyâ' 'ulûm al-dîn, ch. on Science). Certain sciences are harmful, like mathematics and the science of talismans (which still come into Ibn Sinâ's classification); they must be rejected. As for the theology of the falsâsâfa, this is frankly bad, since it teaches that bodies are not resurrected, that it is disembodied spirits that are rewarded or punished, and that penalties are spiritual, not bodily. Moreover, the theories of the eternity of the world and of the knowledge of God who knows only the universal is complete heresies (kufr). On the other hand, the doctrine which reduces the divine attributes to essence is not kufr in the eyes of al-Ghazâlî since the Muʿtaṭzila, who cannot be charged with infidelity, adhered to it. Finally, the political theory of the falsâsâfa is taken from the ancient prophets (ṣulûk al-anbiyâ), a very ancient idea which Philo of Alexandria had already rejected, and which is a moral philosophy inspired by the mystics. From the end of the period of antiquity the opinion was widespread that Plato was an initiate and inspired. For al-Sjahristâni (6th/12th century), philosophers are men of passions (ahl al-aḥwâl), that is to say men who follow their own judgment and who must be distinguished from those who follow a revelation (arbâh al-ʾiṣâbâ), to whom they are diametrically opposed (takbût al-iṣâbâ). Later, Ibn Taymiyya (7th-8th/13th-14th centuries), in the K. al-Radd 'ala ʾl-manṭîkîyyin, denounces the uselessness and inconsequence of the logic of the falsâsâfa. Finally we may mention Ibn Khaldûn (8th/14th century) who attacked philosophy in his Mukaddima (Ibâd al-falsâsâfa). Philosophers think that it is reason, not tradition, which confirms the truth of the foundations of the faith. They proceed by successive abstractions, reach the first intelligibles and then integrate them to establish sciences in the manner of second intelligibles. The soul which, in purifying itself, comes to the sciences, experiences joy and has no need of the illumination of the Law. The soul that is ignorant is in affliction. Such is the meaning of the rewards and punishments of the other world. But this opinion is false: when they relate all beings to the first intellect and find this a satisfactory means of reaching the necessary, they reveal a lack of vision in regard to the actual organization of the divine Creation, which surpasses any representations of it that they give. Existence is too vast for man to be able to embrace it in its entirety.

These criticisms make it possible to place the falsâsâfa in relation to orthodox Muslim ideals. But they give too sharp a definition of outline to falsâsâfa. In reality, the philosophers of Islam remain truly Muslim, in touch with the theologians and with the mystical elements which have not tried to break away from the teaching of the Kurʾân. As for the legacy of Greece, this was first acquired by the Muslim world as a whole, in spite of the opposition raised by strict orthodoxy. If it appears to be systematized in their structure, it is not in fact limited to the falsâsâfa alone. It is therefore impossible to regard falsâsâfa as a sect sharply differentiated from the general cultural and spiritual movement which is the pride of Muslim civilization. 

FALCONRY [see BAYZARA, ĖS cuddî-baṣîlì, DOĞANDIJ]\n
FALLAH [see FILÂSHA]\n
FALLÂHÎYA [see DAWRAK]\n
FALLÂK, an Arabic word used particularly in the Beduin dialect form fellâg, pl. fellâgâ (in the western press principally in the pl., with the spelling: fellâga, fellâgah, fellâgha), and denoting in the first place the brigands and subsequently the rebels who appeared in Tunisia and Algeria.

A connexion with fellâsha [q.v.] “instrument of torture”, of which the etymology is, in any case, obscure (see Arabîca, 1954/3, 342-36), is certainly to be ruled out. On the other hand, the Arabic root FLK (comp. FLID, FLH, etc.) seems worthy of retention; Tunisian rural and nomadic dialects make use of fellâg “deflower, violate”, fellâg “split, cleave (wood), split in two (skull)”, etc. (M. Beussier, who gives feïléeg “split” as well as the 5th and 7th forms and other derivatives of the root, is acquainted with a fellâg in the Algerian South meaning “of which the stone is easily detached (peach)”, while G. Boris, Lexique du parler arabe des Marâzis, Paris 1958, has only recorded the 7th form, and it is to this root that the Tunisians (who have coined a toth form stuffâg “to split, to break”) relate the intensifying adjective fellâgâ). Originally the term was applied to individuals who wished to escape punishment, to deserters, and to fugitive offenders, who eventually formed bands supporting themselves by brigandage. The first lexicographer to have noted fellâlâ is E. Bochor, who may well have created it himself in order to translate the French word pour-fendeur; H. Wehr, Wörterbuch, on the other hand, lists it with the sense of “bandit, highwayman”, but this is obviously a recent usage of the Arabic press, which, moreover, finds the term too pejorative to use it as freely as does the European press.

The real popularity of the word, however, dates from the beginning of the first world war, and the uprising brought about by Ḫulâlī b. Ḥaskâr [q.v.] in southern Tunisia. These rebels were designated by the name of fellâghâ, less perhaps by the Tunisians themselves, than by the French troops. Somewhat forgotten between the wars, the term was resurrected on the occasion of the incidents which occurred in Tunisia between 1952 and 1954: the whole of the western press used it to describe the rebels who, for political reasons, formed armed groups fighting against the French army. When the Algerian rebellion broke out in 1954, the term was quite naturally applied to the outlaws, and then to the combatants of the rebel army. It is thus that a Tunisian colloquialism was borrowed by the French army and then by the French press, subsequently spread into western newspapers and the Algerian dialect of Arabic, and made its appearance in the Arabic press in the classicizing form fellâlâ.

(C. PELLAT)

FALLÂTA, although strictly signifying the Fullân [q.v.], is used in the Nilotic Sudan generally for Muslim immigrants from the western Bilad al-Ṣâdîn, and in particular for those from northern Nigeria. The term has largely superseded the older Takârîr or Takârîn (which had a similarly loose application), presumably after the Fullân conquests under ʾUṯmân b. Fodîo. The Takârîr/Fallâta immigrants are primarily pilgrims en route to Mecca: their first appearance in the Nilotic Sudan can hardly have been before the establishment of
Muslim sultanates in Dār Fūr (q.v.) and Waddāl during the 11th/12th century. Many have become domiciled in the territories which now compose the Republic of the Sudan. Takārīd founded a border state in the Kallābāt (Sudanese-Abyssinian marches) in the 16th century; its ruler, Shāykh Mīr, submitted to the Turco-Egyptian governor of Sinnār in 1245/1830-90. A Fallāta settlement exists at the southern end of Dājbal Marra in Dār Fūr. Some Fallāta-Takārīd settlers in Dār Fūr and Kurdufān have intermarried with local Bākērā, become arabilized, and now constitute tribal sections. More recent immigrants form an important element in the labour-force of the Republic of the Sudan, as domestic servants, and as labourers employed by the tenants of the Geizira (cotton-growing) Scheme; see Saad Ed Din Fawzi, The Labour Movement in the Sudan, London, 1957, 5-8.

Bibliography: An important account of the Takārīd pilgrims in the early 19th century is given by J. L. Burckhardt, Travels in Nubia, London 1859, 406-14; more generally, see Fellāta (and also Takārīd) in the Indexes of H. A. Mac-Michael, The Tribes of northern and central Kordofan, Cambridge 1912; and idem, A History of the Arabs in the Sudan, Cambridge 1922. (P. M. Holt)

Fallāta, name of two districts (jāttā) of the Arab-Byzantine: Immediately following the Arab conquests the Arabs continued to strike copper coins almost exactly as they found them—religious formulae, obsolete dates and all. These imitations, frequently barbarized, are probably the earliest extant Islamic coins. While the basic Byzantine types were maintained until 'Abd al-Malik's reforms, various modifications of an Arabizing nature were introduced before that date. Among the most important of these are the addition in the margin of abortive religious formulae, indication of the mint in Arabic characters, the addition of words such as baraka, tayyib, etc., as well as the occasional mention of the governor or local 'āmil under whose authority the coin was issued. The most interesting departure from the Byzantine style is to be found in the "Standing Caliph" type, on the obverse of which the sword-girt figure of the Caliph dressed in typical Bedouin garb displaces the likeness of the Emperor with his cross, crown and orb, while maintaining a modified form of the reverse Byzantine type. The stance of the Caliph appears to be an attempt to portray him in the posture of leading the prayer service. The fact that all five extant dināris of this type, as well as most of the fulās, date from the early part of 'Abd al-Malik's reign, and immediately precede his armament reforms, is an indication that these coins are to be considered as a transitional type through which the emerging Islamic state was attempting to find an appropriate iconographic form for its coinage (cf. John Walker, A Catalogue of Muhammadan coins in the British Museum, ii, London 1956, pp. xxviii-xxxi, 22-43).

Arab-Sasanian: These copper coins are very rare. They have the regular Sasanian bust on the obverse, and some modification of the fire altar and attendants on the reverse. (For examples cf. Walker, Catalogue, i, 73, 125, 161, 170-2, and G. C. Miles, Excavation coins from the Persepolis region, New York 1959).

Byzantine-Pahlavi: This type exists only in copper. These coins represent a unique combination of Byzantine and Sasanian elements, with the obverse usually following the Byzantine model, and the reverse the Sasanian one (cf. Walker, Catalogue, ii, pp. li-liii, 81-3). The purely epigraphic, non-pictorial coin which resulted from 'Abd al-Malik's reforms appeared in copper somewhat later than in gold and silver. The earliest preserved dated epigraphic fals is of the year 87/705-6 struck at Damascus. The effect of the reform was that the coin, which was purely epigraphic with no metrological aspects as in the case of gold and silver (cf. Ph. Grierson, The monetary reforms of...
Neither the size, weight or epigraphic content of the copper coins was uniform. They all contained some religious formula, and sometimes the mint, date and names of the issuing official or officials.

Unlike the centralized system of copper minting in Byzantium, its emision in Islam was highly proliferated and decentralized. In the period immediately preceding the conquests there were twelve known copper mints in the entire Byzantine Empire, only three of which were in Syria, Egypt and Africa. Under the Umayyads there were fifty-three known copper mints, thirty-three of them in the former Byzantine provinces. The number of mints increases to eighty-three under the Abbāsids, with most of the new mints in the eastern part of the Empire. Copper coinage was a token currency issued to fill the need for petty commercial transactions, and passed by tale and not by weight. Its emission was left to the discretion of governors and local authorities, without any centralized control. As a result, the fals varied greatly in weight, size, and probably value from one district to another. The weight variation was sometimes as much as five grams between contemporary fals from different mints (e.g., a fals from al-Mawṣil dated 157 weighs 10.63 grams, whereas another fals of the same year weighs 5.42 grams). It is for these reasons that the circulation of the fals, unlike that of the dinār or dirham, was limited to the near vicinity of its emission.

This may help to explain why small sums of money are so infrequently expressed in the written sources in terms of fulūs, but rather in terms of minute weights of gold and silver. Such small sums as 1/144th or 1/1288th of a dinār mentioned in the Arabic papyri, or the fractional division of the dirham into kīrat, dānṣik and ḥabbā have no counterpart in actual gold or silver coins. These are rather monies of account pegged to the fluctuating and diversified value of the fals, and were the only standard way to express small sums of money.

Fals — falsafa

During the first half of the 3rd/9th century there was a sudden cessation of copper minting throughout the Islamic world. This scarcity of coinage lasted for several centuries. That the absence in our collections of falsūs for this period is not a mere coincidence is confirmed by the results of excavations at such important Islamic sites as Rayy, Persepolis (Iṣṭaḵṭar) and Antioch. From among the large number of copper coins found at these sites only one dates after 207/822. The only exception to this general pattern are the mints of Transoxiana. The mints of Buḫkārā and Samarkand have a continuous series of copper coins throughout the late ninth and tenth centuries. The absence of copper coinage in western Europe during most of the Middle Ages is ascribed to the self-sufficient nature of the feudal system and to the negligible volume of petty trade, an explanation which is eminently unsuitable for the Islamic world of the 3rd/9th to 6th/12th centuries. An explanation of this phenomenon may be connected with the inflationary trend created by the greatly increased production of silver and gold which occurred at this period, and which would have made the production of copper coins more expensive and less necessary.

The plural form fulūs persisted in use as the designation of the autonomous copper coins of Persian localities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (e.g., R. S. Poole, The coins of the Shāhs of Persia, London 1887, 212-61). To the present day fals designates the petty coin of ʿIrāq and Jordan, and the plural falsūs (flus) is a general term for money in colloquial Arabic in Egypt, Morocco and elsewhere.

Bibliography: For the coins see the standard catalogues of various collections, especially: Berlin (H. Nützel), British Museum (S. Lane-Poole, J. Walker), Istanbul (İsmail Ghalib), Paris (Lavoix) and St. Petersburg (W. Tiesenhausen). See also A. Grohmann, Einführung und Christomathie zur arabischen Papyrusschriften, Prague 1925, 214-5; al-Makrizi, Traité des monnaies musulmanes, tr. de Sacy, Paris 1972, 44-8; C. Miles, The early Islamic bronze coinage of Egypt, in Centennial Volume of the American Numismatic Society, New York 1958, 471-502; H. Sauvaire, in JA, vii/15 (1880), 257-70. See also síkka.

(A. L. U dovitch)

Falsafa, 1. Origins. The origins of falsafa are purely Greek; the activity of falsafa (q.v.) begins with Arabic translations of the Greek philosophical texts (whether direct or through a Syriac intermediate). Thus falsafa appears first as the continuation of φιλοσοφία in Muslim surroundings. But this definition leads at once to a more precise formulation: since strictly orthodox Sunni Islam has never welcomed philosophic thought, falsafa developed from the first especially among thinkers influenced by the sects, and particularly by the Shīa; and this arose from a certain prior sympathy, such sects having absorbed gnostic ideas, some related to Hellenistic types of gnosticism, others to Iranian types—for Persia is known in any case to have been an influence on religious and philosophic speculation throughout the Eastern Mediterranean since the Alexandrian epoch.

But it is more difficult to give precise significance to the concept of a Greek legacy; Greek thought is far from unified. Though falsafa may be called a continuation of Greek thought there is no perfect continuity, since the Arabic-speaking Muslims were not part of the movement in which φιλοσοφία was developing. They were forced to integrate themselves into it as if foreign bodies: they could not simply follow on; they had to learn everything, from the pre-Socratic teachings to the writings and commentaries of Proclus and John Philoponus. They started therefore from an acquired knowledge of a con-
spectus of Greek thought, comprehensive and abstract, which they envisaged as a separate culture lacking any links that of Heroism. They were not unaware that thought had a history but this knowledge came almost exclusively from their reading of Aristotle, and in practice, for them, he seems the culmination of this movement; after him, they only see commentators or works written under his direct inspiration. Even Neoplatonism itself is not viewed as an original system but in the light of a generalized Aristotelian influence.

It would be an easy solution of this difficulty to describe falsafa as having assumed one particular form of post-classical Greek thought: eclecticism, which had already appeared in the middle period of Stoicism and exercised considerable influence in the development of Neoplatonism. Certainly this school, in spite of its internal diversity, favoured the development of falsafa and contributed to the spread of the belief that Greek philosophy was unified. A text such as the Theology of the pseudo-Aristotle would confirm this belief. Nevertheless it is difficult to suppose that the falsafa failed to notice the differences, not only between Aristotle and Plato, but also between the commentators, or that they passively took over eclecticism, which is itself a synthesis and in any case necessarily varies from one writer to another. Primate philosophy could not establish itself as a "sect" (to use the term employed by Renan) except insofar as it borrowed from Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic philosophy a common form, a general concept of the world, a comprehensive theory of the spirit, the soul, man and human knowledge, with a technical vocabulary to become the familiar jargon of the schools. In detail, beyond the standard uniformity, each faqârasîf made his own choice, and the first falsafa is much more original than one would suppose if it were described as nothing but Arab Neoplatonism.

2. — Utilization of Greek sources. — Ibn al-Kiftî (568-646/1172-1248), though remote from the beginnings and later than al-Ṭabâṣârî, provides some interesting information. He enumerates seven sects of Greek philosophy, adding that the two principal ones are that of Pythagoras and that of Plato and Aristotle. He considers in fact two great sections of Greek philosophy: natural philosophy, which is that of the ancients, exemplified by Pythagoras, Thales of Miletus, the Sabaeans and the Egyptians; and "political" philosophy, which characterizes the moderns, with Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. He explains that this division comes from Aristotle. But he does not separate them absolutely, since he goes so far as to say that Plato achieved the level of Pythagoras in the study of intelligible realities (fi 'l-'umûr al-'abiṣiyâ) and the level of Socrates in the questions of the constitution of the perfect city (fi siyāṣâ al-maḍīna al-fâdiya). Thus in the eyes of the Muslims philosophy, culminating in Aristotle, the disciple of Plato, is a synthesis which studies the universe in relation to human life, which views man in the whole and which conceives of the whole man, while in which moral and intellectual knowledge and virtue realise his ultimate goal in re-discovering the principle of his being. The philosophy of nature opens out into a mystical cosmology in which the central concept is the Stoic cosmopolis. It is comprehensible that in this light Neoplatonism, which embodies all these viewpoints in one system, should have appeared to them as the final form of a philosophic ideal in harmony with the religious ideal put forward by a more or less heterodox form of Islam. It is clear that the primary motive for the choice of falsafa is religious by nature, since the falsafa always rejected with horror that type of thought also offered by ancient Greece, known as the ḍabriyyâ (q.v.), of whom Ibn al-Kiftî also says: "This is a sect of ancient philosophers who deny the Creator, the director of the Universe. They assert that the world has not ceased to be what it is in itself, that it has no creator who made it and freely chose to do so; that the circling motion has no beginning, that man comes from a drop of sperm, and the sperm from man, the plant from the seed and the seed from the plant. The most famous philosopher of this sect is Thales of Miletus; those who follow him are called sandîsî." Since Thales was classed among the "physicists" (labīsîyûn), it is clear that there are in fact two kinds of physicists: those who are purely materialist and rejected, and those who may be taken over by the "metaphysicists" (lākîsîyûn) as Pythagoras is by Plato. It may be argued that Aristotle, in spite of his metaphysics, does not lend himself to use by religious thought: God, nûsîs nûsîes, is not the efficient cause of the world; He is the end, but not the principle. In reply it could be said that the Uṯrâlîgîyâ intervened here most aptly, "since it seemed to present the theodicy absent from the Metaphysics, though itself brief on the divine attributes and silent on the creation" (A. M. Goichon, La Philosophie d'Avicenne et son influence en Europe médiévale, Paris 1951, 12). But it should not be forgotten that Porphyry, the disciple of Plotinus, had steeped himself in Aristotelian thought and saw no opposition in it to that of Plato. Equally, the Neoplatonic commentator Simplicius (6th century), educated both in Alexandria and Athens, had already attempted to harmonize the systems of Plato and Aristotle (as al-Fârâbî was to do). Now Simplicius, who had emigrated to Persia upon the closure of the School of Athens by Justinian in 529, was well known to the Muslims (cf. Ibn al-Kiftî: art. Samîsî). Syrianus also (ibid., art. Sûrûnsâsî) was as frequently quoted by the specialists; and he, though he did not believe that the two sages of antiquity were in agreement, at least saw the study of Aristotle as a preliminary to the understanding of Plato. The Muslims therefore did not lack precedents authorizing them not to make too great a gulf between the two great masters of Greek thought. Nevertheless it would appear that the "Plotinus source", as F. Rosenthal calls it ("Al-Šāhî al-Yânâni and the Arabic Plotinus sources", in Orientalia, xxi (1952), xxii (1953), xxiv (1955), played very much a major rôle, together with the Uṯrâlîgîyâ which is related to it. On this point P. Kraus, Plotin chez les Arabes, Remarques sur un nouveau fragment de la paraphrase des Ennéades, in BÉ, xxii (1940), 41, may also be consulted. Thus everything combined to give a Neoplatonic form to the meeting of Plato and Aristotle in Muslim thought. P. Duhem (Le système du monde, iv, 322) observes that Neoplatonism permitted the conservation in a single harmonious whole of what could be saved of the Aristotelian theory of the universe together with what theology claimed. At the same time certain elements of the Greek inheritance could not be absorbed with comfort in this synthesis. On the one hand, the whole Gnostic, or, rather, theurgic tradition as it developed from Iamblichus to Proclus, becoming burdened with Egyptian and Hermetic ideas, preoccupied with every religion and every god, developing a fantastic
angelology, was ready to fuse with the mystic concepts of Persia and India and revivify that esoteric cult which is still alive. These tendencies, subjugated by falsafa. Avicenna, were to flourish freely in the philosophy of Fikhr. On the other hand, an Aristotelianism which had remained more faithful to Aristotle, confining itself to the correction of those points where he displayed weaknesses, difficulties, obscurities or incoherence, had never ceased to be represented in the post-Hellenistic period up to the 6th century. Alexander of Aphrodisias (2nd century) tries to explain Aristotle and defend him against the doctrines of other schools. In doing so, he insists on the naturalist aspect of his teaching and professes a nominalism. The universal exists only in human thought; “separated from the intellect which thinks it, it is destroyed.” Thus it neither preexists particular things nor is drawn from them; it appears only as a consequence of the experience which thought has of these things: thus the soul is a form of the body and cannot subsist without it. As for the doctrine of the intellect, a distinction must be drawn between the νοης φυσικός or υλικός (natural or material, which is potential), the νοης ἑπίκτητος or καθ' ἐξίν (acquired and possessing the habitus of intelligible thought), and the νοης ποιητικός which makes the transition from the former to the latter. “As for the habitus of the latter but which does not belong to the human soul, coming to it from outside (θοράκιν). This theory of the intellect was to be the constant subject of consideration in the falsafa of every age. But the Aristotelianism of Alexander was especially to characterize the Western philosophers: Ibn Bāṣīlīja (Aventpace) and particularly Ibn Rūshd (Avemaro) and the intention is to study the influence of the Stoa. In psychology, he follows the Platonic teaching of the tripartite division of the soul. Though concentrating on the study of positive sciences, he believed in the possibility of theab, which he regarded logic and physics as merely the intellectual substance of the body and in Providence, which is mani

The Greek heritage is therefore a very varied body of doctrines and trends of whose multiplicity the Muslims were not unaware. Thus falsafa had to make a choice, and this explains the varied forms it assumed from time to time, reflecting no doubt different philosophical temperaments but also religious attitudes to dogma and theology and to the history of the sects and of kalām. 3. — The establishment of falsafa. — The influence of translations is of prime importance. But that falsafa was born at all is due to the fact that most of the translators were original thinkers. Original work was often linked to the translation by the intermediary of commentary. Thus Kūstā b. Lūkā made use of technical language gleaned from translations to produce individual work, as shown in the Book of characters (ed. P. Brath, in BIE, xxiii (1940-1)). Ibn al-Nadim (d. 386/995) appreciated his value as a philosopher. Kūstā reveals great subtlety in analysis, and a spirit of synthesis which enables him to borrow from the different sciences whatever material he needs to deal with his subject. It is important to note that a thinker like al-Kīfi, who is revered by posterity as a philosopher and savant, is also a translator. Moreover, all the great falsāsfa applied themselves to commentaries on Greek texts. Thus, falsafa does not follow from works of translation and commentary; it is born among them and continues them; its lexicon (lisiqāt) was not written as a purely philological exercise unrelated to it; falsafa gained definition by an undertaking which combined translations, commentaries, personal reflections and practical examples. 4. — The first period of falsafa. — This could be called Avicennan. It takes shape in the East between the 3rd/9th and the 5th/11th centuries, with al-Kīfi, al-Ṭārābī, and Ibn Sinā (Avicenna). It is a synthesis of the universal foundations of a system of natural science and mysticism: Plotinus enriched by Galen and Proclus.
This first falsafa is quite distinct from the kalām which preceded it (Muʿtazili kalām); although it takes pleasure in the rediscovery of Kur'anic texts or ideas, it does not make them a starting point, but is presented as a method of research independent of dogma, without, however, rejecting the dogma or ignoring it in its sources. Nevertheless, its problems are not unrelated to those of theology. The Muʿtazila, in order to preserve the absolute transcendence of the divine unity, had distinguished essence from existence in created beings. For them, there was in God no paradigm (mathal) for the essence of the creature, and creation consisted simply in bestowing existence on essences which were in "a state of nothingness". The creative act was conceived in a positive sense as what causes essences to pass from non-existence to existence (lām yakun fayakun). God, Whom nothing resembles, was ignoring it in its sources. Nevertheless, its problems of the essence and existence of the divine unity, had distinguished essence and existence in all beings other than the Godhead. For God alone, existence is identical with essence. But for this reason He is the unifying and unique Creator, and creation consisted simply in producing from it the world from which it came; on the one hand there is a First Principle in whose unity are rooted both the essences and the existences of all beings, and in consequence a continuity is postulated between the Being and beings, which is not interrupted by any creative act; on the other hand, there is an absolute discontinuity between the modes of being of the Principle and of that which proceeds from the Principle. Thus it is possible to speak of a cosmological continuity between the universe and its source (theory of emanation), tending to a form of monism, and of an ontological discontinuity between the necessary and the possible, tending to re-establish the absolute transcendence of God. Furthermore, the God of One who transcends time and space, is possible only if considered in themselves. But they are necessary if considered in relation to the Principle: granted a Being necessary on its own account, everything else is necessary because of it. As was to be the case with Spinoza and Hegel, the possible is always real. Hence we return to monism. Is that a reason for considering that this falsafa is incoherent? Up to now we have considered only the cosmology and the ontology of the first falsafa, which means that this falsafa needed to be completed by a third attitude to Being: the mystical. Falsafa of the Avicennan type may be analysed as regards its system in the following manner: a first upward movement going from beings to the Being, which seeks an ontological foundation for given reality; this is human intelligence in search of a principle of intelligibility in the universe; then a second, downward movement going from the Being to the universe on the basis of a declared principle, which should provide a total explanation of it; these two movements involve only human thought; but in the first, the principle is attained so to speak in perspective, as the limit where conditions of intelligibility converge; thus there may well be some lack of continuity of thought, since it is logically impossible for thought to reach this limit; whilst in the second movement, thought starts from the idea which corresponds in it to this Principle, and tries to produce from it the world from which it came itself; this is a difficult task, since it is beyond the scope of logical deduction, and recourse must be made to images (metaphors of light) through which the continuity which is postulated but not demonstrated can be re-established. Then comes the third movement, which is a second ascent, but this time no longer a simple discursive procedure, since it is by intelligible intuitions of the spiritual realities themselves, already identified, that progress is made. Man first sees himself in his contingency, separated from his Principle, endowed with a precarious existences. But ontology has taught him that his whole being is rooted in God, and cosmology supplies him with a spiritual itinerary, whose postulated continuity will be verified by mystical experience. The last word therefore is with this experience.

A second theme which Greek philosophy had touched on, and which Muʿtazili kalām had studied very closely, is that of the knowledge God has of particular things. The first falsafa, in its theory of the possible, considerably simplified the problem posed by the theologians who believed that contingent things could be or not be. However, there still remained the difficulty of the knowledge of the particular as such: God could not make contact with this in itself in its materiality, but only in His universal knowledge of that which is. This is human intelligence in search of a principle of intelligibility in the universe; then a second, downward movement going from beings to the Being, which seeks an ontological foundation for given reality; this is human intelligence in search of a principle of intelligibility in the universe; then a second, downward movement going from the Being to the universe on the basis of a declared principle, which should provide a total explanation of it; these two movements involve only human thought; but in the first, the principle is attained so to speak in perspective, as the limit where conditions of intelligibility converge; thus there may well be some lack of continuity of thought, since it is logically impossible for thought to reach this limit; whilst in the second movement, thought starts from the idea which
future life. The union of members of the earthly community foreshadows the union of souls with souls, and of souls with God, in the after life. Whatever value one may place on the falsafa, as criticized by al-Ghazali. The historical significance of his work demands recognition. Even if he conceived his religious system only for political ends associated with the gnostic trends opposed to the Qur'anic spirit, no doubt he remained an Ash'arist and criticized the falsafa. Whatever value one may place on the thought of al-Ghazali, the historical significance of his work demands recognition. Even if he conceived his religious system only for political ends associated with the gnostic trends opposed to the Qur'anic spirit, no doubt he remained a mu'takallim; it would be an abuse of language to say that he created a Sunnī falsafa. He simply allowed falsafa, and mysticism too, to detach itself from Shī'ī heterodoxy and to become acclimatized in an orthodox environment.

The principal points of his criticism (which were to be taken up again by Ibn al-Kifti) may be brought together under three headings: against falsafa he maintains (a) the resurrection of the body and the materiality of the rewards and punishments of the after life, (b) the creation of the cosmos in a finite period in which he was living, yet he introduced Greek philosophy into the realm of Sunnī thought, through the way he developed Ash'arī and criticized the falsafa. In falsafa, as in esoteric mysticism, he denounced Gnostic trends opposed to the Qur'anic spirit. No doubt he remained a mu'takallim; it would be an abuse of language to say that he created a Sunnī falsafa. He simply allowed falsafa, and mysticism too, to detach itself from Shī'ī heterodoxy and to become acclimatized in an orthodox environment.

The second period of falsafa. — This may be called post-Ghazālī. It is distinguished geographically by having one centre in the East with Falāhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and another in the West with Avempace (Ibn Bāḍīṣa), Ibn Tufayl and Averroes (Ibn Rushd). The period is characterized by the hosts of mystics; mysticism in both by Avicenna and al-Ghazālī. Averroes, in his refutation of the Tahāfut al-falsafa, was led to take up again the problems with which Avicenna faced, and found himself in a dogmatic and theological context, reappear in another context as late as Ibn Khaldūn. It may be said that falsafa wished to support shariʿa, fikhr, and ahkām sulṭāniyya, and that it is thus opposed to the spirit of the Kur'ān. This is true as far as rigorously orthodox Islam is concerned. But falsafa developed in more liberal surroundings, where there was a desire for a less legalistic view of religion and for an Islam which would be cultural and universal in character.

6. — The reaction of al-Ghazālī. — If Avicenna is a much discussed figure, al-Ghazālī is discussed much more. Some see him as a reactionary who brought to an end the blossoming of the rational thought of the philosophers, and made supreme a theology which was itself the slave of dogma. For others he clipped the wings of mystical thought by fighting the Bāṭinīyya, whose teachings were in harmony with the great spiritual constructions of falsafa. Whatever value one may place on the thought of al-Ghazālī, the historical significance of his work demands recognition. Even if he conceived his religious system only for political ends associated with the gnostic trends opposed to the Qur'anic spirit, no doubt he remained a mu'takallim; it would be an abuse of language to say that he created a Sunnī falsafa. He simply allowed falsafa, and mysticism too, to detach itself from Shī'ī heterodoxy and to become acclimatized in an orthodox environment.

Falsafa

The meaning of Averroism has been much discussed. Some, with Renan, view him as a pure rationalist. According to L. Gauthier, Ibn Rushd only rejects the kind of theology which encloses itself in the revealed texts and desires to comprehend them dialectically; but he allows literal belief to the uneducated, who react to the rhetoric of images, while philosophers should submit everything to apodictic proof. It appears that this explanation can be partially accepted. Al-Ghazālī was led to take up again the problems with which Avicenna faced, and found himself in a dogmatic and theological context, reappear in another context as late as Ibn Khaldūn. It may be said that falsafa wished to support shariʿa, fikhr, and ahkām sulṭāniyya, and that it is thus opposed to the spirit of the Kur'ān. This is true as far as rigorously orthodox Islam is concerned. But falsafa developed in more liberal surroundings, where there was a desire for a less legalistic view of religion and for an Islam which would be cultural and universal in character.

The second period of falsafa. — This may be called post-Ghazālī. It is distinguished geographically by having one centre in the East with Falāhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī and another in the West with Avempace (Ibn Bāḍīṣa), Ibn Tufayl and Averroes (Ibn Rushd). The period is characterized from now on as late as Ibn Khaldūn. It may be said that falsafa wished to support shariʿa, fikhr, and ahkām sulṭāniyya, and that it is thus opposed to the spirit of the Kur'ān. This is true as far as rigorously orthodox Islam is concerned. But falsafa developed in more liberal surroundings, where there was a desire for a less legalistic view of religion and for an Islam which would be cultural and universal in character.

Of the three who most adorned Western falsafa, Avempace displayed the least religious spirit. His Rule of the solitary (Tadhkīr al-mutawāḥhid) has as its ideal isolation from the mass of mankind in a purely intellectual contemplation of the intelligible. In his Risālat al-Ītīsālī (a reinterpretation of the problems of creation and the nature of the after life, philosophy has no real privilege, and risks indeed encouraging doubt, while revealed knowledge, though in itself inferior, gains the advantage because it brings assurance. To the fundamental problems of the first falsafa as criticised by al-Ghazālī, Averroes replies like a mu'takallim: he gives up the postulate that from the One nothing but the one can emerge; God moves the world by His amr which permits Him to act while remaining unmoved (cf. the unmoved prime mover of Aristotle); God has no will resembling the human will, since He has nothing to desire, having all; but the idea of a voluntary act better represents what creation is than the idea of an involuntary emanation (a viewpoint to be found in al-Rāzī in his commentaries on the divine attribute of life, hayāt); God does not know particular things in a sentient manner; but the knowledge He has of them resembles the sentient knowledge by which man grasps them rather than our abstract and general knowledge. These few observations suffice to show that Averroes took note of the theological criticisms of al-Ghazālī.

In the East, Falāhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī is an Ash'arī
like al-Ghazālī, whom he takes for guide, while remaining attached to the thought of Avicenna. He criticizes the Mu'tazila but he borrows from them what he can use, and he attacks the extremist sects without breaking down the bridges to them. Ironic in outlook, in spite of his polemical vigour, he is endowed with great powers of synthesis and it is perhaps in him that the richest, widest and most open system is to be found. He explains Avicenna while correcting him. He achieves a profound union of kalām and falsafa. Thus, like his adversary al-'Ṭusi, he studies the Mu'tazila not for the sake of a conflict but in relation to the problem of the divine attributes. For him, philosophical reason may well collect ideas into coherent systems, but it is for revelation to pronounce upon their truth. Finally, the sacred text is a stimulus for philosophical thought. Al-Rāzī therefore clearly differs from Averroes in his approach; he does not limit recourse to dogma and kalām to certain difficult cases: with him philosophy and theology are co-extensive and interpenetrating.

7. — The tradition of Avicenna in the philosophy of ʿIṣḥāq. — The work of al-Ghazālī was not accepted by the whole of Islam; in particular those circles, of Shi'ī tendencies, who resisted his criticism developed the most mystical aspects of Avicenna's thought in order to produce a union of Avicenna's type falsafa with a mystical kalām of Gnostic inspiration.

Here we must mention the philosophical corpus of Abu 'l-Barakāt al-Baghdādī (d. 550/1155), which develops into an angelology. But the great representative of ʿIṣḥāq is al-Suhrawardī (d. 578/1181), who was influenced philosophically by Avicenna but gives an important position to Aristotelian concepts in the exposition of his mystical ideas. On the philosophical plane, it was Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Tūsī (d. 672/1273) who was to undertake the Shi`ī defence of Avicenna's thought against al-Rāzī, a defence which is not, however, accompanied by absolute fidelity: the real distinction between essence and existence is denied, and one finds in the end an explicit monism in al-Suhrawardī, al-'Ṭusi and Sa'dr al-Dīn al-Sīrāżī (d. 1050/1640). This monist philosophy developed above all in the Iranian areas, which is often expressed in Persian. It remained alive and flourishing for a long period.

8. — Falsafa as scholasticism. — In spite of the great names which adorn even the last period of falsafa, it must be recognized that from now on thinkers are in possession of received ideas and that they develop them in variations which offer interest but without real invention. The union of falsafa and kalām was completed: the stages of this process are marked by Tustarī, Kuṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 765/1364) and al-Ījālī (d. 756/1355), for whom kalām includes metaphysical questions and logical procedures while offering the greater security of reason founded on tradition. Al-Ījālī appears in this period as the leader of a school whose disciples were to diverge in different directions, some attaching themselves to Ash'arī orthodoxy, such as al-Djurjānī (d. 816/1413); others remaining in the fold of Avicenna, like Sayf al-Dīn al-Abharī (8th/14th century), al-Fanārī (d. 886/1481), al-Siyālātkūfī (d. 1065/1659). Thus the earlier discussions over the opposition of Avicenna and Ghaṣāʾīl are taken up again: these the partisans and continuers of Avicenna are ʿIṣṬālū al-Dīn al-Ḥilli (d. 726/1320), a leading theologian of the Imāmīyya, and Kuṭb al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 749/1348); while those who attacked Avicenna's school in the spirit of Ash'arī, ʿIṣṭālū al-Dīn al-Hāfīz (d. 726/1320), and in the tradition of al-Ghazālī included al-

9. — Supplementary and conclusion. — To enumerate here all the theological philosophers of the last period would be tedious. We ought rather to mention those works of previous centuries which, though philosophical, do not exactly fit into the categories we have outlined. We should first recall that theologians like the Ash'arīs al-Bākīlānī and al-Duwaynī or the Zāhīrīs Ibn Hazm, wrote purely philosophical questions from a point of view which was properly that of kalām (e.g., al-Bākīlānī's theory of causality and atomism). On the other hand, the Rashīdūlī of the Ḳhwān al-Sufīā deserve mention; these develop Pythagorean ideas, frequently with remarkable originality, on the fringes of the school of Avicenna but in an analogous spirit, in spite of the polemics and the characteristic of their writings. Ibn Masarrā, who has been studied by Asin Palacios, was influenced by the philosophy of Ṣamīdūkī, and was by the philosophy of Ẓābīfī mysticism (cf. Ibn al-Kūtī, art. ʿAbīdābī). Further, it should be noted that in order to study not falsafa as such but the philosophical ideas current in Islam one should also consider the use of Greek concepts by sages such as ʿAlī b. Rabban al-Ṭabarānī and above all ʿAbū Bakr Muhammad b. Zakariyya al-Rāzī and many others. The corpus of al-Djurjānī also, in the analysis of it by P. Kraus, should not be neglected by those seeking to establish the function of Pythagoreanism in the alchemical concepts of Islamic scholars. In another field, the examination of the theories of the grammarians, particularly Ibn ʿIṣḥāqī, would supply very interesting information. We should also consider the character of Greek ideas in Arabic grammar. In special philosophical disciplines such as ethics, Ibn Miskawayh should be mentioned, whose thought extensively overlaps pure questions of morals and reflects the life of his age. The literary circle of Baghdād made known to us by ʿAbū Ḥāyān al-Tawḥīdī, is very representative of philosophical culture in the Muslim East of the 4th/10th century. To sum up, falsafa was a focus of reflection on the legacy of Greek thought. It was not at the beginning a matter of Muslim apologetics utilizing Hellenic philosophy to explain and justify the faith. Falsafa began as a search by Muslims with Shi`ī leanings for a coherence in their intellectual and spiritual life, that is, the quest for a religious humanism, with all that humanism implies in freedom of spirit. Later it evolved, grew closer to orthodox kalām and ended by fusing with it. Only then did falsafa begin to burden itself with apologetic elements: fides quaerens intellectum or, conversely, faith illuminating and fortifying knowledge. Only the mysticism of ʿIṣḥāq retained the primitive humanism of Avicenna (cf. al-Insān al-kāmil). In the course of its development, falsafa spread Greek ideas in every realm of thought. But it concluded by becoming a school activity. It is perhaps this decline which inspired the disillusioned observations of Ibn Khaldūn on the pernicious effects of education in the Muslim world.
This great thinker of the 8th/14th century, who spared nothing and no-one in his scientific criticism, indeed saw in these great systems concepts inspired purged of all Neoplatonic metaphysics. Ibn Khaldun, as with a true scientist, was not content to maintain the view of the universal church, but he attempted to synthesize new systems of his own. He aspired to the scientific criticism of fundamentals, to the accomplishment of a positive all-embracing science, the science of human societies.

This person is Ibn Khaldun, a great Islamic thinker and historian. He was born in 1332 and died in 1406. His works, especially the *Mukaddima*, are considered to be the first modern historical work. He was known for his critical approach to the past and for his emphasis on the importance of research and the study of human societies.
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**FAMAGUSTA** [see MAGHOSHA].

**FAMILY** [see *S.L.1*].

**FAN** [see MIRWAḤA].

**FANĀ’** [see BARĀ’].

**FANAK** (pl. *fanāk*; from Pers. *fanak*/*fanādγ*) may refer to other terms and with different authors, to various animals of different orders or families. In the Muslim west *fanāk* is commonly applied to the fennec-fox, *Fennecus zerda*, a small wild member of the genus *Vulpes* of the Canidae with very large ears, a pale dun coat, and a spreading bushy tail. The nocturnal habits of this puny carnivore, and its essentially desert habitat, have contributed to its being ignored by Arabic writers, naturalists, encyclopaedists and poets; al-Dīḥīḥī, for example, frankly confesses his ignorance of the real *fanāk* (*Hayawān*, vi, 32). For a better knowledge of the fennec it is necessary to turn to the desert tribes; one finds, for example, six terms at least in the various dialects of Tamāb which refer to this animal (see Ch. de Foucauld, *Dictionnaire Touareg-Français*, Paris 1953, ii, 962, s.v. *akhōrī*; H. Lhote, *La chasse chez les Touaregs*, Paris 1951, 133). In the eastern countries which do not know the fennec proper of the Sahara fauna, *fanāk* is used for the Corsac or Karagan Fox, *Vulpes corsac* (from Turk. *harsāh*), found from Turkestan to Mongolia; this little animal when domesticated enjoyed a great vogue as a lady’s pet in Europe in the 16th century, when it was known as “adive”.

However, neither of these two foxes is meant by the term *fanāk* in the imagination of all the authors who have used the word; all mean a member of the Mustelidae whose pelts were greatly esteemed in the luxury fur-trade and which ranked with such fur-bearing animals (*ghawāl al-wabar wa l-fird*), the ermine (*bbidam*), sable (*sammar*), Siberian squirrel (*ingāb*) and the pelt of the *fanak* was imported, at great expense, from central Europe and Asia (*min arḍ Khāriżm, min biḥl al-Sakāliba*).

Although the identification of this animal has troubled many translators, there is no doubt that it must be the mink, *Mustela lutreola*; sufficient proof of this is given by Ibn al-Baytār (tr. L. Leclerc, *Traité des simples*, Paris 1879-83, iii, no. 1708), who says of this fox that it is a small species of marten, and its fur is brought from the land of the Slavonians, or from the lands of the Turks and Russians”. It is difficult to understand how the *fanak*, worn in cloaks (*farsaw*) by the young Andalusian dandies and poets of the 4th-5th/10th-11th centuries, could have been identified with the weasel (see H. Peres, *La poesie andalouse ... au Xème siecle*, Paris 1951, 34) and the “fennec” of the eastern countries which do not know *fanak*; it is a matter of conjecture, however, that in the eyes of the jesters the *fanak* cannot belong to the Canidae, the canine species, domestic or wild, being absolutely impure, on the authority of many traditions of the Prophet.


**FANĀR** [see FENIR and MANAR].

**AL-FANĀRĪ** [see FENIR-EDE].

**FANN** (the modern) Arabic name for art. Individual treatment of aspects of the art of Islam will be found in articles under the following headings;
the examples are given as a guide and are not intended to be exhaustive.

1. Techniques, e.g., ARCHITECTURE, BINA\(^2\) (building), KIRK \(=\) KIRMAN \(=\) (the potter's craft), FUSAPIS\(^3\) (mosaic), KALI (carpets), KHATT (calligraphy), KUSMA\(^4\) (textiles), METALWORK, TSAWIR (painting), etc., as well as description of materials in the articles on techniques.

2. Materials, e.g., A\(^5\) (ivory), BILLAWR (crystal), DJIS (plaster), KMAZA\(^6\) (pottery and ceramics), \(\text{'IRE AL-LU'TU'}\) (mother-of-pearl), LIM\(^7\) (costume), etc., passim.

3. Objects, types of buildings, artistic features, e.g., KALAM\(^8\) (pencaoses); BAN (gates), BAL\(^9\) (well-sells), BURG\(^10\) (towers), BUSTAN (gardens), HAMMA\(^11\) (baths), HIN (fortification), KANTARA (bridges), MAKARA (tombs), MANARA (minarets), MASPI (mosques), SABIL (fountains), etc.; AMUD (capitals), ARABESQUE, IWAN (arcs), MUKARNAS (stalactites), etc.

4. Artists, e.g., BINE\(^12\), MANSUR, SINAN, etc.

5. Music, theatre, etc., e.g., MO\(^13\) (articles) on individual musical instruments, e.g., DUFF, TANB\(^14\), CINEMA; MAGRAHYYYA (drama); LAM (games).

6. Countries and cities, passim. (Ed.)

7. Dynasties, and in some cases individual rulers passim.

The idea of a specifically Islamic art can hardly have been without preliminary reference to the idea of an Islamic civilization which allows the bringing together, across the apparent contradictions of form, style and material, of monuments widely separated in time and space and objects produced according to widely different techniques. If it be indeed commonly admitted that a new faith and a new idea of an Islamic civilization which allows the perpetuation of certain modes of life and thought, in a society dominated by a rigid legalism of a religious character and faithful until the dawn of the modern era to the principles established in the Middle Ages, has produced a similar fixeness of artistic traditions, as seen in the most diverse natural surroundings from the moment when they were first incorporated into the heart of Islam; thus we may group under a common heading, in spite of all the exterior reasons for differentiation, works produced according to widely different techniques. If it be indeed commonly admitted that a new faith and a new idea of an Islamic civilization which allows the perpetuation of certain modes of life and thought, in a society dominated by a rigid legalism of a religious character and faithful until the dawn of the modern era to the principles established in the Middle Ages, has produced a similar fixeness of artistic traditions, as seen in the most diverse natural surroundings from the moment when they were first incorporated into the heart of Islam; thus we may group under a common heading, in spite of all the exterior reasons for differentiation, works produced according to widely different techniques.

In this sense one can speak of the unity of Islamic art, the principal factor of which was without doubt the constitution, in the first centuries of Islam, of that immense empire of the Caliphate, Umayyad and later 5ABB\(^15\)S\(^16\), which brought together under a single authority many regions formerly independent of one another; it thus provided an environment favourable the elaboration of a primitive “classicism” which was to serve as a point of reference for the later developments, and to bring into being, according to clearly discernible lines of affiliation, local or national flowerings which could not fail to develop individually in the years that followed.

Sprung therefore from the conjunction of several inheritances, in the first rank of which were a Hellenistic heritage from the southern provinces of the Byzantine empire and an Iranian heritage which shortly before had been crystallized under the aegis of the powerful S\(\text{S}\)\(\text{A}\)\(\text{n}\)\(\text{d}\) dynasty, this first Islamic art deserves primarily to be described as profoundly eclectic, through its having gathered and mingled without restraint, while the conquerors were willingly susceptible to the atmosphere of the arts around them, structural or decorative elements borrowed from the practices of the conquered countries, with the one proviso that these elements be adapted, in conformity with the observance of certain rules, to the needs of the new Muslim society.

This practice was to be perpetuated in the ensuing periods, and although the first phenomena of absorption and transformation, particularly noticeable in the Near Eastern regions which might be called the heart of the empire, marked Islamic art as such with Syro-Mesopotamian features, it must not be forgotten that other influences, sometimes transmitted throughout the Muslim world, more often integrated in lands on the periphery where they could have but a weak diffusion—this is exemplified in North Africa or Spain just as in K\(\text{u}\)\(\text{r}\)\(\text{s}\)\(\text{a}\)\(\text{s}\)\(\text{n}\) or in India—continually influenced here and there the traditional modes which had gradually spread from the active capitals of Damascus or Bagdad. The receptivity, demonstrated very early, to trends coming from the East, which brought into \(\text{'Ir}\)\(\text{k}\)\(\text{l}\) sculpture the characteristic rhythms and scrolls of that Asian art known as “Steppic”, was thus soon to be surpassed by the facility with which, from the Sal\(\text{g}\)\(\text{s}\)\(\text{h}\)\(\text{g}\) era onwards, modifications of taste and feeling directly attributable to the Turkish invaders were to be imposed. Similarly the reception by Persia of a decorative repertoire of Chinese origin, which had considerably diversified and was to stimulate the imagination of its miniaturists, was to have as a counterpart that extraordinary perfection of architectural techniques accomplished in 10th/16th century Ottoman Turkey by artists who applied themselves to the school of the Byzantine masters and who were to succeed in equaling, if not surpassing, Byzantine chefs-d'oeuvre by erecting the great series of imperial mosques in Istanbul.

One may also understand in this perspective the multiplication of regional styles (see articles on the relevant countries or dynasties) within an art whose faculty of assimilation remains its dominant characteristic and whose various stages develop within varying ethnic groups and as a result of borrowings which are undisguised; these borrowings have, however, in the course of their transmission undergone a subtle transformation which makes it impossible—even in a creative milieu as clearly individualized as that of Iran, for example—to confuse works anterior to Islam and those which belong, after the lasting triumph of the new religion, to a differently orientated cycle of aesthetic experience.

Indeed, whatever be the type of monuments or objects under consideration, it would appear that the artistic production of Muslim countries has always conformed to a double set of requirements; the one imposed by the material organization of a society in which artistic patronage was bestowed principally by princes and sovereigns, impressing on the art an aulic, sumptuary and dynastic character whereby the taste for richness and brilliant ornament was necessarily developed; the other, and more important, inspired by the particular form of intellectual and religious outlook which came into being in the 7th century with the preaching of Muhammed and which, far from becoming more tractable, became more and more rigid in its claims to model the life of the Muslim community according to the dictates of the holy law and the opinions of its practitioners, providing the dominant themes of architecture and encouraging the increasingly systematic employment of decoration in accordance with stereotyped formulas, remote from all realism and spontaneity.
Indeed, it is this deliberate impoverishment of plastic imagination, with its aniconic tendency, which most frequently comes to mind when one attempts to define the basic originality of Islamic art, whether the emphasis is put only on the abstract character of the surface ornamentation which it uses in such profusion, or whether this characteristic is more precisely related with the religious prohibitions peculiar to Islamic doctrine or with a system of theologico-philosophic opinions which dwells on the illusory and precarious character of the visible world as contrasted with God Who alone endures. This may be a somewhat simplified view of a very complex problem, all the more since the exclusion of images was not observed with the same rigour in every region or period; to deny this would be to ignore some of the most beautiful Muslim achievements, starting with those of the schools of illuminators who were well able to portray or transpose with delicate touch the scenes which surrounded them. Yet one should not disregard the large share of truth which such an axiom contains.

As a general rule, indeed, artists working in the Muslim milieu have remained unaffected by a concern to reproduce faithfully the forms of the living world, forms which certainly served them as sources of inspiration, but which became relegated to an accessory role in larger compositions — an effort is necessary to discover, for example, the medallions with human or animal representations which are on so many objects enmeshed by networks of arabesques, and the miniatures themselves were conceived solely as an appendage to the manuscript page which they were to enrich — or else recourse was had to them merely for the guiding lines of stylisations which were to be repeated, divorced from all direct contact with nature. This is not unrelated to the lack of favour with which work in high relief was regarded, a technique which more than any other was likely to disturb the rigorists by producing from its medium an image so close to its original; it is connected also with the growing disregard, which visibly asserts itself, for the feeling for the third dimension: it disappears in the interplay of flat colours with which the surfaces of monuments were covered, as in the productions of the artistic workshops or in the grisaille of moulded interlacing work which filled the previously compartmented borders and panels.

Thus it is justifiable to define Islamic art as a whole as an art of decorators and ornamenters, concerned to decorate every surface with a multiplicity of figures springing from their own imagination in accordance with a repertoire of motifs which had long passed to the stage of studio prescriptions, motifs often executed in relief or in shallow patterns which were vibrant with light and shade effects, but to which was frequently added the refinement of notes of colour, obtained from very different media according to the period or the region. This art of the ornamenters thus corresponded to a peculiar regard for agreements and harmonies, founded, not without some aridity, on the observation of rules such as the horror of the void and the continuation of the line, in a climate which had introduced also the beauty of the rhythmic line of Arabic music and the cadences of its poetry.

It is also true to say, however, that this precious art was first and foremost a scholarly and intellectual art, which grew from a continual recourse to geometrical design and to complicated calculations, permitting decorative forms which were sometimes of a rudimentary nature to be used effectively. This is admirably illustrated by the use of stalactite corbelling, with straightlined or curvilinear cells [see MUKARNAS], which were ultimately used in the adornment of domes or semi-domes (for example in the coping of portals) according to extremely complex constructional schemes, and which demanded a very specialized technique from the artisans who carried them out, empirical though this may have been. This is revealed also by the study of the basic lines of so many opulent arabesques [q.v.], whose value lies in the convolutions of their stylized vegetal stems which are in other respects rather poor; or by analysis of the innumerable combinations of star-shaped polygons on which are based systems of interlacing which often serve as the starting-point for further stylizations. This is also expressed by the variations developed from the angular or cursive letters of the Arabic script, letters which had the double advantage of offering continually fresh themes to the invention of artists, and of being in themselves shapes with an inherent meaning and embodying the results of a long development [see KHIAT]. The growing development of ornamental compositions of this genre, apparently without regard for calligraphic form or legibility, is certainly to be included among the most typical aspects of art in Islamic countries.

It goes without saying, however, that such considerations alone do not suffice to characterize the creative vigour of an art which was not content merely to impress its sign manual on certain modes of aesthetic expression, notably in the field of ornament, but was also able to demonstrate, in the field of architecture, its ability to respond, with new programmes, to the situation resulting from the development of Islam and its establishment in regions where there was an older civilization—regions already so enriched with past monumental glory as to prevent the conquerors from being content with the primitive constructions of Mecca or Medina. In this connexion it is necessary to stress the ability of Islamic architects to adapt the results of a rudimentary nature to be used effectively. This is also expressed by the variations developed from the angular or cursive letters of the Arabic script, letters which had the double advantage of offering continually fresh themes to the invention of artists, and of being in themselves shapes with an inherent meaning and embodying the results of a long development [see KHIAT]. The growing development of ornamental compositions of this genre, apparently without regard for calligraphic form or legibility, is certainly to be included among the most typical aspects of art in Islamic countries.

It goes without saying, however, that such considerations alone do not suffice to characterize the creative vigour of an art which was not content merely to impress its sign manual on certain modes of aesthetic expression, notably in the field of ornament, but was also able to demonstrate, in the field of architecture, its ability to respond, with new programmes, to the situation resulting from the development of Islam and its establishment in regions where there was an older civilization—regions already so enriched with past monumental glory as to prevent the conquerors from being content with the primitive constructions of Mecca or Medina. In this connexion it is necessary to stress the ability of Islamic architects to adapt the results of a rudimentary nature to be used effectively. This is also expressed by the variations developed from the angular or cursive letters of the Arabic script, letters which had the double advantage of offering continually fresh themes to the invention of artists, and of being in themselves shapes with an inherent meaning and embodying the results of a long development [see KHIAT]. The growing development of ornamental compositions of this genre, apparently without regard for calligraphic form or legibility, is certainly to be included among the most typical aspects of art in Islamic countries.

It goes without saying, however, that such considerations alone do not suffice to characterize the creative vigour of an art which was not content merely to impress its sign manual on certain modes of aesthetic expression, notably in the field of ornament, but was also able to demonstrate, in the field of architecture, its ability to respond, with new programmes, to the situation resulting from the development of Islam and its establishment in regions where there was an older civilization—regions already so enriched with past monumental glory as to prevent the conquerors from being content with the primitive constructions of Mecca or Medina. In this connexion it is necessary to stress the ability of Islamic architects to adapt the results of a rudimentary nature to be used effectively. This is also expressed by the variations developed from the angular or cursive letters of the Arabic script, letters which had the double advantage of offering continually fresh themes to the invention of artists, and of being in themselves shapes with an inherent meaning and embodying the results of a long development [see KHIAT]. The growing development of ornamental compositions of this genre, apparently without regard for calligraphic form or legibility, is certainly to be included among the most typical aspects of art in Islamic countries.

It goes without saying, however, that such considerations alone do not suffice to characterize the creative vigour of an art which was not content merely to impress its sign manual on certain modes of aesthetic expression, notably in the field of ornament, but was also able to demonstrate, in the field of architecture, its ability to respond, with new programmes, to the situation resulting from the development of Islam and its establishment in regions where there was an older civilization—regions already so enriched with past monumental glory as to prevent the conquerors from being content with the primitive constructions of Mecca or Medina. In this connexion it is necessary to stress the ability of Islamic architects to adapt the results of a rudimentary nature to be used effectively. This is also expressed by the variations developed from the angular or cursive letters of the Arabic script, letters which had the double advantage of offering continually fresh themes to the invention of artists, and of being in themselves shapes with an inherent meaning and embodying the results of a long development [see KHIAT]. The growing development of ornamental compositions of this genre, apparently without regard for calligraphic form or legibility, is certainly to be included among the most typical aspects of art in Islamic countries.
ors or other rich persons in building tombs designed to glorify their memory.

It is no less significant to notice, on a different level, the various interpretations taken, from the beginning of Islam to the present day, by royal palaces [see KASR], for which there has been a continuous need since the early conquests, and the building of which has been the principal care of each Muslim dynast. Nor are the less grandiose aspects of civil and military architecture to be overlooked, as illustrated by, for example, works of public utility such as water works, fountains [see SABIL], baths [see HAMMĀM], warehouses [see KAYSARĪYA] and covered markets [see SMK], simple private houses, or the various types of fortification [see BURDJ, HISN] represented as much by town walls as by the defence systems of isolated strongholds. Here also one may see the preservation of constant traditions, which it is difficult to separate from the strictly mediaeval historical conditions within which they have been perpetuated, but which nevertheless deserve to be described as Islamic inasmuch as the limits of the geographical region in which they appear correspond exactly with those of the territories characterized by adhesion to Islam.


(J. SOURDELL-THOMINE)

**PÃO [see AL-FARABI]**

**FĀRĀB**, a small district on both sides of the middle Jaxartes at the mouth of its tributary, the Aris, which flows from Isfīḍāb. It is also the name of the principal settlement in this district. The older Persian form Pārāb occurs in Ḫudūd al-Īslām, (72, 118 ff., 122), the form Bārāb in Ḫistāḥr (346) and Mukaddasī (273; but also Fārāb) as well as in the later Persian sources. The extent of the district in both length and breadth was less than a day's journey (Ibn Hawḵāl, 390 ff.). According to Masūdī (Tābīḵ, 366) the region was flooded annually at the end of January, and traffic between the settlements was suspended for ten days by his death (in fact the Jaxartes is usually frozen at that season).

The principal settlement of the district was originally apparently Kadar (Kadr?), with a Friday mosque and lying about half a parasang east of the Jaxartes (Ḫistāḥr, 346). Near there but of later origin (according to Barthold) was a new centre, called after the district Fārāb, set up by Mukaddasī (262, 273). According to the latter it was an extensive fortified city of 70,000 (?) inhabitants (mostly Šāfīis, according to Samʿānī, GMS, xx, fol. 415b), with a Friday mosque, a citadel and a marketplace. Kadar and Fārāb fought for pre-eminence in the area. Also worthy of mention in the district of Fārāb is Wasīlī, a small village on the left bank of the river somewhat below the mouth of the Aris and, according to Ibn Hawḵāl, the birthplace of the philosopher al-Fārābī [q.v.], who got his name from the district where he was born.

Fārāb is rarely mentioned in historical sources. In 121/738 for example the prince of Čāḍ (Ṭashḵent), owing to the pressure of the Arabic provincial government, had to banish to Fārāb an Arab who had taken refuge with him (Ṭabīḥ, ii, 164; the only mention of Fārāb by this historian). Islam did not penetrate Fārāb apparently until the Sāmānīd period [q.v.], after the conquest of Isfīḍāb [q.v.] in 225/839-40 (see Ballāḏurī, Futūḥ, 422; Samʿānī, fol. 286b, lines 11-13, s.v. Sāmānī). Wasīlī was mentioned as late as the 12th century as a fortress. For a long time Fārāb lay on the north-east border of Islam territory, until 340/950 when the neighbouring Turks were also converted to Islam. One of the overland routes which led to the land of the Kimāk Turks had its point of departure in Fārāb (Ḡardīz, 83).

According to the common view of the Islamic sources the city of Fārāb corresponds to the later Otrār (for evidence see that article) which, according to Šaraf al-Dīn ‘Ali Yazdī (Ẓafarmand, Calcutta edition, ii, 668), lay two parasangs from the right bank of the Jaxartes. For the further development of the town see OTRĀR. (The ruins of Otrār are in fact about 10 km. from the river.)

**Bibliography:** Le Strange, 484 ff.; Barthold, Turkestän, 176-9; Ḫudūd al-Īslām, index, and 358. See also the bibliography to OTRĀR. (W. Barthold—[B. Spuler])

**AL-_FARĀBĪ, ABŪ NĀṢR MUḤAMMAD B. MUḤAMMAD B. TĀRḤĪN B. AWZĀLĀḠ (UZUGI?),** referred to as Alfarabius or Avenasar in medieval Latin texts. One of the most outstanding and renowned Muslim philosophers, he became known as the "second teacher", the first being Aristotle.

i. — Life

Very little is known of al-Fārābī's life. There neither exists an autobiography nor do we have any report by contemporaries. Al-Fārābī was of Turkish origin. He was born in Turkestan at Wasīlī in the district of the city of Fārāb [q.v.] and is said to have died at the age of eighty or more in 339/950 in Damascus. His father, described as an officer (ḵādīḏ gāyīn), may have belonged to the Turkish body-guard of the Caliph, and al-Fārābī may have come to Baghdad with him early in life. He settled down there for many years as a private individual; he did not belong to the society of the court nor was he a member of the secretarial class. For reasons unknown he accepted in 330/942 an invitation of the Shīʿ Ḥamdānī ruler Sayf al-Dawla [q.v.] and lived in his entourage, mainly in Aleppo, together with other men of letters, until his death in 358/970.

His teacher in philosophy was a Christian, the Nestorian Yūbānā b. Haylān. Al-Fārābī himself...
AL-FARABI 779

(Ibn Abi Usaybi'a, ii, 135, 8 ff.) and al-Mas'udi (Tanbih, 122 ff.) connect him ultimately with a branch of the Greek philosophical school of Alexandrian descent which somewhat continued to exist after the Arab conquest; some of its representatives are supposed to have come to Antioch, and the school subsequently spread to Marw and Harran and from there to Bagdad. Yuhanna is reported to have come from Marw to Bagdad after 295/908. The possibility that he had taught al-Farabi in Marw cannot be ruled out. Apart from this, we learn that al-Farabi was somehow in touch with the great translator and commentator Abu Bighir Matta' b. Yûnus (d. 329/940), a prominent figure in the Bagdad school of Christian Aristotelians, and that he had a great influence on Yahyà b. 'Adi (d. 362/972), its main representative in the next generation. Al-Farabi's extant philosophical works bear out his dependence on the 10th century syllabus of Christian Aristotelian teaching in Bagdad and the impact of the late Alexandrian interpretation of Greek philosophy on his thought (cf. M. Meyerhof, Von Alexandrien nach Bagdad, in Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad., Phil. hist. Klasse, 1930, xxiii).

ii. — Thought

Al-Farabi was convinced that philosophy had come to an end everywhere and that it had found a new home and a new life within the world of Islam. He believed that human reason is superior to religious faith, and hence assigned only a secondary place to the different revealed religions which provide, in his view, an approach to truth for non-philosophers through symbols. Philosophical truth is universally valid whereas these symbols vary from nation to nation; they are the work of philosophers—prophets, of whom Muhammad was one. Al-Farabi thus went beyond al-Kindî (q.v.), who naturalized philosophy as a kind of appropriate handmaiden of revealed truth; on the other hand, he differs from al-Razi (q.v.) by not condemning the prophets as impostors but allotting, like his master Plato, an important and indispensable function to organized religion. There is some evidence to suggest that al-Farabi reached this view gradually.

Al-Farabi set out to explain how Greek philosophy—which had reached him as an almost closed system of truth and an established method of reaching felicity—could provide valid explanations of all the important issues raised in contemporary Islamic discussion. Greek natural theology shows the truth about God as the first cause of emanation, about divine inspiration (wakû) as the outcome of the supreme perfection of the human mind, about the true nature of creation and divine providence as it manifests itself in the hierarchic order of the universe and about immortality, which is by no means granted to every human being. As magistra visae, philosophy gives the right views about the freedom of moral choice and of the good life altogether. The perfect man, the philosopher, ought also to be the sovereign ruler; philosophy alone shows the right path to the urgent reform of the caliphate. Al-Farabi envisages a perfect city state as well as a perfect nation (umma) and a perfect world state.

Apart from building up a philosophical syllabus for different levels of study, al-Farabi had to rethink the existing Islamic sciences and to give them a new meaning and a new function in his novel theistic philosophy: a grammar adaptable to every language (cf. P. Kraus, Fabir et la science grecque, Cairo 1942, 251, n. 2); a dialectical theology (kalâm) and a jurisprudence (fiqh) restricted to the service of a particular religion, its "legal theology," and using the forms explained in Aristotle's Topics and Sophistici Elemyci (cf. Gardet-And&s, Introduction à la theologie musulmane, Paris 1948, 102 ff.); the metaphysician is also the true lawyer, as Plato has shown in his Laws, which were translated into Arabic a second time by al-Farabi's contemporary Yahyà b. 'Adi (see ARAÎN). Rhetoric and Poetic provide the best method for bringing home the truth to non-philosophers, i.e., the majority of men, by working on their imagination; no Greek philosopher would ever have envisaged that Rhetoric and Poetic could be applied to Muslim scripture, and to the Muslim creed (cf. R. Walzer, Greek into Arabic, Oxford 1962, 129 ff.).

Only a few characteristic tenets of al-Farabi can be mentioned here. Like many later Greek thinkers, he believed in the ultimate identity of Plato's and Aristotle's views. He based himself on Aristotle, as understood by the Greek commentators of late antiquity, in logic, natural science, psychology, metaphysics (these metaphysics however understood and developed on moderate Neoplatonic lines). In political science he preferred to follow Plato's Republic and Laws, as understood by middle Platonic thinkers, convinced that Plato's theoretical framework had by Aristotle and the Neoplatonists, but that his analysis of the imperfect states and his solution of the problems of politics remained valid and compatible with the changed political conditions. The Greek antecedents of this particular branch of later Platonism—which also appealed strongly to Ibn Rushd (q.v.)—are lost and can be reconstructed only from al-Farabi's writings and those of his successors (cf. R. Walzer, Aspects of Islamic political thought, in Oriens, 1963).

According to al-Farabi, the first cause is at the same time the Plotinian one, the eternal creator of an eternal world, and the Aristotelian Divine Mind, a conception which is probably of middle-Platonic origin. Aristotle's ψυχή σοματική is for Al-Farabi neither identical with the Aristotelian soul situated within the human soul but has become a transcendental entity mediating between the higher and the sublunar world and the human mind—probably another later Greek interpretation of the difficult Aristotelian chapter De an., III 1. Very remarkable is the theory of imagination and prophecy adopted by al-Farabi; it may also derive from some otherwise lost Greek original (cf. R. Walzer, Greek into Arabic, 206 ff.). Prophecy, though being an indispensable ingredient in man's perfection, is auxiliary to his rational faculty, being confined to the inferior faculty of representation. It is neither described as a state of possession by supernatural powers nor understood as a mystic 'state'. Divine inspiration may be granted to the perfect man who has reached the highest philosophical level together with the highest form of prophecy.

The Christian-Arabic Aristotelian teaching in 4th/5th century Bagdad is the immediate background of al-Farabi's thought. His proximate ancient sources are within the orbit of the Greek philosophical schools in 6th century Alexandria. To a large extent, he appears to continue a tradition which became distinct during the later tenth century. Introduction of Byzantine civilization and whose original form may now be reconstructed from Arabic versions and imitations only. His particular variation of Neoplatonic metaphysics and his full acknowledgment of the
political aspects of Plato's thought distinguish him from Proclus and his followers. Much more of Porphyry's thought may be preserved in al-Farabi's work than is apparent to us today. His ultimate roots seem to lie in a pre-Platonist platonic tradition.

Al-Farabi's importance for subsequent Islamic philosophers is considerable, and would well deserve to be described in detail. His impact on the writings of 4th/10th century authors such as the Ikhwan al-Safa', al-Mas'udī, Miskawayh, and Abu 'l-Hasan Muhammad al-Āmīrī is undeniable. Ibn Sīnā seems to have known his works intimately and Ibn Rushd follows him in the essentials of his thought. Maimonides appreciated him highly. His political ideas had a belated and lasting success from the 13th century onwards (cf. T. W. Arnold, The Caliphate, Oxford 1924, 125 ff.). A few of his treatises became known to the Latin Schoolmen; more were translated into mediaeval Hebrew.

iii. — Works

More than one hundred works of varying size are attributed to the Arab bibliographers to al-Farabi, not all of them genuine. One, the Risālā known as al-Fusūs fi 'l-bikma, is most probably by Ibn Sīnā (cf. S. Pines, in REI, 1951, 121 ff.), and its wrong attribution to al-Farabi has made it unnecessarily difficult to realise how fundamental the differences between these two most influential Islamic philosophers are, in spite of many obvious similarities.

a. First to be mentioned among the genuine works are the great scholarly commentaries on a number of Aristotle's lecture courses; they continue the tradition of the late Greek schools without a gap (cf. the twenty-two volumes of the Commentaria in Aristotelica graeca published by the Berlin Academy); they seem to have been used by Ibn Bāḍijīa [q.v.] and especially by Ibn Rushd [q.v.] and have to a large extent been superseded by their commentaries. One of them, on the Ilīsī ḫ ṭūrīya, has just been edited for the first time, with valuable and copious indexes, by W. Kutsch and S. Marrow (Beirut 1960); it is based on a Greek original different both from the 6th century A.D. commentary by Ammonius [q.v.] and from the Greek work used by his Latin contemporary Boethius; all three seem somehow to depend on a lost commentary by Porphyry. We learn about similar commentaries on all the remaining parts of the Organon, including the Rhetorica (widely, I think, used by Ibn Rushd), on the Physics (which al-Farabi read more than forty times), the De caele, the Meteorology and parts of the Nicomachean Ethics (depending probably on a lost commentary by Porphyry). There may well have been more. A commentary on Alexander of Aphrodisias' De anima is mentioned. A commentary on Porphyry's Isagoge attributed to al-Farabi is in fact by Abu 'l-Faraqī b. al-Tayyib (cf. S. M. Stern, in ASCSA, xix (1957), 119 ff.). I assume that Ibn Rushd's Commentary on Plato's Republic (ed. E. I. J. Rosenthal, Cambridge 1950) depends on a similar work by al-Farabi.

b. A number of relatively small introductory monographs 'tōsī ḫūṣaynīyanīn'.


The very titles of three not yet traced refutations of philosophically difficult topics help to circumscribe Al-Farabi's position among the philosophers of his time. One is against Galen (Dāllūs)—known to the Arabs not only as a physician but as a philosopher as well—and rejects Galen's attacks against Aristotle's first cause, most probably in the wake of Alexander of Aphrodisias' refutation of Galen [see Dālīnūs]. Another is against John Philoponus (again in defence of Aristotle) and, by implication, al-Kindī [q.v.], who both adhere to the creation of the world from nothing (cf. R. Walzer, Greek into Arabic, 193 ff.). In a third treatise al-Farabi set out to refute Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī [q.v.], presumably because of his belief in atoms and the creation of the world in time. A treatise against Ibn al-Rawandi may have been concerned with his radical rejection of prophecy altogether (ed. F. Kraus, Beitrag zur islamischen Ketzergeschichte, in RSO, 1932).

d. There is finally a group of important major works which sum up the results of philosophical research and al-Farabi's further reaching intentions. They all are concerned with the sovereign position to be given to philosophy within the realm of thinking and with the organization of the perfect society and the philosopher-king. Their right understanding provides, in my view, the key to al-Farabi's


A critical edition, with English translation and commentary, is being prepared by R. Waizer.

IV. On political government (al-siyasa al-madawiyya), a similar survey of the whole of philosophy, written with the same definite political purpose in mind. Edited Hyderabad 1346/1927. Ger. trans. (Die Staatsleitung), by F. Dieterici, Leiden 1904. A critical edition and an English translation are being prepared in Chicago.

Bibliography: C. Brockelmann, I, 232 ff.; S I, 375 ff., 957 ff.; Pearson, nos. 4731-50 and Supplement, 1342-58; A. Ateş, Farabinin eserlerinin bibliyografyası, in Belleten, xvi/57 (1951), 175-92; N. Rescher, Al-Farabi. An annotated bibliography, Pittsburgh 1962; M. Steinschneider, Die Hebräischen Ubersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher, reprint, Graz 1956, 158 ff.; idem, Al-Farabi, in Mémoires de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Petersbourg, 1869; Ibrahim Madkour, La place d’Al-Fardabi dans l’école philosophique musulmane, Paris 1934; P. Kraus, Platon chez les Arabes, in BÉ, xxiii (1940), 263 ff.; idem, Jābir et la science profane, in Wako 1947, passim; Leo Strauss, Al-Farabi, inGeschichte der Wissenschaften, New York 1945; idem, How Farabi read Plato’s Laws, inMilanges Massonien, iii, Damascus 1957; E. J. Rosenthal, Political thought in medieval Islam (later atabeg [see ATABAK AL-‘ASAKIR], and Taghiri Birdi al-Bashbughawi. On 25 Rabî 1 I 808/20 September 1405, upon report that Faradi had fled in the company of Taghiri Birdi to Syria, it was Yashbak and Baybars who arranged the accession of ‘Abd al-‘Azîz. After the restoration of Faradi, Djakam and Nawruz revolted in Syria, the former proclaiming himself Sultan, with the regnal name Al-Malik al-‘Adil (11 Shawwâl 809/21 March 1409), but was killed soon after in his siege of Âmid. Syria, however, remained in the hands of Nawruz, who succeeded in winning over Shaykh al-Mahmûd, now viceroy of Damascus, Baybars (later atabeg [see ATABAK AL-‘ASAKIR], and Taghiri Birdi al-Bashbughawi. On 25 Rabî 1 I 808/20 September 1405, upon report that Faradi had fled in the company of Taghiri Birdi to Syria, it was Yashbak and Baybars who arranged the accession of ‘Abd al-‘Azîz. After the restoration of Faradi, Djakam and Nawruz revolted in Syria, the former proclaiming himself Sultan, with the regnal name Al-Malik al-‘Adil (11 Shawwâl 809/21 March 1409), but was killed soon after in his siege of Âmid. Syria, however, remained in the hands of Nawruz, who succeeded in winning over Shaykh al-Mahmûd, the amir sent by Faradi to replace him. Despite three expeditions against them, Faradi was unable to break the power of these two amirs, who defeated him finally at Lajdijin (Dhu ‘l-Hijjâdja 814/March-April 1412), and forced his deposition at Damascus whither he had fled. After a brief reign of six months by his puppet, the Caliph al-Musta’in, Shaykh himself became Sultan, taking the regnal name Al-Mu’ayyad (q.v.).

The only exception to the bleak rule of amirs’ rivalries in this period is provided by the appearance in Syria of Timur (q.v.). Although Faradi, after some hesitation and refusals of aid to the Dâlà’irid and Ottoman rulers against the threat from the East, did make a stand at Damascus against Timur, it would not be true to assert either that the external challenge provoked any real degree of internal consolidation within the Mamluk Sultanate, or that fear of defeat at the hands of Faradi made Timur turn north to Anatolia and Bâyazid I rather than south to Egypt, after plundering Damascus (Radjab 803/March 1401). The chronicler Abu ‘l-Maḥbûsî b. Taghiri Birdi (q.v.) does, however, report Timur’s respect for the Egyptian army, whose effectiveness he considered reduced
only owing to the youth of the Sultan and the lack of unity among its commanders (Nudium, vi, 46). The brief encounter between the two rulers at Damietta also provided, in the opinion of the chronicler, an interesting if inconclusive meeting between Timur and Ibn Kathaldun who, though out of office, had been prevailed upon to accompany Faradj to Syria.

With regard to the rôle of Faradj in Mamluk history the two Egyptian chroniclers al-Makrizi and Ibn Taghri Birdi represent diametrically opposed opinions. Whereas the former ascribes to him the ruin of Egypt and Syria because of poor administration, debased coinage, corrupt officials, and oppressive taxation (Khitai, cited Nudium, vi, 271-3), the latter gives Faradj a most favourable obituary despite his observation that the Sultan had brought about the financial ruin of his family and indirectly the death of his father (Nudium, vi, 270-4). In fact the remarks of Ibn Taghri Birdi must be considered with the greatest care, owing to the involvement of his family's affairs with those of Faradj, who had married a sister of his and, during an acute crisis, appointed his father atabeg (810/1407-8). His son's portrayal of Taghri Birdi as a loyal and self-sacrificing subject of the Sultan may not be inaccurate, but it is bound to have affected the chronicler's view of the recipient of such loyalty and sacrifice. Such observations on the finery and extent of commercial records of Western powers then active in Egypt and Syria would suggest that al-Makrizi's evaluation of Faradj as one addicted to arbitrary fiscal policies and indifferent to the importance of a sound and consistent administration, is not unfounded.

Bibliography: Ibn Taghri Birdi, Nudium, vi, 1-300; idem, Manhal șafi, fol. 507 (no. 1789; see Wiet, in Mém. Inst. Égypte, xix, 265, for further bibliography, including inscriptions); Ibn Ivās, Badāwi al-suḥrā, i, index; al-Kalfashandi, Ṣubḥ al-ašrādī, iii, 439; v, 305-25, 407-11; Weil, Geschiehten der Chalifen, v, 72-105, 108-25; W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant, ii, 471-2; Gaudeyroy-Demobynes, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, xxiv-xxvii, cvii; W. J. Fischel, Ibn Kathaldun and the Christian and Moslem, passim; Mayer, Fantasia in costume, index.

AL-FARAFRA, an oasis in the eastern Libyan desert, in Egypt, situated approximately on lat. 27° N. and long. 28° E., equidistant from the Nile and the Libyan frontier. It is a halting stage between the oases of al-Dāhla and al-Bahrīyya 160 km. to the north-north-east; the routes are motorable only with difficulty. Al-Farafra is a single village of about 1,000 inhabitants. Its mud huts surround a slightly raised fortification. Village and oasis are situated in a vast plain 70 to 90 m. high, partially covered with sand and surrounded by an immense barren plateau of Lower Eocene limestone extending all round, some 300 m. in height; the depression includes a score of wells and springs, the most abundant of which are Ayn al-Bellad and Ayn Ebsay. They provide the irrigation for a plantation of palms with a few olive-trees, pomegranates, and some barley, wheat, sorghum and onions. Groups of wild palms mark other areas with water. The inhabitants sell dates and a few olives, and buy in particular grain.

Al-Farafra is said to be the T3-šew (land of oxen) of Pharaonic times and the T3-maṣūrān of Classical sources (E. Mayer). R. N. Frye (1951) has suggested that the name Farah is not mentioned in Arabic works dealing with the conquests, but it is mentioned (as Faraj) by the geographers Istakhri (247), Ibn Hawkal (420), and al-Mukaddasī (306). The bridge over the river, and the road from al-Birna to the oasis are both noted. Although the town is mentioned by later geographers (Rudād al-šalām, Yākūt, etc.) it never had any historical importance. It was abandoned in the time of the Mongols, rebuilt, and sacked by Nādir Shāh, and today has ca. 15,000 inhabitants.

Bibliography: Classical sources are discussed in Pauly-Wissowa, xx, 738; xxiii, 817. Arabic sources are summarized in Le Strange, 341. Upon the present town see E. Caspian and E. Cagnacci, Afghānistan crocevia dell' Asia, Milan 1953, 256.

FARAH ANTUN, (Antūn being the family name; 1874-1922), Arab author and journalist. Trained in a Greek-Orthodox school near Tripoli (now in Lebanon), he migrated to Egypt, and published a journal in Alexandria. He then migrated to the U.S.A. but, following the Turkish revolution of 1908, went back to Egypt and became active in the national movement.

Well versed in French literature (and translations) he was attracted mostly by social-political-ethical and philosophical-religious themes, but he lacked method, system, and consistency. His adherence to Westernism in the spirit of the French Revolution, as well as his lucid exposition, felicity of expression and a ceaseless search for new ideas and the 'latest word' marked him as a representative of enlightenment. He was essentially a gifted eclectic, translator and excerpter, exponent of Western ideas and of their conflicts in his mind. Thus he brought to the Arab reader Renan's ideas on the origins of Christianity and on Ibn Rushd; discussions of Nietzsche and Tolstoy, of socialist theories. A pr vincity for polemics caused him to clash with literary and public figures (notably with Muh. ʿAbduh, on Ibn Rushd).

His New Jerusalem (1904) is a novel set in the time of the Arab conquest, and, though it suffers from lengthy ideological monologues, has a place in the history of the novel in Arabic. He was also a playwright.

His influence was considerable and he was used to be styled in schools as a classical author, mainly on account of scope and style.

Bibliography: Brockelmann S III, 1924;
FARAH ANTÜN — FARA'IDIYYA


(M. PELLMANN) FARAHĀBĀD, the name of a place in Mażandārān, situated 35° 50' N, 53° 2' 38" E., 17 m. north of Sārī and 26 m. north-west of 'Aṣgar [q.v.], near the mouth of the Tīgīn (or Tīgīn, or Tīgīna) river. Formerly known as Tāhān, the site was renamed Farahābād by Shāh Ābās I, who in 1020/1612-1 or 1021/1612-3 ordered the construction of a royal palace there. Around the palace were built residences, gardens, baths, bazaars, mosques, and caravanserais. The new town, according to Pietro della Valle, was peopled by Shāh Ābās with colonies of different nationalities—including many Christians from Georgia—transplanted from territories overrun by Šafāwī forces. Farahābād was linked to Sārī by Shāh Ābās's famous causeway (completed in 1031/1621), and until his death in 1038/1629 Shāh Ābās regularly spent the winter either at Farahābād or 'Aṣgar, usually not returning to his capital Isfahān until after Naw-rūz. The Ta'rikhi 'Alamārā-yi Ābbāsī uses the terms dār al-saltana and dār al-mulk with reference to Farahābād; this suggests that it had become virtually a second capital (cf. also A Chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, London 1939, i, 282).

Pietro della Valle, who visited Farahābād in 1628, declared that the circuit of the walls was equal to, if not greater than, that of Rome or Constantinople, and that the town contained streets of more than a league in length, and Chardin, who saw it forty years later, stated that the palace housed a vast treasure (including half-brothers on the mother's side), the palace housed a vast treasure of all this see MIRATH, (local Indo-Persian pronunciation farā'idiyya). Hādīdī Shari'ī Allāh was born at an uncertain date in a humble family in the pargana of Bandarkhola, a district of Faridpūr (eastern Bengal); when hardly 18 years old he went to Mecca, where he remained for a long time (about twenty years apparently) and is said to have been the pupil of Shāykh Tahir al-Asbār, a Shāfi'i scholar. The date of his return to Bengal varies in the different sources, which give it as 1807, 1822 or 1828, while certain writers affirm that he made two journeys to Mecca, returning home to his country in the interval. If we accept the latest date, it is unquestionable that Shari'at Allāh was in touch with the Wahhābī reformers in Mecca. A specific Wahhābī influence is in no sense indispensable for an understanding of the orientation of Shari'at Allāh's activities in Bengal, which are to be explained above all by the contrast he so vehemently resented between a certain type of Islam in his own country and the "Arab" Islam of the Prophet's native land; mutadis mutandis, other Muslim reformers in India (beginning with Shāh Wali Allāh of Delhi himself) had had the same experience. On returning to his native country,
Sharfī'at Allāh launched a reform movement which mainly attracted the lower classes of Muslims in Bengal, and in substance of a legal rather than mystical nature, shining with the widespread application of the sharfī'a so often spoken of in Islam, but so laxly applied. The very name of the movement (from *fārāḍīd* “religious duties”) underlines this aspect. To Western observers today, some of the reforms envisaged by Sharfī'at Allāh might seem to be of little interest; thus, besides various para-Hindu customs, he rejected the celebration, with funerary lamentations and special ceremonies, of the martyrdom of Husayn at Karbalā, the pomp and ceremonial that had been introduced into the very simple, austere rites of Muslim marriage and burial, the offering of fruit and flowers at tombs, etc.; moreover, he prohibited the use of the mystical terms *pīr* and *murīd* (“master” and “disciple”), which at that time conveyed an almost Brahmin-like implication of total devotion of the disciple to his spiritual master, out of keeping with the sturdy Islamic tradition, and instead proposing the two terms *ustādād* and *shāghīrd* (also Persian, but more “secular”); the initiation ceremony common to the various Muslim confederacies, the *bay'a*, was also prohibited and replaced by a simple statement of repentance (*tauba*) and a changed life made by the *pir* or *shāghīrd*. Another significant precept of Sharfī'at Allāh was the prohibition of various nocturnal prayers on Fridays or feastdays, based on the exclusion of British India from the *dar al-Isālm*. But Sharfī'at Allāh does not seem to have gone so far as to preach the *dhikr*, the holy war. His preoccupations, more concretely, were with the wretched condition of the oppressed Bengal peasants (especially as their lack of financial means prevented them from turning to the courts, which in certain cases could have given them justice). He tried to alleviate their miserable state by living among poor peasants as one of them and by making efforts to organize them to escape from the unjust demands of the land-owners, whom he revealed as transgressors of the pure holy law of Islam.

Sharfī'at Allāh's son Muhammad Muhsin, known as Dūdūh Mīyān (1819-60), had a more vigorous temperament, a talent for organizing and a natural authority; under his direction the Farā'idiyya became a homogeneous and disciplined organization with Dūdūh Mīyān himself at its head; by a curious violation of the founder's precept he was called *pīr*. The territory of eastern Bengal (especially the region of Bākgaradgī, Dacca, Farīdpūr and Fābana where the sect was most active) was divided into districts entrusted to special agents whose duty it was to make converts and to organize resistance to the rich proprietors. An especially effective and important measure was the prohibition made by Dūdūh Mīyān of recourse to the ordinary courts; disputes between the Farā'idiyya themselves had to be settled by him personally. Since in many cases the impossibility of the poor peasants securing justice sprang from their individual lack of resources, as has been said, “collections” were organized in order to aid the *sāmīndārs* in the courts in cases of injustice to peasants unable to defend themselves without help. In other words, the Farā'idiyya did not restrict themselves to upholding the beauty of the theoretical principles of “ancient” Islam, like “The earth is God's” (as Dūdūh Mīyān in fact used to proclaim), but, on the contrary, they took effective and practical steps toward putting them into practice. Since the taxes and forced labour imposed by landlords on peasants

were illegal from the point of view of the *shā'ī'a*, Dūdūh Mīyān advised landless peasants to leave the privately-owned estates and settle on the *makhāl*, that is, State property, thus avoiding all taxes other than those owed to the government. It is certain that, faced by a movement so efficiently organized, the rich *sāmīndārs* and indigo planters united and tried to destroy it. As in similar cases, two methods were used: firstly, they tried violence, both privately and officially (Dūdūh Mīyān was even prosecuted on charges, which were more or less pretexts, for piracy, etc.); numerous disturbances broke out in the areas controlled by the Farā'idiyya and the landowners resorted to barbarous tortures; secondly, on the strength of certain religious juridical statements by the Farā'idiyya, they tried to demonstrate their “heterodoxy” and at the same time, placing the discussions on a theoretical-religious basis, they tried to turn the Farā'idiyya aside from practical action. To a certain extent this second method became effective, while the Farā'idiyya lost the sympathy of some neutral Muslims of the neighbourhood (easily persuaded by the Muslim landowners) on account of the mistakes made by them and by Dūdūh Mīyān who, from Bahādūrpūr where he generally lived, “excommunicated” by declaring “non-Muslim” those who were not willing to accept all the doctrines of the sect. Disturbances became more and more serious and frequent and, in 1856, the enemies of the Farā'idiyya succeeded in having Dūdūh Mīyān sent to prison in Allīpūr. The movement continued to vegetate under the direction of Dūdūh Mīyān's sons, who were lacking in energy and whose qualities of organization were very inferior to those of their father. Dūdūh Mīyān died in 1860 and was buried in Bahādūrpūr, but a subsequent flood has left no trace of his tomb. The sect dwindled, to become one of the very many purely religious communities in India, while its social effectiveness was lost.

**Bibliography:** Abdul Bari, *The reform movement in Bengal*, in *A history of the freedom movement (being the story of Muslim struggle for the freedom of Hindo-Pakistan, 1797-1947)*, 1, Karachi 1957, 542 ff. (with copious bibliography). (A. Bausani)

**FARAS (A.)** (pl. *frās*, *furās*, *furān*) denotes the Horse (*Equus caballus*), in the sense of saddle-horse; philologists further restrict the meaning of the word to “saddle-horse of the Arabian breed”. This original name is applied to both sexes without distinction, and serves as a noun of unity for the collective of the species *khayyī* (*Equus*); hence this term is found in agreement with either gender, the feminine, however, seeming the more usual, in ancient Arabic (see Ch. Pellat, *Sur quelques noms d'animaux en arabe classique*, in *GLECS*, viii, 95-9). The word *faras*, pronounced *fras*, pl. *frāsāt*, with the meaning “thoroughbred horse”, has survived in the Bedouin dialects on the borders of the Sahara, whereas the Maghribi dialects only really recognise *hikān* (Tunisia) and *'awd* (Algeria, Morocco) to denote the horse (for the etymology of *'awd*, see Ph. Marquis, *Documents de dialectologie maghrébines*, in *AIEO-Alger*, vi (1947), 206-7). The immense interest taken by the Arabs in their breed of horses, both before and after Islam, and the considerable part which this animal played in Muslim expansion have endorsed the language with a great number of terms, many of them qualifying words, to complete all that *faras* left unspecified as to sex, origin, extrinsical peculiarities and temperament; from it sprang the philology of the
horse which, in amplitude, is in no way inferior to that of the camel. For example, to distinguish the sex, the pure-bred stallion (fabi) will be called khidr, that is to say "one who reserves his seed jealously", and the pedigree brood-mare (faraa) will be kahil, that is "forbidden to all comers", while the mare of mixed breed will be merely ramaka, that is "the offspring of misalliance". The age of an animal is determined by the stage of development of the teeth, as is the present practice; at birth the foal is called muhr, then, up to the year of age filâha = weaned, up to two years old, to three thanî, to four râbai, to five kârib, after which it becomes musdakhân for the rest of its life.

The origin of the so-called "Arabian" breed of horses has been the subject, in the written document-ation of the Arabs, of a multitude of traditions, from which we must exclude those of a purely religious character as well as works of natural history strongly influenced by Greek thought. Pre-Islamic poetry alone can provide some information on this subject, for it represents the least distorting medium for the oldest Arab traditions. Without hoping to find in these archaic poems any precise expositions on the subject, we can nevertheless glean from them the names of celebrated horses and great horsemen which can be tolerably well placed in history, and by means of a genealogy in its general outline, can supply the gaps in the genealogy of ancient families of Arabian horses. The first of these is said to have sprung up among the Azd in the Yemen and the Taghlib in Bahrain, descended from Zâd al-Râkıb (= "the horseman's vaticium"), a famous stallion given by king Solomon to the Azd's delegation on the occasion of their visit to that illustrious monarch and his celebrated stud (hijam). The mother of this sire was the sire al-'Ardwâdî, owned by Hudjir, king of Kinda who had emigrated from the Hadramawt in the 5th century B.C. to the borders of the Syrian desert. The son of this Hudjir is none other than the great poet Imru' al-Kays whose lines giving a description of his steed "with its fine-haired coat" (munsurud) in his classic Mu'allâba (lines 51 ff.) have remained unequalled, though, Of the seven other families of horses known to tradition, four are also connected with Zâd al-Râkıb. To one of these strains was attributed the stallion Dâbis, the fruit of an accidental mating of the noble pure-bred Dhu 'l-koshâl. This degrading origin caused Dâbis, as the outcome of a race, to become the cause of the famous war of Ghâṣafân which lasted for forty years; consequently his strain soon became extinct since it was thought to bring bad luck. Of the three remaining strains, one is purely Persian and the other two of forgotten origin. The story of Dâbis demonstrates the importance which the Arabs originally used to attach in the pedigree to the stallion, whilst after Islam the genealogy was traced through the mares; there is here a curious contra-diction.

With Islam, a new version of the facts comes to light; we now go back to Ismâ'il, to whom is attributed the domestication of the horse, the special gift of Allâh, though without omitting the episode of Solomon's stallion. Then we leap over the centuries of the Djihihîyya and start again with an authentic historical event, the breaching of the dam of Ma'rib, in the Yemen, which occurred in the middle of the 6th century A.D., to explain the origin of the Arabian breed. The flooding of the country is said to have driven the horse population into the desert where they became wild; five mares from these wandering herds were seen by the people of Najd and captured in a curious manner. Five lines of descent sprang from these five mares and one of their descendants, taken to Syria, in her turn bore five thoroughbred strains. From one of these the celebrated mare Kuhyalât al-'Âdâjûz became the eponym for every pure-blooded creature; the term kuhâyân, with its variations khabînâ, khubayl, and kâhîl, even now still denotes the thoroughbred Arab.

In reality, the greatest confusion reigns among the horse-breeds of Arabia and Syria on the matter of these "five strains" (al-kâhâl al-kham), in which they take such pride and to which they claim that their own stock is related. Inquiries undertaken in the interests of historical and scientific truth by trustworthy travellers like Niebuhr (1779), Burkhardt (1836), Blunt (1882), von Oppenheim (1900) and in particular Major Upton (1881) (see Bibl.) have not succeeded in establishing logical connexions between the statements of the various parties consulted; nor could it be otherwise, as the Bedouins have never kept any written pedigrees and entrust the recol-lection of their prized lines of descent to memory alone.

After the Kûrânic revelation, the victorious Muslims created a corpus of mythical traditions making the horse the chosen mount of Allâh, of the Prophet, of the warrior king and of the Prophet. Then emerged the multiplication of traditions bearing witness to the great prestige of the horse, attesting the animal's highly aristocratic origins: they owed their victorious expansion to that animal. Together with the angels' winged horses and those of king Solomon, and al-Burâk, the Prophet's celestial steed, the charger (dhâ'âd) of the warrior for the Faith (al-mudhâqâdî) became, on earth, a powerful agent for ensuring the final reward in the hereafter; that explains what solicitude and care the Muslim rider had to devote to his beast, which in times of shortage was often given precedence over his wife and family. Among certain tribes in Morocco, popular superstition even went so far as to make the horse a mascot and bringer of luck. On the other hand, the time has now long passed when the horse received so much attention from its master in Arabia; the ignignant testimony of all the investigators (see above) bears witness to this.

In the countries of the Near East we can still today find pedigrees (hujidîa) drawn up when there is a sale of horses, in the form of official deeds and attesting the animal's highly aristocratic origins: these are merely the inventions of horse-copers. But, like the medieval treatises on hippology, they betray a preoccupation with the classification of horses, according to the purity of their breeding, in four degrees; thus we have—(a) al-'arâbi or al-suhbî, the "thoroughbred", well-proportioned, of moderate size, and with a flat forehead; its parents are noble, and the belief is that the devil will not approach its owner; (b) al-haqîn or al-shâhârî, the "mixed breed", whose sire is better bred than the dam; (c) al-mubrîf, the "approacher", whose dam is of better breeding than the sire; (d) al-irkhamân, of common parentage: this is the draught-horse or pack-horse. According to the etymologists, it is from this term that the French have derived the words "bardot" or "bardeau" to describe the offspring of the union of the she-ass and the horse. The horse, other than the saddle-horse, is still called kahdi (in Persian kîshâd), or khârdîl, "bastard". A gelding (ghâ'î) can be a thoroughbred, but its sterility deprives it of all estimation in the eyes of the Muslims, the Prophet having disapproved of castration.

Leaving aside those Arab traditions which do not stand up to historical criticism, the origin of the
Arabian breed of horses has been the subject of extensive research by such discerning historians and mammalogists as Piétrement, Ridgeway, von Oppenheim and S. Reinach (see Bibl.), whose conclusions prove irrefutably the very recent character of this breed. Assyria and the Caspian region, long before Arabia, possessed horses very closely resembling the Egyptian and the Barb, and very clearly distinguished from the type of the steppes of central Asia and the Przewalski. Syria first of all became acquainted with this source, which must have been crossed with certain Libyan horses imported during the reigns of David and Solomon, while northern and central Arabia for many centuries remained unaware of the existence of this noble beast. Strabo, writing at the start of the Christian era, testified (Geography, XVI, 268, 284) to the absence of the horse from Arabia in his day. It was only later, in the 4th century, that the large migrations of tribes from southern Arabia towards Syria and ‘Iraq brought a new reinforcement to the horse population of those countries with the Dongola breed; the Yemen had for some centuries had the benefit of Ethiopian exports from this Egypto-Libyan source. From the contact of the two existing stocks, that of Syria-Palestine in the north and that of Naglī-Yemen in the south, both of them of Libyan origin, the Arabian type began to become fixed; the nomadic element, and in particular the tribe of ‘Anaza, by their seasonal migrations for pastureage in effect created a permanent link between the two centres. The great Islamic conquests in the 1st and 2nd/7th-8th centuries further increased the infusion of new blood, first Assyrian, later Caspian, into Arab breeding, horses being one of the forms of booty most highly prized by the Muslim warriors. Furthermore, their rapid advance in the west, with the occupation of the Maghrib, made them appreciate the excellence of the Barb horse and Berber cavalry, the inheritors of the reputation of the ancient Numidian cavalry; in them they found an inexhaustible source of supply for remounting their squadrons; in fact, in the view of Ibn Khallikan (K. Sifāt al-faras, K. Khābl al-faras, and K. Sifāt al-khayl, Paris 1953, 235-6), in prose, the number of works dealing with the horse would be well over a hundred had they all survived; there are frequent mentions of titles such as K. al-Faras, K. al-Khayl, K. Khābl al-faras, and K. Sifāt al-khayl in the lexicographers and encyclopaedists devoted to adab; Ibn al-Nadim, in his Fihrist, gives quite a long list of them. Of the various manuscripts of this sort preserved in the libraries, very few have been published, in view of the fact that many of them became lost or were destroyed. In all periods, the chief preoccupation of the writers of these treatises was to reproduce the terminology relating to the horse, very often at the cost of scientific reality. Moreover, the large place given in these works to superstitious interpretations of the physiognomy of the faras deprives them of what technical value one might wish to find in them; every anatomical detail, when considered from this angle, implies consequences either good or ill for the animal’s owner; in this attitude we can see the mark of the nomad, with his excessive credulity, and similarly in the curious nomenclature of the horse borrowed from the names of desert birds. It is sufficient to consult the classic K. Hilyat al-fursdn wa-shi^dr al-shud/fdn (M. G. de Slane, trans. M. G. de Slane, Paris-London 1843-71, iii. 476), we know that, in the 12th century, a dozen Berber cavalry who disembarked in Spain under the command of Tārik, there were only twelve Arab horses. The theory of the introduction of the Arab horse into the West by Islam is therefore no longer tenable since, on the contrary, it was on the Barb stock, of Libyan breed and perfectly unified, that the Muslims drew so constantly; they hastened to introduce a number of fine stallions to the Barb stock, of Libyan origin, the Arabian type being one of the forms of booty most highly prized by the Muslim warriors. The principles of rearing, teaching and training (tadmir, idmdr) specified in these writings and in general use among the Muslims are very often...
completely contrary to the nature of the horse and differ sharply from modern scientific methods; they served as "manuals of instruction" for the use of the warriors of the Caliph's cavalry squadrons [see FURUSIYYA].

Allah gradually lost the passion for the race-course, in proportion as the number of horses declined. The other Muslim countries have remained quite interested in racing, but the sport is at present governed by rules imported from the west, and the Anglo-Arab thoroughbred is everywhere supplanting its illustrious ancestors. We may add that, but for the judicious and praiseworthy intervention of English horsemen, the pure-bred Arabian would long since have been extinct.

To sum up, we may say that the horse reached its apogee, in the Near East, between the 5th and 1st centuries A.D., and that Arab horsemanship was in its prime. It is possible, in view of mediaeval Arabic literature on subjects concerning the horse regarded from the military viewpoint of military usefulness; they served as a basis for modern methods. But the lack of rational methods in breeding, on the one hand, and the replacement of the breed by new methods of breeding and selection by the Thoroughbred, on the other, have condemned the Arab cavalry to an inevitable decline. Those Bedouins who still ride horses today use only violent and cruel methods to breed them, and it is not unbelievable that the breed is declining at a rapid rate. It is not without reason that the Breton, gifted with rare qualities of intelligence; it must be realised that these horsemen are not and never will be as close to the horses as were their mediaeval ancestors. We may add that, but for the judicious and praiseworthy intervention of English horsemen and breeders, the breed of the pure-bred Arabian would have been extinct.


FARASAN (FARSAN), a group of islands in the Red Sea opposite Abū ‘Arish. They are not mentioned in the Periplus. In the Martyrology of St Arthes the Φαράσιον islands are said to have contributed seven
The name is tribal. According to Hamdani, the Banu Shuwa to the Christian expedition against the Yaman. The name is tribal. According to Hamdani, the Banu Shuwa was equally well received at Kufa (see Aghdni1, xix, 2, n f.). There is no doubt that it is from this time that al-Farazdak entertained pro-

Cawiya; Ali and Muawiya; Abu Numayy II seized them but was ejected by the Turks. According to Ovington "Farazdak" exported corn to Arabia and the inhabitants were employed by Banians in pearl mining. Despite Yamani claims the islands became part of Idrisi, and later, Saudi territory. Philby found a few troops there. They were visited by Ehrenberg and Hemphirch (1825), by Bové (1830-1), and later by oil geologists. Bibliography: J. Boissonade, Anecdota graeca, v, 44: Hamdani, Diwata, 23, 119; Yākūt, iii, 873-4; Albuquerque, Cartas, 1, 268; W. Foster, The Red Sea and adjacent countries, 178; Philby, Arabian Highlands, index. (C. F. BECKINGHAM)

AL-FARAZDAK, "the lump of dough", properly Tammān b. Ghālib (Abū Fīrās), famous Arab satirist and panegyrist, died at Basra about 110/728 or 112/730. Born in Yamama (Eastern Arabia) on a date which is uncertain (probably after 20/640), this poet was descended from the sub-tribe of Mudjashi of the Dārīm group of the Tamīl. His father, Ghālib [q.v.], is said to have played some part, in the Basra area, in the conflict between ʿAllī and Muʿawiyā; to this fact must be attributed the later idea that al-Farazdak entertained pro-ʿAlī sympathies which, however, are not very apparent in his works. The tale that verse does not seem to have been widespread in his family; however al-Farazdak, endowed with a prodigious memory and precocious talent, seems very soon to have made himself known in his tribe by laudatory and epigrammatic compositions in the Bedouin style. The accession of the Umayyad dynasty must have been a decisive factor in the career of the young poet, because of the choices to which it limited him. By the bonds of affinity as much as by obligation, al-Farazdak was first led to choose himself protectors in Yamama, then at Basra, amongst people more or less close to the fortunes of the family ruling in Syria. This attitude is particularly noticeable in the relations he maintained, for example, with the Banū Bakra, who were secretly flirting with the ʿAlīds, though supporting the Umayyads.

The satire attributed to al-Farazdak against the caliph Muʿawiyā, contrary to what Nallino maintains, is far from being definitely authentic. Nevertheless circumstances, fortuitous or contrived, must have affected his behaviour occasionally: it is known, for example, that al-Farazdak, as a result of some rather obscure proceedings, had to flee from ʿIrāk and seek refuge in Medina to escape the threat that Ziyad, the governor of Basra, laid upon his life (in 49/669). At Medina the poet was welcomed most warmly by the local authorities, and he remained in this town till 56/675-6; he then returned to ʿIrāk immediately after the death of Ziyad to attach himself to the latter's son, ʿUbayd Allāh. In 67/686, the panegyrist confirmed his attachment to the Umayyad branch of the Marwānid which was in power, by celebrating prince Bishr, who had come to ʿIrāk, and his brother ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, whose praises he sang in a threnody in 85/790 (Dīwān, ed. Šāwī, 225 ff.). There is no doubt that under the governorship of al-Ḥādīdī [q.v.], probably because of the intrigues of his enemy Djarīr, who was in the good graces of this powerful personage, al-Farazdak was less in disgrace. Nevertheless he dedicated a number of laudatory poems to al-Ḥādīdī and to some members of his family. Perhaps his delicate position in relation to the governor of ʿIrāk prevented al-Farazdak from obtaining the protection of the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik and it is to be noted that no ode was addressed by him to this ruler. On the other hand, under Wazlī, al-Farazdak was the official poet of the caliph, as witness numerous panegyrics dedicated to him and to his two sons. Under Sulaymān he enjoyed the same favour. It was otherwise on the accession of ʿUmar II in 99/717, when al-Farazdak was rather in the shade. However, the insurrection of Yazīd b. al-Muhallab gave the poet the chance to recover favour and, under the caliph Yazīd II, he violently attacked the rebel whom he had celebrated several years before, at the time of his power (see the panegyrics to Yazīd II and to Maslama, dated 101/720 and 102/720-1 in Dīwān, 262-7 and 201). At this time, al-Farazdak, who was eighty years old, hardly ever left Basra. Caught up in the whirlwind of conflicts between the "Yemeni" and ʿAyṣāf factions, he experienced many difficulties with governors of Arabia who belonged to one or other of them. Twice he was thrown into prison because of this, but succeeded in getting out thanks to local support.

In his career, struggles against rivals occupied a prominent place. Political attitudes, notably attachment to the "Yemeni" or the ʿAyṣāf faction, provoked or aggravated these enmities. In the background one can also sense some tribal partisanship. This is the reason for the implacable hostility nursed by al-Farazdak for Djarīr, also a Tamīl, but of another branch. There is no doubt that the contents between these two rivals have been a fruitful source for anecdotal literature (as one can ascertain from Kūūb al-ghānī, viii, 32-7). Moreover, it is certain that this opposition inspired al-Farazdak—and his enemy likewise—with the poems which most clearly characterize his work. These diatribes should not however, allow us to forget those other relationships, of a different kind, maintained with al-Abwās [q.v.], at Medina, with the "reader"-grammarians Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ [q.v.], or with al-Ḥasan al- Баsīr (cf. Aghdānī, xix, 14).

Al-Farazdak seems to have been too unusual a figure not to have stimulated the imagination of the "logographers" who interested themselves in him. In the biographical facts we have, there often comes to light a tendency to exaggerate the eccentricities of his personality, to accentuate his cowardice, bawdiness, drunkenness, and venality. This harsh approach is in fact of little concern because it does not touch on the essentials. What is important in reality is to discover in al-Farazdak the traits which are of relevance for the panegyrist, the satirist, and the representative of a generation torn between bedouin culture and the new ethics. On these lines might be explained certain traits of his character, his recantations and his final impotence, all to be found echoed in his poetry.

The greater part of his poetry has survived, because of Tamīl particularism on the one hand, and also because of the favour al-Farazdak still retained in learned circles in Basra. After an oral transmission about which we have few facts, his poetry was equally well received at Kūfa (see Aghdānī, xix, 2, 3 ff.).

There is no doubt that it is from this time that al-
Farazdak, along with Djärlr and al-Akhtal [q.v.], becomes one of a trio who for several centuries furnished his own lifetime, al-Farazdak did not hesitate to adopt the verses of his contemporaries (cf. Ibn Saläm, 126 and Aghânî1, ii, 266-7, vii, 96); there is also reason to doubt the authenticity of many of the poems which appear in al-Sukkarî's recension in the 3rd/9th century. The Dlwdn, in Sâwi's edition, numbers about 7,630 verses, which is the largest total that is known in the whole of Arabic poetry. His work is presented in the form of fragments or complete poems of 20 to 30 verses, rarely more. Many poems are in kasîda form. With al-Farazdak this form had a tripartite structure with a short nasîb (e.g., Dlwdn, ed. Sâwi, 7, 8, 74-6, etc.), but usually—and this is remarkable—this elegiac prelude is omitted (so ibid., 84-7, 99 f., 228-33 etc.), and very frequently the kasîda is reduced to the laudatory elements alone (so ibid., 57-9, 63-7, 70-1, 99-101, 109-14, etc.). The thematic sequence in the kasîda with nasîb often anticipates the sequence which imposed itself on the "classical" theoreticians (so ibid., 219-24, 302-8 etc.). Too often the thronoid form is difficult to find in this poet, but we have a good specimen of it in the threnody composed on Bishr (ibid., 268-70). The various types of poem are unequally represented in al-Farazdak. He omitted the laudatory themes made up of the traditional stereotypes, among which should be pointed out the traditional theme of the greatness as caliph and the religious value of the Caliph-Imâm (so ibid., 63-7, 89-92 lines 12 ff., 219-24 lines 18 ff. etc.). Naturally enough, tribal and personal fâhûr is frequent in this poet. Like his contemporaries, al-Farazdak treated the epigram in short impromptus or developed it as a thematic element in a kasîda. In this latter case he obtains an effect of contrast with the laudatory elements (so ibid., 115-23 where the glories of the Dâirim are contrasted with the "shames" of the Kulaib, Djârlr's tribe). In al-Farazdak, more than in his contemporaries, the satirical genre has a rare vigour and obscurity (e.g., the parody directed against al-Tirimmah, in Dlwdn, 155-7). The poet, who probably, poorly represented in this panegyrist and satirist, is of a distressing banality, and the Islamic ethic has in no way enriched in depth a spirit completely impregnated with Bedouin culture. Sometimes, however, the poet seems to have been able to strike a moving tone, in lamentation, for example, the death of a child (so Dlwdn, 764 and Aghânî1, xix, 12-3). It is worth noting that, dissolute as al-Farazdak is supposed to have been, he did not to all intents and purposes write in the Bacchic genre (cf. Ibn Kutayba, 294). Likewise this epicurean hardly felt the need to celebrate his loves, and the ode composed on a gallant adventure confirms this deficiency in his sensibility (ibid., 253-62). Similarly in the fragments, in any case suspect, on his separation from his wife Nawâr, the poet is without deep emotion and reduced to repeating banal formulas (see Aghânî1, xix, 9).

The language and style of the works ascribed to al-Farazdak are of a remarkable homogeneity: very rarely does one find a laboured effect due to the use of rare terms or hâfûs legomena. In this poet as in his contemporaries of the 'Irâkî tribe, the only five current metres are employed; nadîâ is employed only sporadically. From this point of view, his work is well worth attention, in the sense that it enables us to assess the prosodic resources available in this epoch to a poet dependent on the Tamiîl tradition.

Put beside the poetry of Djârlr, it is thoroughly representative of the poetry of the great nomads of Eastern Arabia at its height, at the very moment when, in contact with the big 'Irâkî cities, it was to yield before new influences.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Salâm, Tabâhî, index; Ibn Kutayba, Sâwi, index; Aghânî1, i, 116, 148-9, vii, index and especially 33-8, 44-5, xv, 441-7, and Aghânî1, xix, 1-61; Âmidî, 166 and index; Marzubânî, Mu'âlîm, ed. Krenkow, 272, 477, 466-7; idem, Muwâdahâh, index; Ibn Khallîkân, Wajfâyûl, Cairo 1310, ii, 15202; Baghdadî, Khizâdîn, Cairo 1347, 1, 202-7 (summarizes or quotes Ibn Kutayba and Aghânî1). The 'Irâkî anthropologists and others have frequently quoted or mentioned al-Farazdak, see esp.: Djâhi, Bayâm, index; Ibn Kutayba, 'Uyûn, index; Ibn 'Abd Rabbîh, 'Ibûd, Cairo 1359/1940, index (72 mentions and quotations); Kurâshî, Djanâhî, 336-44. Edition of the Dlwdn by Sukkarî (see Fihrist, 158, i. 27-8); for the manuscripts of the Dlwdn, see Brockelmann, i, 56, 1, 85; Muh. b. Habîb, Nasâbî'd Djârlr wa'I-Farazdak, ed. Bevan, passim; editions of the Dlwdn by R. Boucher, Divan de Farazdak, récit de Muh. b. Habîb, Paris 1870 (1st part, 270 nos.) and by J. Hell, photolithographic ed., Munich-Leipzig 1900-1 (2nd part); note also other editions of the earlier and later period (e.g., Cairo 1293, very defective); another edition by Sâwi, Sharh Divan al-Farazdak, Cairo 1354/ 1356 (782 poems and fragments, amounting to about 7650 verses; besides the fragments and short pieces, it includes about 80 long satires, 94 panegyrics, 24 threnodies, often brief; it is an uncritical and mediocre edition, with glosses often of slight importance; there is no indication how the known ones were utilised; it seems to reproduce Boucher and Hell, but it has the advantage that it adds the text of the Nasâbî'd; a partial French translation by Boucher (Paris 1870-5); and by Hell (Leipzig 1902: trans. of the panegyric to Walîd II), also idem, in ZDGM, lix (1905), 595-600 and lix, 1-55; on the Muhallabîds, cf. Rosen in Zaspitskî, index; Litt., xxiv, 1900; there is no indication in this mgc, Lxxiii (1919), 80-5 and Krenkow in Islamica, ii, 344-54. Notes and studies: Caussin de Perceval, Notice sur ... al-Farazdak, in JA, xiiii (1834), 507-52; Hell, Einleitung über das Leben des Farazdak, Leipzig 1902; Lammens, Etudes sur le règne du Calife omayyade Mo'awia I", in MFOB, iii (1908), 145 ff. (= 295-44 of the offprint); Nallino, Littérature arabe, index; Blachère, Litt., III, 3rd part, chap. I, section C.

(R. Blachère)

**FARD** (adj.), can be taken as a substan., pl. afrâd, used of the individual, and so with the meanings of only, solitary, unique, incomparable; the half, that is to say one of a pair or couple (pl. firdûd, Kûmût root fr.d); and other derivative meanings. The word has been used to denote Allah, as the single Being who has no parallel: al-fard fi sifât Allah (al-Layth, Lisân, iv, 327f, iii, 331a), but it does not occur in the Kur'ân or in hadîth as an epithet of Allah. It is for that reason that al-Azhâr (ibid.) found fault with this usage. There is every reason for believing that al-fard was at that time simply used as an equivalent of ahd, in accordance with the verse huwa'lladhâ hâd (Kur'ân, CXI, 1) "Oo so résume le dogme de l'unicité divine", as R. Blachère said (Le Coran, Paris 1940, ii, 123). In addition, al-fard serves as a technical term in different sciences: (a) in poetry it denotes a line of verse taken in isolation...
FARD — FARGHĀNĀ

(intact or reduced to a single hemistich); (b) in lexicography, the afrḍd are the words handed down by a single lexicographer (see al-Suyūṭī, Mushwrī, ch. v, distinct from ḥaṭaddīb, ibid., ch. 15); (c) in grammar, al-fard has been said to signify “the singular” by de Sacy (Gr. Ar. 5, i, 149), Fleischer (Kleine Schriften, i, 97), Wright (Ar. Gr. 3, i, 52B). This can only be a recent or exceptional meaning of the word, which should be dropped and replaced by the traditional terms al-wḍīd or (more often used today) al-mufrad;

(d) in the science of ḥadīth, fard is synonymous with gharīb mutlaq: a tradition in which the second link of the chain of those who have transmitted it is only represented by a single tābī; (e) in astronomy, al-fard denotes the star αHydra (al-ṣuṭād), and hence the most brilliant (idea of isolation);

(f) in arithmetic, al-ʿadad al-fard is “the odd number” (from 3 upwards, inclusive), as opposed to al-ʿadad al-zawdi “even number” (al-Kh. al-ʿadad al-zawdi, w. 111, 114, lines 8-12); (g) for theologians and philosophers, al-fard denotes the species, as restricted by the bond of individuation.

Bibliography: in the text; see also Taḥānawī, Dictionary of technical terms, ii, 1087, 1107, 1178 foot and 1179; Lane, Lexicon, s.v.

(H. Fleisch)

AL-FARD [see NUDĪM]

FARD (A), also farḍa, literally “something which has been apportioned, or made obligatory”, and as a technical term, a religious duty or obligation, the omission of which will be punished and the performance of which will be rewarded. It is one of the so-called al-ʿakhām al-ḥamsa, the “five qualifications” by which every act of man is qualified in religious law [see ʿAḴMĀ]. A synonym is ṭawḍīb. The Ḥanafi school makes a distinction between fard and ṭawḍīb, applying the first term to those religious duties which are explicitly mentioned in the proof texts (Kūrān and sunna) as such, or based on ṭājmūd, and the second to those the obligatory character of which has been deduced by reasoning. This distinction is not made by the other schools, and as a norm for action fard and ṭawḍīb are equally binding. Individual duties (fardʿāyin), such as ritual prayer, fasting, etc., and the collective duty (fard ḥifāya), the fulfilment of which by a sufficient number of individuals excuses the other individuals from fulfilling it, such as funeral prayer, holy war, etc.

Bibliography: Taḥānawī, Dictionary of technical terms, 1124 ff., 1144-5; N. P. Aghnides, Mohammedan theories of finance, New York 1916, 112 ff.; Santillana, Istituzioni, i, 57 ff. See also FURDA.

(TH. W. JÜYNEBOLL)

FARGHĀNĀ, Fergānā, a valley on the middle Jaxartes (Sr-Daryā), approximately 300 km. long and 70 km. wide, surrounded by parts of the Tian-shan mountains: the Čatkal range (Ar. Diādgahal, up to 3,000 m. high) on the north, the Fergānā mountains (up to 4,000 m.) on the east, and the Alai mountains (up to 1,000 m.) on the south. The only approach (7 km. wide) accessible in all seasons is in the west, at the point where the Jaxartes leaves the valley and where the trade-route (and since 1899 the railway from Samarkand to Ťash) enters it. The Farghānā valley covers approximately 23,000 km.2; the irrigated land (9,000 km.2) has increased during the last decades, owing to the constant extension of irrigation. The interior of the area consists of a desert.

The Farghānā valley has always been fairly densely populated since the earliest irruption of Islam, and even in pre-Islamic times, according to Chinese sources. As a consequence, the indigenous population has been able to withstand the Turks, who have pressed in repeatedly ever since early Islamic times; thus the Turks have only settled in one part of the district (cf. the present political distribution below). Since the end of the nineteenth century the Russians have also settled almost exclusively in the towns, leaving the agricultural areas in the hands of the indigenous population.

Evidently Farghānā became known to the Chinese in 122 B.C., from the description of an envoy who had travelled through it. But the connexion of the Chinese accounts with individual areas or persons cannot be established with any certainty. After the spread of the second (western) Kūk-Turkish kingdom Farghānā was exposed to Turkish attacks and, after continued fighting between 627 and 649 A.D., came under Turkish dominion. A Turkish prince took up residence in Kāsān (Chinese K'ū-tai), the capital of that time. After the overthrow of the first west-Turkish kingdom by the Chinese, in 657, the whole district was governed from Kānān by a Chinese governor. The indigenous Iranian dynasty, whose influence had for some time been weakened by a succession of local princes (as reported by the Chinese envoy Hsian-tsang in 630), was evidently supplanted by a Turkish ruling family, after the elimination of Chinese rule in about 680. In 739 Arslan Khān is mentioned as ruler of Farghānā.

An Arab-Muslim advance into Farghānā, alleged to have taken place in the time of the Caliph 'Uthmān under the leadership of Muhammad b. Djarīr, who is said to have fallen at Safīd Bulān at the head of 2700 warriors (according to Djamāl Kargar apud Barthold, Turkestan, 160), certainly belongs to the realm of legend. The legend formed the basis for a Persian folk-tale (said to have been translated from Arabic) which later spread throughout Central Asia, and was finally translated into Turkish (cf. Protokol Turkest. Kırška Lyubilele Arkeologi, iv, 149 f.).

In fact the Muslim invasion of Farghānā is connected with the occupation of Transoxania by Kutya-b. Muslim [q.v.]. He first advanced into the country in 94/712-3 and attempted a revolt from there against the Caliph in 96/715, but was killed by his own soldiers (Tabari, ii, 1256 ff., 1275-81; S. G. Klyashtorny, Iz istorii bor'il narodov Sredney Azii protiv arabov [Remarks on the history of the struggle of the peoples of Central Asia against the Arabs], in Epigrapha Vostoka, ix (1954), 55-64; this treats mainly of the events of 712). Kutya-b.'s grave is still pointed out today close to the village of Djalāl Kuduk, near Andīṣan (Protokol, iii, 4). This revolt and the battles which followed in Persia in the next decades, finally leading to the downfall of the Umayyads in 749-50, prevented for some time the consolidation of Arab-Islamic rule over Farghānā. The Muslims apparently had to leave the country again and in 103/721-2 the indigenous Sogdian prince was able to recall and resettle in part of his country those Sogdians who had migrated further eastwards to avoid the summons to adopt Islam (Spuler, Iran, 37, 254 f.). At that time the local nobility (gentry: Dīkhāns [q.v.]) played the leading rôle in Farghānā, as in the rest of Transoxania. The local prince also bore this title before that of Ikhshīdī (cf. Nūqūrdīs, and Ol'ga I. Smirnova, Sogdīyskie monety kak nostnātstvo dnyi istorii Sredney Azii [Sogdian coins as a
new source for the history of Central Asia], in Sovetskoe Vostokovedenie, vi (1949), 356-67; further, A. Yu Yakubovskiy [ed.]: Trudy sogdiansko-te⽅shiyskoy ekspe-

dtii, [Works of the Sogdian-Tadik expedition . . .], i, Moscow-Leningrad 1930, 224-31; further as sources: al-Baladhi, Futak, 420; al-Tabari, ii, 1442, 2142; al-Hudud al-Islam, ed. Minorsky, 115-17, 355; idem in BSOAS, xv/i (1955), 265.—In the year 121/739 the Arabs were once more able to send a governor to Farghana (al-Tabari, i, 1694), but there was still continued opposition to Islam, especially as the permanence of Arab rule had again been put in doubt by the advance of Chinese armies into Western Central Asia as far as Transoxania, between 745 and 751 (cf. Spuler, Iran, 302 and the sources and studies given there). An envoy sent to the Caliph al-

Manṣūr by the local prince, who had evidently fled to Kāḥshahr, was held prisoner for a long time owing to his refusal to adopt Islam (Yaḵūbī, i, 645). The Caliphs al-Mahdi, Hārūn al-Raṣīd (175/6-791), and al-Maṭrūn were also forced to send troops to Farghana to overcome the opposition to Islam and Arab rule (Yaḵūbī, ii, 465 f.; Gardēš, 19; further Spuler, Iran, 31 f.).—The only inclusion of Farghana in the dominions of the Šamānids [q.v.] in approximately 205/820-1, under the administration of the governor Nūh b. Asad (d. 227/841-2), opened the last chapter of Karakhoj, Yaḵūbī, 420, Geogr., 204, al-Yaḵūbī, ii, 478; al-Tabari, ii, 1257), the centre of administration, and Ürast. The indigenous dynasty had in the meantime disappeared. From then on, the inhabitants of Farghana supplied soldiers for the guards of the Caliph al-Mu탈ašīm (218/833-42: al-Baladhi, 431; Spuler, Iran, 137, 185, fn. 8). They thereby strengthened the influence of the Khwarizm (al-Tabari, ii, 1694), but the indigenous dynasty, which from now on increased considerably under the Šamānids. Farghana in the time of the Šamānids has been amply described by Arab geographers. At that time a change in the economic importance of the several parts of the country appears to have taken place. According to Ibn Khurraḍaḵbih, 30, the road leading into the country from the west crossed the country in the Khānd (q.v.), now Lenina, and continued to Akhsikat (q.v.), along the right bank, then to Kūbā, Šah and Özkānd (Üzgānd) along the left bank. Al-Ṯaṣkhirī, 335, on the other hand considers the road running south of the river to be the main one and lists several populated places along it; only a secondary road led to Aḵṣhikāl at that time. The Farghana valley then formed the frontier district against the (still unconquered) Turks, who had recently been driven back north-eastwards in several places. There were strong garrisons in Šah and some neighbouring forts, used as observation posts against them. Aḵṣhikāl (al-Ṯaṣkhirī, 333) was the capital at that time, a position it held as early as the middle of the seventh century, according to Chinese reports and al-Baladhi, Futak, ed. de Goeje, 420). On the other hand Kūbā is designated as larger, and as the actual capital of the country by al-Mukaddas, 272, though its period of prosperity was certainly short.—In the tenth century Farghana was divided into three provinces and many administrative districts, which are listed by the geographers. They stress the fact that the villages of the country were bigger than elsewhere in Transoxania and occasionally exceeded the length of a day’s journey. Islam (of the Hanafi school of law) had already set itself successfully in the meantime, and converts (Ḵānḵāh) of the Karrāmiyā (q.v.) are also mentioned by al-

Mukaddas, 323. Nothing else is reported about adherents of other religions, such as Christians, Manicheans and Zoroastrians. Nevertheless an Arabic inscription dating from 433/1041-2 was discovered in the gorge at Wārōghāk (in the south), showing a Sassanian and Christian (rāmī) date beside the Muslim one (Protokoll, viii, 46 f.). A further Arabic inscription (without this peculiarity in the dating) from the year 399/940-1 was found in Šah in 1855 (Ost. Imp. Akhīb. Komissii za 1882-

1888 godih, p. LXXIII). Buildings from Šamānids times, on the other hand, have evidently not been preserved. The mountain ranges surrounding the valley supplied gold, silver and coal (already then used for heating), al-Istakhri, 334, and furthermore petroleum, iron, copper, lead, turquoise, sal ammoniac and a medicament called Kū’ilkān (cf. BDG, iv, 344; parti-
culars in Spuler, Iran, 387, 399, with sources, especially al-Muḵaddas, 326; Ibn ῾Awhak, 384). Turkish slaves, iron and copper, swords and armour as well as textiles were exported from Farghana and Istāḏ (Ḥudud al-Islam, 116; Spuler, Iran, 407 f.). Judging by the growth in revenue the country’s prosperity increased greatly in Šamānids times. According to Ibn Khurraḍaḵbih, 38, it amounted to 280,000 dirhems; Ibn ῾Awhak, 470, writing about 130 years later, in 977, puts it already at one million (Spuler, Iran, 407 f.).—After the collapse of the Šamānids state in 389/999, Farghana came under the dominion of the Karakhoj (q.v.) and thus of the ruling dynasty of the Ilīq-Ḵāns or Karakhanids (q.v.). Özkānd (q.v.), where twelfth-century buildings and tomb-stones are still preserved, now became the centre of administration. It was there that most coins were minted (often bearing the province name under the dominion of the Gūrkhāns) but other minting-places also occur. The whole of Transoxania was originally administered from Özkānd. After the divisions which soon took place within the Karakhanid dynasty (cf. O. Pritsak, in Iš, xxxvi (1953), 17-68), the princes of Farghana settled in Özkānd, where they witheld a Salṭik advance in the years 482/1090-9. In 536/1141 Farghana came under the dominion of the Gūrkhāns (q.v.) of the Karakhtīyā (q.v.), but the indigenous dynasty was still tolerated, as elsewhere within this state. Until 560/1165-79, this dynasty seems also to have ruled over Šamārḵānd, which later again came under the rule of a separate branch of the Karakhanids. From 1212 to 1218 Farghana was disputed between the Khīrḵānḵā Muhammad II (q.v.) and first the Nāyman prince Kūlīgīn, who had fled westwards, then the Mongols; with the sub-

}
at different times, up to the time of Timur. As Farghana belonged to Mogholistan during the greater part of this struggle, its administration shared certain aspects of the 'Germanic' tradition of the Turco-Mongols; the tax districts in both countries were called Urtin, not Tumän (Mongolian түмэн: unit of ten thousand) as in the rest of Transoxania.

Under the Timurids (q.v.) Farghana mostly belonged to Khusrušān (i.e., to the dominion of Shahrūkh (q.v.) and his son Ulugh Beg (q.v.) and from 873-99/1469-94 had its own ruler in ‘Umar Shahrūkh (q.v.), a great-grandson of Timur. He was succeeded by his son Bābur, who from Farghana moved against the intruding Shāybanids (q.v.) and advanced as far as Samarḵand; but in 909/1504, after frequent battles he saw himself forced to surrender Farghana, and finally fled altogether to India (for details see Bābur). It is to him that we owe a more exact description of Farghana at a time when power-relations in Central Asia were undergoing a decisive change, through the fall of the Timurids, the advance of the Shāybanids at the head of the Šīfī Saʿāvids (q.v.) as well as the establishment of the Šīfī Saʿāvids (q.v.) in Persia. At that time there were nine larger towns in Farghana, to which Bābur also adds Khojašān. Khojašān, the later capital, was only a village at the time. The capital was Andīzān, which was already completely Turkicized. (According to H. de G. Boer, it was here that Caghatay, raised to a literary language by ‘Aṭī Shīr Nawawī, was spoken). Marghānān was then still Iranian.—At the time of Bābur there were numerous orchards and gardens in Farghana and various kinds of wood used for making quivers, bird-cages and similar articles; also a reddish-white stone, discovered in about 1492 and used for making knife-handles and articles of that kind. Iron and turquoise (q.v.) were obtained from the mines; but Bābur makes no mention of coal-mining or the manufacture of weapons, two formerly important branches of the economy. According to his estimate the country was only sufficiently rich to support an army of 5,000 men.

After the final expulsion of the Timurids, Farghana belonged to the Šīfī Saʿāvid state of the Shāybanids; Andīzān was taken by the sea in a local dispute over Agra (i.e., the mine) which gave its name to the whole valley (cf. Māhmod ibn Wall, Bahār al-asrār, MS India Office 575, fol. 102b). After the collapse of the Shāybanids state in 1598-9, several Khoja families divided the country up among themselves. They lived within the nominal dependency of Būghār, in Čadak, north of the Jaxartes, and had to submit to a number of arrangements with the Kuzaks and Kurgiz, who repeatedly pressed into the valleys of the mountains surrounding Farghana. In 1121/709-10 the Farghana valley became a separate Šīfī Saʿāvid Khanate under Shahrūkh Bi (Mullā Niyāz Muḥammad, Taʾrīḵ-i Shahrūkhī, ed. N. N. Pantusov, Kazan 1885, 21; cf. Ivanov, 178-214). From then until 1876 the Farghana valley was the centre of the Khanate of Khojašān (q.v. for details about the name and history of the town).

In 1876 the Khojašān was annexed by the Russians: and became the centre of the "Farghana district" (Ferganskaia Oblast'?), an area of 160,141 km² (according to Brockhaus-Efron) with 5,160,411 inhabitants (in 1897). The seat of the military government was the town New Margelan, founded by the Russians, called Skobelev from 1907-24, and subsequently Farghana (pop., 1931, approx. 50,000) and still today the centre of administration of the "Farghana Oblast'", an area of approximately 720,000 inhabitants (in 1951). The towns of Khokhand and Nangamān were, however, considerably larger and of greater economic importance (Khokhand had approximately 115,000 inhabitants in 1912; and Nangamān 70,000; in 1951, in contrast, approximately 93,000 and 115,000 respectively).

The Russians forthwith raised Farghana's cotton-production considerably, introduced new American kinds of cotton and made Farghana (as Central Asia generally) one of their main providers of cotton and silk. The most important source of uranium of the Soviet Union is also situated in the Farghana valley (especially near Kizyl-Yuning); petroleum and coal are also extracted.—The ancient system of irrigation has been expanded and improved and, as the "Farghana system", it has gained significance for the entire irrigation economy of the USSR: construction of the great Farghana canal in 1939; Farhat dam on the Jaxartes.—The sudden economic advance caused an inflation which led to a revolt in 1898. From 1916 to 1922 Farghana was involved in the fighting between the indigenous Turkish Basmachi associations and the Russians, and later the Bolsheviks. After the October revolution the Farghana valley was no longer a single administrative unit. Instead the central and eastern areas—essentially according to the nature of the majority of the population—were handed over to the Uzbekistan republic, and the west to Tajikistan. The knowledge of Farghana valley belong for the most part, however, to Kirgizistan: this division demonstrates the result of the gradual advance of Turkish tribes into this area and, since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, into the mountains, as well as the retreat of the Iranians. This political organization has had no significance for the development of the valley's economy or system of communication. The knowledge of Russian has increased greatly in the last decades among the indigenous population, but without supplanting the indigenous languages.


Islamic period: Barthold, Turkestân, 155-65, 186-202 and index; idem, Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türkischen Mittelastas, Berlin 1935; idem, Four Studies, ed. V. Minorsky, i, Leiden 1956; idem, Die Geschichte der Turken Mittelasiens, Berlin 1935; idem, Wiesbaden 1952, index; P. P. Ivanov, Oletki po istorii Sredney Asii (Sketches in the history of Central Asia), Moscow 1958, passim, especially 178-213.


he went to Egypt where his son, it seems, was born, and he and his family remained there. He wrote a continuation of al-Tabari’s historical work, entitled al-Ši’a or al-Mu’tadidiyya, a text which has not survived. Both works are known only from quotations in the works of other historians, though it has been suggested that a papyrus leaf containing the account of a battle from the reign of al-Muktafi may derive from the Śi’a; they were probably much more widely used than extant manuscripts under their names indicate. The younger Farghani also wrote biographies of Kāfār al-Khusdī and the Fātimid al-Aziz, both of which, unfortunately, have been lost along with most of the historical literature written under the Fātimids.


Farḥād wa-Shirīn [see Ferdād wa-Shirīn]

Farḥād wa-Shirīn. A. Christensen (Sassanides, 469 and index) has collected together the information relating to Shirin (Pehlavi ‘the victorious’, 590-628). Moreover Christensen (Gesta, 116-9) has noted certain features in the Persica of Cesias in which he sees elements which helped to form the legend of Farhād and Shirīn—Semiramis creating a garden near Mount Bagistanon (Bisutun), having a way cut through the Zagros mountains to allow for the passage of a canal, and having a royal castle built for her own use.

After the occupation of Iran by the Arabs, the first text in their language to mention Shirin and Farhād (Pehlavi Frahadār) became the subject of a series of romances in verse, in Persian, Turkish (see below) and Kurdish (Duda, 3, n. 7 and 8). Moreover Christensen (Gesta, 116-9) has noted certain features in the Persica of Cesias in which he sees elements which helped to form the legend of Farhād and Shirīn—Semiramis creating a garden near Mount Bagistanon (Bisutun), having a way cut through the Zagros mountains to allow for the passage of a canal, and having a royal castle built for her own use.

After the occupation of Iran by the Arabs, the first text in their language to mention Shirin and her lovers is the Chronicle of al-Tabari; in its Persian adaptation by Balʿami, we read: “Shirin was loved by Farhād whom Parvīz punished by sending him to prison (Gestes, 116-9).” Moreover Christensen (Gesta, 116-9) has noted certain features in the Persica of Cesias in which he sees elements which helped to form the legend of Farhād and Shirīn—Semiramis creating a garden near Mount Bagistanon (Bisutun), having a way cut through the Zagros mountains to allow for the passage of a canal, and having a royal castle built for her own use.
built for her, named Kasr-i Shirin [q.v.]. In the Persian language Firdawsi, when writing the history in verse of the reign of Khusraw, tells briefly at the appropriate point, the relations with Shirin, though without giving them in his epic the importance which they were later to assume in the eyes of other poets: Parviz had parted from this childhood friend; meeting her again while hunting, he took her to the palace and decided to marry her, in spite of powerful opposition; then Shirin poisoned her rival Maryam whose son Shiruya was cast into prison; some time afterwards, released him and proclaimed him king, while Parviz was held prisoner in his palace, only accepting food prepared by Shirin; the leaders had him stabbed to death. Later, Firdawsi gave reign to his imagination: Shirin, on Shiruya's orders, consented to appear before an assembly of the nobility; she justified herself in respect of all the accusations brought against her, returned to her palace, made her final dispositions, asked Shiruya for permission to see Khusraw once more, in his tomb, and there she took a violent poison and died at his side.

It was Nizami who, in his Khusraw wa-Shirin (completed in 576/1280), created the romance of Farhad and Shirin, a notable part of this vast poem, from which it can be detached to form a complete work in itself. It would be superfluous to analyse the contents of this and the following poems, which have been studied by H. W. Duda; but a brief analysis of this romance, from which all the others are derived, is indispensable (leaving aside the first part): Shirin wishes to construct a canal; Farhad is assigned to dig it, Farhad came across a vein of gold; Farhad brought before him and, finding his passion unshaken, gives him orders to cut a way through the mountains to keep him away from Shirin; but when digging a tunnel, Farhad came across a vein of precious stones; he managed to escape and was then recaptured. The inspiration of Wahshi, in his Farhad and Shirin (966/1558-9, completed by Wisal, 1265/1848-9), some details of which were taken from Amr Khusraw Dihlawi, is lyrical rather than narrative: the sentimental incidents are in later respects reminiscent of the inspirations of Western poets of love and chivalry. In the short Farhad and Shirin (about 400 lines of verse) of Urif (d. about 1390), which is even more lyrical than the work of Wahshi, the hymn to the beauty of nature and the meditation on the diverse emotions of love form the essential parts of this poem in which sentiment is personified by Shirin, the author refraining from repeating the legend itself which he assumes will already be familiar to the reader. Finally, in 1920 Dhabbeh Behruz published the script of a film "The king of Iran and the Armenian princess".

Bibliography: Faruk K. Timurtsa, Iran edebiyyatinin ve Farhad ve Farhad-ndme: Harimi (Prince of China, an exile who has become an artist; after his death, the leaders had him stabbed to death. Later, the troops mutinied, released him and proclaimed him king, only accepting food prepared by Shirin; the poems of Farhad and Shirin are a notable part of this vast poem, from which it can be detached to form a complete work in itself. The poet Amir Khusraw Dihlawi is the author of this romance, which has been studied by H. W. Duda; but a brief analysis of this romance, from which all the others are derived, is indispensable (leaving aside the first part): Shirin wishes to construct a canal; Farhad is assigned to dig it, but one day, visiting Kari Shirin on the pretext of hunting, the king meets Shirin again; after a long discussion, reminiscent of that between Wis and Ramin [see Gurğan], they are reconciled and marry; the end of the reign and Khusraw's assassination correspond, in essentials, with the records of the historians; after his death Shirin, scorning Shiruya's attentions, kills herself in Khusraw's tomb.

The poet Amr Khusraw Dihlawi is the author of a Shirin and Khusraw in which the narration is more lively and the style simpler than in Nizami's romance; his account of the reign and the amorous exploits of Khusraw (apart from the romance with Shirin) is different from Nizami's; Farhad is no longer a simple engineer but is a son of the emperor, a widower, he met Shirin and fell in love with her; then Arifi follows his predecessors quite closely, until Farhad dies, poisoned by the mother of a young man whom Gulistan had promised to Haffif (about 1520) for the most part kept to the traditional account, but he added various episodes: for example, Khusraw had Farhad imprisoned in a pit in the mountains to keep him away from Shirin; but when digging a tunnel, Farhad came across a vein of precious stones; he managed to escape and was then recaptured. The inspiration of Wahshi, in his Farhad and Shirin (966/1558-9), completed by Wisal, 1265/1848-9), some details of which were taken from Amr Khusraw Dihlawi, is lyrical rather than narrative: the sentimental incidents are in later respects reminiscent of the inspirations of Western poets of love and chivalry. In the short Farhad and Shirin (about 400 lines of verse) of Urif (d. about 1390), which is even more lyrical than the work of Wahshi, the hymn to the beauty of nature and the meditation on the diverse emotions of love form the essential parts of this poem in which sentiment is personified by Shirin, the author refraining from repeating the legend itself which he assumes will already be familiar to the reader. Finally, in 1920 Dhabbeh Behruz published the script of a film "The king of Iran and the Armenian princess".

This theme penetrates very early into Turkish literatures. There exist two very old versions of the poem Khusraw and Shirin, dating back to the first half of the 8th/14th century: one adapted by Kuth (ca. 741/1341) in the territories of the Golden Horde (ed. A. Zajczkowski, Najstarsza wersja Turecka (ed. A. Zajczkowski, Praque 1933), another written by Fakhr al-Din Yahy"a in Western Anatolia, in the principality of the Aydin Oghullari (ca. 707/1306; Ms: Marburg, Westdeutsche Bibl., Or. Q. 1609). There is also a fairly close Turkish translation of Nizami's poem by Shemykh [q.v.], made early in the 9th/15th century.

In Eastern Turkish literature the theme was first treated by Nawâî, who gave first place to the person of Farhad; Farhad, possessed with love for Shirin, pierces a mountain and dies on hearing the false news of Shirin's death. Many subsequent Turkish poets elaborated this theme, for example: Farhad and Shirin: Ahmed Ridwan, Şadri, Hayâtî, Âh, Dişliî; Farhad and Shirin or Farhad-nâme: Harîml (Prince
FARHAD wa-ShIRIN — FARHAT

Korkud), Shami, Nakam, etc. (see Faruk K. Timurtas, Tiirk edebiyatinda Husrev u Shirin ve Ferhad u Shirin hikayesi, in Ist. Un. Tiirk Dili ve Edebiyati, iv (1959), 65-88).

There exist also some versions presenting the story in the form of a dramatic play, e.g., the Farhad wa-Shirin by the Azerbeyzandan poet Samed Vurgun (d. 1956) and that by the modern Turkish poet Nazim Hikmet (d. 1963), translated into Russian as "A Legend of Love".


(A. Zajaczkowski)

FARHANG [see KAMÜS and MAŞIRF].

FARHANGISTAN [see MARJIMA].

FARHAT, DIJAMMUS, Arabic philologist and poet, forerunner of the nineteenth century literary renaissance in the Arab countries, born at Aleppo on November 18, 1630, and died there on June 1732. He was Maronite archbishop of his native town from 1725 to 1732, but we are not concerned here with his activity as an organizer, which was of the greatest importance to the Maronite church, nor with the majority of his dogmatic and polemic writings and his works of edification and history; he must however be mentioned in the history of Arabic literature as a lexicographer, grammarian and poet.

Aleppo was one of the few Arab towns which after the Ottoman conquest had retained and to a certain extent developed a literary tradition. This tradition had been fortified by certain European influences, particularly among the Arabic-speaking Christians. The establishment of the Maronite college at Rome in 1584, and the presence at Aleppo of a large colony of European merchants played an important part in this; it must not be forgotten that J. Golius (1624-6) and E. Pococke (1630-6) both spent some time there. Some literary activity flourished in all the Christian communities, and the Orthodox patriarch Makarius b. al-Za'im al-Halabi (d. 1672) is only one example out of many.

Born of a prosperous Maronite family, the Matar, Farhat received an excellent education from the Christian and Muslim scholars of Aleppo: Butrus al-Tlaawi, a pupil of the Maronite college of Rome (d. 1745; cf. Manash in Machrik, vi (1903), 769-77; idem, Mustatırât, 7; Cheikho, Catalogue, 76-8, no. 270; Mas'ud, Dibra, 9-11), Ya'qub ibn Dibsi, a great authority on rhetoric (cf. Cheikho, op. cit., no. 344), and the famous Muslim scholar Shavkh Sulayman al-Nahwi al-Halabi (d. 1745; cf Manash in Machrik, ii (1902), 396-405), and provided the resulting dictionary under the title: Bulugh al-arab fi Him al-adab (only in manuscript; see P. Sbath, "Uarrive'e aubut Christian and Muslim scholars of Aleppo: Butrus al-Tlaawi, who settled in Lebanon where he sat at the feet of the Maronite archbishop and the Orthodox patriarch Makarius b. al-Za'im al-Halabi (d. 1672) is only one example out of many.

As a philologist, Farhat understood above all the need to make available to his fellow countrymen textbooks which would facilitate for them the study of Arabic. In almost all fields—lexicography, grammar, rhetoric—he wrote such textbooks, some of which have remained until recently in common use among Syrian Christians. Although they are based mainly on Arabic tradition, here and there, particularly in grammar, can be detected traces of European influence, especially of the Roman Maronites and of the school of Erpenius. Among his works of lexicography we have: Muthallathât al-lugha al-^arabiyya (Tâmirh Lebanon) 1867, and Odtân, pp. 2-106), an imitation in verse, composed in 1705, of the famous Muthallathât of Kutrub (q.v.), and provided later with a commentary (manuscripts of it are not uncommon: one, of 1712, is in the Asiatic Museum in Leningrad; see v. Rosen, Les manuscrits ar. de l'Inst. des Langues Or., St. Petersburg 1877, 71, no. 156). His dictionary, Ishâh bâl al-i`rdb, which was completed in 1718, is of greater importance; it is based for the most part on the Kámus of al-Flurâzâbdâl (q.v.), but contains many modern words and terms used by Christian Arabs; the Maronite patron of learning, the emirugh Rûshâd al-Dâhdâl (1813-89), collated five manuscripts of it with the Kâmus and published the resulting dictionary under the title Dictionnaire arabe par Germanos Farhat, évoqué d'Alep. Revu, corrigé et considérablement augmenté sur le manuscrit de l'auteur par Rocharm de Dahdah, sœur maronite, Marseilles 1849, with portrait of the author (Arabic title: Ishâh bâl al-i`rdb); as an appendix to the dictionary is printed the treatise al-Fâsî al-mu`addî fi `awâmîl al-i`rdb. Among Farhat's grammatical works, the Bahût al-ma`lîlîb (cf. Manash in Machrik, iii (1902), 1077-83; idem, Dibra, 111-2) was particularly successful; written on a very large scale, in 1705, and provided the following year with notes, it was abridged in 1707 by the author himself, and it is this abridged form which has been published in many editions with commentaries by Fâris al-Shidyâdî (q.v.), Malta 1856; by Butrus al-Bustânî, Beirut 1854; by Sa`îd al-Sartûnî, Beirut, 1865, 1883, 1891, 1896, 1899, 1913 etc.).

As the zealous pupil of Ya'qub ibn Dibsi, Farhat compiled also a manual of rhetoric and poetical texts under the title: Bulûgh al-arab fi `lim al-i`rdb (only in manuscript; see P. Sbath, "L'arrivée au but
Dans l'art de la littérature : Ouvrage sur la rhétorique par Germanos Farhat, in BTE, xiv (1932) 275-9 with portrait; cf. Diwan, 89; Chehko, Catalogue, 151, no. 6. In the field of prosody two small treatises of his are known: 

\[ \text{Tadkira fi 'l-ba'i} \] (printed with the Diwan, 13-22) and a Risala al-fasli'lid fi 'l-sar'ad (cf. Chehko, Catalogue, 161, no. 7).

Farhat is famous not only as a scholar but also as a poet. He himself collected the poems of his Diwan under the title of al-Tadkira, and it is in this form that the Diwan has been published three times (Beirut 1850—lithog. 1856, 1894)—with the commentary of Sa'd al-Sharti', but in two manuscripts; on the last edition cf. C. F. Seybold, in Litterarisches Zentralblatt, 1895, col. 1447). This collection does not contain all his poetic works, many of which were later printed separately (cf. for example Chehko, Shu'arda', 463-8, and also in Machrîq, vii (1904), 268, xxiv (1926), 397 and passim). His work is interesting from the point of view of literary history as representing a systematic effort to apply the forms of Arabic poetry to specifically Christian themes: the form of the ghâṣal to hymns to the Virgin, the khamisîyyât to the Eucharist, etc. Farhat was of course not the first to do this: as early as the 8th/14th century we have the Diwan of a certain Sulaymân al-Ghazî (cf. Chehko, Shu'arda', 404-24) devoted to the same religious themes, but his name and these works are almost forgotten, and he did not find a school. The Christian element is largely predominant in the Diwan of Farhat, although it cannot be denied that he possessed a fairly deep knowledge of Arabic poetry in general; we find in it vigorous polemics directed against Abu l-'Alâ al-Ma'ârifî (248, 420, 439), many traces of the influence of Ibn al-Rûmî (257), Ibn al-Fârîd (295), al-Suhra'î (248, 420, 439), many traces of the influence of Farhat, although it cannot be denied that he possessed a fairly deep knowledge of Arabic grammar, impressed even the specialists. He introduced the 

\[ \text{Awdrif al-ma'drif} \] into the mystic syllabus of those days, taught it to his disciples and himself prepared a summary of it.

His mastery of Arabic grammar, impressed even the specialists. He introduced the 

\[ \text{Awdrif al-ma'drif} \] into the mystic syllabus of those days, taught it to his disciples and himself prepared a summary of it. A student of the great Shaykh Baha'î, who belonged to a ruling house of Khurasan, and an important mystic centre for the people of Afghanistan, is Shykh Farîd al-Mas'ûdî of Kalyar—

\[ \text{Farîd al-Dîn Mas'ûdî} \text{GANDJ-I-SHAKAR} \]

one of the most distinguished of Indian Muslim mystics, was born some time in 571/1175 at Kâshâwî, a town near Multân, in a family which traced its descent from the caliph Umar. His grandfather, Kâdi Shu'â'î, who belonged to a ruling house of Kâshul, migrated to India under the stress of the Ghuzz invasions. Shaykh Farîd's first teacher, who exerted a lasting influence on him, was his mother, who kindled that spark of Divine Love in him which later dominated his entire being, and moulded his thought and action. Shaykh Farîd received his education in a madrasa attached to the mosque of one Mawlâna Minhâdî al-Dîn Tîrmîghi at Mûtân where, later, he met Shykh Kuth al-Dîn Bikhîyâr Kâkî (q.v.), khalifa of Shykh Mu'în al-Dîn Cîstî (q.v.), and got himself admitted into the Cîstî order. According to Shykh Shatîri, Shaykh Farîd excelled all other saints in his devotions and penitences. At Ush he performed the salatî mîrâs by hanging head downwards in a well, suspended from the boughs of a tree. He observed fasts of all types, the most difficult of them being Dâ'âdî and Tasyî. He had committed to memory the entire text of the Qur'ân and used to recite it once in twenty-four hours. Accounts of his visits to foreign lands by later writers are hardly reliable because no early authority refers to them. Besides Shaykh Kuth al-Dîn Bikhîyâr Kâkî, he received spiritual bedictions from Shaykh Mu'în al-Dîn Cîstî also. For nearly 20 years he lived and worked at Hânsî, in the Hîsâr district. Later on he moved to Adjodhan (now called Pîk Pantan on his account) from where his fame spread far and wide. He died at Adjodhan on 5 Muharram 664/17 October 1265. During the last 700 years his tomb has been one of the most venerated centres of pilgrimage for the people of the subcontinent. He is venerated in Afghan Sikhism alike hold him in high esteem. Numerous rulers, including Timur and Akbar, have visited his grave for spiritual blessings. The town of Farîdkhâît was named after him. He left a big family which spread in the country and many of his descendants (e.g. Shaykh Bâhâ al-Dîn of Radjâpur, near Amroh, and Shaykh Salîm Cîstî of Fatehpur Sikri) set up important mystic orders.

To Shaykh Farîd belongs the credit of giving an all-India status to the Cîstî silsila and training a number of eminent disciples—like Shaykh Dîmâl al-Dîn of Hânsî, Shaykh Nîza'm al-Dîn Awlîyâ'î of Dîhil and Shaykh 'Alâ al-Dîn Sâbir of Kalyar—who disseminated its teachings far and wide. By establishing close personal contact with people, he transformed the Cîstî order—which was, till then, limited in its sphere of influence—into a powerful movement for the spiritual culture of the masses. He attracted towards Islam many of the Hindus tribes of the Pandîb. The impact of his teachings is discernible in the sacred book of the Sikhs, the Guru Granth, where his sayings are respectfully quoted. His knowledge of tafsir, hûrâtî and fiqh, besides his mastery of Arabic grammar, impressed even the specialists. He introduced the 

\[ \text{Wâ'arîf al-ma'drif} \] into the mystic syllabus of those days, taught it to his disciples and himself prepared a summary of it. 

\[ \text{Bibliography: G. Manache (Manash), Historical note on the bishop Diwan Mas'ûdî Farîd (in Arabic), in Machrîq, vii (1904), 49-56, 105-11, 210-9 (with portrait); idem, The works of the bishop Diwan Mas'ûdî Farîd, ibid., 354-61 (a list of 104 works, of which 37 are original, the rest being the works of other authors annotated, translated and edited by Farîd); idem, al-Mustatafâyî fi hayât al-Sayyid Diwan Mas'ûdî Farîd, 1904; B. Ma'sad. al-Dîkhrâ fi hayât al-Matrûn Diwan Mas'ûdî Farîd, Dînjâîrya 1934; Mârûn 'Abîdî, Riwâyât al-nâhâda al-\text{bâdîha}, Beirut 1952; F. Taoutel, Mgr. Diwan Mas'ûdî Farîd, spiritual director, in Machrîq, xxxi (1934), 267-72 (with portrait and autograph); Butrus al-Bustâni, Dî'irat al-ma'ârifî, Beirut 1882, vi, 437-8; A. Baugmant, Geschichte der Weililiteratur, i/v, Freiburg 1897, 413-4; C. Huard, Littérature arabe, Paris 1912, 41-2; K. T. Khairallah, La Syrie, Paris 1912, 41-2; Dîrîdîl Zaydîn, Ta'bîkî dâ'dî al-lughâ al-\text{arbâ'iyây}, Cairo 1914, iv, 13-4 (with portrait); L. Chehko, Catalogue of the Christian Arabic autographs in libraries of Leningrad by I. Yu Krackovskiy, in Machrîq, xxii (1925), 681; idem, Kita'b Shu'arda' al-nârânîyâya ba'd al-Isldm, Beirut 1927, 459-68; J. E. Sarkîs, col. 1441-2).
Since all sorts of people—djogls and kdfirdn-i siydh posh, Hindus ... districts of lower Bengal.


FA RID [see FAR 'ID, FARO].

FA RIDKOT, formerly a small feudatory princely state in the Fardub, now merged with the Furdup Division of the Indian Fardub, and lying between 27° 32' and 27° 5' E. with an area of 642 sq. miles. Both the State and the principal town of the same name are unimportant. The town, lying in 30° 40' N. and 74° 49' E., 20 miles south of Furdup [q.v.], has a fort built by Râdja Muchul, a native Râdjudt chief, in the time of Fardub-ud-Din Ganj-Shakar (q.v.), popularly known as Bâwâ (Bâbî) Fardub, after whom the fort was named Fardubkoh (koh = fort). The founder was apparently an admiral and devotee of the saint, who was equally popular with the Muslims and the non-Muslims. The former ruling family belonging to the Sdhdhd-Bhr clsn of the Dlids [q.v.], who later embraced Sikhism, occupied the town and the neighbouring territory during the time of Akbar [q.v.]. They were, however, involved in several petty quarrels with the surrounding Sikh states belonging to the same family, badly disturbed during the communal riots of 1947 which followed in the wake of Partition, and is now without any Muslims who have all migrated to Pakistan.

Bibliography: Aitchison, Engagements and Samads . . ., s.v.; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1905, xii, 521.

FARID, or Faridkot, a name frequently used among the people of the same name in East Pakistan. The district was created in 1807 out of the older division of Dacca-Dhailupur. It embraces an area of 2,372 square miles and has a population of 2,709,711 (1951 census). The city (pop. 25,287), which is named after that of the local Dîr Shaykh Farid, is situated on an old channel of the Padma. It is generally identified with the Fardubahd of the Muslim period. The A'în-i Abhâr mentions Sarkar Fardubahd, and this name is believed to originate from that of Djalal-ud-Din Fadl Shâh, the Bengal Sultan (886-92/1481-6). But Fardubahd as a mint town is known to have been first started by Djalal-ud-Din Muhammad (818-31/1415-35) after his conquest of the Hindu Râdjaig of south Bengal. Since then Fardubahd maintained its integrity, rising to an almost independent status in the time of the Dihli emperor Akbar under the local zamindar Mâqîl Shâh, who was finally subjugated in about 1013/1609 by Islam Khan, the Mughal of Bengal. It is popularly known as Bawâ (Babî) Fardub, after whom the fort was named Fardubkoh (koh = fort). The founder was apparently an admiral and devotee of the saint, who was equally popular with the Muslims and the non-Muslims. The former ruling family belonging to the Sdhdhd-Bhr clsn of the Dlids [q.v.], who later embraced Sikhism, occupied the town and the neighbouring territory during the time of Akbar [q.v.]. They were, however, involved in several petty quarrels with the surrounding Sikh states belonging to the same family, badly disturbed during the communal riots of 1947 which followed in the wake of Partition, and is now without any Muslims who have all migrated to Pakistan.

Bibliography: Aitchison, Engagements and Samads . . ., s.v.; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1905, xii, 521.
FARIDPUR — FARIGHONIDS

45-60; L. S. S. O'Malley, Bengal district gazetteers: Faridpur, Calcutta 1925; A. H. Dani, History of the Farighoni movement in Bengal, to be published by the Asiatic Society of Pakistan, Dacca. (A. H. Dani)

FARIDUN (Pahlavi, Firdun; ancient Iranian, Thraetaona), the son of Abityan or Abtin, one of the early kings of Iran. The most complete text on the subject is the account of his reign by Firdawsī, in verse; some of the sources for it will be found in pre-Islamic texts. §130-3 of the Yasha of the Avesta reveals the names of the first kings of Iran in their original order (the first being Yima [see qmishmid], whose conqueror and murderer, Azhi-Dahaka, was overthrown in his turn and put to death by Thraetaona; the latter was rewarded by a share of the aureole of glory (haureno) which, from the throne of Ahura-Mazda, descends upon the heads of saints and heroes, and which as the result of a grave transgression had forsaken Yima (Yasht 19); Thraetaona the son of Athwya, the priest responsible for preparing the sacred potion known as haoma, saved the world from the domination of the monstrous dragon Azhi-Dahaka, liberated Arnavak and Sahavak (Firdawsī: Arnavāz and Shahrnaz), the daughters of the dead Yima, became king of Iran and lived in peace in the land; three sons, one of whom, Iradj, was assassinated by the other two, leaving a daughter; Thraetaona married her, with the object of procreating an avenger for his son (J. Darnesteter, Zend-Avesta, i, 131, n. 15, sees in this consanguineous union, subsequently transferred by national tradition, an early instance of khetuk-dasi; cf. the same author, Études iraniennes, ii, 217 ff., and al-Masʿūdī, Muridūs, ii, 145). According to religious tradition, Thraetaona fought against the demons of Mazandaran (national tradition describes him as an expert in magic). In the national tradition, handed down by the Shāh-nāma of Firdawsī, Azhi-Dahaka (Persian: Zahhāk) retains only one feature of his monstrous appearance—two serpents which sprang from his shoulders at the kiss of the devil, and which he has to feed by demanding the daily sacrifice of a group of his subjects; one night, in a dream, he sees the young warrior who overthrows him; he consults his soothsayers and learns that Farīdūn will be born and will overthrow him; he orders the execution of the father of Farīdūn, for whom he has a vigorous search made from the time of his birth, though in vain, aided by partisans led by the blacksmith Kavāh, Farīdūn defeats Zahhāk’s troops and imprisons him, in a cave on Mount Damawānd [q.v.]; he is a proclaimed king of Iran, he established justice and peace in the land; three sons were born to him and, in due time, he divided his empire between them; the two eldest, jealous of their younger brother, put him to death—a murder which gave rise to innumerable wars; from the union of Iradj and a slave-girl married to a nephew of Farīdūn was born Manuchīr who succeeded his father on the throne of Iran, overthrew and put to death his two uncles whose heads he sent to Farīdūn; the latter ended his life in solitude, mourning his sons, his eyes fixed on their three skulls.—To this narrative, Arab and Persian historians (Ibn al-Athir, Rashīd al-Dīn, Ibn Khaldūn, etc.) have been followed by the later historians (Ibn al-Athir, Rashīd al-Dīn, Ibn Khaldūn, etc.). The list as usually given includes:

(a) Aḥmad b. Farīdūn, amīr of Gūzgān, about 970. He was a prince of importance, who according to Nasrakhī refused the friendship of the amīr of Marw, whereupon the latter turned to Ismaiʿīl, the Sāmānid ruler of Transoxiana. Aḥmad b. Farīdūn subsequently did homage to ʿAmr b. Lāyīh, the
FARIGHONIDS

After 380/990 Abu ‘l-Harith as Saffarid amir of Gurgan was ordered to oppose Fāʾik, the amir of Harāt, who was then in rebellion. He assembled a large force and advanced from Gurgan against Fāʾik, last heard of at al-Tirmidh across the Oxus. Fāʾik sent a cavalry force of 500 men, Turks and Arabs, who routed the army of the Farīghunid and returned to Gurgan with all its spoils. Abū ‘l-Harith Muhammad b. Abū Farīghun evidently gave his daughter in marriage to the young Saffarid sovereign Nūb b. Mansūr, some time after the latter’s accession in 365/976 (Gardzī, ed. M. Nāzīmī, 48), and in 372/982 he received the dedication of the geographical work Hudud al-‘ilm, possibly written by another Ibn Farīghun (see Minorsky in A Locust’s Leg, 189–90).

It is somewhat striking that Abu ‘l-Harith Muhammad b. Abū Farīghun is apparently never named by ‘Utbī. In his formal account of the Farīghunids (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, ii, 101–5) he states that Abu ‘l-Harith Ahmad b. Muhammad was the father of Abū Naṣr, who in the sequel appears as the head of the family (below, (c)). It seems feasible that some time after 372/982 Abu ‘l-Harith Muhammad, who had already enjoyed a career of perhaps as long as 50 years, was succeeded by a son with the same kunya, Abu ‘l-Harith Ahmad, who would then be the Farīghunī who engaged in the various campaigns mentioned by ‘Utbī between 990 and 995. But the texts of the passage vary: Minorsky has already pointed out that in ‘Utbī-Maṭnī (ii, 101) Abu ‘l-Harith Al-Bawāqī b. Muhammad is succeeded by his son Abu Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad, apparently an impossible, from which he concludes that Abu ‘l-Harith Ahmad b. Muhammad never existed (Hudūd al-‘ilm, 176), and although in the same passage the Delhi (1842, p. 283) and Lahore (1930, 188, p. 227) editions of ‘Utbī give, as the son of Abu ‘l-Harith Ahmad b. Muhammad, Abu Naṣr Muhammad b. Al-Bawāqī b. Muhammad, no positive conclusion is afforded. Edmonds ‘Utbī al-Bawāqī is Abu Naṣr Al-Bawāqī b. Muhammad al-Farīghunī (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, ii, 84, also Delhi, 271, Lahore, 218). The successor of b. Abu ‘l-Harith Muhammad b. Ahmad is usually said to be

(c) Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Farīghunī. In 385/995, when Mahmūd destroyed the Saffarid power in Khorasan and established himself at Balkh, the local rulers who had previously acknowledged the Saffarids, submitted to him, including Aḥ-ḥi Farīghun, rulers of Gurgan (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, i, 316, cf. Ibn al-Aṭḥir, sub anno 385). Thus when the Ḳānsī crossed the Oxus to attack Mahmūd, Abū Naṣr al-Farīghunī the governor of Gurgan fought in the centre with the Sultan’s brother Naṣr against the Ḵara-Ḵhānsī at the battle of Ḳarhiyān in 389/January 1008 (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, ii, 84, cf. Ibn Khādī̀dūn, iv, 288). Later in the same year, or in the following year, Mahmūd invaded India. His brother-in-law Abū Naṣr al-Farīghunī accompanied him, and played a prominent part (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, ii, 98, cf. Ibn Khādī̀dūn, iv, 789). Abū Naṣr had been confirmed in the possession of Gurgan at his father’s death, and continued to enjoy all his rights there till his own death (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, ii, 102, cf. Ibn al-Aṭḥir, sub anno, Ibn Khādī̀dūn, iv, 790). (d) Hasan b. Farīghunī, once mentioned by Bayhaḵī (Ṭaʿlīḵī, ed. Morley, 125, cited Minorsky, Hudūd, 177), apparently did not succeed to, or did not retain, the governorship of Gurgan, which was ruled by 408/1017–8 as a Ghaznawī fief by Abū Ahmad Muhammad b. Mahmūd (married to a daughter of Abū Naṣr al-Farīghunī) (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, ii, 230).

Nothing can be gleaned concerning the Farīghunīs from the portion of the Taḥābāt-i Nāṣīrī of al-Ḳarīḏḏānī translated by H. G. Ravery, who in his notes mentions a Maḥmūd b. Muhammad Farīghunī, i.e., Maḥmūd b. Muhammad [q.v.] of Khārīḏāzīm. This man is called Farīghunī also by the late (17th century) writer Ǧaffārī (Ǧīfḏārī) (cf. Hudūd al-‘ilm, 174; Cahār makdāla, ed. Mirzā Muhammad Ḳaẕwīnī, GEMS, 1920, 243), and this is usually reckoned a mistake. It is possible, however, that Maḥmūd b. Muhammad (whose genealogy is still unknown) belonged to a collateral branch of the family of the Khārīḏāzīm Shāhs whom he dispossessed in 386/996, in which case he might claim descent from the Afrīqī or Farīghī of Khārīḏāzīm mentioned earlier in this article.

In the 10th century under the Farīghunīs Gurgan appears to have possessed greater importance than at other times in its history. Apart from their political activity, the Farīghunīs were also patrons of learned men and poets, including Bāḍīʿ al-Ẓamān al-Hamāḏānī and Abu ‘l-Fath al-Bustī (‘Utbī-Maṭnī, ii, 102–5, cf. Ibn al-Aṭḥir, sub anno 401; Ibn Khādī̀dūn, iv, 790) and of course the author of Hudūd al-‘ilm. Bibliography: V. V. Barthold, Preface to Hudūd al-‘ilm, 47; V. Minorsky, ibid., 173–8 (the best and most complete account); idem, Ibn Farīghunī and the Hudūd al-‘ilm, in A Locust’s Leg, Studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh, London 1962, 189–96; E. Sachau, Ein Verzeichnis muhāmedanischer Dynastien, in Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1923, i, 5, p. 5 (based on the 17th century author Mūnedīḏḏīm-Bāshī; D. M. Dunlop, The Jawsīnīs al-‘ulamī of Ibn Farīghunī, in Z. V. Togān’s armaṇān, Istanbul 1955, 348–53; Muḥam-
it was necessary to have performed deeds of prowess on the battle-field and, in single combat, to have shown courage above the ordinary. When warring armies came face to face, the farsā stepped forward from the ranks and, after certain preliminaries, issued a challenge to the foe: ‘Is there a champion (mulḥārīz) [ready to prove himself against me]?’. In the wars waged by the Arabs, single combats often formed the first phase of the battle; historians give the names of the fursān and describe with satisfaction the deeds that they accomplished, a notable feature being that they did not always belong to the military aristocracy and often held only a very subordinate rank; their feats of arms nevertheless won them generous rewards. In battle, the farsām remained composed, encouraged his comrades in arms, hastened to the rescue of those who were hard pressed, was ready to give up his mount for an unmounted officer and to continue the combat on foot, etc. When the army was put to flight, he stayed on until the end to fight a delaying action, once again brought solace to his companions, gave aid to the footsore, and finally sacrificed himself to minimize the results of the defeat. The farsā wore a light coat of mail and carried a sabre, a javelin and also a lasso (sakād) which, in single combat, was used to unhorse his adversary and make him bite the dust (for later developments of this use of a lasso, see [sakād]).

Works of adab and history enumerate the fursān of the various tribes, some of whom have become proverbial; in particular, there is the saying afras min Summ al-fursān “a better fursān than Summ al-fursān” (=? Uyatyba b. al-Hārith of the Tamīm), afras min Mulāzib al-asinna (=? Amīr b. Mālik of the Kays), afras min Asīr (= b. al-Tufayl), afras min Bistām (= Kays b. Shaybānī), etc. Hamāma b. Abd al-Muṭṭāb is regarded as the farsā par excellence of Kurayyah, Umayr b. al-Hubbāl al-Sulāmi as the farsā of Islam; Antara is called ‘Antar al-fawāris, etc. Some of these fursān have become the heroes of “romances of chivalry” which in Arabic bear the name Sīra [see 'Antar, Bāṭṭal, Dhu l-Himm, Sīra].

Bibliography. Maydānī, Amīhāl, Cairo 1352, ii, 32 ff.; Ibn 'Abd Rabbīh, 'Ibd, Cairo 1346/1928, i, 60 ff.; Mary Mustafā, bāb 40-1; Wacoyd Boutrous Ghali, La tradition chivaleresque des Arabes, Paris 1959, passim; Bichr Fārēs, L’honneur chez les Arabes avant l’Islam, Paris 1953, 22 ff.; see also Futuwma, Sīfāh, Suwār. (Ed.)

FARS AL-MUḤAMMAD, alias HUSĀM AL-DIN ABD AL-SHAWAQ [see 'ANNAZĪD].

FARS AL-SHIDYĀK, Lebanese writer, lexicographer, journalist and poet, born at 'Ashkūt in 1804 (B. al-Bustānī, Dā‘īra, x, 428; T. al-Shidyaq, Aḥhāb al-d-yān, 194; Zaydān, Maqālik, ii, 74; al-Dībā, al-Dīmā‘i al-muṣaffal, 353; Tārāzī, Ta’rīkh al-ṣīḥāfa, i, 96), and not at Beirut (as Brockelmann, ii, 505), nor in 1805 (as Masʿād, Fāris al-Shidyāq, 16; Y. Yāzībīk, in al-Maḥkām, n. 172, 8). In 1809 his parents moved to Hadath (14 km. from Beirut, fāsat al-Butn), where Fāris received his early education, later going on to the seminary of ‘Ayn Warāqā (Kisrāwān, Lebanon: see al-Sāḥ, 14-7; Dā‘īra, x, 428; Masʿād, op. cit., 17). As the result of a political clash and the death of his father (in 1820: Masʿād, 17; al-Sāḥ, 32-2), he embarked on the profession of his brother Ṭunnūs (1791-1861), the copying of manuscripts (Aḥhāb, 193, 197; al-Sāḥ, 31-2, 45-8, 68), finding the necessary materials as large as those of the plain foot-soldier [see 'Akhā, Ghāmīma], but to rank among the true fursān
his talents—the passion and martyrdom of his brother Ascad (1798-1830), who, because of his conversion to Protestantism, was arbitrarily imprisoned, and tortured to death by the Maronite Patriarch Yussuf Hubayysh (d. 1845, see Khabarayat As'ad al-Shidyak, in B. al-Bustanl, Kitabat As'ad al-Shidyak, 31-59, 93-104, 106, 109, 120-1). Fâris's conversion to Protestantism is to be dated towards the end of 1825 (Cheikho, Addb, ii, 79, Tarrazi, Sihâfa, i, 96, and Mas'âd, 18, who allege that he was converted in Malta, i.e., between 1834 and 1848, are to be rejected: see al-Shidyak, 377-8 and the dispute between Khârdji and Sîkî; pages 130-2 confirm that he attached himself to the Protestant Evangelical Mission before his departure for Egypt).

His stay in Egypt (1825-34) was marked by his first marriage (his wife, a Maronite born at al-Sülî, was the mother of his two sons Salim, 1826-1906, and Fâyz, 1828-56), and by his coming under the influence of men of learning and of letters as such Nasr Allâh al-Târâbîlûsi (1770-1840) and Sihâbb al-Dîn Muhammad b. Ismâ'îl al-Mâlikî (1803-57). He found there an environment conducive to the study of Arabic, of logic, of theology, of halâm and of prosody. Winning the favour of Muhammad 'Ali, he was appointed Arabic editor of the official gazette, the Wa'âdî' al-Mursîyya, in place of Rif'â'a al-Dîn Muhammad b. Mahfûz (see ibid., x, 428, 'Abûbîd, 135-6; Dâghîr, Masîdîr, ii, 472-3).

At the request of the head of the Protestant Evangelical Mission, he moved to Malta, where he spent several years (1834-48: see Wâsîsâ, 3) teaching Arabic, writing text-books and correcting manuscripts; he interrupted this austere existence only twice: al-Shidyak, al-Sâbî, 157-62 c (zdrat Su'dd, v, 249 ff.; Diwdn, 633-41). Two of the Bible was completed (in less than 20 months), of prosody. Winning the favour of Muhammad 'Ali, he found there an environment conducive to the study of Arabic, of logic, of theology, of halâm and of prosody. Winning the favour of Muhammad 'Ali, he was appointed Arabic editor of the official gazette, the Wa'âdî' al-Mursîyya, in place of Rif'â'a al-Dîn Muhammad b. Mahfûz (see ibid., x, 428, 'Abûbîd, 135-6; Dâghîr, Masîdîr, ii, 472-3).

In 1848 he was invited to London (Kashf al-mukhabbd, 67) to assist in the translation of the Bible (Kanz al-raghdâbî, i, 168-70); there, divorcing his first wife, he married an Englishwoman, who came to England in 1845 (see Najm, Thesis, 61).

In 1848 he was invited to London (Kashf al-mukhabbd, 67) to assist in the translation of the Bible (Kanz al-raghdâbî, i, 168-70); there, divorcing his first wife, he married an Englishwoman, who came to England in 1845 (see Najm, Thesis, 61).

But it was in Istanbul (end of 1857) that Fâris was to reach the summit of his fame. In favour with Sultan 'Abd al-Majîd in 1854 (see al-Sâbî, 665-72), to return secretly to Lebanon in 1837 and to visit England in 1845 (see Najm, Thesis, 61). He found there an environment conducive to the study of Arabic, of logic, of theology, of halâm and of prosody. Winning the favour of Muhammad 'Ali, he was appointed Arabic editor of the official gazette, the Wa'âdî' al-Mursîyya, in place of Rif'â'a al-Dîn Muhammad b. Mahfûz (see ibid., x, 428, 'Abûbîd, 135-6; Dâghîr, Masîdîr, ii, 472-3).

In 1854 (see al-Sâbî, 665-72), to return secretly to Lebanon in 1837 and to visit England in 1845 (see Najm, Thesis, 61). He found there an environment conducive to the study of Arabic, of logic, of theology, of halâm and of prosody. Winning the favour of Muhammad 'Ali, he was appointed Arabic editor of the official gazette, the Wa'âdî' al-Mursîyya, in place of Rif'â'a al-Dîn Muhammad b. Mahfûz (see ibid., x, 428, 'Abûbîd, 135-6; Dâghîr, Masîdîr, ii, 472-3).

When the translation of the Bible was completed (in less than 20 months), he took up residence in Paris (ibid., 633-41). Two panegyrics, the one addressed to Ahmad Pasha, Bey of Tunis (usrat Su'dd, 1851: see ZDMG, v, 249 ff.; H. Pèrès, in-Mahk thouf, no. 341, 2, the other to Sultan 'Abd al-Majîd in 1854 (see al-Sâbî, 665-72), to return secretly to Lebanon in 1837 and to visit England in 1845 (see Najm, Thesis, 61).

In 1854 (see al-Sâbî, 665-72), to return secretly to Lebanon in 1837 and to visit England in 1845 (see Najm, Thesis, 61). He found there an environment conducive to the study of Arabic, of logic, of theology, of halâm and of prosody. Winning the favour of Muhammad 'Ali, he was appointed Arabic editor of the official gazette, the Wa'âdî' al-Mursîyya, in place of Rif'â'a al-Dîn Muhammad b. Mahfûz (see ibid., x, 428, 'Abûbîd, 135-6; Dâghîr, Masîdîr, ii, 472-3).

In 1854 (see al-Sâbî, 665-72), to return secretly to Lebanon in 1837 and to visit England in 1845 (see Najm, Thesis, 61). He found there an environment conducive to the study of Arabic, of logic, of theology, of halâm and of prosody. Winning the favour of Muhammad 'Ali, he was appointed Arabic editor of the official gazette, the Wa'âdî' al-Mursîyya, in place of Rif'â'a al-Dîn Muhammad b. Mahfûz (see ibid., x, 428, 'Abûbîd, 135-6; Dâghîr, Masîdîr, ii, 472-3).
In the religious sphere no faith satisfied him, and in search of honours and pleasures. Yet he rebelled, both Oriental and European circles (al-Mufrtabas, 68-9, 235) and wrote two text-books of Arabic grammar, in French (with G. Dugat, Paris 1854) and in English (Practical Arabic grammar, 2nd ed. London 1866). Drawing on the old lexicons, he undertook the translation of a work on the nature of animals (Malta 1841), assisted in the translation of the Bible, borrowed extensively from Western journals, and composed a trilingual (Persian-Turkish-Arabic) dictionary (Beirut 1876).

Extensive though it is, al-Shidyak's poetical production (Diwan of 22,000 lines: Maqdhir, ii, 82; Darih, x, 430; selections published Istanbul 1291/ 1874; various poems in al-Sah, al-Wasat, Kasfi, see especially Kasn al-raghadib, iii and introduction to the Diwan) remains on the whole linked with the classical tradition. Besides the quatrains in which he expressed his pious feelings, there are some satirical effusions and some lyrical outbursts (Kans, e.g. 8, 11, 56-7, 80, 85, 87 and passim; Diwan, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22, 30, 33, 43, 80, 84, 88, 89). The rest is a more or less servile imitation of the older writers, most of it occasional verse.

The Kans al-raghadib (7 vols.), selections from al-Diwasib, reflects the results of his reading, his travels, his translations and his personal contacts. It is a mixture of ethics, sociology, politics (i and ii), history (v-vii), literature and linguistic discussions, composed of numerous diverse elements and assorted pieces of information which have aroused interest in both Oriental and European circles (al-Muktubas, vi).

In the religious sphere no faith satisfied him, and he remained a sceptic, a cynic, a realist, a materialist forerunner, if not actually the first, of the progressive thinkers of the 19th century. Born 288/900 at Fasa century. Born 288/900 at Fasa (called by Ibn Khallikan al-Adudi, iii, ii). He died at Baghdad in 377/987.

Despite this ambivalence of culture and outlook, we can discern in his works some of the features which characterize the writings of his contemporaries, and the seeds of a literature of innovation which blossom-ed after him. Concerned with the everyday problems of the century, he is the creator of the genre of the Maqala, the newspaper article (see Maqala), and the forerunner, if not actually the first, of the progressive reformers. Conservative and radical, traveller, linguist, man of learning and journalist, this humanist is undoubtedly one of the chief representatives of 19th century Arabic literature.

Bibliography: M. 'Abbudd, Sahr Lubndn, Beirut 1950; B. al-Bustani, Diwar al-ma'arif, x, 1893; idem, Kisal A'sad al-Shidyak, Beirut 1878; Brockelmann, ii, 505-6, S ii, 867-8; Cheikh, al-Addib al-arabiyya fi 'l-harb al-adid 'asghar, Beirut 1908; al-Diwasib, no. 432, 127; Darih, Maqasad al-adidra al-adabiyya, ii, Beirut 1956; Kurd 'All, Nahdat al-arabiyya al-

1884; vol. ii appears to exist in MS in private hands, see Najm, Thesis, 196), in which the author undertakes the study of the verbs and nouns in current use, which of the subject (Firuday, 68-9, 235) and wrote two text-books of Arabic grammar, in French (with G. Dugat, Paris 1854) and in English (Practical Arabic grammar, 2nd ed. London 1866). Drawing on the old lexicons, he undertook the translation of a work on the nature of animals (Malta 1841), assisted in the translation of the Bible, borrowed extensively from Western journals, and composed a trilingual (Persian-Turkish-Arabic) dictionary (Beirut 1876).

Extensive though it is, al-Shidyak's poetical production (Diwan of 22,000 lines: Maqdhir, ii, 82; Darih, x, 430; selections published Istanbul 1291/ 1874; various poems in al-Sah, al-Wasat, Kasfi, see especially Kasn al-raghadib, iii and introduction to the Diwan) remains on the whole linked with the classical tradition. Besides the quatrains in which he expressed his pious feelings, there are some satirical effusions and some lyrical outbursts (Kans, e.g. 8, 11, 56-7, 80, 85, 87 and passim; Diwan, 11, 12, 15, 16, 22, 30, 33, 43, 80, 84, 88, 89). The rest is a more or less servile imitation of the older writers, most of it occasional verse.

The Kans al-raghadib (7 vols.), selections from al-Diwasib, reflects the results of his reading, his travels, his translations and his personal contacts. It is a mixture of ethics, sociology, politics (i and ii), history (v-vii), literature and linguistic discussions, composed of numerous diverse elements and assorted pieces of information which have aroused interest in both Oriental and European circles (al-Muktubas, vi).

In the religious sphere no faith satisfied him, and he remained a sceptic, a cynic, a realist, a materialist forerunner, if not actually the first, of the progressive thinkers of the 19th century. Born 288/900 at Fasa century. Born 288/900 at Fasa (called by Ibn Khallikan al-Adudi, iii, ii). He died at Baghdad in 377/987.
AL-FARISIYYA — FARMAN 803

Athir, ix, 36; Ibn Taghrlbird I, 533-4; Ibn al-\clrnad, Shadhardt, iv, 88-9; Suyuti, Bughya, 216.

(\text{C. \text{RABIN}})

FARISIYYA \[\text{see IRAN.}\]

AL-FARISIYYA, DIZAHRAT, island in the Persian Gulf in Lat. 27° 59' N., Long. 50° 10' E., about midway between the shores of Saudi Arabia and Iran. Like Dizahrat al-\Arabiyya, 14 statute miles to the south, al-Farisiyya is low and less than one square mile in area. The island is administered by Iran which maintains a meteorological station there (although Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have also advanced claims on it), and the Persian Gulf Lighting Service maintains a navigation light.

(W. E. MULLIGAN)

PARK \[\text{see FASL.}\]

AL-FARKADAN* \[\text{see NUJUM.}\]


Ancient Persian framdn (fra = "fore", Greek προ, modern Persian farman through dropping the ending α and insertion of a vowel owing to the initial double consonant (still fra- in Pahlavi). In the derived verb framndan the 8 of the stem became ℓ (after the third century: far-midan, analogous to az-midan "to try", pay-midan "to measure", nu-midan "to show", etc.).

In Firdawsi framdn is found with the following meanings: command, authority, will, wish, permission; and framdnad accordingly: to command, to regulate, to have something done, to say, to announce, as well as "to permit"; in those meanings mentioned first it is construed with (i) the content of the command as direct object, (2) a following infinitive, (3) with tā "that", or (4) kī "that", and (5) with kī introducing direct address. In addition the forms framdn dālān (or kardān) "to command" and framdn būrdān "to obey" are also found in Firdawsi. Among composite forms Firdawsi has framndinad "commander", "master", framndnārāvād (one whose commands are accepted), "commanding", "powerful", and framndnābar "servant", "slave", as well as framndnāpāhār "submissive", "yielding". In the Farchvan-i Nafṣi the other hand such expressions as "composing a formula" are to a degree identical with those mentioned above and which may be divided into the same two groups according to meaning: f-dāh, f-ramā, f-farmā, f-goḍāh (to command), and f-bār, f-bārdār, f-pādār, f-gōnā, f-nīyād (to obey). There are in Firdawsi isolated examples of the Arabic equivalents of framān: hūkm (sentence, decision, command) and amr (command), although the "Command of God" is called framān-i yāsidān.

Framān in the sense of "document" does not, however, occur in Firdawsi, who uses only the three Arabic (1) expressions rakam (sign, script, writing, decree), manṣūbār (diploma, decree, investiture) and barādī (diploma, assignment). Firdawsi also uses the word nīyād only in the sense of "sign", "emblem", "trace", "target", etc., though in the Aṣbaḥ al-kalahā (mid 12th century) nīyād is already a common term for edicts and diplomas in the broadest sense of the word. But framān as a designation: command for the writing itself came only very slowly into usage and became part of the official language of administration at a very late date. Thus we find in the earlier period framān in the sense of "document" in examples of language which is not quite official, such as the Seyyednāma of Nizām al-Mulk, where framān is employed occasionally as a parallel to mithāl (ed. Hubert Darke, Tehran 1962, 90), clearly designating two different kinds of document, one of which (framān) was issued by the ruler himself, and the other (mithāl) by authorities of lower rank (cf. \text{Ist., xxxvii (1962), 195-8}). A diploma, which would later be called officially framān or nīyād, is designated by Nizām al-Mulk (ed. Darke, 191), still dependent upon Arabic usage, ṣahād-nāma, a term which more accurately applies to treaties in a narrower sense. In religious matters of course a treaty is (now) called ṣahād-nāma. Framān in the strict sense of "document" cannot be unquestionably established before the 13th century, when it occurs as "... dar framān (here in the Arabic broken plural) masta' ati", "... (as is) written in the documents" (Busse, Untersuchungen, Document No. 3).

Until well into modern times expressions such as hūkm, māṣūrān, nīyād, etc. are used beside framān with very little difference, occasionally in the combination hūkm-i framān or hūkm-i mithāl, and it is not always possible to establish without reservation whether by framān the actual command or the writing of it is meant. In this double application of the term framān an echo of an older juridical concept is perceptible, according to which the document was only the writing down of an originally oral (which alone was authoritative) decree. During the Safavid period the edicts of subordinate authorities were designated framān or rakam and (presumably) in the Kāḏār period the terminology had become consolidated to the extent that framān was reserved for the ruler's edicts, while those of governors were called according to their rank either rakam or hūkm (cf. Diplomatic, iii, Persian, 309).

Like rulers' titles the various designations for edict and document are distinguished by epithets: nīyād (framān, hūkm)-i humāyūn "royal edict" (Firdawsi: diraftāh-i humāyūn "felicitous, glorious, royal banner"); akhūm-i mutāf-i humāyūn "royal edicts, which are obeyed"; arāhām wa-akhamān-i mutāf; farāmān-i muṭāfī lāsim al-ādāt-ī-i humāyūn "royal edicts which are and must be obeyed"; hūkm ùfāhmānāt wa-āfāhmānāt "edict, obeyed by the world and shining (like) the sun's rays"; framān-i a‘lā muḥāfīzān-yi a’lām-yi 'abd-llāhī opinion most high, lordly, royal, composite "most high, lordly, royal, composite edict"; rakam mubārāk-i aṣka‘f "blessed and most honoured edict". In comparison to the elatives are the basic forms ālī and šarīf, which were employed for edicts not originating from the ruler himself in the highly developed nomenclature of the Kāḏār period, and to some extent even earlier. A formula of benediction likewise follows mention of the edict or command: a‘lākā ūlā ra‘īn ākālādā naṣīfākāhū "May God elevate it and make abiding its effect"; lā sāla muṣafād** "* l-āḣād wa-l-ārābā "may it be always effective in the regions and quarters of the earth", and other formulae of the kind.

In the Dispositio, that part of the document containing the resolution of the ruler, firmly established formulae are employed: (1) Substantive plus framān: ḥūkm, mīthāl, māṣūrān, framān, hūkm, kūnā (to make an assignment), māṣūmad (to proclaim praise); (2) Arabic verbal noun II plus framānād: tabīrī, taṣfīdī, etc.; (3) Arabic passive participle II plus framānād: mukkarrārī, etc. In the first group of formulae framānād can be replaced by dādan, in those of the second and third groups by kūnān or dāṣhtān and gardānādān. Very frequently two formulae are combined: māṣāramān framānādān ("most exalted favour") (in Firdawsi arzānī means "worthy" or "poor"); in Vullers arzānī dāṣhtān is "dignum putare, tanquam
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digno largiri, concedere, conferre'; thus also in Steingass). In the Dispositio impersonal formulae are also favoured: ُ farmer* naqṣāq anqādīmdīl 'a... command has found the path of issue'; ُ farmer* ُ ُ isdār yafī 'a... command has found the honour of issue and the esteem of promulgation'. Out of these and the equally current formulae with ُ shūd ('had to enable them to issue ُ tughrās for various purposes by a following substantive or adjective, thus: according to the promulgating authority (mīthkālī al-sadārā) for an original document or a confirmation (rākām-ī muḥāmmād, muqaddād, ُ farmer*-ī imād) or taqāddīmīdīl yafī (nishān-ī), and ُ farmer*-ī ُ ُ šāhānmutāl shūd, with the later distinction also here between 'ālī and 'ālī as adjectives for ُ farmer* and ُ šāhām. The issuing authorities and the rank of the originator can be determined by the various introductory formulae, which to some extent, however, depend upon the content of the document or the addressee. Directly related to the introductory formulae are the seals affixed and parts of the protocol (invocation) sometimes used.

The designations for edict and command can in addition be made more precise for various purposes by a following substantive or adjective, thus: as its 'bearer' (inscriptio) or by the authorities (ulak [q.v.]) etc.). The persons in whose favour a ُ tughra was made up by its ُ tughra the office, and often also the name and rank, of the addressee preceded by his honorific titles and composed in a certain form which was abolished by the Grand Vizier Kemānḵesh Muṣṭafā Paşa (1638-44) (Taʻriḵ-i Naʿtimād, 1147, ii, 11). The Grand Vizier and certain other viziers when away from the capital and the Deputy Grand Vizier in Istanbul were often provided with blank papers on which the ُ tughra was drawn before hand to enable them to issue ُ farmāns on the spot. The completed ُ farmān was put in a small bag (bīše, kese) and used to be conveyed to its destination either by government couriers (ulāb [q.v.]) or by the permanent representative of the addressee (provincial governors, etc.) in Istanbul (kāpt ketkūdāsī) or the person who had submitted a petition and asked for the decree. The latter is frequently referred to in the document as its 'bearer' (dārēndē, hāmīl, rāfīs, etc.). The persons in whose favour a ُ farmān was issued were often explicitly allowed to keep it after it had been shown to its addressee (and copied into the local kādī's register), so that they could present it in case of a violation of their rights in future.

Internal structure. In its composition, which changed surprisingly little over the centuries, the ُ farmān bears much similarity to certain occidental documents. It opens with an invocatio (da'wēl, taḥmīd) of God, the shortest form of which is ُ hūwa. Beneath a considerable blank space, a sign of respect, there follows the ُ tughra, which, particularly in later periods, is sometimes richly decorated. The text begins with the address (inscription) which mentions the office, and often also the name and rank, of the addressee preceded by his honorific titles (ulāb) and followed by a short benediction (da'wēl) (see TOEM, i, 1330, suppl., 30-2; Feridūn, Munṣūqātī, i, 2-23). The addressee is not a private citizen but mostly a
government official in the capital or the provinces, a dependent Christian ruler, and the like. Many fermands are addressed jointly to two or more such persons, others to a class of officials in a certain province, along a given road or in the whole Empire.

Following an introductory formula, such as tezkir-i resfi-i humâyûn waşîl oldûqar ma'tâm ola ki ('when the exalted imperial cipher arrives, be it known that...'), most fermands then relate the facts that caused the order to be issued (narratio, iñâbah). Usually this section is a summary, partly verbatim, of an incoming report or petition.

Thereupon follows the main part of the fermand, the dispositio (hükûm, emr), which may open with the words yâley olsa, îmdâ (geherdî ki), etc. In many fermands it consists of two parts. The first, ending in emr edûb, fermandînîm (sadîn) omlûhdîr, and the like, states the sultan's decision in the form of a short, impersonal order. This clause seems to be the 'documentary commission' which, as mentioned above, was generally written by a high official or the sultan himself in the upper margin of the incoming communication or on a separate piece of paper and was sometimes reproduced verbatim in the fermand. The second (or only) part of the dispositio, which sets forth the sultan's command to the addressee in greater detail, mostly begins buyurdum ki. The space left empty after these words in many fermands, the address, a short reference to the contents, examined and approved, the peculiar signature with a wide range of subjects—administration, or khatt-i sherif—ments are called mudiebindjî-e standard formula is amel oluna, which contained rules of general applicability.

The later words in his own hand near the end, the signature, the address, a short reference to the contents, examined and approved, the peculiar signature with a wide range of subjects—administration, or khatt-i sherif—ments are called mudiebindjî-e standard formula is amel oluna, which contained rules of general applicability.

The composition and form of the Ottoman fermand were certainly influenced by oriental (Sadîbîk, Mamûlûk, etc.) and, possibly, occidental models, but this question has not yet been adequately studied. Originals and copies. Original fermands are preserved in the archives and libraries of Turkey, other parts of the former Ottoman Empire and many European countries. A number of them have been published (see Bibli.). Other fermands have survived in the two well-known collections of fermand copies, often legalized by a kâdi (see MOG, ii, 138 ff.). Innumerable fermand texts, generally without the 'protocol' at the beginning and the end, are found in various registers, such as the Mûkimme Defteri [q.v.], Şâhiyet Defteri, Aşkâm Defterî and a few others, most of which are kept today in the Başvkedât Arşivi [q.v.] in Istanbul. Collections of such copies have been published by A. Borchardt (especially for Istanbul), H. T. Dağlıoğlu (for Bursa), D. Sopova (for Macedonia), U. Heyd (for Palestine), I. H. Uzunçarşılı (for Ottoman history and institutions in general), and others. The registers (sîdijî [q.v.] of the şâri'a courts also contain a large number of fermand copies (see publications by J. Grzegorzewski, H. Inalcik, M. Ç. Uluçay, H. Ongan, J. Kâbrda, H. W. Duda-G. D. Galabov, etc.). Finally, many copies of fermands, including many others, are found in indel works by Ferîndûn and others, collectanea (meşâ'îmâ) and chronicles.

iii.—India.

The authentic texts of many formal written royal orders have survived from the Mughal period, in originals located in the archives of former princely states, of the descendents of great merchants or of religious communities. From the references collected in I. H. Qureshi, The administration of the sultanate of Delhi, Lahore 1942, 86, it would seem that the procedures of Mughal times designed to ensure that farmans were intentional, authentic and effective were founded on long-established Indo-Muslim precedent, though in the absence of extant texts from the sultanate period, many details are lacking. The formalizing of the discourse of the Mughal pddshah into a state document could, the A^in-i Akbari suggests, be stately and elaborate. First, the speech and actions of the pddshah were recorded daily by two wazir-nawis, the record being confirmed by the wazir before the pddshah; the pddshah and the officers who had placed it before the pddshah for a second approval. Farmans, which were distinguished from parawans in point of force and generality of application by the attachment of a royal seal, were often, but not always, prepared from a ta'lika or abridgment of the yad-darghi, particularly in the granting of money or of an office entailing the grant of money. Although the pddshah was bound by no invariable rule, farmans were usually issued for appointments as wakil, wazir, sadr, mir bakhshi or naim or for the grant of a mansab, di^agar or sayydarshah. They were also sent to tributary princes, to foreign rulers and used to grant privileges to religious communities and trading organisations.

The procedure for a farman appointing to a di^agar or mansab involved many checks against inaccuracy, fraud and caprice. The farman was drafted both on the basis of a sarkhat or certificate specifying the salary being granted (the details of which were copied in the bakhshis' department from the ta'lika), and on the basis of a ta'lika-yi tan or certificate of salary which went to the di^win or finance minister. These preliminary documents went before the pddshah for continuing approval at various stages and were signed and sealed by such officials as the mir bakhshi, the mustawfi-i di^win and the sabb-i ta'likhi (accountant in the bakhshis' department). The farman of grant or appointment called farman-i ^ahbit received the seals of the bakhshis, the di^win and the wakil before receiving a royal seal. Confidential and important farmans, not involving sums of money, received only a royal seal and were folded and dispatched in such a way that their contents remained private to the recipient. They were called farman-i bayad'i.

The two most important royal seals were the wuzk seal (a 'priy' seal), kept often either by one of the royal ladies or by a trusted official, and a large linear seal (a 'great' seal), the muhir-i mudaddas-i kalim, on which was engraved the name of the pddshah and of his ruling ancestors from Timur. This was particular but not exclusively used for farmans to foreign rulers and to tributary princes. Besides the seal, a tughra or 'sign manual', giving the full name and titles of the pddshah himself, written in naskh, was superscribed. The pddshah might favour the addressee of a farman by adding his own signature to the seal, or by writing a few lines in his own hand, or by impressing the mark of the royal hand (pandia-yi mubarak) upon the farman. Shah Djahân sometimes wrote out the entire farman himself.


FARMASUN [see MA'SUNIYYA].

FARMING [see PILÎHA].

FARMING OF TAXES [see BAYT AL-MAL, DARBA, ILTIZAM, MUKATA].

FARMUL (also FARMSUL). A town east of Ghazna in Afghanistan near Gardêz. It is mentioned by al-Mu^addasi (296), and the !Hudud al-^alam (251). The exact location of the town is unknown and it no longer exists. (R. N. Fays)

AL-FARRA\(^2\), the sobriquet of the grammarian of al-Kûfa, Abû Zakairiyâ' Yahyâ b. Ziyâd, who died in 307/918 according to al-Samânî, Ansâb, f 420a (quoted by Ibn Khâliqân, ii, 229, l. 34), as one of the "grammatical school of al-Kufa"; the fact is that he remained as a dependent of an Arab clan, either the Asad or the Minkâr (see !Fîhrîst, 66 and !Tarîh al-Badî'îyya). He was born at al-Kûfa in about 144/761, of a family that were natives of Daylam and that had moved to Basra. He is not attested after 860/1459, but he remained as a dependent of an Arab clan, either the Asad or the Minkâr (see !Fîhrîst, 66 and !Tarîh al-Badî'îyya). He received an education in Baghdad that went back to the well-known traditionists (!Tarîh al-Baghdadîyya, al-Samânî, loc. cit.) and it is on the subject of his grammatical education that he possesses the fullest particulars, but these must, however, be used with discretion, on the authority of the "Kûfan" Thâlabi (d. 291/904) (q.v.), he is on the subject of his grammatical education that we possess the fullest particulars, but these must, however, be used with discretion, on the authority of the "Kûfan" Thâlabi (d. 291/904) (q.v.). It has been customary to regard al-Farra\(^2\) as one of the masters and indeed one of the founders of the "grammatical school of al-Kûfa"; the fact is that al-Farra\(^2\) holds a place in the list of Kûfans who were influenced by al-Ru'âsî (q.v.) and al-Kisâ'î (q.v.) (see anecdotal material in !Fîhrîst, 64, l. 16, repeated by al-Anbârî, 65, in which the customary must be read, not asannu); in any event, al-Farra\(^2\) would only have met al-Kisâ'î in Baghdad when in his years of maturity, and what is more, it is not admissible to accept that at that time the division between the "School of al-Kûfa" and that of al-Baṣra had already assumed the intensity which it later attained during the grammarians' polemics at the end of the 33rd/9th century and in the following century (cf. Pleisch, 14 and al-Maghrûmi, who refer to Weil, !Mujâfî, Introduction); like his contemporaries,
al-Farra\(^3\) seems in fact to have made wide use of direct inquiry among Bedouin informants; to some degree he was influenced by other Barzanī scholars such as \(\text{Yākūt}\), al-
\(\text{Tha\^{a}f\^{a}}\), perhaps also al-
\(\text{Aṣmā'ī}\), Abu \(\text{Zayd}\) al-
\(\text{Anārī}\) and Abu \(\text{Ubaydā}\) (cf. Abu \(\text{Ib\text{'} t-Tayyib}\) al-
\(\text{Lughawi}\) \(\text{?}\) \(\text{ayd} \) al-
\(\text{Su\^{u}yīt}\), \(\text{Mūti\^{r}}\), ii, 403); like most if not all the Kūfān, al-Farra\(^3\) had an intimate knowledge of the Book of Sībawīyah (cf. the information going back to al-
\(\text{Dhāhib}\), in Ibn Khālikān, i, 385, 1, 21, where the polygraph says a gift was made to the vizier Ibn al-
\(\text{Zayyāt}\) of a copy of this work, originating from the library of al-Farra\(^3\) and executed by the latter himself); in fact the problem of the Baṣrān influences on al-Farra\(^3\) remains partly obscure since the evidence is contradictory (cf. \(\text{Yākūt}\), \(\text{Udābā}\), xx, 10 and al-
\(\text{Su\^{u}yīt}\), \(\text{Bughya}\), 411 and also the summary by al-
\(\text{Māzhūmī}\), 146 ff.); in any case, he does not seem to have undergone direct influences of master on disciple. By his personality, the austerity of his habits, his disinterestedness, and also as a result of his position in relation to the caliph al-
\(\text{Rashīd}\) (see Zubaydī, 143; Ibn Khālikān, ii, 228, l. 12) and especially al-
\(\text{Māzmūn}\) who appointed him tutor to his two sons (see \(\text{Tā'rikh Bhagdad}\), xiv, 150, repeated by al-
\(\text{Anābīrī}\), 130-1), al-Farra\(^3\) appears to have largely deserved the renown which his erudition had won. His knowledge was encyclo-
\(\text{pedic} and derived simulaneously from hadith, ḥikāḥ, astrology, medicine, the "Days of the Arabs", and, naturally from grammar (cf. \(\text{Tā'rikh Bhagdad}\), xiv, 151, condensed in \(\text{Yākūt}\), \(\text{Udābā}\), xx, 11 and al-
\(\text{Anābīrī}\), 132-3); his Mu\(\text{tazīlī} leantings are certain but, according to al-
\(\text{Dhāhib}\), al-Farra\(^3\) had no real gift for kalām (see Ibn Khālikān, ii, 229, l. 13; cf. \(\text{Yākūt}\), loc. cit.). It is above all as a grammarian of the Kūfan school of al-
\(\text{Bughya}\) that he came to be recognised as the leader of the "School of al-
\(\text{Kūfa}\)" (cf. the in-
\(\text{formation given by Ibn Khallikan, ii, 228, l. 12) and especially al-
\(\text{Māmūn}\) who appointed al-
\(\text{Farrā}^3\) to the vizier Ibn al-
\(\text{Nadīm}\) consisted of four volumes; the work is in process of being edited (i, Cairo 1374/1955) by Ahmad Nadjati and Muh. Nadjīdār (for the MSS see Brockelmann, S I, 179); other Kūfan had written works bearing the same title, among them al-
\(\text{Ri\'āsī}\), al-
\(\text{Kūfān}\), (sic) the list of works given in the \(\text{Tā'rikh Bhagdad}\), 67, enumerating 13 titles (cf. \(\text{Mā\text{\^{a}}}nī al-
\(\text{Kūfān}\)), introd. by the editors, to-1, who include 17 titles; this initial list serves as the basis for those given by \(\text{Yākūt}\), Ibn Khālikān, and al-
\(\text{Su\^{u}yīt}\), \(\text{Bughya}\) which includes only 11 titles); a number of these works appear to be lost; note also that certain titles appear to apply to chapters of the \(\text{Hudūd}\). His work consists of: (a) writings on grammar such as — 1. \(\text{K. Ma\text{\^{u}}\text{zīdīm} (}\?\text{)}\) (see \(\text{Yākūt}\), xva, 14; Ibn Khālikān, ii, 229, l. 30; the \(\text{Fīrist}, 67\), gives a \(\text{Haddā mulūsamāt radqān} (sic) among the chapters of the \(\text{Hudūd}\)) — 2. \(\text{K. al-
\(\text{Hudūd}, \text{"Definiiones grammaticae"}, thought by some to have been dictated at the instance of al-
\(\text{Māznūm}\), after 204/819 (cf. \(\text{Tā'rikh Bhagdad}\), xiv, 149) or, more probably, before that date (see Cairo ed., i; cf. al-
\(\text{Ma\text{\^{a}}}nī al-
\(\text{Kūfān}\)), 151); according to the \(\text{Fīrist}, 67\), we possess the list of 45 chap., but al-
\(\text{Su\^{u}yīt}, \text{Bughya}, \text{gave it as 46 and al-
\(\text{Zubaydī}, 150, speaks of 60; the work was imitated by the Kūfan Ibn Sa\text{\d{a}dān} (d. 231/ 845; cf. \(\text{Fīrist}, 70, l. 5) — 3. \text{K. Fa\text{'}ala (}\?\text{) wa-
\(\text{af\text{'}ala (see \(\text{Fīrist}, 67); the K. al-
\(\text{Hudūd} contains a chapter with the same title; a work possibly quoted by al-
\(\text{Su\^{u}yīt}, \text{Mūtīr}, ii, 95 — 4. \text{K. al-
\(\text{Ma\text{\^{u}}\text{ṣār} wa \text{\textquotesingle}m-
\(\text{mādad} (\text{Fīrist}, 67); quoted by al-
\(\text{Su\^{u}yīt}, \text{Mūtīr}, ii, 225 ff. and by Ibn al-
\(\text{Sa\text{\d{a}dān} (ibid., ii, 106); for the MSS, see Brockelmann, S I, 179), and \(\text{K. al-
\(\text{Mu\text{\^{a}}}\text{shkar wa \text{l-
\(\text{mu\text{'}ammāt} (\text{Fīrist}, 67); the K. al-
\(\text{Hudūd} contains a chapter with the same title; ed. Mu\text{\^{a}}\text{ṣāfā Zara\footnote{The Cairo ed. reproduces the version of Muh. b. al-
\(\text{Dhāhib al-
\(\text{Simarī}) were of importance (cf. the in-
\(\text{formation given by Ibn Khallikan, ii, 228, l. 12). 17. \text{K. al-
\(\text{Wāhīf} wa \text{l-
\(\text{ibtidāt} fi \text{l-
\(\text{Kur\text{'}ān} (\text{ibid., 35, l. 10 and 69); — 17. \text{K. al-
\(\text{Wāhīf} wa \text{l-
\(\text{ibtidāt} fi \text{l-
\(\text{Kur\text{'}ān} (\text{ibid., 35, l. 10 and 67); — 18. \text{K. al-
\(\text{Yākūt\footnote{At present we can really only judge al-
\(\text{Farrā}^3\) by the published part of the K. \text{Mā\text{\^{a}}}nī al-
\(\text{Kūfān}\). The work is highly disappointing and without any general theme, being confined for the most part to argumentation on casual syntax; if here and there certain
interpretations of a Mu'tazili character are to be observed (as in i, 353: nur-imdn) or lexicographical remarks which are not devoid of subtlety (i, 385 on fataha "to judge"), on the other hand the comments on the "lectures" are curious rather than convincing (i, 455). Bearing in mind that this work has not come down to us in the form which the master gave to it, we reach the conclusion that al-Farra' mainly owes his importance to the influence which he exerted over his pupils, either through writings received from him or through his personal authority. In general his followers have, without exception, been distinguished by the same grammatical anomality, of which so many instances are to be found in the K. Mu‘āní al-Kur‘ān, based upon respect for usage particularly when aberrant (see the discussions on certain "readings", op. cit., i, 353, 355, 375-383, 363, 375, 460).

Bibliography: Fihrist, 30, 34 ff., 36, 41, 63, 66-70, 71, 74, 75, 88, 107, Tāhirīk Baghādād, xiv, 149-55; al-Anbārī, Nasha', 65 ff., 126-127, ed. Samarrā’t (Baghdād 1959), 34, 65-8 (repeating the previous work without acknowledgement); Yākūt, Udbab, ii, 276-8 = ed. Rīfā‘ī, Cairo 1936 onwards, xx, 9-14; Ibn al-Mudār al-ISFĀHĀNī, Ṣaḥḥārat al-nahw, ii, 19 ff. and Ibn Khallīkān, Wafaydt, Cairo 1310, ii, 228-30 (all three going back to or somewhat later). Suyūtī, Buḥyghayn, 411 (probably summarizes Yākūt or Ibn Khallīkān); Abu ‘l-Tayyib al-Lughawī, Marāṭīb al-nawwiyin, ed. Muḥ. İbrāhīm, Cairo 1375/1955, 88 and passim; Zubaydī, Tabakāt al-nawwiyin, 60 ff., 143-6, passim; Sam‘ā‘nī, Anṣab, f° 4204; Suyūtī, Musḥir, Cairo 1942, i, 19 quotations or mentions, ii, 33 quotations or mentions, particularly p. 410. Articles or studies by Ahmad Amin, Dā‘ūd al-Islām, iii, 309-8 (biographical synthesis); Makhzuml, Madrasat al-Kufa, Baghdād 1374/1955, 99 ff., 144-71 (important); H. Ritter, in Isl., xvii (1928), 249-57; Pretzl, in Islamica, vi (1933), 16; H. Fleisch, Traité de philologie arabe, Beirut 1961, 13-5, 30, 48 and index; Brockelmann, i, 46 and S I, 178. (R. BLACHERE)

FARRUKHĀBĀD, name of a town and district in the Uttar Pradesh state of India; situated between the Ganges and the Yamuna (Diamna) between 26° 46' and 27° 43' N. and 78° 8' and 78° 8' E., with an area of 1,685 sq. miles. Before the establishment of Pakistan the Muslims were in a majority but many of them later migrated to Pakistan. While the district can boast of an ancient past, the town itself is of comparatively recent growth, having been founded in 1126/1714 by Muhammad Khān Bangash (b. c. 1076/1665), an Afghan military adventurer belonging to the Ma‘ūν-Raghībdābād (now a mere name), a village near Kā‘limangūr, where his father ‘Ayn Khān was employed as a trooper by one ‘Ayn Khān Sarwānī. A dashing soldier, Muhammad Khān had collected about him a band of Afghan mercenaries. When Farrukh-Siyar (q.v.) contested the title to the throne of Dīhlī, he joined him and helped him to win the throne by providing a force of 12,000 men on the battle-field of Samuqārā (1124/1713), nine miles east of Āgra (q.v.). Soon afterwards Kāsim Khān Bangash, father-in-law of Muhammad Khān, was killed in a clash with the local Rādjīptas, and the king, as a token of gratitude, granted his daughter (Muhammad Khān's wife) five mābdīs by way of blood-money. He also ordered the building of a town, named after him, in memory of the slain Bangash chieftain. Thus was founded the town of Farrukhābād, which soon grew in prosperity: and an Imperial mint was established there at which coins (mostly silver rupees) continued to be minted even for the later Mughal emperors. The coins of ‘Alamgīr II, Shāh Durraitī, and Shāh ‘Alam II have the name of the town—Ahmadnāgar—derived from Nawwāb Ahmad Khān, younger son of Muhammad Khān, who had defeated the forces of Sa‘dār-Dīnj, the Nawwāb-Wāzīr of Awadh, in 1163/1750 and recovered from him his lost patrimony, Farrukhābād, which had been captured by the Awadh forces in 1161/1748. This second name appears for the first time on coins minted at Farrukhābād in 1170/1756. Even after the British occupation of the town in 1191/1777 the Farrukhābād mint continued to function for the East India Company, which used it up to 1835, minting silver rupees in the name of Shāh ‘Alam II, although he had died years earlier in 1221/1806. These rupees bore the legend (sikka) of Shāh ‘Alam II in Persian and were known as the Farrukhābād Sīcā rupee.

The earliest account of the district is that of the Chinese traveller Huien Tsang, who mentions some of its ancient sites including that of Sankṣa. The historic Kanawājī, capital of the empire of Hardha Vardhānī in the 7th century A.D., which was plundered and sacked by Maḥmūd of Ghaznī in 409/1018, captured by the Ghūṭrī Sultan Shāhāb al-Dīn Muḥ. Ibrahim, Suyūtī, Buḥyghayn, 411 (probably summarizes Yākūt or Ibn Khallīkān); Abu ‘l-Tayyib al-Lughawī, Marāṭīb al-nawwiyin, ed. Muḥ. İbrāhīm, Cairo 1375/1955, 88 and passim; Zubaydī, Tabakāt al-nawwiyin, 60 ff., 143-6, passim; Sam‘ā‘nī, Anṣab, f° 4204; Suyūtī, Musḥir, Cairo 1942, i, 19 quotations or mentions, ii, 33 quotations or mentions, particularly p. 410. Articles or studies by Ahmad Amin, Dā‘ūd al-Islām, iii, 309-8 (biographical synthesis); Makhzuml, Madrasat al-Kufa, Baghdād 1374/1955, 99 ff., 144-71 (important); H. Ritter, in Isl., xvii (1928), 249-57; Pretzl, in Islamica, vi (1933), 16; H. Fleisch, Traité de philologie arabe, Beirut 1961, 13-5, 30, 48 and index; Brockelmann, i, 46 and S I, 178. (R. BLACHERE)
FARRUKHABAD — FARRUKH

... His mastery was universally acclaimed, and numerous poets imitated his manner.
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... numerous poets imitated his manner.

FARRUKHISTAN, Abru 'l-Hasan 'Ali b. DqrolGh, the celebrated Iranian poet, a native of the town of Sistán (cf. Yákût, s.v.; Karwint, Nuzhat, s.v.), as he says in a hemistich: "I place how two of his most beautiful poems (Dinwan, 177 and 331) which he recited in the presence of the amir governor of Saghaniyán (Barthold, Turkestan, index s.v.) won him the favour of that prince, Fakhir al-Dawla Abú 'l-Muzaffar, the last of his line (cf. Niżāmī 'Arūdī, Cikār makāla, trans. E. G. Browne, 122-3; ed. Mu‘in, Tehran, 176-80), and then a little later (cf. ibid., 331) which he recited in the presence of the sultan's first two successors, whose praises he celebrated without fulsome ness, mentioning their bounty in several of his kasidas; he also wrote poems in honour of leading court dignitaries. On several occasions he accompanied the sultan on his expeditions against India (witness these lines: 'Three times was I with you on the immense sea ...', the trials and fatigue embittered, journey home has broken me'). The collected edition of his poems (diwan) contains more than 9,500 lines of verse; while the treatise on rhetoric Tardījman al-balāgha, often attributed to him, is in reality the work of Muhammad b. Umar al-Radūyānī (end of 5th/11th and beginning of 6th/12th centuries; ed. Ahmed Atész, Istanbul 1949—important introduction). He died probably in 429/1037-8, while still young, according to the lines of his contemporary Labī (quoted by Radūyānī): "If Farrukh died, why did not Unsürl die? The old man lingered on; the young man went so soon" (Tardījman, 32). His kasidas, which are panegyrics, are characterized by the ease and vigour of their style; uncomplicated ideas and sentiments are expressed in sober, clear and fluent language which gives his poetry a particular charm. According to Rāghdh-i Wātān (Haddākh al-sābīr), his talent is reminiscent of that of the Arab poet Abū Fīrās. His shorter poems (a small number only: kīfa, ghasal, rubā’) are remarkable for their freshness and spontaneity of feeling, and for the occasionally ironical and pungent subtlety of thought which sometimes transforms a kīfa into an excellent epigram; in short, the delicacy he shown in the ghasal is just as great as the rhetorical force in the hasida. His mastery was universally acclaimed, and numerous poets imitated his manner.
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Farrukh-Siyar now marched on Delhi, being joined on the way by the elder Sayyid brother, 'Abd Allah Khân, who was the
deputy-governor of šâha Ilâhâbâd, and by many nobles from the eastern parts. He defeated Diahândâr Shâh [q.v.]
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Matters being dominated by the orthodox elements outside the court against them. As a result, the court became divided into two opposing factions, the administration suffered, and the prestige of the central government was undermined. However, it does not seem correct to identify the court factions as "Mughals" and "Hindustânis", with the Sayyids acting as the leaders of the latter. A close study shows that the factions were not based on any religious or ethnic groups in the Mughal nobility, personal and family attachments and considerations being the main factor. Taking advantage of dissatisfaction at Farrukh-Siyar's patronage of unworthy favourites, the Sayyids gradually succeeded in winning over to their side or in neutralizing most of the important nobles—Radja Diay Singh Kâzwâlâ of Âmber remaining a notable exception. Matters rapidly came to a head. In February 1719, Husayn 'Ali, who had assumed personal charge of the Deccan in May 1715, re-entered Delhi at the head of a large army, which included a force of 15,000 Marâthi horsemen under the command of the Peshwa, Bâldji Wishwanâth. After a proffered compromise had been rejected by Farrukh-Siyar, he was deposed and blinded on 9 Rabi' II 1131/28 February 1719, and a new prince, Râffi' al-Dardjat, was proclaimed. Soon afterwards, in the night of 9 Dhu'mâdâ 1131/ 27-28 April 1719, Farrukh-Siyar was strangled.

The chief importance of Farrukh-Siyar's reign lies in a clear breach with Awrangzbâd's policies in a number of spheres. The dzîya was abolished even while Farrukh-Siyar was in Bihâr. After his victory, an effort was made to conciliate the leading Râdjâts by granting them high munsâbâs and appointing them to important posts. The marriage of Farrukh-Siyar to the daughter of Maharâjâ Adît Singh of Dijdhpur, which was celebrated with great pomp and ceremony in December 1715, was intended as a symbol of the reconciliation. Under the stress of the factional struggle at the court, the Sayyids also befriended the Dîa't Râdja, Čurâman, acquiescing in his usurpation of many areas in the neighbourhood of Âgra, and made far-reaching concessions to the Marâthas, recognizing Radja Shah's right to levy causâs and receiving in return a commission of 35% of the revenue, in the six šâhas of the Deccan. Farrukh-Siyar actively opposed the concessions to the Dîats and the Marâthas. He also sought, belatedly, to rally the orthodox elements to his side by reviving dzîya in 1129/1777. The impost was again abolished by the Sayyids after his deposition.

Another development, which marked an important phase in the growth of the English East India Company, was the grant to it in 1129/1777 of fardmânsecureing the right to carry on trade free of duties in Bengal, Bihâr and Orissa, and at Sûrat and Madras, besides sundry other privileges. There is, however, little justification for the view that these grants were made by Farrukh-Siyar out of gratitude to the English surgeon, Dr. William Hamilton, who had successfully treated him. Dr. Hamilton's services were rewarded by the grant of a robe, a horse, five thousand rupees and other costly gifts. But it was not within the power of Farrukh-Siyar to make grants of the nature desired by the English without the agreement of 'Abd Allah Khân, the wzâir, whose domination over the affairs of the state was almost complete at this time. The English realized this only when two successive applications made by them through their agent, Farrukh-Siyar's personal favourite, Khân-i-Dawran, proved fruitless. Finally, they approached 'Abd Allah Khân, and he sanctioned their petition, over-

Farrukh-Siyar accordingly, and inciting the nobles and elements outside the court against them. As a result, the court became divided into two opposing factions, the administration suffered, and the prestige of the central government was undermined. However, it does not seem correct to identify the court factions as "Mughals" and "Hindustânis", with the Sayyids acting as the leaders of the latter. A close study shows that the factions were not based on any religious or ethnic groups in the Mughal nobility, personal and family attachments and considerations being the main factor. Taking advantage of dissatisfaction at Farrukh-Siyar's patronage of unworthy favourites, the Sayyids gradually succeeded in winning over to their side or in neutralizing most of the important nobles—Radja Diay Singh Kâzwâlâ of Âmber remaining a notable exception. Matters rapidly came to a head. In February 1719, Husayn 'Ali, who had assumed personal charge of the Deccan in May 1715, re-entered Delhi at the head of a large army, which included a force of 15,000 Marâthi horsemen under the command of the Peshwa, Bâldji Wishwanâth. After a proffered compromise had been rejected by Farrukh-Siyar, he was deposed and blinded on 9 Rabi' II 1131/28 February 1719, and a new prince, Râffi' al-Dardjat, was proclaimed. Soon afterwards, in the night of 9 Dhu'mâdâ 1131/ 27-28 April 1719, Farrukh-Siyar was strangled.

The chief importance of Farrukh-Siyar's reign lies in a clear breach with Awrangzbâd's policies in a number of spheres. The dzîya was abolished even while Farrukh-Siyar was in Bihâr. After his victory, an effort was made to conciliate the leading Râdjâts by granting them high munsâbâs and appointing them to important posts. The marriage of Farrukh-Siyar to the daughter of Maharâjâ Adît Singh of Dijdhpur, which was celebrated with great pomp and ceremony in December 1715, was intended as a symbol of the reconciliation. Under the stress of the factional struggle at the court, the Sayyids also befriended the Dîa't Râdja, Čurâman, acquiescing in his usurpation of many areas in the neighbourhood of Âgra, and made far-reaching concessions to the Marâthas, recognizing Radja Shah's right to levy causâs and receiving in return a commission of 35% of the revenue, in the six šâhas of the Deccan. Farrukh-Siyar actively opposed the concessions to the Dîats and the Marâthas. He also sought, belatedly, to rally the orthodox elements to his side by reviving dzîya in 1129/1777. The impost was again abolished by the Sayyids after his deposition.

Another development, which marked an important phase in the growth of the English East India Company, was the grant to it in 1129/1777 of fardmân securing the right to carry on trade free of duties in Bengal, Bihâr and Orissa, and at Sûrat and Madras, besides sundry other privileges. There is, however, little justification for the view that these grants were made by Farrukh-Siyar out of gratitude to the English surgeon, Dr. William Hamilton, who had successfully treated him. Dr. Hamilton's services were rewarded by the grant of a robe, a horse, five thousand rupees and other costly gifts. But it was not within the power of Farrukh-Siyar to make grants of the nature desired by the English without the agreement of 'Abd Allah Khân, the wzâir, whose domination over the affairs of the state was almost complete at this time. The English realized this only when two successive applications made by them through their agent, Farrukh-Siyar's personal favourite, Khân-i-Dawran, proved fruitless. Finally, they approached 'Abd Allah Khân, and he sanctioned their petition, over-
ruling the objections advanced by the officials of the revenue ministry (Early annals of the English in Bengal, ed. C. R. Wilson, iii, 235, li/2, p. xxiv-xxvii, 42-73). 4Abd Allah Khan accepted no personal gratification, and his motives in approving the grants can only be guessed at.

Though Farrukh-Siyar possessed none of the qualities of greatness, his deposition and death made him a martyr in popular eyes, and contributed to the subsequent downfall of the Sayyid brothers. He was apparently survived by only one daughter who married the emperor Muhammad Shah [q.v.] in 1131/1720-1.

**Bibliography:** Documents as well as contemporary and secondary works for the reign of Farrukh-Siyar are very numerous. For details, see Later Mughals, by W. Irvine, ed. J. Sarkar, Calcutta and London 1921; Satish Chandra, Parties and politics at the Mughal court, 1709-1740, Aliqar 1959; from detailed personal enquiries I have learnt that no Ms. of the type described in the Oriental College Magazine, i1a (Aug. 1926), p. 58, no. 70, and referred to by Storey (sec. II, no. 276) exists in the Punjab Univ. Lib. See also M. Mu'imin b. Muhammad Kâsim al-Šârâ'i al-Šârézâl, Khatam al-khayâli, J.R. Lib., ff. 152a-152b (summarized by A. Mindana, in Bull. J.R.Lib., xix (1924), 150-65); Jâhed al-sháh al-Muhammad al-Ma'mûn b. Muhammad, I.D. no. 1711, ff. 520a-524b, 647-8; 'Uthmâd Khân, Mirâd al-hakâ'îb, Bod. Lib., Fraser no. 124, ff. 124a-124b (contents summarized by R. Singh, in Proc. IHRC, xvii (1941) 356-62); Early annals of the English in Bengal, ed. C. R. Wilson, 3 vols., London 1895-1917; Home Misc. Series, Ikix; Satish Chandra, Jisjaz in the post-Anurângp period, in Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong., 1946, 320-6; idem, Nafis, Early relations of Farrukh Siyâr and the Sayyid brothers, in Med. Ind. Quart., Aliqar 1957, 135-46; B. N. Reu, Letter of Maharajah Ajit Singh relating to the death of Farrukh Siyâr, in Proc. 9th A.I. Or. Conf., 1937, 839-42; A. G. Pawar, Some documents bearing on imperial Mughal grants to Raja Shah, in Proc. IHRC, xvii (1941), 204-15; S. H. Ashkari, Bishar in the first quarter of the 15th century, in Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong., 1941, W. Basque, and J. Sarkar, The Magna Carta and after, in Proc. IHRC, vii (1925), 79-87. For works dealing with the revenue and administrative history of the period, see N. A. Siddiqi, Mughal land revenue system in Northern India in the first half of the eighteenth century, (unpublished thesis, Aligarh University). For the career of conquest which culminated in the establishment of the greatest empire of the ancient world. Two centuries later, Farrukh, together with the rest of Persia, was overrun by Alexander the Great. Little is known of the province in Seleucid and Parthian times save that it was ruled by a native of Farrukh of which he became king in 280 A.D. His grandson and father had both been tenders of the sacred fire in the temple of Anahit (Venus) at Isfâl (A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassaôides, Copenhagen 1944, 86). In 224 A.D. 'Amrrevolted, killed Artavan, the last Arsacid, in battle, and thus threw off the Parthian yoke. In this way the Sasanian dynasty and empire were founded. Not without reason did E. C. Browne (ii, 92) describe Farrukh as the 'cradle of Persian greatness'.

In Sasanian times Farrukh was divided into 5 districts, namely, Ardashir-Khurra, Shâpûr-Khurra, Arradjân, Isfâl, and Dârâgbîrd.

It was during the caliphate of 'Umar that the Muslim Arabs made their first attempt to conquer Farrukh (or Farrukh, as they called it), when al-'A'la b. al-Hadrâmî, the governor of Bahrayn, sent 'Arfaqâ b. Harâmâ to attack it from the sea, but the enterprise proved unsuccessful. When 'Uthmân b. Abî 'l-As succeeded 'A'la b. al-Hadrâmî as governor of Bahrayn, he sent his brother al-Hakam to effect the conquest of the province. Al-Hakam, after seizing some islands off the coast, landed on the mainland, but was unable to penetrate far into the interior. During the caliphate of 'Uthmân [q.v.] the Arabs made a further attempt to overrun Farrukh. At Tawwadjî (or Tawwaq), near Râshâh, 'Uthmân b. Abî 'l-As and his men fought a desperate battle with the Sasanian forces under the command of the marshâb Shahrâk; victory at length went to the Arabs after Shahrâk and many of his men had fallen (Balâghûr, 386). Simultaneously, another Arab army, under the command of Abî Mûsâ al-Ashâ'î, set out from Basra and invaded Farrukh from the west. The two generals, having joined forces, penetrated deeply into Farrukh, capturing Shîrâz; in the north the town of Simûz (the ruins of which are near Ganâfâ (Djânânbâ) also fell into their hands. 'Uthmân then detached his forces and captured Dârâgbîrd (which then became arabisized as Dârâgbûd), Pasâ (Fašā [q.v.]) and Shâpûr (Sâbûr). In 286/69-8 the army under Abî Abd Allah b. 'Amir besieged and captured the city of Isfâl; he then marched southwards and took Fârûṣzâbâd and Fars was watered by a number of rivers of Fars. The land-tax (khârûdh) was fixed first at 33 million dirhams; later, in the reign of al-Mutawak-
kil, it was raised to 35 million. The poll-tax (diržya) brought in a revenue of 18 million (diizya). With the decline in the temporal authority of the Caliphate in the 3rd/9th century, Fars came under the sway of Yaʿṣūb b. Layth, the founder of the Saffārīd dynasty. He made Shīrāz his capital city, where his brotherʿAmr b. Layth built the great cathedral mosque on the site of which the present Masjīd-i ʿDāmī stands. The Buwayhids later obtained possession of Fars, one of whom, ʿAḍud al-Dawla, extended his power over most of Persia and part of Mesopotamia; one of his notable achievements was the construction of the great barrage over the river Kurr which was called the Band-i ʿAmir or the Band-i ʿAḍud after him. The Buwayhids were succeeded as rulers of Fars by the Saljūqs [q.v.]; when the power of the latter was on the wane, Sunjkūr, the first of the Salghurid Atabegs, gained possession of the province in 543/1148-9 and refused to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Saljūqs. The Salghurid Atabegs maintained themselves as rulers of Fars until that remarkable woman Abīṣ Khatūn, after ruling for a year, married Manūg Ţumīr, a son of the Il-Khan Hūlegū Khan, in 667/1268 (Hamd Allāh Mustawfī, Taʾrīḵ-i ʿUstāda, 509); thenceforward her authority was only nominal.

Mubārak al-Dīn Muhammad, the founder of the Muzaffarid dynasty, added Fars to his dominions in 754/1353. The Muzaffarids ruled over Fars until Mubārak al-Dīn's grandson Shāh Maṣrūṣ was defeated and killed outside Shīrāz in a fierce encounter with the forces of Timūr in 795/1393. Shah Ismāʿīl I, the first of the Šafavīd line of rulers, who was enthroned at Tabrīz in Muḥarram 907/July 1501, established his authority in Fars two years later. Under him and his successors both Fars and its capital Shīrāz prospered. During the reign of Shāh Abāb I [q.v.] ʿImām Kull Khān, the great Governor-General of Fars, maintained almost regal state in Shīrāz where, in March 1628, he sumptuously entertained the English envoy, Sir Dodmore Cotton, and his suite (see Sir Thomas Herbert, Travels in Persia, 1627-1629, edited by E. Denison Ross, London 1928, 74-85).

Shīrāz, in common with many other places in Fars, suffered severely in the fighting between the Persian forces under Nādīr Kull Begg (Tahmāsp Kull Khān, the future Nādīr Shāh) and the Ghāzīzād Afghāns under Ṭabrīz. This fighting ended with the complete defeat and virtual annihilation of the Afghāns in 1730 (see L. Lockhart, The fall of the Safavid Dynasty and the Afghan occupation of Persia, Cambridge 1938, 336-9). Fars suffered again in the disturbances which occurred after the assassination of Nādīr Shāh in 1760-1747, but the accession to power of the beneficent Karim Khān Zand [q.v.] who made Shīrāz his capital, soon resulted in a return of peace and prosperity. After Karim Khān's death in 1193/1770 Fars suffered once more during the struggle for supremacy between various members of the Zand family and, subsequently, between the gallant Lutf ʿAll Khān Zand and his relentless foe Agha Muḥammad Khān Kāḏjār.

In more recent times the history of Fars has been comparatively uneventful except on the following occasions: In 1250/1834, following upon the death of Fath ʿAll Shāh, his brother ʿAlī Muḥammad, the Governor-General of Fars, had himself enthroned in Shīrāz, but was soon after defeated and forced to relinquish his claims by his nephew Muḥammad Shāh (for details of the battle, which was fought near Kumūshā, see Baron de Bode, Travels in Luristan and Arabistan, London 1845, 1, 61-2; see also Ḥādījī Mīrzā Ḥasan ʿFarsāy, Fars-Nāma-yi Nāṣīrī, Tehran 1133/1723, 111-2). Four years later, in consequence of Muḥammad Shāh’s insistence on maintaining the siege of Herāt despite protests by Great Britain, that power occupied the island of Kharg, 35 miles north-west of Būghār, and threatened to declare war on Persia. The Shīrāz thereupon gave way, and the troops were subsequently withdrawn from Kharg. On 5 Džumādā I 1260/23 May 1844 Sayyīd ʿAll Muḥammad announced in Shīrāz that he was the Bāb or ‘Gateway’ (to the divine Truth), a development which led to very serious disturbances not only in Fars but throughout the country (see bāb, bābāh). In 1273-4/1856, when the seizure by Persia of Herāt involved her in war with Great Britain, the latter power again occupied Kharg and then landed a force on the coast of Fars. This force, after taking Būghār, advanced upon Shirāz; the occupation of the latter, the operations of the British troops, and the disturbances which occurred after the accession of Nādir Shāh in 1160/1747, but the accession to power occupied the island of Kharg, 35 miles north-west of Būghār, and threatened to declare war on Persia. The Shīrāz thereupon gave way, and the troops were subsequently withdrawn from Kharg. On 5 Džumādā I 1260/23 May 1844 Sayyīd ʿAll Muḥammad announced in Shīrāz that he was the Bāb or ‘Gateway’ (to the divine Truth), a development which led to very serious disturbances not only in Fars but throughout the country (see bāb, bābāh). In 1273-4/1856, when the seizure by Persia of Herāt involved her in war with Great Britain, the latter power again occupied Kharg and then landed a force on the coast of Fars. This force, after taking Būghār, advanced upon Shirāz; the occupation of the latter, the operations of the British troops, and the disturbances which occurred after the accession of Nādir Shāh in 1160/1747, but the accession to power occupied the island of Kharg, 35 miles north-west of Būghār, and threatened to declare war on Persia. The Shīrāz thereupon gave way, and the troops were subsequently withdrawn from Kharg. On 5 Džumādā I 1260/23 May 1844 Sayyīd ʿAll Muḥammad announced in Shīrāz that he was the Bāb or ‘Gateway’ (to the divine Truth), a development which led to very serious disturbances not only in Fars but throughout the country (see bāb, bābāh). In 1273-4/1856, when the seizure by Persia of Herāt involved her in war with Great Britain, the latter power again occupied Kharg and then landed a force on the coast of Fars. This force, after taking Būghār, advanced upon Shirāz; the occupation of the latter, the operations of the British troops, and the disturbances which occurred after the accession of Nādir Shāh in 1160/1747, but the accession to power occupied the island of Kharg, 35 miles north-west of Būghār, and threatened to declare war on Persia. The Shīrāz thereupon gave way, and the troops were subsequently withdrawn from Kharg. On 5 Džumādā I 1260/23 May 1844 Sayyīd ʿAll Muḥammad announced in Shīrāz that he was the Bāb or ‘Gateway’ (to the divine Truth), a development which led to very serious disturbances not only in Fars but throughout the country (see bāb, bābāh). In 1273-4/1856, when the seizure by Persia of Herāt involved her in war with Great Britain, the latter
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minism and Free-will), ed. with Eng. transl. and notes by 'Ali Mahdi Khan, Allahabad 1934. A treatise on the kinds of women and a dā'īn of Persian poems is also attributed to him.


**FĀRKĪDS,** the Fārūkī dynasty (so-called because of claimed descent from the ḥalīfāʾ ʿUmār al-Fārūk) established and ruled the semi-independent Muslim principality of Ḍīlī between the rivers Ṭaptī and Narbāda for two centuries, until, in 809/1409, his way to the court of Firuz Shah Tughluk of Dīlī, led by the latter's nephew Bahram Khan Mazandānī, and fled to Dawlatabad. Thence he made a further open clash between Gūḍiṟāt and Ahmadnagar over Khandesh, with Mahmud Baykara supporting another Ālam Khan, which waited on Firuz, in an effort to persuade him from exercising any authority at Thānīn. Unreconciled, however, to the supremacy of Firuz, in 833/1429 Nasir concluded a marriage alliance between his daughter and Ḍalāʾī al-Ādīm Ahmād, son of Ḍalāʾī Ahmād Bāḥmān. This move did not save Khandesh from being overrun in the following year by Gūḍiṟāt forces, agreeing to pay tribute to the Bahmani and Khandesh forces on the Gūḍiṝāt border district of Nandūrbār. In 839/1435, disillusioned with the connexion with the Bahmanis, Nasir Khan attacked Berār with the approval of Ḍalāʾī Shāh of Gūḍiṝāt. But this was severely defeated by the Bahmani general Malik al-Tūḏqīrānī, suffering the plunder of his capital Būrḥānpur before the threatened invasion of Ahmad Shāh Bāḥmanī's forces. These persuaded Malik al-Tūḏqīrānī to withdraw. Nasir Khan died in Ṣaḵbī Augustine 1437. Nasir Khan's immediate successors, ʿAḍī Khan (died Ḏuʿl-Ḥijjah 844/1441) and Mubārak Khan (died ḎuṬb-i Thādiwa ascent 1457) accepted Gūḍiṟāt's overlordship without apparent stir, but ʿAḍī Khan (died 907/1504). Then, the death of Dawūd Khan (Djumda I or Ḏuţb-i Thādiwa capture 1441) precipitated a further open clash between Gūḍiṝāt and Ahmadnagar in support of a mythical Mahāmūd Shāh Fārūḵī against Mahāmūḍ Bāyḵārā. This is probably a garbled version of efforts by ʿAḍī Khan II to loosen the ties with Gūḍiṟāt, garbled, as Haigh (op. cit., 120) suggests, to disguise the discomfiture of Ahmad Niẓām Shāh.

Following the death of ʿAḍī Khan II, the political life of Khandesh was torn by dynastic rivalries which invited the intervention of the stronger neighbouring powers. First, a struggle occurred between Dawūd Khan, brother of ʿAḍī Khan, who had succeeded to the throne (though not without first having to overcome opposition by some of the āmirūn), and an unspecified relation, ʿĀlām Khan Fārūḵī, a protégé of the ruler of Ahmadnagar, Ahmad Niẓām Shāh. Dawūd successfully sought aid from Māwā rather than provide Mahāmūḍ Bāyḵārā with further opportunity for intervention in Khandesh, and the Ahmadnagar forces were forced to withdraw (907/1504). The death of Dawūd Khan (Ḍuḍ中介机构 A 914/Agustus 1508) precipitated a further open clash between Gūḍi rượ and Ahmadnagar over Khandesh, with Mahāmūḍ Bāyḵārā supporting another ʿĀlām
Khán, a descendant of Hasan Khán the brother of Nasír Khán (see above), against the Nizam Shah’s Farukid client, the previously-named Álam Khán, invading Khandesh in Shádán 984/November-December 1508, Mahmúd captured Thalhné and Burhánpur from the forces of the Nizám Shah and his supporters and in Dhu ‘l-Hijja 947/April 1509 installed the Gujárát candidate as ‘Ádil Khán III of Khandesh. The latter married the daughter of the later Muṣaffar II of Gujárát. ‘Ádil Khán III’s son Muslim Khán (reg. Shádán 997/December 1532-3. Mahmúd I died, however, before he could consolidate the Farukid claim to succeed Bahádúr Shah in Gujárát.

The reign of Muḥammad I’s successor in Khandesh, Múbárak Sháh II (died Dúmádá II 972/December 1566) witnessed the first encounter of the Farukids with the Mughals. In 962/1562, Akbar’s general Pír Muḥammad followed Báz Bahádúr (q.v.) into Khandesh burning and killing Bahádúr’s defeated forces by a combination of the forces of Múbárak, Báz Bahádúr and Tufál Khán of Bélí and drowned in the Nárbadá. In 972/1564, Akbar himself marched to Málwa and compelled Múbárak to accept Mughal overlordship and a marriage alliance. At first Mughal overlordship did not prove any more restrictive than that of Gujárát and the Farukids remained free to pursue their alliances with other powers, subject to the obligation to give military and other support to the Mughals in their enterprises. In 975-6/1568-9 Mírán Muḥammad II (died 984/1576) invaded Gujárát to take advantage of the discontents of its amirs under the puppet Muṣaffar III, but after some initial success was obliged to retie rebuffed. In 982/1574 Muḥammad II in collusion with the rebel Bahádúr Shah and Mínáma attempted to win Berár, newly annexed by Murtuẓá Nizám Sháh I, but the forces of the Nizám Sháh overmatched those of the Farukid ruler and the latter was obliged to buy off a siege of Asfír for 900,000 or 1,000,000 muṣaffaris.

From c. 993/1585, however, with Akbar rounding out his empire in the north, Mughal pressure to the south began seriously to be felt and in 994/early 1586, Rádžá ‘Álī Khán (or ‘Ádil Khán IV, killed Dúmádá II 1005/February 1597), the last Farukí with any ability for successful diplomatic manoeuvre, was desired to give passage and aid to a Mughal army appointed to intervene in Ahmádánágra. Overtly complaisant, Rádžá ‘Álī Khán covertly engaged the support of the Berár forces against which the Mughals wished to move, and Mírán ‘Azíz Kóka, Khán-i Aṣam, Mughal governor of Málwa, retired from the Deccán discomfited. In 999/1591, however, Rádžá ‘Álī Khán actively furthered Akbar’s policy of aiding Bérún Nizám Sháh II (to become ruler of Ahmádánágra, being mainly responsible for the victory of Rohankhé, Dúmádá II or Raqab 999/April or May, 1591. Rádžá ‘Álī Khán now probably assisted indirect Mughal intervention in the Deccán in hope of staving off direct Mughal intervention, but the death (Shádán 914/ April 1515) of Búrún Nizám Sháh II, followed by appeals from one of the Ahmádánágra factions for Mughal aid, precipitated the direct Mughal military interference which Rádžá ‘Álī had tried to head off. Rádžá ‘Álī, bending with good grace before the wind, joined Akbar’s forces in the siege of Ahmádánágra (Rábí’ II to Raqab 1004/ December 1595 to March 1596) which ended in the negotiation of the cession of Bérár to Akbar. An uneasy peace was soon broken by disputes over the limits of the ceded area and in Dúmádá II 1005/February 1597 Rádžá ‘Álī Khán, supporting the Mughals against the forces of Ahmádánágra, Búránpur and Golkóná, was killed at the battle of Ašhí. Unfortunately, practice of impious influence by the other male members of the ruler’s family under Hábshí guard enabled Akbar, following their capture in Asfír, easily to send the entire dynasty into exile, without
The fear of subsequent local opposition finding a focus in a Farukid claimant. (According to Firishta, ii, 568, Bahadur died at Agra in 1033/1623-4).

The extant evidence for the history of the Farukids mainly displays them in their dealings with outside powers and not with their own servants and subjects. From the references given in hagiographical literature (e.g., Gulzar-i Abrar, available to me only in the Urdu translation Adhkar-i Abrar) it appears that Burhanpur (q.v.), the Farukid capital, was a favourite burial place for Shah, and that the Farukids provided madrasa lands for the disciples of Shaykh Burhan al-Din Qarib, said to have foretold the foundation of the later Burhanpur and the rule of the Farukids there. The details and the significance of this apparent association between the Farukids and the madrasa have yet to be critically established. C. F. Beckingham, Anwa Selon and Asgarh, in JSS, ii (1937), 182-5, has noted the parallels between Ethiopian and Khânêdês custom in keeping imprisoned the male members of the ruling dynasty in an attempt to avoid dynastic quarrels. Habshîs became prominent in Gudjarat under Bahadur Shah and his successors and it may be suggested that Habshî prominence in Khânêdês as amirs and as guardsians of imprisoned relatives of the ruler also dates from this period. C. F. Beckingham, Tabakdt-i Akbari, Nizamat al-Dîn Ahmad, Gulzdr-i abrdr, iii, 151-2, index, as having their madfan at Burhanpur or Asir; T. W. Haig, The Farukid dynasty of Khânêdês, in Indian Antiquary, viii (1918), 113-24, 141-9, 178-86; Cambridge History of India, 1928; the account of Khânêdês in (ed.) R. C. Majumdar, The Delhi Sultanate, Bombay 1960, 169-73, 238, has been written in apparent ignorance of much contemporary or near-contemporary evidence and of important iconographical material. Coins of Nâzir Shâh Fâruqi of Khânêdês, in Journal of the Numismatic Society of India, vi (1944), 46-7; idem, A copper coin of Bahadur Shâh Fâruqi of Khânêdês, in JNSI, xii (1950), 154-6; M. K. Thakore, Coins doubtfully assigned to Qâdir Shâh of Mâled, in JNSI, ix (1947), 36-44; M. Hamid Kuraishi, Some Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit inscriptions from Asirgarh, in Central Provinces, EIM, 1925-6, i-6. For the controversy over Akbar's detention of Bahadur Khân Fâruqi and the fall of Asirgarh (inadequately referenced in the article Asirgarh) see also Vincent A. Smith, Akbar, the Great Mogul 1542-1665, Oxford 1917, 272-86, 297-300; Fernão Guerreiro, Relaçm annual das cousas que fizeram os padres da Companhia de Jesus na India de Japão, i, EIM, 1953, fols. 29a-9, trans. H. Heras, The siege and conquest of the fort of Asirgarh by the Emperor Akbar, in Indian Antiquary, lii (1924), 33-41; C. H. Payne, Akbar and the Jesuits, London 1926, 102-9, 251-8; Cambridge History of India, iv, 1937, 147-8; E. Maclagan, The Jesuits and the Great Mogul, London 1952, 58, 372; John Corrêa Afonso, Jesuit letters and Indian history, Bombay 1955, 86-7; Shâhpurshâh Hormaş Maddville, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, i, Bombay 1939, 589-90, Supplement = vol. ii, Bombay 1957, 289-91. For valuable remarks on the historical geography of Khânêdês see O. H. K. Spate, India and Pakistan: a general and regional geography, London 1957, index s.v. Khandesh.


FARUKIDS — FARW

(A.) or FARWA (pl. farā), 'a fur; a garment made of, or trimmed with, fur.' Although farwa can mean also a cloak of camel-hair, it is likely that when this term is encountered in ancient poetry it refers to sheepskins with the wool left on (what in Morocco are called haydûra), used as carpets, to cover seats, or for protection against the cold; the farwa which Abu Bake had with him and which he spread on the ground in the cave or the Parwâdi, and the rest on (what in Morocco is called the parwâdi) was presumably a sheepskin. The wearing of costly furs was introduced only after the Arabs had reached a fairly advanced stage of civilization, at which time the name farà?
The furs most often mentioned are grey squirrel (sīnḏāb), sable (samāmjīr), ermine (ḵājum), fox (ḵošaḵāb), beaver (ḵundus or Ḵošūd, khowz), mink [? see ḵanak], lynx (wāgšāk) and weasel (inb ḵeš). The geographers and travellers provide information on the origins of these furs: they came chiefly from dealers in furs and pelts who used the skins of sheep and thisba battled Caspian is more highly prized than the red and the irs). There were establishments for their manufacture in addition to those given in the article: B. Schier, Wege und Formen des altesten Pelzhandels in Europa, Frankfurt 1951, 21-45; Th. Lewicki, Il commercio arabo con la Russia e con i pasi slavi d'Occidente nei secoli IX-XI, in ATUON, n.s. vii (1958), 57-8; cf. ibid. 47-8, where other writings on Arab trade with Eastern Europe are cited; C. E. Dubler, Abā Ḥāmid al-Ǧarandūn . . ., Madrid 1953, index and glossary, s.vv. samāmjīr, sinḏāb, ḵājum, etc.; L. A. Mayer, Mamluk costume, Geneva 1952, 23, 25, and index, under the names of the individual furs; Makrīzī, ḵaṭṭāt, i. 103 (on the furriers' market: cf. Dozy, Dictionnaire . . . des noms des vêtements chez les Arabes, Amsterdam 1845, 357).

Farwān, also Farwān, ancient town in the Hindu-Kush mountains and a modern administrative district of Afghanistan, the capital of which is Charikar.

The modern town of Dījābal al-Sirā digit. 1751 m.) is located near the site of the ancient Farwān, ca. 69' 15" E., 35° 7' N. by the Panjūrīr valley near its junction with the Ghūrābān river. Farwān may have occupied the ancient site of Alexander's Alexandria of the Caucasus or Alexandria-Kapisa. It was conquered by the Arabs ca. 176/792 (Ibn Rusta, 289) and included in the province of Bāmiyān. Coins were struck in Farwān by the Ghāznawī rulers, and it was the centre for silver mining of the Panjūrīr valley. Many geographers mention the town, but it achieved prominence only under Dījābal al-Dīn Ḵbārīzamēkh when he defeated the Mongols there in 618/1221. The site of the battle, however, may be another Farwān (Ḫuḏād al-ṯīlam, 348). The site was the scene of a battle in the first British-Afghan war in 1840, but there is no indication of a settlement. In 1937, with the construction of a textile factory in the modern town of Dījābal al-Sirāḏī, the area began a new history.


Farwardīn (see taḵrīgh).

Faryāb (also Fārīyāb and Faryāb), name of several towns in Iran:

1. A town in northeastern Afghanistan, now called Daulatabad, formerly in the province of Dūrūndān. It was conquered by al-ʿAṭaf b. Kāyā in 65/685 (al-Baladhrūr, 407). Many geographers mention the town as large and flourishing until the Mongol conquest: when it was destroyed. It never regained its former importance.
2. A small town in southern Fars province (Le Strange, 257, 296).
3. A village in Kirmān (Le Strange, 317).
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(R. N. Frye)

_FAS_ (Fēs, Fez), a town of Northern Morocco situated at 4° 34' W., 34° 6' N. It stands at the north-east extremity of the plain of the Sā'īs, at the exact place where the waters of the eastern side of this plain go down into the valley of Sebou via the valley of the Wāḍī Fās. It is therefore on the easiest route between the Atlantic coast of Morocco and the central Maghrib. Furthermore, one of the least difficult roads across the Middle Atlas to the south passes by way of Sefrou, 30 kms. south of Fās, and the communications between this last town whether with the Mediterranean coast (Bādīs or Vélez) or with the Straits of Gibraltar (Tanger) are relatively easy, too. It might be said that Fās is clearly situated at the point of intersection of two great axes of communication, indicated by the general contours of the country: one axis north-south between the Mediterranean or the Straits of Gibraltar and the Tāfīllāt and so beyond to the negro countries; the other west-east between the Atlantic coast and central Maghrib.

Moreover, the site of Fās is rich in water; apart from the river itself and its tributaries, which it has been easy to canalise, and to which a very later use, numerous springs rise from the steep banks of the water-courses, especially from the left bank, which is actually inside the town. In the immediate vicinity there are quarries which provide building stone, sand and lime, while the cedar and oak forests of the Middle Atlas are not far away and offer wood of very good quality. Finally, for considerately distances around, the neighbouring country is favourable to all types of farming. Cereals, vines, olives and various kinds of fruit-trees grow here, while not only sheep and goats but cows also can be raised here.

Nevertheless it seems that no urban centre existed on this privileged site before the Muslim town came into being. Archaeology has not confirmed the vague legendary tradition of the "Founder of Fās" according to which a very ancient town existed long ago on the site of Fās. It can therefore be regarded as likely that Fās came into being at the end of the 2nd/8th century at the desire of the Idrīsids. When Idrīs b. Idrīs, had it destroyed with the exception of the principal sanctuary of the left bank area, the Karawīyyīn mosque (Djami [q.v.]), it and the original ones. The Almoravid conquest marks a very important date in the history of Fās, since Yūsuf b. Tāṣhūfīn combined the two towns into one and made it his essential military base in Northern Morocco. There is therefore good right to consider the Almoravid conqueror as the second founder of Fās: it was he who did away with the duality which had for so long prejudiced the city's development; it was he also who marked out for it the direction in which it was to develop in the future by building to the west of the two original towns and on the very edge of the plain of the Sā'īs, an important fortress, now disappeared, which stimulated the growth of more new quarters between it and the original ones. The Almoravids were also responsible for the construction of the principal works in the Wāḍī Fās, thanks to which the city has possessed a system of running water from a very early date, to back to the Almoravid epoch. Fās lived thus under the Almoravids for almost three-quarters of a century (457-540/1062-1145), one of the most prosperous periods of its existence, but a period about which unfortunately we have all too little detailed information.

The Almoravid conquest [see AL-MUWAHHIDUN] marks a brief pause in the history of Fās. When ʿAbd al-Muʿāmin [q.v.] attacked it in 540/1145, the city, which had every good reason for remaining faithful to the Almoravids, put up a violent resistance. The Almohad only conquered it after a hard siege, and punished the town by razing the Almoravid kasaba and the city ramparts. But like the Almoravids, the Almohads had need of Fās and the town grew afresh in its proportions of which al-Idrīs's account gives a fair idea. It is a city in full development and at the height of economic progress that he describes
in his work, The fourth Almohad Caliph, al-Nasir, even ordered on the very day after the defeat of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212), that the ramparts of Fâs should be reconstructed. The general outline of these and a good part of their masonry date from this period (Pl. XIII). Thus the old city of Fâs attained the proportions that we now know. Its surrounding wall is pierced by eight huge gates, four on each bank, and it seems certain that empty spaces, gardens and orchards, once existed within this enclosure.

A century later, Fâs changed masters anew and once more under the authority of the Marinids [q.v.]. Though badly received at first, the new masters succeeded in raising the city's prosperity to a height as yet unknown. Unlike the Almoravids and the Almohads, they did not come from the south but from the east, and Fâs was the first large town which they had succeeded in conquering; hence they made it their capital and relegated Marrakush to second place. Because of this the fortunes of Fâs were assured for several centuries. The new court lived at first in the kasaba which the Almohads had constructed on the site of the ancient Almoravid kasaba, in the district now called Bû Djulûd (probably a popular corruption of Abu l-Djumâd). They soon found themselves cramped for space here; hence the Marinid sovereign Abu Yusuf (1258-1286) decided to found a new kasaba close by, which he called al-Madînâ [i.e. the white city], but has been known for a very long time and still is known as Fâs al-Djâdîli (New Fâs). It consisted essentially of the palace, a great mosque to which were added little by little various other sanctuaries, barracks, the homes of various important Marinid dignitaries, and later, in the 9th/10th century, a special quarter in which the Jews were compelled to live. From the beginning, this town was surrounded by a double city wall, broken by only a few gates. In the 10th/11th century, these were reinforced and decorated with a number of bastions capable of supporting cannon. Thus Fâs became again a double urban centre, with a middle-class and commercial town, Fâs al-Bâli (Ancient Fâs), known locally as 'al-Madinâ' (i.e. the 'town' proper) and an administrative and military centre which complemented rather than entered into competition with the first. The description which Leo Africanus gives of Fâs at the beginning of the 16th century gives the impression of an active and heavily populated city, so heavily populated indeed that several areas of lightly constructed buildings had been established outside the ramparts, especially to the north-west of the ancient city. It was a commercial and industrial city (notable for its textiles and leather-goods), but also a city of religion and learning, where around the Karawiyyn Mosque flourished what J. Berque has called 'the School of Fâs' (Ville et Université. Aperçu sur l'histoire de l'École de Fâs, in Rev. hist. de Droit fr. et étr., 1949), and finally a centre of art, thanks to the country palaces built by the Marinids on the hills which dominate Fâs to the north, thanks above all to the colleges (madrasas) built mainly in the 8th/14th cent by various Marinid princes around the Karawiyyn Mosque, the Mosque of the Andalusians in the upper part of the old town, and in Fâs al-Djâdîli. These colleges are almost all ornamented with good taste and variety and form one of the greatest adornments of Fâs. This favourable situation lasted for three centuries during which Fâs enjoyed political, economic and intellectual priority throughout Morocco as well as in the western regions of what is now Algeria, and was in economic and cultural relations with the western Sahara as far as the loop of the Niger. In 870/1465, the city was the scene of an attempt to restore the Idrisids, which hung fire; the Wattâsîds, successors of the Marinids, do not seem to have been very hard in their treatment of those concerned, as is shown by the description of Leo Africanus who describes an active and flourishing city.

Nevertheless the Sa'dî [q.v.] sharîfs, masters of Marrûkûsh since 931/1524 (R. Le Tourneau, Les débuts de la dynastie sa'dîenne, Algiers 1954) gradually extended their influence over the rest of Morocco, threatened Fâs from 954/1547 on, and thanks to inside intrigues, managed to get hold of it on 28 Du'tu 'l-Hijdîja 955/28 January 1549. This change of dynasty was not a good thing for the city, for the Sa'dîs, a southern people, had already made Marrûkûsh their capital. Fâs became once again the second city of the Sharîfian empire. At first it accepted this situation very unwillingly and welcomed the Wattâsîd pretender, Abu Hassûn, when he put the Sa'dîs to flight on 2 Ša'âr 601/19 January 1554 with the promise of freedom and pardon to all that had accompanied him from Algiers. But this venture was not to be successful for long; the Sa'dîs returned in force in Ša'wâl 601/September 1554. Abu Hassûn, who had been forced to discharge his over-enterprising Turkish allies, was killed in battle beneath the walls of Fâs, and the city came back into the possession of the conquerors. These did not long continue to treat the opposition harshly, reinforced its defences, perhaps in order to hold it more strongly, and put in hand works of improvement and embellishment at the Karawiyyn Mosque. A diminished but still prosperous situation was the lot of Fâs in the second half of the 10th/16th century.

When the Sultan Aḥmad al-Mânsûr [q.v.] died at Fâs on 16 Rabû‘i ‘1 1012/25 August 1603, his sons fought savagely to tear up the succession. There was a state of anarchy in Morocco which lasted more than sixty years (R. Le Tourneau, La décadence sa'dîenne et l'anarchie marocaine au XVIIe siècle, in Ann. de la Fac. des Lettres d'Aix, xxxii (1958), 187-225). Fâs was caught up in this whirlwind of violence, conquered by naked force, and despoiled in various reconquests; very grave internal disputes added to its misfortunes and for more than fifty years it suffered the darkest period of its history. It was an exhausted city of which the 'A-launch pretender, Mawlây al-Râghid, took possession in 1061/1656.

Under the power of this energetic prince, the wounds of Fâs began to heal and it began to come to life again with the help of a sovereign who was putting in hand great works of public utility (construction of a bridge over the neighbouring Sebou, of two fortresses to the west of the ancient town, restoration of a bridge over the Wadî Fâs, creation of a new madrasa in addition to those built by the Marinids) when he was killed accidentally in 1082/1672. His brother, Mawlây Ismâ'îl [q.v.], who replaced him, was also a remarkable man but he detested Fâs; he had a new capital constructed at Meknès and continued to insult and offend the people of Fâs throughout his long reign of fifty-five years, to such a degree that the city was becoming depopulated. On the death of Mawlây Ismâ'îl (1139/1727) matters became even worse; several of his sons
fought over the succession and, just as in the preceding century, Morocco fell back into a grave state of anarchy. Once again, for a period of thirty years, the end of the 19th century, the capital, Fas, was desolate and the country was a scene of ephemeral rulers, among them Mawlay 'Abd Allāh who detested its people, and to the pillaging of the soldiery, especially that of the military tribe of Udaya. At last, when Sayyidī Mūhammad (1171-1204/1757-1790) succeeded his father, 'Abd Allāh, Fas was granted a long period of respite, which was disturbed only briefly by the disorders which darkened the end of Mawlay Sulaymān's reign (1207-1230/1792-1824). Its position as capital was restored and it shared this with Marrākush up to the beginning of the 20th century. Then Mawlay 'Abd al-'Azīz [q.v.], freed from the tutelage of his Vizier, Bā Aḥmad, adopted a policy of modernization which raised a large part of the Moroccan population against him.

In the course of the second half of the 19th century, many Fās merchants had entered into contact with various European or African countries (England, Spain, France, Italy, Germany, French West Africa) and the city was gradually being drawn into international trade. Moreover a number of Europeans and Americans (soldiers, diplomats, clergy, doctors, businessmen) came and settled in the city of Fas. The discovery of Fas, like that of other parts of Morocco, was beginning to take a new turn. Furthermore, the Sultan Mawlay al-Hasan (1290-1311/1873-1894) [q.v.] had undertaken important public works in this city where he normally lived when he was not travelling around the country at the head of his army: he set up a small-arms factory near his palace, the Makma; he connected by long walls the two urban areas of Fas al-Djallīd and the Madīna, which had remained separated so far, and had a new palace built at Bū Djulud, on the edge of the Madīna.

From 1901 on, Fas once again faced disturbed conditions; it was threatened in 1903 by the pretender, Bū Ḫmāra [q.v.]; then when Mawlay 'Abd al-'Azīz was forced to abdicate in 1908, Fas put into power a descendant of its founder Idrīs, the Shāriṭ Mūhammad al-Kattānī; but he did not succeed in raising an army and could not prevent the Sultan proclaimed in Marrākush, Mawlay 'Abd al-Hāfīz, from installing himself in the city. Unrest continued, however, and the new sovereign, threatened in his capital by Berber tribes from the Middle Atlas, finally appealed to the French army for help in 1911. A column commanded by General Moinier came and encamped under the walls of Fas, the first time that a European army had been in contact with the city; the troops established themselves south of Fās al-Djallīd, at Dār al-Dubbaybaḥ (colloquial pronunciation: Dār ad-Dibābah), a country house built by Mawlay 'Abd Allāh in the 18th century. On 30 March 1912, in the following year, the Protectorate treaty between France and Morocco was signed in a room of the palace of Bū Djulud. A few days later (16 and 17 April 1912), Moroccan troops revolted and massacred a number of Europeans, while at the same time others were rescued by the people of Fās. A little later, General Lyautey, the first French Resident-General of Morocco, was besieged in Fas by rebelling Berber tribes; the town was set free by a column under General Gouraud (end of May - beginning of June, 1912). From that time onwards, Fas was able to live in peace and organize itself for a new type of life.

A European town soon began to rise on a vast flat area in the region of Dār ad-Dibābah; it was called Dār ad-Dibābah in Arabic and the 'Ville Nouvelle' in French. The palace of Bū Djulud became the seat of the Resident-General, and the Bū Djulud district began to fill up with many Europeans. Behind the city walls of Mawlay al-Hasan, there arose administrative buildings adapted to their mediaeval style. The merchants of Fās quickly accommodated themselves to the new economic conditions of the country. Very early on, some of them went and established themselves at Casablanca, without however breaking off all contact with their ancestral city. A system of modern education was organized alongside the traditional religious teaching.

Perhaps startled by so many novelties, the city of Fās retired into its shell for a few years, but soon began to take an attitude of discreet opposition to the new régime. The Rif war and the first successes of 'Abd al-Karīm (1925) raised fear of pillage and hopes of liberation. Little by little, a young people's party turned towards political action hostile to the Protectorate, and led the opposition against the sāhir on the organization of justice in Berber regions (16 May 1930). In 1937 and 1944, at the time of political crises which ended finally in the demand for independence of 11 January 1944, Fas was the scene of important demonstrations. Nevertheless the political centre of gravity of Morocco was shifting towards Rabat and Casablanca, and Fas played no more than a secondary part in the events which, between 1953 and 1956, led to the proclamation of Morocco's independence. At present, Fas is the capital of a province and ranks as the third city of Morocco after Casablanca and Marrākush.

The city, whose population is 279,400 (census of 1952) of whom 15,800 are Europeans, is made up of four main centres: (1) the Madīna, in which empty spaces have almost disappeared, but where certain areas on the outskirts have been opened to motor traffic; (2) Fās al-Djallīd, itself composed of three elements: a little Muslim town of rather humble people which is called Fās al-Djallīd; the palace and its dependencies; the Jewish quarter or Mellāḥ; (3) the New City (Ville Nouvelle), where many Jews and some Muslim families live; (4) a new Muslim town situated to the north-west of the palace and created since 1950 according to modern standards. Around these urban areas, general areas of lightly constructed buildings have sprung up, inhabited by poor people recently come from the country, and these are generally nicknamed 'bidonvilles'.

Fās is connected with the outer world by excellent roads and by a railway which connects the Atlantic coast and Tangier with Oujda on the Algerian frontier. It has also an aerodrome of moderate importance.

Its economic life is founded above all, just as in the past, on its relations with the neighbouring countryside. Its industry has to a great extent remained traditional (textiles, leather-goods, industries connected with food) and has been only partly modernized; the adaptation of its artisans to modern economic conditions is one of its principal problems. By contrast, its agricultural hinterland has grown considerably into a wide belt around the city. The main business city of Morocco at the beginning of the century, it has been dethroned by Casablanca where, however, a good number of its inhabitants have settled.

Not less than as the economic metropolis, Fās has
long been the intellectual metropolis of Morocco, thanks to its great centre of traditional learning, the Djami al-Karawiyyin. In modern Morocco it seems to have been overtaken by the departure of many French and Jews. In the political arena it seems to have been having some difficulty in keeping this priority, since the modern Moroccan University of traditional and modern learning and of intellectual life.

All in all, it seems questionable whether Fás, despite to be having some difficulty in keeping this role of outstanding importance which it has played so many times in its long history. At the moment, the population seems stationary or has perhaps even slightly diminished since independence, following the departure of many French and Jews. In the political arena it seems to have been overtaken by Rabat, the capital, as well as Casablanca. In brief, events in Morocco since the beginning of the 20th century do not appear to have been favourable to Fás.

The actions of the Umayyads in the Maghrib were hardly ever concerned with the spread of artistic influence: the ancient minbar of the mosque of the Andalusians, detached from a more recent one in the course of a restoration of the sanctuary, bears witness to the persistence of oriental influences. Made in 396/986 at the time of the occupation of Fás by the Zirid, Bulukkín, this pulpit of turned and carved wood is of a completely Fātimid style. When in 375/986 an Umayyad expedition retook the town, they began by destroying this Shī‘ī pulpit; but once this pious fury had passed, they saw that the ancient minbar, repaired and provided with a new seat-back to the greater glory of orthodoxy, could very well continue to be used, and an artist was found to make the repairs and additions in the original style. This pulpit, after that of Kayrawán the oldest of all the minbars which have come down to us, is the only monument which remains as a witness of the struggles between the Fātimids and the Umayyads in Morocco.

Thus Fás awakened little by little to artistic life under the prevailing influence of Kayrawán, and in the middle of the 4th/10th century had also received some influences from Andalusian sources.

Monuments

Under the Idrisids.—We know of the two places of prayer which formed the origins of the two great sanctuaries of the city only from brief accounts. The mosque of Fátima in the quarter of the Karawiyyin (243/859) and the mosque of the Andalusians in the quarter of the same name (245/859-60) were buildings of medium size, with naves parallel to the kibla wall, with šāhs planted with trees, and minarets of very modest height. Some rubble remains of the surrounding wall exist in the quarter of the Karawiyyin but, in the absence of all traces of doors or towers, these are not sufficient to allow us to plot the main lines of this first rampart.

The two monuments founded by the two Idris attained urban status only very gradually, and there can have been few monuments built during this period. Under the Zenāta Emirs.—After a troubled period, the city began to develop a certain amount of artistic activity under the Zenāta Emirs, who were allies and vassals of the Umayyads of Cordova. After a Fātimid incursion, the mosque of Fátima, from that time on called the Karawiyyin, and that of the Andalusians became the cathedral-mosques of the two quarters (321/933). The two structures were rebuilt and enlarged under the Maghrāwā Emirs: their naves, still parallel to the wall of the kibla, were made of rows of horseshoe brick arches; the axial naves were bordered with bastions of stone with a four-sided plan. The two stone towers resembling the Andalusian type of minaret, but their copings of projecting string-courses and cupolas belong to the Ifrīkiya type. Andalusian influences were only beginning to be added to the African and oriental elements which had come from Aḥlabīd Tunisia.
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The two monuments founded by the two Idris attained urban status only very gradually, and there can have been few monuments built during this period. Under the Zenāta Emirs.—After a troubled period, the city began to develop a certain amount of artistic activity under the Zenāta Emirs, who were allies and vassals of the Umayyads of Cordova. After a Fātimid incursion, the mosque of Fátima, from that time on called the Karawiyyin, and that of the Andalusians became the cathedral-mosques of the two quarters (321/933). The two structures were rebuilt and enlarged under the Maghrāwā Emirs: their naves, still parallel to the wall of the kibla, were made of rows of horseshoe brick arches; the axial naves were bordered with bastions of stone with a four-sided plan. The two stone towers resembling the Andalusian type of minaret, but their copings of projecting string-courses and cupolas belong to the Ifrīkiya type. Andalusian influences were only beginning to be added to the African and oriental elements which had come from Aḥlabīd Tunisia.

The actions of the Umayyads in the Maghrib were hardly ever concerned with the spread of artistic influence: the ancient minbar of the mosque of the Andalusians, detached from a more recent one in the course of a restoration of the sanctuary, bears witness to the persistence of oriental influences. Made in 396/986 at the time of the occupation of Fás by the Zirid, Bulukkín, this pulpit of turned and carved wood is of a completely Fātimid style. When in 375/986 an Umayyad expedition retook the town, they began by destroying this Shī‘ī pulpit; but once this pious fury had passed, they saw that the ancient minbar, repaired and provided with a new seat-back to the greater glory of orthodoxy, could very well continue to be used, and an artist was found to make the repairs and additions in the original style. This pulpit, after that of Kayrawán the oldest of all the minbars which have come down to us, is the only monument which remains as a witness of the struggles between the Fātimids and the Umayyads in Morocco.

Thus Fás awakened little by little to artistic life under the prevailing influence of Kayrawán, and in the middle of the 4th/10th century had also received some influences from Andalusian sources.

Monuments

Under the Idrisids.—We know of the two places of prayer which formed the origins of the two great sanctuaries of the city only from brief accounts. The mosque of Fátima in the quarter of the Karawiyyin (243/859) and the mosque of the Andalusians in the quarter of the same name (245/859-60) were buildings of medium size, with naves parallel to the kibla wall, with šāhs planted with trees, and minarets of very modest height. Some rubble remains of the surrounding wall exist in the quarter of the Karawiyyin but, in the absence of all traces of doors or towers, these are not sufficient to allow us to plot the main lines of this first rampart.

The two monuments founded by the two Idris attained urban status only very gradually, and there can have been few monuments built during this period. Under the Zenāta Emirs.—After a troubled period, the city began to develop a certain amount of artistic activity under the Zenāta Emirs, who were allies and vassals of the Umayyads of Cordova. After a Fātimid incursion, the mosque of Fátima, from that time on called the Karawiyyin, and that of the Andalusians became the cathedral-mosques of the two quarters (321/933). The two structures were rebuilt and enlarged under the Maghrāwā Emirs: their naves, still parallel to the wall of the kibla, were made of rows of horseshoe brick arches; the axial naves were bordered with bastions of stone with a four-sided plan. The two stone towers resembling the Andalusian type of minaret, but their copings of projecting string-courses and cupolas belong to the Ifrīkiya type. Andalusian influences were only beginning to be added to the African and oriental elements which had come from Aḥlabīd Tunisia.

The actions of the Umayyads in the Maghrib were hardly ever concerned with the spread of artistic influence: the ancient minbar of the mosque of the Andalusians, detached from a more recent one in the course of a restoration of the sanctuary, bears witness to the persistence of oriental influences. Made in 396/986 at the time of the occupation of Fás by the Zirid, Bulukkín, this pulpit of turned and carved wood is of a completely Fātimid style. When in 375/986 an Umayyad expedition retook the town, they began by destroying this Shī‘ī pulpit; but once this pious fury had passed, they saw that the ancient minbar, repaired and provided with a new seat-back to the greater glory of orthodoxy, could very well continue to be used, and an artist was found to make the repairs and additions in the original style. This pulpit, after that of Kayrawán the oldest of all the minbars which have come down to us, is the only monument which remains as a witness of the struggles between the Fātimids and the Umayyads in Morocco.

Thus Fás awakened little by little to artistic life under the prevailing influence of Kayrawán, and in the middle of the 4th/10th century had also received some influences from Andalusian sources.

Monuments

Under the Idrisids.—We know of the two places of prayer which formed the origins of the two great sanctuaries of the city only from brief accounts. The mosque of Fátima in the quarter of the Karawiyyin (243/859) and the mosque of the Andalusians in the quarter of the same name (245/859-60) were buildings of medium size, with naves parallel to the kibla wall, with šāhs planted with trees, and minarets of very modest height. Some rubble remains of the surrounding wall exist in the quarter of the Karawiyyin but, in the absence of all traces of doors or towers, these are not sufficient to allow us to plot the main lines of this first rampart.

The two monuments founded by the two Idris attained urban status only very gradually, and there can have been few monuments built during this period. Under the Zenāta Emirs.—After a troubled period, the city began to develop a certain amount
and new naves of the hall of prayer. A row of rich cupolas—above all domes with stalactites—covered it. The Almoravid enlargements were made of glazed or bonded brick, which on the outer wall of the minbar formed a very beautiful interlacing design. Inside the building, in the great axial nave, rich sculptured decorations, heightened with colour, had been covered with plaster by the Almohads in the period of their rigorous puritanism. These magnificent ornaments, mainly epigraphic and floral, were uncovered in the course of a restoration of the whole of the building directed by the author of this article.

The work of the Almohads, who kept Marrakušh as their capital, was slower to interest themselves in Fas. They gave a cathedral-monastery to the Karawiyn and a house of the Almoravids to the Kasba of Bu Jlud. Under Muhammad al-Nâsir, the mosque of the Andalusians was reconstructed, with the exception of its minaret. The ancient Zirid and Amrid minbar was covered, except for its seat-back, with a new sculptured decoration. At the Karawiyn, which was given a great ornamental chandelier and a room for ritual ablutions, some works of detail were carried out. But the greatest work of the Almoravids was the reconstruction of the great city wall (PI. XIII) which still to-day surrounds Fas al-Ball. Bab Gisa (Djisa) and Bab Mahruk, more or less repaired or altered, date for the main part from this period.

During the whole period of the Almohads, Fas was very prosperous, and Andalusian influences continued to prevail there without rival.

The Marinids. — The Almorahids, who kept Marrakušh as their capital, were slower to interest themselves in Fas. They gave a cathedral-monastery to the Karawiyn and a house of the Almoravids to the Kasba of Bu Jlud. Under Muhammad al-Nâsir, the mosque of the Andalusians was reconstructed, with the exception of its minaret. The ancient Zirid and Amrid minbar was covered, except for its seat-back, with a new sculptured decoration. At the Karawiyn, which was given a great ornamental chandelier and a room for ritual ablutions, some works of detail were carried out. But the greatest work of the Almoravids was the reconstruction of the great city wall (PI. XIII) which still to-day surrounds Fas al-Ball. Bab Gisa (Djisa) and Bab Mahruk, more or less repaired or altered, date for the main part from this period.

Under the Almohads. — The Almohads, who kept Marrakušh as their capital, were slower to interest themselves in Fas. They gave a cathedral-monastery to the Karawiyn and a house of the Almoravids to the Kasba of Bu Jlud. Under Muhammad al-Nâsir, the mosque of the Andalusians was reconstructed, with the exception of its minaret. The ancient Zirid and Amrid minbar was covered, except for its seat-back, with a new sculptured decoration. At the Karawiyn, which was given a great ornamental chandelier and a room for ritual ablutions, some works of detail were carried out. But the greatest work of the Almoravids was the reconstruction of the great city wall (PI. XIII) which still to-day surrounds Fas al-Ball. Bab Gisa (Djisa) and Bab Mahruk, more or less repaired or altered, date for the main part from this period.

During the whole period of the Almohads, Fas was very prosperous, and Andalusian influences continued to prevail there without rival.

The Marinids. — The Almorahids, who kept Marrakušh as their capital, were slower to interest themselves in Fas. They gave a cathedral-monastery to the Karawiyn and a house of the Almoravids to the Kasba of Bu Jlud. Under Muhammad al-Nâsir, the mosque of the Andalusians was reconstructed, with the exception of its minaret. The ancient Zirid and Amrid minbar was covered, except for its seat-back, with a new sculptured decoration. At the Karawiyn, which was given a great ornamental chandelier and a room for ritual ablutions, some works of detail were carried out. But the greatest work of the Almoravids was the reconstruction of the great city wall (PI. XIII) which still to-day surrounds Fas al-Ball. Bab Gisa (Djisa) and Bab Mahruk, more or less repaired or altered, date for the main part from this period.

The Almoravid and Almohad monuments were planned and decorated by artists who came from Spain, but towards the end of the 7th/13th century they had its own workshops, closely linked with those of Granada. From the beginning of the 8th/14th century on, beautiful houses were erected both in Fas al-Djadid and Fas al-Ball, which, like the madrasas, were adorned with floors and facings of faience mosaic, plaster and carved wood. The same decorative style prevailed in sanctuaries, palaces and rich homes.

The Masonry, also very homogeneous in style, is less beautiful but almost as delicate as the ornament. In the walls, stone gives place to bonded or glazed brick, and often also to cobwork. Cedar wood plays a large part in all the architecture of Fas. Whether in beams, lintels, corbeling, ceilings or artesonados domes, it provides both roof beams and cover for all types of buildings. In the framework of doors and openings and in joinery, it is moulded, decorated with pieces of applied ornament, or carved. At the tops of walls and court-yards, it is worked into friezes and projecting porches resting upon carved and painted corbels. This wide use of wood, the frequency of pillars and the rarity of columns, are the only characteristics which distinguish the Marinid monuments from contemporary Nasrid buildings.

Vaulted architecture is to be found only in the great store-houses of Fas al-Djadid and in the hammâms which follow the very simple plans of the Andalusian baths.

Thus under the Marinids Fas received not only its shape as two distinct agglomerations, but also its architectural appearance. From then on it was, second only to Granada, the most active centre of Hispano-Moorish art. Once Muslim Spain had disappeared, all the processes of masonry, techniques and ornament inherited from the 14th century continued to be used in Fas up to our own
times, in a slow decline and with a touching fidelity.

Under the Sa'dis.—The end of the Marinid dynasty and the reign of the Banū Waṭṭās produced no great monuments in Fās. Nevertheless, its buildings maintained the same architectural and decorative traditions as those of the art which preceded this period. Relations with Granada had become more rare, and from the end of the 8th/14th century onwards, the latest innovations in ornament of the Alhambra of Muḥammad V had not been passed on to Fās. And in 966/1462, Granada was reconquered. In the victorious thrust of the emir who had previously been defeated, art in Spain, Hispano-Moorish art became confined by the 10th/16th century to its African domain.

Under the Sa'dīs, who struggled for a long time against the Banū Waṭṭās for the possession of Fās, the city went through difficult times. Mārākūṣh once again became the capital of Morocco and the sultans distrusted the metropolis of the North. They reinforced the ramparts of Fās al-Djādīd, which remained the headquarters of government, with bastions for the use of cannon. Two works of the same kind but even more powerful, the northern burdż and the southern burdż, dominated and overlooked Fās al-Bālī. The Karawīyīn was enriched with two fountain kiosks, jutting out of the southern façade. For a long time, which the Sa'dī dynasty went down, Fās passed through terrible times and in such a troubled period no monuments could be constructed.

Under the 'Alawīs.—The founder of the dynasty, Mālāwī al-Raşḥŏd, hastened to give Fās al-Bālī a new madrasa, that of the Ṣḥārātīn (1081/1670). His successor, Mālāwī Ismā'īl, transferred his capital to Mīkān, near Mālāwī, his Abū al-Raḥmān (1237/1822-25) and Mālāwī al-Ḥāsān (1289-1311/1873-94). The ramparts were repaired many times and one of the great gates, Bāb al-Futūḥ, was entirely rebuilt by Mālāwī Sulaymān.

Numerous sanctuaries, whether cathedral-mosques or simple places of prayer, were built in Fās under the 'Alawī sovereigns and very often through their initiative. The most important of these were the mosques of Bāb Gisā (Dīlās), of al-Raşḥ and of al-Siyād at Fās al-Bālī, and the mosque of Mālāwī 'Abd Allāh at Fās al-Djādīd. Local mosques, places of prayer dedicated to saints, headquarters of brotherhoods, were built in great numbers. Sanctuaries of reasonably large dimensions consisted according to local tradition of naves parallel to the wall of the bidā, the minarets were square towers surmounted by turrets but the decoration of a network of interlacing and falence was almost always omitted and the walls of brick, glazed or not, were ornamented with simple blind arcades. Some little sanctuaries still keep their 'platform' minarets of a very archaic type. An occasional madrasa was built: those of Bāb Gisā and al-Wād preserve very nearly the traditional arrangement.

Most of the houses of Fās date from the 'Alawī period but continue the Marinid tradition. The walls are made either of cobwork or more commonly of brick, and sometimes of coated rubble. In the old town, the houses rise vertically, mostly on two floors around narrow court-yards. These houses, though poor in light and ventilation, are nevertheless sometimes sumptuous; the pillars of the court-yard and the bases of the walls are panelled in faience mosaics; carved plaster often ornaments the door and window frames and the tympanums of the openings, and sometimes even the walls themselves. A cornice of moulded or even carved cedar-wood crowns the whole. The ceilings and the joinery—also of cedarwood—are worked with care. In the less dense outlying districts, there are lower houses around vast court-yards and even gardens.

The fundūqs, with several storeys and galleries, follow the same arrangement as that of the Marinid hostels, and are, in this city of commerce, very often beautiful buildings.

Thus in the work of these last centuries there is nothing new, but a remarkable fidelity to a great architectural and decorative tradition. Despite the baldness of the ornamental detail, both the civil and the religious architecture of Fās preserves, sometimes not without-grandeur, a sense of balance which does not exclude the picturesque. Above all, a perfect unity of style, maintained by guilds of artisans, knowing and loving their work, has given Fās al-Bālī and even more, Fās al-Djādīd, an astonishing harmony. A perfect arrangement of town and country has succeeded in preserving in Fās as in other ancient cities in Morocco, their originality and beauty. In Fās, more than elsewhere, there has been preserved the architectural and decorative climate of Muslim Andalusia.
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F. Mā (formerly Fasa), is situated in 28° 56' N. and 53° 39' E. Long. (Greenwich); it is 1,565 metres above sea level. Fās is 164 km. from Shīrāz, 55 from Dārābjird and 70 from Djaḥrum. The district (qāhristān) of which Fās is the capital forms part of the seventh Ustūn (Fārs). The Muslim Arabs under Uγmān b. Abī 'l-'Aṣ captured Fās in 236/644. According to Ḥṣām Allāh Mustawfī (Nāsha, 124), it was originally called Saʿān and was triangular in shape. Ibn al-Baʾbīlī (Fara-norma, 130) stated that Fās was as large as Iṣfāḥān; it had been destroyed by the Ṣḥābānḵara tribes, but was rebuilt by the Atabeg Čawīl. The climate was temperate and the surrounding district produced the fruits of both the cold and hot regions. The abundant water supply was entirely from Ḥuṣn, there being no wells. The cathedral mosque was of burnt brick and rivalled that of Mālīnā for splendour (Mūkaddas, 431). Fās was famous for its carpets and brocades and also (according to the Ḥudūd al-ʾĪlam, 127) for its rose-water. In 1951 the population was 8,300. 4 km. to the south of the town is the ancient mound known as the Tell-i Daḥāk.
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Fās Bālī — Madrasa of Abū ʻInān: court, and façade of the prayer-hall.

(Service des Monuments Historiques du Maroc, photograph by Jean Latour)
Fās Bālī — General view from the north, with the Almohad walls in the foreground.
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Fas Diadid — The Great Mosque: sahn and minaret.

(Service des Monuments Historiques du Maroc, photograph by Jean Latour)
Fās Bāli — Şāhn of the Karawīyyīn mosque: Zenāta minaret and Sa'dīd pavilion.
(Service des Monuments Historiques du Maroc, photograph by Jean Latour)
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Fās Diadid — The Great Mosque: mihrāb.
(Service des Monuments Historiques du Maroc, photograph by Jean Latour)
Fās Bālī — The Şahridj madrasa: north-west façade of the courtyard.
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Fās Bālī — Madrasa of the Sharrāṭīn: courtyard.
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FASA — FAŠAHA

Southern Persia, in Eastern Persia, i, 109; Le Strange, 290, 293, 294; Rāhnama-yi Iran, 170 (with plan on 177). (L. LOCKHART)

FAŠAD [see FASÄT, KAWN].

FAŠĀHA, an Arabic word, properly "clarity, purity", abstract noun from fašīh, "clear, pure". To summarize the definitive analysis of the concept as it was achieved in the work of Djalal al-Dīn al-Kazwini, the Khasīt Dimaghk (666-739/1267-1338), and his commentator, Sa'd al-Dīn al-Taftāzānī (742-751/1342-80), in Arabic rhetoric fašīh is applied to: (1) a single word or phrase; if it is not difficult to pronounce, it is not a foreign or rare word and its form is not an exception to the usual; (2) a whole sentence, when it does not contain an objectionable construction, a discord, an obscurity (through a confusion in the arrangement of the words) or a metaphor too far-fetched and therefore incomprehensible. The first kind of fašāha is called fašhāt al-mufrad, the latter fašhāt al-kalām. There is also (3) a fašhāt al-mutakallim. This is peculiar to a person whose style conforms to the above conditions (Kazwini, Tálkhis al-Miṣfāt, Cairo 1342/1923, i, 70-6, with Taftāzānī's Muḥāṣar). The adjective fašīh denotes a word or a sentence only when free from objection in itself; it is distinguished from baligh, which also implies that the expression is necessary for its meaning.

From its inception Arabic theory gravitated towards a strict separation between the stylistic areas where the ideal accomplishment is represented by fašāha and balāgha respectively; in practice, the dividing line between the two concepts was not always clearly drawn. A number of critics tended to enlarge the scope of fašhāha at the expense, as it were, of balāgha. In the 5th/9th century Khafadjī, the Khatib Dimashq (666-739/1267-1338), writing on the arrangement of the words, when actually the expression is necessary for its meaning, is called fašhāt al-mutakallim. This is peculiar to a scientific language such as the Kur'an from which the wording and not on the idea, ma'nā. Hence a parrot could be called fašīh, but never baligh. An isolated kalām, however, may be described as fašīh baligh provided it is clear in concept and smoothly fluent, sahl, in style (ibid., 7; some authorities require in addition a certain stateliness, ḥakhamā, without which a discourse may qualify as baligh but not fašīh; this reversal of the usual terminology deserves to be noted).

Abū al-Kāhir al-Djurjani (d. 1078 or 1081; cf. Ritter, Asrār, German translation, Wiesbaden 1959, 5*) clearly felt dissatisfied with the treatment accorded fašāha. The more he studied what scholars had to say about it the more he realized that their statements failed because of their all too general character. Characteristically, nothing much is gained from explanations where fašāha is merely described as a peculiar trait in the putting together of words, ḥusūṣiyat bi fi nāzim al-kalim (Dālā'il al-i'dās, Cairo 1310/1913, 30). Specifically, he is critical of those who maintain that fašāha has no meaning beyond the "harmony within the words and the adjustment of the sequence of the letters so that the real meaning is not lost because of tongue will be avoided", al-talā'āt al-lajf wa-ta'dīl misād al-hurūf ḥattā lā yatalābā bi l-'nawāt hurūf tathkulu 'ala l-tisān. This view would lead to separating fašāha from balāgha (as a separate science or approach) and would constitute euphony the only criterion of rhetorical perfection and the 'ādāt al-Kur'ān, or at least lend it too much importance against such virtues as huṣn al-tarīb, good organization.

The reason why the ancients, al-budama', maintained the strict division between lajf and ma'nā and stressed the function and merits of lajf is that the ma'nāni are manifested by words only. Hence the custom of attributing to the word what has no meaning (ibid., 45-58).

From these remarks one is led to conclude that Durjani did not know al-Khafadi's (d. 465/1073) Sīr al-fašāha (completed 2 Sha'bān 454/11 August 824 FASA — FASAHA
FASAHÁ 825

1062; cf. Sirr, Cairo 1932, 276), perhaps the most thorough examination of the concept. KhafadJI, too, was, ostensibly at least, motivated by a desire to neglect the study of phonetics; the grammarians that of the principles, al-ajs wa 'l-tuss; the critics, ahl nafs al-kaldm, do not rise above the aheru, ibid., 5. KhafadJI is deeply concerned with the phonetic aspect. He observes that Arabic disposes of 29 (or according to al-Mubarrad, who does not count the hansa, 28) huruf; actually, the language has 14 more for which there does not exist any graphic representation. Of these, six add to the fasdh (e.g., the imdla, the z for s in the pronunciation 'masdar' in lieu of 'masdar'), whereas eight detract from it (e.g., the sh for d in the pronunciation 'kharashat' for kharadjal; 19, 21-2). Other languages have in part different huruf; thus Armenian has 36 against the Arabs' 29 (53). The putting together of huruf into words is guided by aesthetic principles; three consonants of the same phonetic category are avoided in the formation of any given word. The best procedure is to combine sounds with distant bases of articulation (53-4).

Fasdh is, then, as a property confined to individual words (55), can be attributed to the al-lafs if certain requirements, shurut, are met. (A) Some of these are manifest in the isolated word, (B) others when the words are connected one with the other (60). The shurut of the first type (A) are the following: (1) the words must be composed of sounds whose bases of articulation are varied; (2) over and above this conformity their sequence must be acoustically pleasing; (3) the words must be neither 'raw' nor barbarous, mutawaddir and waqsh (Suyu'tl, Muzhir, Cairo 1282, i, 114-15, offers a definition of the waqsh and a listing of [near-]synonyms of this term); (4) nor must they be low and vulgar, sad bif and 'ammi (both these requirements are to be found in Djubba, KhafadJI observes); (5) the words must conform to Arabic usage; (6) here objections may arise from fourteen causes, such as (a) the un-Arabic origin of a word; (b) the wrong use of an Arabic word; (c) the unwarranted shortening or (d) lengthening of a word; (e) the extreme rarity of a word or the particular form of a common word as, e.g., an unusual plural; etc. Trespasses of this kind do not impair fasdha very badly yet had better be avoided. (6) The word must not have a second meaning which brings to mind something one does not wish the hearer to think of; (7) the word should be "well-balanced" and not composed of (too) many huruf; (8) if the word is a diminutive it should be used only where a diminutive is directly appropriate: KhafadJI dislikes the tasghir bi-ma'ma al-tashim.

Of these shurut, nos. 1 to 6 apply also to (B) al-alldJI al-mu'allafa, i.e., they constitute requirements for a sequence of words exactly as for a sequence of huruf within the individual word; in fact, nos. 2 to 4 depend on ta'lti entirely on their occurrence in the lasfa mutrada. Az and A8 do not bear on B. To be fasdh, ta'lti must instead fulfill these additional shurut: (1) the words must be placed exactly where they belong; no unjustified changes of the customary word order are allowable (thus ta'ldm and ta'shir as well as the kalb al-kaldm are to be avoided); (2) they must exhibit wasm al-its'ara, appropriate metaphors; (3) they must be free from hashw, padding; in opposition, however, to both the Mu'tazill al-Djubba'T (d. 303/915) and his orthodox critic al-Rummani (d. 387/994), KhafadJI admits (140-x) that some hasg enriches the meaning and adds lustre to the discourse; (4) there must not be any unnecessary repetitions; (5) the words must be properly selected according to the purpose; this includes the use of kinaya, metonymy, where tasrih, plain speech, would be out of place; (6) technical terms are inadmissible (60-161).

There is another set of properties of fasdha which KhafadJI treats separately (162 ff.) even though they could be subsumed under the requirements of (B). These are: (1) munadsaha or tanansab, correspondence between words in regard either (i) to their pattern or (ii) to their meaning. It is under (i) that KhafadJI deals with sadji and isdawddi, bawdji, lusum mā lam yatasm and tasri (internal rhyme), tarsī, haml al-ajs 'ala 'l-ajs 'il-tasī (an unusual name for al-ajs wa 'l-nasr; bokh), al-tanansab fi 'l-misād (requirements concerning the relative length of the various cola in a sadji passage), al-muđijānas (covering both figura etymologica and paronomasia) and, as the lowest form of tanansab, al-taškid (paronomasia based on modifications of the graphic representations of two words and not on sound).

By introducing category (ii) of tanansab, which is concerned with closeness and contrast of the meaning of two lasfa, KhafadJI leaves definitely the area which Arabic theory is generally willing to assign to fasdha. Considering that tibāh, antithesis, for instance, clearly derives from meaning and not from the word pattern or its huruf, it can hardly be viewed as a component of fasdha which, after all, KhafadJI himself had explicitly tied to the word while leaving the meaning to balāgha. KhafadJI goes on to consider tafsī, concision, as a shurut of both fasdha and balāgha. The same applies to clarity, an yakāna ma'ma al-kaldm wādī** sāhir** djālīyy**. KhafadJI justifies its connexion with fasdha by pointing to six reasons for obscurity of discourse (210), two each inherent in (a) the isolated word: the unusual expression; the use of homonyms; (b) the composition of words, ta'lti al-alldJI ba'da-ka ma'na ba'd; concision; (c) the accuracy of tanansab fi 'l-misād; and (c) the ma'ma as such: over-subtlety; too much advance knowledge required for understanding. In this context KhafadJI (212-5) takes sides in a controversial issue by asserting that some parts of the Kur'ān are more aljah than others. Since everybody agrees that Torah, Gospels and Psalms although kalām Alāh are less fasdh than the Kur'ān, there is no reason why all of the Book should be on the same level of fasdha. Additional characteristics, mu'āl, of balāgha and fasdha (not integrated in any classification by KhafadJI) are (1) the designation of an idea not by its usual name but by an expression implying it, and (2) the rendering of an idea through a simile, tanmik. Only at this point does KhafadJI definitely turn to the examination of the ma'ma and their properties such as (224 ff.) soundness, sīkah (eight sub-categories), completeness, or emphatic presentation.

Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rā'īsī's (d. 606/1209) motivation in discussing fasdha is the same as KhafadJI's: its fasdha makes the Kur'ān mu'dījī (Nihayat al-miżār, Cairo 1317, 5). This fact makes its investigation research into the noblest of all religious subjects, viz. the manner in which the Holy Book indicates the veracity of Muhammad (7). But although Rā'īsī follows his predecessor in overextending the content of fasdha his presentation is much more orderly
and shows the progress of scholastic disciplining of scientific thinking in the intervening century.

Fāsāḥa is defined (9) as ǧūlūs al-kālim min al-ṭāʿākīl, the freedom of the discourse from obscurity, or confusion, from anything that "ties" thought and mind. (This definition recurs, e.g., in Ibn Kayyim, Fawāʾid, 9; the concept of ʿtaʿākīl is discussed by Kāzinwī and Taftazānī, Talkhsī, i, 102-108). The purpose of kālim, the conveying of meaning, is achieved on the verbal and the intellectual level. Neither fāṣāḥa nor bāldgha can be predicated of the connection, established between word and meaning, the signifier and the signified. Were it otherwise, fāṣāḥa would have to inhere in the individual ʿurūṭ or in their agglomeration which, however, could not possess any ʿiṣa lacking in the individual ʿarb. Also in this case, a person ignorant of the Arabic tongue would have to be able to recognize al-kālim al-ʿarabī al-fāsfaḥ. Besides, fāṣāḥa is a "plus" achieved by the free choice of words; the qualities of the individual words, on the other hands, are due to the wadʿ al-wāṭiʿ, not to the speaker. Furthermore, a word will be fāṣiḥ in one, ṭakhī, "weak," in another context. The Prophet challenged the Arabs to match the fāṣāḥa of the Book; had this fāṣāḥa rested on the individual words the challenge could easily have been met. Metaphor, ʿiṣiḍā, ʿatšāw, ṭaṣṣāfī, and ṣ̄aṣhī, fāsfaḥa, al-ʿabādī al-fāṣiḥa; since these figures of speech have reference to the maʿnā, not to the laʃz, fāṣāḥa cannot, in its entirety, be word-bound (12-4). The objection (15-6) that everybody speaks of laʃz fāṣiḥ and nobody of maʿnâ fāṣiḥ is countered by the observation that the attribution of fāṣāha to the laʃz refers to its dašāla maʿnawīyya (not its dašāla laʃziyya). In disposing of the criticism that since the same maʿnâ may often be expressed by two laʃz, one fāsfaḥ, the other ṭakhī, fāṣāḥa cannot refer to the maʿnā—nor would it if it did the ṭafsīr al-mufassir be inferior to the speaker's power which it explains—, Rāzī gropes for the concept of the emotive etc. associations surrounding the different terms, Ibn al-Athīr's treatment of "composition" is concerned with removing the subjective element in ascribing fāṣaḥa to a given expression. The frequently proposed definition of the fāsfaḥ as al-ṣāhir al-bayyīn is inadequate. For it is open to three objections: (1) a laʃz would be judged ṭafsīr when clearly understood and ṭaʃiḍ when not clearly understood by the hearer; thereby a subjective element enters, become decisive; (2) consequently an expression would become ṭafsīr to ṣṣiḥ and ḍhāṭir ṭafsīr to ʿArm, whereas the ṭafsīr is uncontroversially so for everybody; (3) an ugly word would be ṭafsīr as long as it was ẓāhir and ṣṣiḥ, evident and clear; yet fāṣāḥa is ṣ̄aʃī ṣ̄uṣn al-laʃz ̀ā wāʃiḥ ḥubh, i.e., it indicates the properties which make a word beautiful, not those that make it ugly. Unfortunately, Ibn al-ʿAṭīr, 82-3, is in the actual discussion replaced by two: al-muḍaʃala al-ṭafsīyīya, the "crowding of one part of kālim upon another" (cf. Lane, 2086a), and, again presented as an original contribution, al-muḍuʃara ṣ̄uʃn al-ʿalāʃ ̀ā ʿl-saʃī (18-9), the juxtaposition of words that do not fit together in the particular context.
the *fasāha* pertaining to a whole sentence. Usage would appear to be for Suyūṭī the decisive factor constituting an expression *fāṣūḥa*. *Fāṣāha* allows of grammatical changes, in an ease not having in another, thus *būr* in relation to *kāmūh* and *hīnūl* (i., 105; cf. Ibn al-Athīr, 26-7 and 59-60 with Ibn al-Hadīd, 40, on *muṣna* and *dīmā* as *āfṣāḥ* than *būr*); so of course are some speakers, and the Prophet is *āfṣāḥ* of all (103).

To be fully understood, the distinction between *fasāha* and *baladgā* must be seen, on the one hand, in the context of the dualism of form and content that dominates the critical thought of the Arab-Muslim theorist and, on the other, in the context of the dualism which the Muslim philosophy of language predicates of its subject. When the activity which results in language is analysed into its two components, *fasāha* emerges as the "virtue" co-ordinated with man's physiological, phonetic effort and *baladgā* as the "virtue" registering the realization of his mental endowment (for the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā as representatives of this "dualism of language" cf. J. Lecert, *Stud. Isl.*, xi (1960), 22-3).

**Bibliography:** In the article; in addition: F. A. Meiser, *Die Rhetorik der Araber*, Copenhagen and Vienna, 1853, 15-8.

---

**AL-FĂŠHIR (EL-FASHIR)**, the capital of Dār Fur [q.v.], formerly a sultanate, now a province of the Republic of the Sudan. The term *fāšir*, meaning a royal residence, more precisely signified an open space, serving for public audience by a sultan, or as a market-place, and was also used in Sinnār under the Fundjī [q.v.], and in Waddāl, where *warā* appears as a synonym (see J. L. Burckhardt, *Travels in Nubia*, London 1819, 486). The *fāšir* of the Fūrī sultan was established in 1206/1791-2 at Wādí Tandālīt, on a sandy ridge, overlooking a seasonal lake. Around this royal residence, the town developed. It was visited between 1793-6 by W. G. Browne, who has left a plan and description of the palace area, but says nothing of the town. Fuller information, and an elaborate but schematized plan of the palace area, were given by al-Tūnūsī, who spent eight years in Egypt and Fūrī from 1818 to 1826, and by Khalīl Zūkal, the first Mahdist governor of Dar Fur. His book, which was surrounded by a triple thorn-fence (ṣarība), were the houses of royal officials, holy men (fakārā) and others. The inhabitants were divided into two groups, the people of Warrādāy (the Men's Gate of the palace), and those of Warrābāya (the Harīm Gate). The houses of the poor were built of millet straw, those of the ruler and notables of mud. Al-Fāšir remained the capital of the sultanate until the annexation of Dar Fur to the Egyptian Sudan in 1291/1874. Sporadic Fūrī resistance continued, and on one occasion Al-Fāšir nearly fell to the troops of the shadow-sultan Harūn. In January 1884, the khedivial garrison surrendered to Muhammad Khalīl Zūkal, the first Mahdist governor of Dar Fur. When the Mahdist state was overrun in 1898, Al-Fāšir became the capital of the revived Fūrī sultanate of All Dinār. In 1926 Dar Fur was annexed to the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and Al-Fāšir became again a provincial capital. Although Al-Fāšir has long superseded Kubbayb (Cobbē), which in Browne's time was the trade-centre of Dar Fur, its difficulty of access from the east has led in recent years to a shift of road-traffic southwards to Nyala, to which town a railway-line was opened in 1959. The population of Al-Fāšir, of varied origins, was estimated at c. 2,650 in 1875, and c. 10,000 in 1905. In 1959 it was 26,161.
Bibliography: for the following principal sources, see under Dar Fur: Browne, al-Tunusi, Nachtigal, Slatin, Shukayr. Also K. M. Barbour, The republic of Fashoda, London 1955; R. Capot-Rey and P. M. Holt, FASHODA proper, the royal village of the Shilluk, lies near the west bank of the White Nile at 9° 50' N., 32° 28' E. It is the principal site of the elaborate ceremonies by which a Reth of the Shilluk is invested with his 'divine' attributes. An Egyptian expedition under the Hübner's All-Khorjan reached Fashoda in 1850. In 1853, a government post was founded on the river some 28 kms. downstream, at 9° 53' N., 32° 07' E., and was named after Fashoda as the nearest place of importance. In 1863 this post became the headquarters of the newly-created mudiriyat of the White Nile. Its garrison contributed to the suppression of the riverain slave-trade, but Fashoda acquired an evil reputation as an unhealthy 'punishment station' for criminal and political exiles. Heavy taxation and forced recruiting led to conflict with the Shilluk. Although the Egyptians were sometimes able to procure the election of friendly Reths, in 1866 and again in 1875 the post was almost overwhelmed by Shilluk risings. The republic of Fashoda, 1850; J. W. Jackson, the Sudan, Oxford 1958; H. W. Jackson, Fashoda 1858, in SNR, iii (1920), 1-9; J. Emily, Mission Marchand, Paris 1913; [A.-E.-A.] Baratier, Souvenirs de la Mission Marchand; Fashoda, Paris 1941; W. L. Langer, The diplomacy of Imperialism, New York 1951; P. Renouvin, Les origines de l'expédition de Fashoda, in Revue Historique, cc/140 (1949), 180-97; G. N. Sanderson, The European Powers and the Sudan in the later nineteenth century, in SNR, xi (1959), 79-100; R. Robinson and J. Gallagher, Africa and the Victorians, London 1961.

AL-FASI, TARI AL-DIN MUHAMMAD b. AHMAD b. 'ALI AL-MAKKIK AL-HASAN b. AL-MALIK (775/832-1373/1429), historian of Mecca, was, through family connexions and upbringing, eminently qualified for his lifework as the outstanding historian of his native city. His father Ahmad (754-819/1353-1416) was married to a daughter of the Meccan chief judge Abu 'l-Fadl Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Abd-al-Hakim b. Ahmad b. Abu 'l-Fadl Muhammad b. Ahmad b. 'Abd-al-Aziz b. Muslim b. Ahmad. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b. 'Agilân. Among al-Fasi's teachers we find the author of Malikibiographies, Ibn Farhun, with whom he studied al-Nakkash, became his father's amir of Mecca, Hasan b.
the waqf deed for his works contained the stipulation that they be not lent to a Meccan.

His numerous works included an abridgment of the Ḥayāl al-hayawān of his teacher, al-Dāmirī, and a number of writings on ḥadīth and other religious subjects, of which two are preserved, Dhawiq al-usūl fi ʿl-ḥadīth and al-ʿArbaʿān al-ḥadith al-mubāyīnīd al-ṣundā. Biographical works on religious scholars included his Supplement to Ibn Nukṭa's Taṣāwīf (which contains an autobiography of himself) and a negative appreciation of Ibn ʿArabī. Of general historical titles, we may mention the Munākhāb al-Mukhtār, an abridgment of Ibn Rāfīʿ's supplement to Ibn al-Najdīḍār's supplement to the Taʾrīkh ʿAbbās (Baghdād 1357/1938; another old ms. in Mecca, cf. Shīrīʿa, ii, 452, n. 2); a partly preserved supplement to al-Dhahābī's Nakaba (Berlin 1873); a supplement to the same author's Ṭabāra and a History of the Rasūlīds (not preserved).

Al-Fāsī's fame, however, rests upon his works on the history of Mecca, a subject which had been strangely neglected practically since the times of al-Azraqī and al-Fākhrī (q.v.). His basic works are Shīrīʿa al-ḍarāṣāt bi-ʿl-bādhā al-ḥalām (Mecca-Cairo 1905; some chapters in Wüstenfeld, Die Chroniken der Stadt Mekka, Leipzig 1857-61, ii, 181 f., cf. 185, 52, 55 f., and ii, 17; and cf. al-Udīd al-ṣanīfī fi ʿl-ḥalām al-ʿālim (Cairo 1289-90; Mecca 1314; additional mss. Cairo Taymūr, ʿaḥrīq 495; Yale L-305 [Cat. Nemoy 1179]; Kattānī, cf. Revue Inst. Miss. ar., v [1959], 184; Istanbul Feyzullah [not Faith] 1482; al-Azhār, cf. Fāshīd al-masāqawārā, ii, 1, 181 f., ii, 106, etc.). The Shīrīʿa contains (1) the description and history of the physical features, both natural and man-made, of Mecca and environs, including a discussion of the holy places and the rituals connected with them; (2) the ancient pre-Islamic history of the city; (3) a chronological list of its governors and rulers; and (4) a selection of historical events connected with it. The ʿIbad, on the other hand, although it starts out with the holy topography of the city (abridged from the Shīrīʿa and entitled al-Zakīʿah al-maktāba min taʾrīkh Makkah al-musawwara), is a collection of biographies of persons connected in some way with the city, beginning with a biography of the Prophet (entitled al-Dhawiq al-ṣanīfīya fi ʿl-sīra al-nabawīyya) and biographies of the other Muḥammads and Aḥmads, including a lengthy autobiography of the author in the third person, and then using an alphabetic arrangement. Of the Shīrīʿa, Al-Fāsī produced five or six successive abridgments, among them Taḥfīz al-ḥarām bi-ʾkhabār al-ḥalām al-ḥarām and, as an abridgment of the Taḥfīz al-ṭarīq al-arḍ, it is the principal characteristic of the Hanafi theory of nullity. In the doctrine of these schools, the two terms are synonymous, the synonymity reflecting their notion of a single sanction. However, we must state at the outset that for the Shīrīʿa and the Hanbal āl this uniform nullity corresponds to the ʿbāṭil form of nullity in Hanafī law, while for the Mālikīs its incidents coincide almost exactly with those of the fāsid type of nullity as expounded by Hanafī law.

If the practical application of the principles we have just expounded does not present serious difficulties, even in Hanafī law, when it is only a question of dealings with property (sale, hire, pledge, etc.), it appears, on the contrary, singularly complicated in relation to the contract of marriage. In this sphere, the fluctuations of the classical doctrine, as it grappled with a contract arbitrarily classified in the same category as sale or hire (fāṣīʿī), and which, in fact, is radically distinct from them, have reverberated down the course of the centuries in the works of authors and have reappeared at the present time—always on the same point—in the codes and laws of personal status recently promulgated in numerous Arab countries. It is therefore necessary to study the theory of nullity in the sphere of marriage separately in a second section.

I. Hanafī Doctri ne. (A) Non-existence, al-buṭlān. This, as has just been explained, is the sanction for the lack of any of the essential elements of a legal act, e.g., free will of the two parties (in
contracts), which, furthermore, must be expressed by the use of a verb in the past tense and which must be declared in those conditions of time and place which are called the false assumption of the contract or the madāḥīs. Free will is presumed impossible (thence occasioning the non-existence of the act) in the case of a mentally defective person, a minor of tender years, and even in the case of a minor who has reached the age of discretion, when this latter performs an act, such as gift, which must necessarily cause him a material loss. Further elements included fundamental are the actual existence of the object, its quality of legal property and the possibility of its delivery (the sale of fish in the sea and birds in the air is bāṭil).

The bāṭil act, since it is considered non-existent, cannot have any legal effect, whether there has been delivery or not. Reasoning on the classical hypothesis of sale—the same rules applying mutatis mutandis to all legal acts—it follows that the purchaser, who has not become the owner, cannot constrain the vendor to deliver to him the sale object, no more than the vendor can require the purchaser to pay him the agreed price. If, in fact, there has been a performance of the agreement reached between them (which is no more than the semblance of a sale) the status quo must be restored, i.e., the vendor must return the property perceived and the purchaser the object delivered, without any need of recourse to law, at least to establish the non-existence of the act. Suppose, now, that after a bāṭil sale followed by delivery the transferee in turn alienates the object, either for a consideration or gratuitously, or that he subjects it to some kind of lien, or that he hires it out or constitutes it as a waqf. In either event, the original vendor will not be deprived of the right to regain his property from the hands of a third party, whether this latter be a purchaser for value, a lessee, or the beneficiary of a waqf. The property, in fact, has never left his ownership because the sale concluded by him was legally non-existent—so much so, the Ḥanāfī authors state, that his heirs will release him; (b) the transferee is a guarantor of the object sold. The property, in fact, has never left his ownership because the sale concluded by him was legally non-existent—so much so, the Ḥanāfī authors state, that his heirs will release him.

There is one case where the application of the principles outlined above may possibly result in injustice. This is where the object sold has perished when in the possession of the transferee.

Strict logic would require that the risks should lie with the vendor: he has remained the owner, since, by reason of the bāṭil character of the sale, transfer of ownership has not been effected. The transferee, after having taken possession of the object, can only be considered, at most, as a trustee; and risks, in the case of a trust, lie with the owner. There exists on this point some uncertainty in the doctrine. In general, authors confine themselves—without taking one side or the other—to expounding two applicable arguments: (a) the transferee is simply a trustee (amanah), and the loss of the object releases him; (b) the transferee is a guarantor of the object, for this has been delivered to him not in the interests of the owner, but in his own interests. His taking of possession more closely resembles ḡāṣib (usurpation) than a trust (amanah).

It would seem that this latter argument prevailed. In the bāṭil sale, therefore, the risks will lie with the purchaser, when this latter has taken possession of the sale object, what is called in his possession. He becomes liable for its value if it is a specific object, and where it is a fungible commod-

ity, he will be bound to restore its equivalent (mahših).

(B). Fundamental nullity, fāsid, is the sanction for the infringement of conditions of validity which do not have the character of constituent elements of a legal act. Such are held to be the precise determination of the object, as regards both its nature and its value, the absence of any illicit gain (ribād) and of the majority of accompanying conditions, and the exclusion of any prejudice which would be occasioned by the delivery of possession. As for the act obtained by duress, this also is regarded as fāsid in Ḥanafi law; but this kind of fāsid nullity is regulated in a particular fashion which distinguishes it from the fāsid nullity of common law.

As a general proposition, we may say that the great majority of fāsid acts derive their character, in Ḥanafi law, from the fact that they contain accompanying conditions: an uncertain term or a suspensive condition (in the majority of the tamālikhāq), immoral or illegal stipulations, or simply conditions which are not in harmony with the nature of the act to which they are attached. This extends considerably the sphere of fāsid nullity, which can thus be regarded as parallel with the nullity of common law, as opposed to the bāṭil nullity whose rôle is most often confined to those theoretical arguments of a school which have no real practical interest.

The effects of fāsid nullity are less extreme than those attached to bāṭil nullity. This is easily explained inasmuch as the fāsid act, although void, is nevertheless constituted; juridically speaking, it exists, although it is vitiated and therefore needs to be negated. The difference between the two kinds of nullity is especially apparent after the delivery of possession or voluntary performance. (a) Before delivery of possession (or, for certain contracts, voluntary performance) the fāsid act is not greatly distinct from the bāṭil act. As is the case with the latter it does not give any of the parties the power to compel performance from the other. Each of them has the right, and the duty, to avail himself of the nullity. A judicial decree is not at all necessary, and the nullity will be established by the declaration of one of the parties or even by the simple act, of the vendor, for example, in alienating the object for the benefit of a third party. The judge who has knowledge of such an act, must, by virtue of his office, pronounce its nullity. It is self-evident that fāsid nullity cannot be removed by confirmation. The act must be performed again in its entirety. However, if the nullity does not stem from a defect in the sale object, but results from the presence of a prohibited condition, the elimination of the offending condition will validate the act, which, thenceforth, will produce its normal effects. A usurious sale, from which the parties, by common agreement, have eliminated the clauses which gave it this character, will transfer ownership from the moment that the forbidden clause disappeared. (b) After the taking of possession authorized by the vendor (reasoning always on the basis of a sale), the fāsid act will produce certain effects which the bāṭil act can never have. It is not that the taking of possession transforms it into a valid act (saḥḥih): this is certainly not so. It continues to be tainted with an absolute nullity, although the vendor has authorized the purchaser to take possession; and this latter is bound to restore the object received and to take back the price he has paid. Delivery of possession, then, following upon a fāsid sale, does not transfer ownership in Ḥanafi law, although such an assertion is often made without the necessary reservations.
According to the opinion which prevails in the school, delivery of possession does not in reality transfer ownership, or at least ownership in the normal sense, since the vendor always reclaim his property as long as it is in the possession of the transference. Furthermore, this transference cannot enjoy or use the thing which he has received (with the agreement of the vendor). "He cannot eat it, nor wear it (if it is a garment), nor ride it (if it is a beast of burden), nor live in the house (which he has bought), nor avail himself of the services of the slave girl that he has acquired" (al-Kásâānî). What does result from delivery of possession following a fâsid sale is solely the transference's power validly to dispose of the object delivered to him, either gratuitously or for a consideration—e.g., he may sell it, give it away, constitute it as a waâfî, or, if it is a slave, set him free. This fiction of ownership, albeit an odd ownership (khabîthâ, bad, defective) in that it confers upon the one in whom it vests the abusus, but not the usuus or the fructus, is quite obviously designed to protect subsequent transferences against a claim for restitution by the original vendor, in so far as their title cannot be impugned on the ground that they acquired the property from one who was not the owner. It is this Hanâfi system, perhaps, which appears the least complicated, the result, vital for the protection of future transferences, delivery of possession or performance following a fâsid contract operates to produce two other effects, less important but not altogether devoid of interest. In the first place, where fâsid nullity is solely the result of the incorporation of a prohibited term within the transaction (an uncertain period, for example), the party in whose interests the term was stipulated has the option of relying upon the nullity or, on the other hand, validating the transaction by renouncing the benefit of the term; whereas, prior to delivery of possession, confirmation of the transaction by repudiation of the offending term could only have been effected by the mutual agreement of the two parties. The second result of the fâsid character of a legal transaction is more significant. The transference has in fact utilised the property delivered to him, or, in case of a contract for services, these services have been performed, or, of course, where the first transference has alienated the property sold. In this case, in order that nullity may not result in unjust enrichment, the price, rent or wages which become due will not be the agreed price, rent or wages (since the contract is null), but will be the market value of the property, or the rent customarily payable, or the usual wages.

II. The doctrine of the other schools. The three other schools refuse to admit degrees of invalidity. To fail to observe the conditions required by the Shi'îa for the validity of an act is equally serious whether it is a question of a fundamental condition or of an attribute (waâfî), which, although it does not have an essential character, is nevertheless imposed by the law. In both cases there is "disobedience" to the rules of the Shi'îa which must be sanctioned by the same nullity.

For the Shi'îa and the Hanâballah, this single nullity corresponds with the bâtit nullity of Hanâfallah law, at least as far as concerns the invalidity of acts of disposition effected by the transference in a valid sale: subsequent transferences cannot be protected against the claim of the original vendor. On this point the texts are explicit. However, outside contracts which operate to transfer ownership, the Shi'îa and the Hanânballah sometimes accept the distinction between bâtit and fâsid in order to avoid, as far as possible, the injustice which would be entailed by the voluntary performance of a void contract if the status quo ante was purely and simply restored as the principle of butuld would require. Finally, the possibility, admitted by both these schools, of the partial annulment of a composite contract concluded by a single legal transaction (saâbâ), which contains both valid and invalid components (the sale, at the same time, of a free man and a slave), fortunately serves to relax, to some degree, the rigidity of their principles.

The Mâlikîs, on their part, regulate the single nullity which sanctions invalid acts (termed fâsid or bâtit) in a different way, with the result that their system is closely parallel to the system of fâsid nullity in Hanâfi law, at least as far as concerns sale, the prototype contract of Islamic law. Recovery by the original vendor in a void sale is impossible, state the Mâlikî authors, when the purchaser has disposed of the property to the profit of a third party, whether by way of sale for a consideration or by gift, or when he has set free a slave, or even when he has merely made the property a pledge or has transferred it to a bailee. In these last two cases the original vendor is bound by the pledge or the bailment for their full duration. Equally, recovery by the original vendor is inadmissible when the form (sûra) of the sale-object has been changed, by "increase or decrease", while in the possession of the first transference. In this case the vendor will have to be satisfied with monetary compensation.

III. Nullity of marriage. Certain Hanâfi authors of authority assert that the distinction between bâtit and fâsid which, for reasons readily understandable, does not apply to ritual obligations (tâbahhâ), is equally alien to the contract of marriage, where all defects, whether they attach to the essence of the contract or to its external conditions of validity, are sanctioned by the same single nullity which is neither exactly a fâsid nullity nor exactly a bâtit nullity. In point of fact, the thought of the classical authors and the transference by the pledge or the bailment for their full duration, the question is bound up with a problem peculiar to Islamic penal law—that of ghubba, or semblance, which is one of the grounds for avoidance of the fixed penalties. The doctrine of each school —and, in the Hanâfi school, the two doctrines there adopted concerning nullity in marriage—are directly influenced by the position taken by the jurists in regard to this theory of ghubba. Indeed, it must not be forgotten that the annulment of a marriage, with its retrospective effect, results in the assumption that the spouses have never in fact been married; if, therefore, there has been consummation, this will, in principle, be held to be fornication, punishable by the severe fixed penalty (kâdd) prescribed in cases of zinât. This penalty, like all the other fixed penalties (bulzâd), is avoided whenever there exists a ghubba, or semblance, which, or the doctrine that the accused is charged and another deed of the same nature which is indisputably not criminal. According to Abû Hanîfa, such a semblance is found in three
sets of circumstances: firstly, when the act with
which the accused is charged resembles an action
which is normally permissible (gshbha fi 'l-fil'),
although text (gshbha fi 'l-makhlu') which precludes
any unani of juristic opinion on the point con-
cerned,—a Hanafi, for example, could believe
that the presence of witnesses at the moment
of the conclusion of a marriage is not indispensable
since they are not required, at that moment,
by the Malikis; finally, when the act has been
done as the result of a contract which observed
merely the conditions of formation (gshbhat al-'akd).
This third category of gshbha is admitted by Abu
Hanifia alone, and is rejected by his two pupils (Abu
Yuṣuf and al-Shaybānī) and by the three other
Imāms: its result is the avoidance of the hadd for
fornication in every case where the dissolution of a
marriage has taken place for any reason what-
soever, even where it is a case of a contract vitiates its essences. Accordingly, in the opinion of Abu
Hanifia—and in his opinion alone—"if the
contract of marriage is ostensibly valid because it
fulfills all the necessary conditions of formation,
but its nullity is nevertheless manifest because there
exists an impediment to marriage between these
two spouses (too close a blood-relation-
ship, foster relationship, the husband already having
four wives, the wife already being married to
another man who has not repudiated her, etc.)
then, in these cases, the penalty for fornication will not be
applied after the separation of the couple; and this
will be so whether or not the spouses acted in good
faith, i.e., whether they knew, or did not know, of
the prohibition they were infringing. The two
pupils of Abu Hanifia, and all the jurists of the three
other schools, did not admit the gshbhat al-'akd, and
accordingly the act of fornication would lapse only if one, at least,
of the two spouses believed that the law was not being
broken by their contract of marriage—this, by
applying the gshbha fi 'l-fil'. In other words, the
dissolution of a marriage on the ground that there
exists a legal impediment between the spouses will
entail the application of the hadd only where the
two spouses acted in bad faith, knowing that they were
being married in contravention of a legal prohibition.
In seeking to reconcile the preceding solutions,
which are of a penal nature and are strictly concerned
only with the offence of fornication, with the rules
relating to the conditions of formation and validity of
a marriage, the authors arrived at two systems of
nullity. The Hanafi school always hesitated between
the two, while the three other schools adopted the
second. It is necessary, at the beginning, to stress
that if the ground for nullity is established before
consummation, the marriage is deemed, purely and
simply, never to have existed: there is no dower,
no maintenance and no rights of succession should one
of the spouses die before the declaration of nullity.
Any Muslim has the right to invoke such a declaration
by the court, if the spouses themselves have not made it:
the trial of the action as such in the civil law includes
no formalities are required. On this point there is a
consensus of opinion. When nullity is established
after consummation, Abu Ḫanifia distinguishes
between the fact that it results from the absence of
a condition of the existence of marriage (legal
capacity, mutual agreement in the
course of the same contractual session) and the fact
that it results from any other cause external to the
formation of the contract. In the first case the
marriage does not exist. It is bāṭil and it pro-
duces no effect, neither entitlement to succession,
nor legitimacy of children, nor the obligation of the
wife to observe the 'waiting period' (īdād). However,
the act—a husband, for example, has had sexual
relations with his wife, believing them to be permis-
sive though the two spouses should be aware of the
illicit nature of their union: (a) firstly, there is no
longer any question of the hadd, the spouses
being relieved therefrom by the gshbhat al-'akd: (b)
that the penalty is avoided, the woman has
the right to a dower—the proper (customary) or
stipulated dower, whichever is less; (c) the woman
will be bound to observe the period of retirement,
which will last until the completion of three menstrual
periods (būrā'); (d) the issue born of this sexual
relationship will be the legitimate children of their
father; (e) finally, the fāsid marriage will raise a bar
to marriage between the relatives of the spouses
whose union has been terminated.
According to the two pupils of Abu Ḫanifia and
the three other Imāms (al-Shafi'i, Mālik and Ibn
Ḥanbal), when nullity is incurred on the ground
that the marriage has been concluded in defiance
of some prohibition concerning blood relationship,
affinity, fosterage, religion, or the fact that the
woman was already married or in her period of
retirement, or that the husband already had four
wives etc., in all cases enquiry must first be made
as to whether the ground of nullity is or is not
disputed. Where there is no unanimity of the
jurists that an impediment in fact exists, the
spouses will benefit from the gshbha which arises
from such disagreement. And even when it is
admitted that the sīma2 condemns the union, still
enquiry must be made as to whether the spouses
were acting, at the moment of the conclusion of
the marriage, in good or in bad faith. Where
they acted in good faith, the marriage, although
naturally null or fāsid, will nevertheless give rise
the limited effects which, in Abu Ḫanifia's
view, follow the dissolution of a fāsid marriage—
although certain schools hold that the wife is
necessarily entitled to the proper dower, even if
this exceeds the agreed dower.
Where the two spouses acted in bad faith, they
are liable to the hadd for fornication, and none of
the normal effects of marriage follows the dissolution
of their union (except the istibrid of one menstrual
period in Mālikī law).
One cannot help drawing a parallel between this
system and the institution of putative marriage in
Christian canon law. In any event, those who adopt
it are remaining, without acknowledging it and,
indeed, without mentioning it, to the distinction
between fāsid and bāṭil.
avoid extending the term fasik to the believer who is guilty only of "lesser sins" (şafik).

The "name and status" (kasab) of the fasik is one of the cardinal points discussed by the kalâm. Its origin goes back to the battle of Siffin and to the question which believers then raised, as to the destiny on earth and the future destiny of the Muslim leader, and hence of all Muslims who sinned.

Two initial trains of thought: a) the Ḥanafis purely and simply condemned the unrepentant fasik to eternal hell and, on earth, denied his right to stand at the head of the Community. To commit an act of fasik rendered the imām unable to hold his office. (N.B.: for the Šī'a, the lawful imām is inherently sinless). b) The Ṣūfis made the unjust man subject, on earth, to the fixed legal penalties (šu'da); but once this debt to the Community was paid, he remained in full exercise of his status as a believer, and, for the life to come, every believer is saved in hope.

These extreme solutions were to undergo certain modifications in the course of scholastic controversies, but were also to be a source of inspiration for them. It was on this theme that the Muʿtazila elaborated the thesis of the so-called "intermediary status", one of their particular characteristics which is attributed to Wāṣīl ibn ʿAṭā. The fasik is not entirely a believer (muʾāmin) nor entirely an infidel (kāfir), but "in a position between the two", fi mansīlatuš* bayna l-mansīlatayn. On earth, he is answerable to the laws of the Muslim Community; but if he does not repent, he will be punished with eternal hell (e.g. Kurʾān, XXXII, 20)—though his punishment, it is true, will be less severe than that of the kāfir. This reply is entirely dependent on the conception of faith (imān) which is involved. In the eyes of the Muʿtazila indeed, to be a believer signifies at once adhering in one's heart, professing with the tongue, and witnessing "with the limbs" by performing the actions prescribed by the Law. Whoever does not fulfill the third condition cannot truly be a believer, and so cannot be saved.

In the İslām (Cairo 1948, ii) and the Maḥālāt (ed. Ritter, 1953): Allah conceives the faith as "words and deeds", kawl and ṣamāl, thereby appearing to integrate the "witness of the limbs" with it, like the Muʿtazila. But his Kitāb al-Lumaʿ (ed. McCarthy, Beirut 1953, 75/104) states: "faith in God is tāṣđīk (adherence) to God". And he taught clearly that it was impossible for a fasik to be neither a believer nor an unbeliever; if he was a believer before becoming a sinner, he said, the "great sin" committed will not invalidate his standing as a believer (Lumaʿ, 75-6/104-6). And al-ʿAshʿarī upholds this opinion with the tradition of the ahl al-taṣītkāmā ("people of Rectitude", in R. J. McCarthy's translation). The later ʿAshʿarītes were to maintain the same principle even more forcibly since, for them, faith came to be identified solely with tāṣđīk, adherence, inner judgement.—The same solution appears in the Hanafi-Maturidī line of thought from which defines faith as tāṣđīk and its avowal in the spoken word (thus Fikh Akbar I, 1; Wasīyyat Abī Ḥanīfa, 4; Fikh Akbar II, 14). The fasik is a sinner, but a believer. In its apparent sense, verse XXXII, 18 of the Kurʾān certainly seemed to open the way to the Muʿtazila solution: "Is then the man who is a believer like him who is fasik? (No), they are in no way the same." But from the 14th-15th century, the dominant tendencies of ʿim al-kalām taught that the fasik would be saved in the Hereafter. He can be punished by a certain time in the (eternal) hell:
Aşqarî; or he will certainly be punished in that way: Maturdîls (Fiqh Akbar II, 14). But finally ... to the references in the text, for āfsīla of carud, LA, xiv, 38/xi, 523b; writers on Arabic prosody, D. Vernier.

Imdn, its expression; to fail in a prescribed duty does not mean to do it without the intention for which it was prescribed. Good deeds become one of the articles of the Wahhabi profession, for faith in his heart, professed it in his words, performed certain prescribed actions, but who committed "great sins".

The Ashârî solution is, in short, that of the akh al-sunna taken as a whole, including the Hadîth. The opponents of kalâm. It will be found for example in Ibn Taymiyya, and subsequently it became one of the articles of the Wahhabi profession of faith (cf. H. Laoust, Doctrine sociale et politiques de Tabi'-Dîn Ahmad b. Tasmî, Cairo 1939, 621).

Two problems. — 1) Can a prophet be said to be āfsîk? Literalists (called haqîqiyâ by their adversaries), have been of the opinion which became generally accepted, good deeds as the Muslim who adhered to the profession and bodily actions (cf. Ihyâ*, Cairo 1352/1934, 71-3), nor even the personal observance of the Law by the prophet is concerned. Moreover, certain acts which appear to be sins have been performed by prophets merely "by way of teaching". The Shî'a (e.g., Naṣr al-Dîn al-Tûsî, Hillî) were to teach the absolute sinlessness (al-sunna) of the prophet, and their doctrine was to influence their adversaries themselves. Thus the "modern" Fâbrîq al-Dîn Râdî (q.v.), who nevertheless maintains the possibility of trivial errors arising from involuntary forgetfulness or from obscurities in the regulations; but still more the Hanbalî Ibn Taymiyya who adopts the Shî'a thesis in its entirety, though making the 'isma a gratuitous (and no longer "obligatory") favour of God (cf. Laoust, op. cit., 191).

2) Is it lawful to rise against an imâm who is āfsîk? Yes, answered the Khârijîs and Mu'tazîs, who even regarded insurrection as a duty in that event. The same attitude is found with the Zaydis (moderate Shî'a) and various Shî'a trends, but the dogma of the imâm's sinlessness widely prevailed among the Shî'a.—Certain jurists make a distinction: no revolt against the imâm who is āfsîk, but refusal to obey the agents who are enforcing the injustice. Common Sunnî doctrine calls for obedience to the imâm (and his agents), even if he be āfsîk in his private life, so long as he orders nothing contrary to Kur'ânic law. But if a command of his runs counter to a precise Kur'ânic or traditional precept, disobedience is permitted and even obligatory; if there is a guarantee of success, he must be deposed, if necessary by force.

In legal terminology, āfsîk is the opposite of 'adl. —

Bibliography: in the article; and all the treatises on 'im am al-kalâm under the heading al-akhâm wa 'l-asma' (e.g. Bâkîllânî, Djuwaynî, Dîrnânî, Bâdîjîrî, etc.); A. J. Wensinck, The Muslim Creed, Cambridge 1932, index s.v.; L. Gardet, Les noms et les statuts, in Stud. Isl., iii, Paris 1910/11, 133ff. (L. Gardner). —

FÂSILA in its original usage indicates a separative: "a pearl (kharasa) which effects a separation between two other pearls in the stringing of the latter" when a necklace or piece of jewellery is being made (see Lane s.v.); āfsîla, with this sense of separative, has received two technical usages, one in Arabic prosody, the other in Kur'ânic terminology.

In Arabic prosody (warâd [q.v.]), āfsîla denotes a division in the primitive feet, meaning three hurâf muthabartha followed by one harâf sâkin, e.g. : katalat (al-āfsîla al-suqâra), or else four hurâf muthabartha followed by one harâf sâkin, e.g. : katala-hum (al-āfsîla al-kubrâ), al-Kâallî (according to LA, xiv, 38, l. 21-2xî, 523b, l. 27 ff.) used āfsîla for the first group and āfsîla for the second. The first denotes the series two short syllables + one long syllable, the anapaest of Graeco-Latin prosody; the second denotes the series three short syllables + one long syllable, the fourth paceon in the said prosody. But there is an important difference: the anapaest and the fourth paceon denote rhythmical units, whilst āfsîla suqâra or kubrâ relate to divisions, groups, within primary rhythmical units (the sâfâfî), in order to express the possibility of trifling errors arising from involuntary forgetfulness or from obscurities in the regulations; but still more the Hanbalî Ibn Taymiyya who adopts the Shî'a thesis in its entirety, though making the 'isma a gratuitous (and no longer "obligatory") favour of God (cf. Laoust, op. cit., 191).

The Kur'ânic text carries rhymes. The question was raised in the Muslim world, by what technical term are these rhymes to be designated? There was no hesitation in rejecting the kâfîya of shîr, for the Kur'ân is not a work of shîr (poetry). Was the Kur'ân sâfî [q.v.]? Many of those who did not profess Ashârîsism (this must refer to the Mu'tazîs) adopted and defended this point of view. But after Al-Asqarî and Al-Bîkîllânî it was abandoned: in fact, on the one hand the verses of the Kur'ân, in general, are not balanced according to the rules of sâfî and the rhymes are given a freedom not permitted by the latter (see Th. Nöeldeke, Geschichte des Qorans, i, 37-41); on the other hand, Muslim religious sentiment was reluctant to apply to the Kur'ân, kharasa and kalama, a description which had been derived from Him, and which was moreover taken from a human source, namely the sâfî of the soothsayers, whom Muhammad disliked. The solution was to consider the Kur'ânic text as prose of a particular kind and to designate its rhymes by a special term, āfsîla, pl. āfsiya, which could be compared with the Kur'ânic expression fassâlir n-šâlîl (VI, 97, 98, 126). Ibn Khaldûn repeats the opinion which for long had been common, when he writes on the subject of the Kur'ân: wa-in kâma min al-manâfrur 'ilâ annahâ ... laya yusumâ mursalî** tilâk** wa-la musâsîfâ** sma** "although it is prose, it is however not free prose, nor rhymed prose (sâfî)** and he expounds its particular character (Muhammad, iii, 332; Eng. tr., Rosenthal, i, 358).

The technical designation of rhyme is thus established according to a triple division: kâfîya for shîr (poetry), āfsîla for Kur'ânic prose, and karâma for sâfî, and the Kur'ânic āfsîla was explained by comparison with its partners: al-āfsîla kalimat ašhîr al-âyâ ka-kâfîyât al-shîr wa-karâmat al-sâfî, "al-āfsîla is the word at the end of the verse, like the kâfîya in poetry and the karâma in sâfî" (al-Suyûtî, Itkân, beginning of Ch. 59); see also Kâmûs, root fâ.$
FASILA — AL-FASIYYUN

Gr. Ar., ii, 515; S. de Sacy, Gr. Ar., ii, 619, etc. For the Kur'anic fdsila, see particularly ch. 59 of the Ibnab of Suyufi; for both, the Dict. of tech. terms, ed. A. Sprenger, ii, 1140-1 (cf. i, 672-3).

(H. FLIRICH)

FASILA, verbal adjective of the fa'il type in the passive sense, as the Arab lexicographers record, denoting an object which is "separated", like the young animal when weaned (young camel or calf), in the feminine faṣila; and the same feminine form is used for a palm-tree sucker when transplanted. It is no doubt the same semantic derivation which explains the meaning of the smallest "section" of a tribe, the closest relatives: thus ʿAbbās, according to the LA, is called faṣlat al-Nabi "close kinship with the Prophet". However, Arabic philological doctrine advances one meaning of faṣila "fragment of the flesh of the thigh" by virtue of the principle which makes every term of this tribal nomenclature correspond with the name of one part of the body. Robertson Smith has, not without probability, claimed to discern in the origin of this series various allusions to the female organs such as baṭn "belly" (starting with ḥayy which seems to be connected), upon which the denominations of male organs would be superimposed when the patriarchal organization was substituted for the matriarchy. (J. L. CLERR.)

FASILA — AL-FASIYYUN or A'H FAS, a name given to the inhabitants of Fās. In the local dialect this name does not apply to all those who live in Fās, but to those who were born there and have right of citizenship of the city and its code of good manners.

The population of Fās was formed little by little from many diverse elements. The original basis was certainly made up of Berbers and some Arab companions of the Idrissids. From the beginning of the 3rd/9th century on, the population grew through the coming of political refugees from Cordova and Rayyāwān, who brought the traditions and techniques of long-rooted urban peoples to the new town. Even though the people of Rayyāwān did not continue to swarm into Fās, the Muslims of Andalusia came in after the fall of the Caliphate of Cordova to establish themselves there, at any rate up to the conquest of Granada by the Catholic Kings (1492).

In addition, various groups were added to the original kernel of the population through the circumstances of Morocco's dynastic history: Berbers from South Morocco under the Almoravids and the Almohads; Berbers from East Morocco and members of Arab tribes under the Marinids; Berbers from the oases of the Sahara and negroes under the Sa'dīs; Fillāls and negroes under the 'Alawīs. At different periods, the Muslim population of the town was augmented by a number of families of Jewish converts to Islam who several, the Cohens for example, have preserved their original names. It must also not be forgotten that, at any rate in the 19th century, groups of Muslims came to Fās from outside for the purpose of practising various specialized trades, Berbers of the High Guir, for instance, who are porters, the people of Tuwat who handle fatty substances, those from the Dra' who are gardeners, those of Sās who are dealers in fatty substances, and those of the Rif who take part in the pressing of the olives. It is interesting that the Middle Atlas, although so near, has provided Fās with very few immigrants.

Since the French conquest of Algeria, Fās has formed a refuge for a number of families from the Oran area, notably Tlemcen, who preferred emigration to foreign domination. This was the case especially first in 1835 and then in 1912.

Before the 20th century the population scarcely ever seems to have passed the 100,000 mark, if it was as high, but no reliable document exists on this subject. Since the Protectorate, the number of Muslim inhabitants has grown, but in modest proportions compared with many other Moroccan towns: 163,000 in the 1952 census. This relative stagnation means that the traditional citizens have not been swamped in an enormous mass of new arrivals but preserve their personality and preeminence. This personality is characterized by a happy balance between economic activity, intellectual activity, and the religious life of the city, and by the existence of an etiquette (bā'īda) which rules most stringently the relationships of the people of Fās amongst themselves. Only those whose roots are truly in the city follow this etiquette, and they alone have a right to the name of Fāsiyyūn. They can be divided into several social strata which complement rather than compete with each other: at the top of the social ladder are the big merchants, the high functionaries and the religious leaders who form the middle-classes; then come the small tradesmen and the artisans; finally there are the workers settled in the city or about to become a part of it. Each of these strata has its own ideas which they form the middle-classes; then come the small tradesmen and the artisans; finally there are the workers settled in the city or about to become a part of it. Each of these strata has its own ideas which they...

Apart from those Jews installed there since the city's beginnings, whose exact origin it is impossible to discover, it is well known that the Jewish community has been enriched on a number of occasions by families or individuals emigrating from Spain; in the 19th century Spanish was still the daily language as was the case in April 1912, at the time of the revolt of the Moroccan troops. More rarely, the government has persecuted the Jewish community, notably during the short reign of Mawlay al-Yazid (1790-1792). Even more than the Muslims, the Jews of Fās have been affected by European influences since the beginning of the 20th century; many have left the Mellāḥ for the New Town (Ville Nouvelle).

Bibliography: Leo Africanus, Deser. de...
FASKH—The term faskh, in the language of the Islamic jurists, has a very wide meaning. It serves in a general way to designate the dissolution of any contractual bond whatever (Ibn Nudjaym, al-Afzikhir, ii, 114). Whether or not the contract was validly formed, the intervention of faskh will reduce it to nought. But faskh presupposes a contract which at least fulfills all the conditions necessary to its formation, i.e., a mun'akid contract. A non-existent contract cannot be the object of faskh. On the other hand, a formed contract which happens to be vitiated by some irregularity (fasl), can be dissolved only by means of faskh, even though in the meantime it does not produce any of its legal effects. Faskh, in this case, is equivalent to annulment. In cases of error or injurious misrepresentation Islamic doctrine does not regard the contract as fasil. It is nevertheless subject to faskh, under certain conditions. Fashk in this case constitutes the sanction of an express or implied condition included in the contract. Generally speaking, faskh or annulment is procured in the case where the contracting parties fail to fulfill one of the express or implied conditions stipulated in the contract. It is by the application of this principle that a sale is annulled in cases of redhibitory defect or eviction. In this sense faskh can be identified with rescission. But the domain of rescission is singularly restricted in Islamic law. In effect, in the absence of an express or implied rescissory clause, it is impossible in Islamic law to obtain the rescission of a contract by reason of the failure of the other party to discharge his obligation. The only remedy available is compulsory performance (Chafik Chehata, Théorie de l'obligation en droit musulman, 147, 204).

Faskh is not only annulment or rescission. The revocation of a gift, or of any other contract revocable by its nature, takes place equally by way of faskh. Likewise, a contract by nature irrevocable becomes susceptible of faskh, or revocable, whenever it includes a right of option (khiydr).

Finally, an irrevocable contract can be dissolved by mutus dissensus (ikba). This dissolution effected by a mutual agreement is equally termed fashk by the jurists—at least with regard to relations inter partes.

Thus the term faskh comes to embrace also the cases of revocation and cancellation.

In every case faskh is effected, as a rule, by means of a declaration of intention pronounced in the presence of the other contracting party. This is why fashk is regarded by the jurists as a juridical act in its own right. However, in certain cases faskh must be obtained by judicial process. This is so in the case of redhibitory defects discovered after the delivery of the object sold. Likewise, the revocation of a gift must, as a rule, be pronounced by the judge. It should be mentioned here that the judge can pronounce officially the fashk of a vitiated contract when one or other of the parties has not requested it.

Moreover, faskh is clearly distinguished in the texts from infashk, which comes about without the need of any declaration or judicial decree. An example is provided by the case of impossibility of performance. If the object sold perishes before delivery to the buyer, the contract is dissolved by the normal operation of the law. Here the authors are fond of the term nullity or bakhsh (Sarakhsh, xii, Mabksh, xii, 174). Likewise in the case where proof of the contract is held impossible by reason of the conflicting oaths sworn by either side, the contract is dissolved by the normal operation of the law: nufasakh (Kasen, Badahi, v, 238).

Once faskh is effected the contract stands dissolved, and things must be restored to their former condition: the status quo ante. This is why fashk becomes impossible if the thing representing the object of a contract happens to perish in the meantime. As a rule, faskh has a retro-active effect (Kasen, v, 239): the contract is held never to have existed. The effects of the contract disappear as from the day it was formed. However, with a view to protecting the rights of third parties, the mutus dissensus (ikba) is considered a new alienation with respect to third parties. As far as they are concerned it does not have a retroactive effect. Likewise the alienation of a thing to the profit of a third party prevents the operation of faskh. Thus the right to dissolve the contract is destroyed, and the thing is established in the ownership of the third party who has acquired it.

We must notice, finally, that in family law faskh is distinguished from taldk. Taldk, which is the exclusive right of the man, brings about the dissolution of the marriage by a simple unilateral declaration. It always presupposes a validly formed contract. Dissolution of marriage by way of faskh takes place at the instance of the wife or her relatives. It generally comes about by judicial process. Like any other faskh, this dissolution embraces cases of failure to fulfill an express or implied condition, as well as those cases where the contract is vitiated by some irregularity. The grounds for dissolution of marriage by way of fashk are defined by the law, and faskh constitutes the legal means open to the wife of dissolving the conjugal tie in case of serious cruelty (Egyptian laws, no. 25 of 1920, no. 25 of 1929).


(Chafik Chehata)

FAŠL etymologically, like fars, expresses the general meaning of separation or disjunction (for the various meanings, see L, xiv, 35-9 for fasil; xii, 174-82 for fars; Abu 'l-Bakr, K. al-Kuliybah, 275). In logic, fašl signifies "difference" and especially "specific difference", the diafora of the five predicables of Porphyry (x. γένος, διάμε, genus; 2. ειδος, nae, species; 3. διαφορα, fašl, difference; 4. τοιχ, kai, property; 5. συμφράστης, tarsad, accident. The iθζων al-Sab'i add, in the tenth risala, shahkh, person). For the logicians, fašl has two meanings: the first covers every attribute by which one thing is distinguished from another, whether it be individual or universal, the second, in transposition (αλα nasl), covering by which a thing is essentially distinguished. In transposition in this way, fašl is used, per prorsus et posterioris (bi-hasan al-tak{m w'il-mkhedh), to designate a term common dii erence (al-fasali al-'^imina), particular difference (al-
fast al-khāṣ), and the particular of the particular (khāṣ al-khāṣ). Common difference (al-faṣl al-dāmm) is what allows a thing to differ from another and that other from the former; equally it is what allows a thing to differ from itself at another time. This is the case of separable accidents. Particular difference (al-faṣl al-khāṣ) is the predicate which is necessarily associated (lāsim, comitans) with accidents, e.g., the difference between a horse and a man constituted by the whiteness of the latter’s skin. Finally, specific difference or that of the particulars (khāṣ al-khāṣ) is what constitutes the species. It is the simple universal attributed to the species in reply to the question: what is it (in quale quid) in its essence in relation to its genus (fi dhawāb ayyuN Shayyā’ huewa fi ḍārithi min dhinshī bi), e.g., rationality for man.

The Platonic method of analysis or division (διάταξις) is distinguished by the name of fārāb al-khīṣa from the Aristotelian (fārāb al-khiṣa wuṣūl-yuṣūl) (al-Fārābī, Abhandlungen, ed. Dieterici, 2). For the metaphysical difference between the incorporeal and the body, fārāb (γνωστικός) is used. God is mufrāb, that is, separated, free of all that is material or corporeal. In the essence of God, there is neither fārāb nor faṣl (Theology of Aristotle, ed. Dieterici, 40). Purely spiritual beings (+wūl), the intelligences of the spheres and the heavenly bodies are mufrābūn (futtaqūn).

Bibliography: I. Pollak, Die Hermeneutik des Aristoteles, Leipzig 1913, glossary; the major text for faṣl is that of Ibn Sinā, Siḥfā’ al-Madkhal, pub. Cairo 1952, ch. XII, 72-82; the Latin translation of this text was used by Prantl, Geschichte der Logik, ii, 345-8; cf. also A. M. Goichon, Lexique de la langue philosophique d’Ibn Sinā, no. 504, and Fikih, L’Organon d’Aristote dans le monde arabe, Paris 1934, 70-133; see also Qīns and Ḥadd. (T. de Boer.[G. C. Anawati])

FASL [see ḤILĀ, MAṢGOL].

FASTS [see ṢAWM].

FAṬA, pl. fīṣāyān, strictly “young man”, has assumed a certain number of meanings in Arabic [see futūwa]: here we confine ourselves to one exclusively Andalusian usage. In Muslim Spain the slaves, who were youths or not very experienced in the service of the prince and his household, and then of the bābāyī [q.v.] at the time when the latter was in practice taking over the reins of power, were in fact called ghulmān (sing. ghulm [q.v.]), whilst those who held an elevated rank in the palace hierarchy bore the title faṣla, the entire management of the household being placed under the control of two majordomos or “high officers”, al-fataydn al-kabirdn (q.v. or “high officers”, al-faṣl al-khāṣ). In the course of the history of al-Andalus a certain number of these slaves, generally of European origin (see ṣaḥāliba), after obtaining the status of free men, were promoted to the highest positions in the social hierarchy and played an outstanding political part, even succeeding in creating independent principalities for themselves, like the ‘Amīrī fāṣl Muḥājīd [q.v.] of Denia. Their elevation inevitably gave rise to disputes with the aristocratic Arab families, with whom they came to blows, not without sometimes resorting to arguments of a Shī‘ī character (see I. Goldzijler, in ZDMG, 1898).

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Xe siècle, index; idem, Hist. Esp. Mus., index. (Ed.)

FATULISM [see al-kā’da wa-l-kadār].

AL-FAṬA, pl. faṣl, the particular of the particular (khāṣ al-khāṣ), and the particular of the particular (khāṣ al-khāṣ). Common difference (al-faṣl al-dāmm) is what allows a thing to differ from another and that other from the former; equally it is what allows a thing to differ from itself at another time. This is the case of separable accidents. Particular difference (al-faṣl al-khāṣ) is the predicate which is necessarily associated (lāsim, comitans) with accidents, e.g., the difference between a horse and a man constituted by the whiteness of the latter’s skin. Finally, specific difference or that of the particulars (khāṣ al-khāṣ) is what constitutes the species. It is the simple universal attributed to the species in reply to the question: what is it (in quale quid) in its essence in relation to its genus (fi dhawāb ayyuN Shayyā’ huewa fi ḍārithi min dhinshī bi), e.g., rationality for man.

The Platonic method of analysis or division (διάταξις) is distinguished by the name of fārāb al-khīṣa from the Aristotelian (fārāb al-khiṣa wuṣūl-yuṣūl) (al-Fārābī, Abhandlungen, ed. Dieterici, 2). For the metaphysical difference between the incorporeal and the body, fārāb (γνωστικός) is used. God is mufrāb, that is, separated, free of all that is material or corporeal. In the essence of God, there is neither fārāb nor faṣl (Theology of Aristotle, ed. Dieterici, 40). Purely spiritual beings (+wūl), the intelligences of the spheres and the heavenly bodies are mufrābūn (futtaqūn).

Bibliography: I. Pollak, Die Hermeneutik des Aristoteles, Leipzig 1913, glossary; the major text for faṣl is that of Ibn Sinā, Siḥfā’ al-Madkhal, pub. Cairo 1952, ch. XII, 72-82; the Latin translation of this text was used by Prantl, Geschichte der Logik, ii, 345-8; cf. also A. M. Goichon, Lexique de la langue philosophique d’Ibn Sinā, no. 504, and Fikih, L’Organon d’Aristote dans le monde arabe, Paris 1934, 70-133; see also Qīns and Ḥadd. (T. de Boer.[G. C. Anawati])

FASL [see ḤILĀ, MAṢGOL].

FASTS [see ṢAWM].
Bibliography: O. Pinto, al-Fatfi b. &dquo;dn, favorito di al-Mutawakkil, in RSO, xiii (1932), 133-49; D. Sourdel, Le vissariat &apos;abdisde de 749 &agrave; 936, i, 182-3; First, Nid. Poëtie, 116-7; Y&amp;#501;kt, Uda&dquo;ab, vi, 116-7 (O. PINTO).

AL-FATH B. MUHAMMAD B. UBAID ALLAH B. KHAKAN, Ab&amp;#501; NA_SR AL-KAYS! AL-!SHB!LI, an Andalusian anthologist whose history is some-what obscure. We do, however, know that he studied seriously under well-known teachers and that he led an adventurous life, travelling through much of Muslim Spain and enjoying to the full pleasures strictly forbidden by the laws of Islam. Despite this, he obtained a position as secretary to the governor of Granada, Ab&amp;#501; Yusuf Tashfin b. &apos;All, but did not keep it and went to Marr&amp;#501;kh where, at the in-stigation of an Almoravid prince or even perhaps of Sultan &apos;All b. Yusuf b. Tashfin, he was assassinated in a &amp;#126; junkub &amp;#126; at a date which, in various sources, varies between 528/1134 and 555/1160, the year 529/1134 being the most probable.

When he decided to compile the first of his antho-logies, dedicated to the brother of the above-mention-ed sultan, Ab&amp;#501; Isha&amp;#501; Ibrahim b. Yusuf b. Tashfin, he wrote to a certain number of prominent person-alities who were reputed to be also men of letters, informing them of his project and asking them to send him some of their own documents; those who accepted and included gifts as well as documents were made the subject of panegyrics, while the others were passed over in silence or criticised adversely. This was the treatment accorded to Ibn Badjida [q.v.] in particular, except that it was his privilege to have two notices, one of blame, the other of praise (text in Yakut). For the earlier writers, Ibn &apos;Ayn, and anthologists show unconcealed pleasure in and the rest, however, in the &amp;#126; junkub &amp;#126; of the 5th/nth century.

However, we do not know whether he was included in the &amp;#126; junkub &amp;#126; of the study of Arabic literature in Spain, principally in the 5th/11th century.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Ab&amp;#501;br, Mu&amp;#501;am, ed. Codera, Madrid 1898, no. 265; Ibn Khallik&amp;#501;n, ed. Cairo, 1370, ii, 407; Y&amp;#501;kt, Mu&amp;#501;am al-ud&amp;#501;ab, xvi, 182-3; Ibn al-Ab&amp;#501;br, Al-Ab&amp;#501;bas, index; Weyers, Specimen criticum exhibens locos Ibn Khacanis de Ibn Zeidoun, Leiden 1846; R. Dozy, Scriptorum arabilocum de Abbasidis, Leyden 1846, i, 1-10; idem, Recherches, passim; Wittenfeld, Geschichteschreiber, 235; Pois Boigsues, Ensayo, no. 162; N&amp;#501;giri Sal&amp;#501;bi, Zaher al-arf&amp;#501;n min had&amp;#501;fis Abi l-Wannan, F&amp;#513;as 1312, ii, 356; M. Ben Cheneb, Etudes sur les personages de l&amp;#39;his&amp;#501;de de Sidi Abd al-Qadir al-F&amp;#501;ysi, Paris 1907, no. 241; A. &amp;#39;Ayyaf, Bal&amp;#501;ghat al-'Arab fi 'l-Andalus, Cairo 1342/1924, 211-25; A. Gonzalez Palencia, Literatura, Barcelona 1945, 204, 206-8; H. P&amp;#501;rs, Poesie andalouse, Paris 1953, index; idem, Glaness historiques . . . dans les Qual&amp;#501;d al-Iqaydn, in Mdl. d&amp;#39;hist. et d&amp;#39;archol. de l&amp;#39;Occ. mus., ii, Algiers 1957, 147-52. (M. BEN CHENEB-CH. PELLAT).

FATH &apos;ALI AKHUND-ZADA [see A&amp;#501;HUND ZAD,A, MIRZA FATH &apos;ALI].

FATH-'ALI SHAH, the second ruler of the K&amp;#501;d&amp;#501;r [g.v.] dynasty, was born in 1185/1777 and bore the name B&amp;#501;a Khan. He was made governor of Fdr, Kirm&amp;#501;n, and Yazd by his uncle, A&amp;#501; Mu&amp;#501;hammad Khan, and heir apparent in 1211/1796. He succeeded to the throne in 1212/1797. He died in 1250/1834 and was buried at Kurnah. Much of his reign of 38 years and 5 months was spent in military expeditions against internal rebels and external foes.

On the assassination of A&amp;#501; Muhammad Khan in 1212/1797 B&amp;#501;a Khan hastened from Sh&amp;#501;rez to Tehr&amp;#501;n, where Mirza Muhammad Khan K&amp;#501;d&amp;#501;r had closed the gates pending his arrival. On reaching Tehr&amp;#501;n he ascended the throne as Fath &apos;All on 4 Safar 1212/30 July 1779, but was not crowned until 1 Sh&amp;#501;w&amp;#501;wl 1212/21 March 1798. S&amp;#501;i&amp;#501; Khan Sh&amp;#501;k&amp;#501;, who opposed his succession, was defeated near Kazvin. Various attempts at rebellion by Fath &apos;All's brother, Husayn Kull Mirza, S&amp;#501;i&amp;#501; Khan Sh&amp;#501;k&amp;#501;, and Muhammad Khan b. Zaki Khan were defeated; and in a series of expeditions to Khur&amp;#501;san Fath &apos;All succeeded in establishing his nominal authority over most of that province. Relations with Europe were actively joined. In 1798 Lord Wellesley, the Governor General of India, sent Mihdi 'All Khan, the East India Company's resident at Bushire, to the Persian Court to induce it to take measures to keep the Afghan ruler, Zam&amp;#501;n Khan Durr&amp;#501;n, in check. A subsequent mission sent under Captain (later Sir) John Malcolm resulted in a political and commercial treaty concluded in 1801. In 1802 France made unsuccessful overtures to
Persia for a Franco-Persian alliance against Russia. In 1804 the Perso-Russian war was resumed. Fath 'Ali sent an envoy to India to seek aid under the British alliance but his request was coldly received. In 1805 a French envoy, Romieux, reached Tehran, and urged Persia to repudiate the British alliance. Disappointed of British help, Fath 'Ali sent Mirzâ Muhammad Ridâ to treat with Napoleon. A treaty was signed at Finkenstein (1807), but was nullified almost immediately by the Franco-Russian treaty of Tilsit. Renewed French activities and the possibility of Franco-Russian activities in Persia induced the British Government to send a mission under Sir Harford Jones to the court of Fath 'Ali. In March 1809 a Preliminary Treaty was concluded. This was followed by a Definitive Treaty in March 1812, which was superseded in 1814 by the Treaty of Tehran. Under this treaty Persia undertook not to allow any European army to advance on India through Persia and Britain undertook in the case of a European nation invading Persia to send a military force or in lieu thereof to pay an annual subsidy. The subsidy articles were abrogated in 1828. The long war with Russia was concluded by the peace of Gulistân [q.v.] (1813), by which Georgia and a number of other districts were acknowledged as belonging to Russia, Russian vessels of war were given the exclusive right of navigation of the Caspian Sea, and a 3% ad valorem duty on Russian imports into Persia was fixed. A rebellion in Khûrâsun fomented by Mahmûd Şâh of Afghanistan gave Fath 'Ali an opportunity to seize Herât (1813), but he failed to keep it. A war with the Porte (1821-3) was concluded by the Treaty of Erzurum (1813). In 1826 war broke out again with Russia and ended disastrously for Persia. In addition to the territory going to Russia under the Treaty of Gulistân, Persia lost Fârûqân and Nağchûdefân; and the exclusive right of Russian vessels of war to navigate the Caspian was reaffirmed. A commercial treaty signed on the same day gave Russian subjects extra-territorial privileges and established the pattern of the capitulations enjoyed by Europeans in Persia under the Kâdîrâ dynast. Fath 'Ali died in 1834. He was succeeded by fifty-seven sons and forty-six daughters. His favourite son was Abbas Mirzâ [q.v.], who had been declared wali 'ahd, died in 1833. Abbas Mirzâ's son, Muhammad Mirzâ, was proclaimed wali 'ahd and succeeded to the throne on Fath 'Ali's death.

The rule of Fath 'Ali was arbitrary and autocratic. pomp and ceremony distinguished his public audiences, but much of his time was spent in camp on military expeditions. Military reform was begun during his reign, first under French officers accompanying General Gardane, who came to Persia as envoy in 1806, and later under British officers, when an attempt was made to introduce European methods and discipline into the army in Ağhabâygân commanded by 'Abbas Mirzâ. Fath 'Ali is described by some European travellers as being intelligent and having a lively and curious mind, by others as being ignorant and vain. Like many of the Kâdîrâ princes he had a great love of hunting. His besetting sin was avarice. He made, or repaired, a number of buildings in Tehran, Kumm, Kâzîmayn, Karbalâ and elsewhere.


FATHNÂME, an official announcement of a victory. This definition excludes large numbers of 'fathnames' written by private persons as literary exercises, such as the Mahrûsû-i Istanbul Fathnâmes of Tâdjîzâde Dja'far Celebi [q.v.], which was composed at least a generation after the conquest (TOEM, nos. 20-1) and works such as Murâdî's Fathnâmest-i Khûsyr al-Dîn Pâsha (A. S. Levend, Osmanlî-nâmeler, Ankara 1956, 70-3), a versified narrative of the exploits of Barbarossa and his brother Oruç. According to Uzuncârşîlî (Osmanlı devletinin saray teskîldî, Ankara 1945, 288), a fathnâmeh consists of 15 elements: (1) praise to God, (2) encomia on the Prophet, (3) the sovereign's duty to relieve oppression, (4) reasons for ending the wrong-doing of the tyrant in question, (5) the Sultan's departure, (6) the multitude of his troops, (7) the position of the enemy, (8) the boldness of the enemy, (9) description of the battle, (10) the Sultan's victory, (11) thanks to God, (12) occupation of the enemy's territory, (13) this success to be proclaimed by land and sea (only in fathnâmehes addressed to the Sultan's own dominions), (14) the names of the place to which the fathnâmeh is sent and of the bearer, (15) the Sultan's joy at the victory, his communication of the good tidings to the recipient and his request for prayers. Although this scheme may well have served as a model to literary men, there is some reason to suppose that it was not closely followed by the official (usually the nishândî?) entrusted with composing the fathnâmeh after a battle. It is difficult to be precise on this subject because of the dearth of original fathnâmehes available for study. In the dozens of examples of fathnâmehes there is none of whose genuineness we can be sure, nor do they seem to bear out Fakâlin's statement (s.v. Fetihname) that fathnâmehes are of great historical importance as being short histories of battles. What Ferîdûn describes as the fathnâmeh on the conquest of Eger in 1005/1596, for instance (Madîjmâ'-i münjdâ'î al-salâdin, Istanbul 1265, ii, 2-3), contains no mention of the massacre of the garrison (see G. L. Lewis, The Utility of Ottoman Fetihnames, in Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt, Historians of the Middle East, Oxford 1962, and cf. Našîmâ, Ta'ârîkh, Istanbul 1281, i, 131). Nor does Ferîdûn's text bear any relation to Našîmâ's statement (ibid., 173) that the Nishândî Lâm 'Ali Celebi was dismissed for exaggerating, in this same fathnâmeh, the part played by his army. On the other hand, we do have one published fathnâmeh which appears to be the genuine article and not a literary exercise: the Uygar account of Mâhemmed II's victory in 878/1473 over Uzun Hasan (R. Rahmeti Arat, Fârsî Sultan Mehmed'in yarhî, in TM, vi (1939), 283-322; cf. idem, Un yarîhî de Mehmed II, le Conquérant, in Annali del R. Ist. Sopr. Orientale di Napoli, n.s. i (1940), 25-58). It is laconic in style and full of information, including a consummate order of battle with the names of the principal
commanders on both sides. There is none of the verbosity and sanctimonious self-justification which we see in the literary fathnámēs; the occasion for the campaign is refreshing: as stated thus: 'Uzun Hasan having burned the city of Tokat, we came to fight him'. The most suggestive feature of the document is its conclusion: the Șultān is coming to winter in Istanbul and adjures various officials there to be steadfast in their work and not to neglect the business of the diāwān; the chief men of all towns are to keep the mosques in a flourishing state, to perform the five daily prayers in congregation and to fulfil the ordinances of the shari'ā and the commandments of God. Yet the fact that the document is in Uygur shows that it was intended only for the eastern territories. The inference is that for this victory, at any rate, there was only one fathnâmē, of which copies and, in this special case, a translation were sent to all parts of the Șultān's dominions. Feridūn (op. cit., i, 283-6) gives the texts of three accounts of the victory: a bektashi sharif to Prince Djem, a letter (nâme-i humâyûn) to Husayn Baykarâ and a fathnâmē 'to the Guarded Dominions'. None contains any useful details of the campaign; compared with the Uygur yarîlk their historical value is negligible. For the victory of Çaldîrân, 41 years later, Feridūn gives no fewer than ten different fathnâmēs, none of them giving a full account of the battle (for a partial analysis see Lewis's article cited above). A working hypothesis is that there was only one true fathnâmē for each victory, which would add greatly to our knowledge of Ottoman military history if only we could lay hands on it. Other so-called fathnâmēs are merely elegant variations on a theme, their value being mainly literary, though they may be of some interest as early specimens of war-propaganda. The last word cannot be said on this subject until more work has been done in the Ottoman archives, particularly perhaps on the ordu muhîmmesî registers (see Uriel Heyd, Ottoman documents on Palestine, Oxford 1960, 5).

Bibliography: Works cited in text. Pakahn's article consists mainly in a lengthy quotation from M. F. Köprüülü, Bizans müesesselerinin ... tesiri, in Türk Hukuk ve İlişkisî Tarihî Mecmuası, i (1931), 243-277; ibid., i (1934), 107-139; ibid., i (1936), 75-105; ibid., ii, in Orjentnegi, xiv-1 (1948), 87-102; L. Fekeste, A fethnemeri, in A Magyar Tudományos Akadémiá Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei, xiv-1 (1965), 65-101 (a fathnâmē of Uzun Hasan); Adnan Sadîk Erzi, Türkiye Kütüphanelereinde nöfaret ve vesikalâr, ii, in Belleten, xiv-56 (1950), 612 ff.

G. L. Lewis

FATHPâR-SIKRÎ, a deserted city, 23 miles from Agra, situated in 27° 5' N. and 77° 40' E., on a ridge of sandstone rocks near the ancient village of Sikri. In 1569 when Akbar visited Shaykh Salim Cîght, who was living on this sandstone ridge, the saint foretold the birth of a son to the childless monarch, and in 1570 Sultan Sûlaimân, afterwards known as the Emperor Diâhânghrâ (q.v.) was born there. Akbar then commenced building a city, covering an area of about 1½ sq. m. and enclosed by a wall (still standing) 3½ ft. long. On his return from his campaign in Gudjarat in 1574, he found his new capital ready for occupation and named it Fathpâr (the City of Victory); he resided here until 1586, when he abandoned it as a capital, probably on account of the brackish nature of the water obtainable there, and shortly after his death it began to fall into ruin. Many of the buildings, however, still remain in an excellent state of preservation; among these may be mentioned the official buildings, such as the mint, the treasury, the record office, and the hall of public audience, and the royal palace, including the private apartments of the Emperor and the residences of several of his wives. The house of the Türkî Sultân is remarkable for the elaborate carving with which it is covered, both within and without; the interior is decorated with a dado, 4 ft. high, divided into eight oblong panels, richly decorated with carvings representing forest and garden scenes. The two-storied building, known as Bîrbal's house (though it was undoubtedly the palace of one of Akbar's queens), is similarly covered with carving exhibiting a profuse variety of patterns executed in minute detail. In close proximity to the royal apartments are some curious buildings, of a unique design, e.g., the Pânâc Mahâlj, a five-storied pavilion, each storey of which is smaller than the one on which it rests, and the so-called Dîwân-i Khâs (or private audience hall), a building consisting of one room only, in the centre of which rises an octagonal column surrounded by an enormous circular capital, from the top of which radiate four narrow causesways, each about 10 ft. long, to the four corners of the building; the top of this capital is thus connected with a gallery, running round the upper part of the room and communicating by staircases (made in the thickness of the wall) both with the roof and the courtyard below. It is not possible to enumerate here the many other buildings connected with the emperor and his court, but special mention must be made of the great mosque, which is one of the finest monuments of Mughal architecture. It covers an area of 438 ft. by 542 ft., having a central court (360 ft. by 439 ft.) enclosed by cloisters, except at the three gateways, of which the Bulând Darvâza (facing the south), erected by Akbar in 1602 to commemorate his victories in the Dâkkân, ranks as one of the noblest gateways in India. In the court of the mosque stands the tomb of Shaykh Salim Cîght, a single-storied building, enclosed by a white marble and surmounted by a dome; the marble lattice screens which enclose the veranda of this building are of extraordinary delicacy and intricacy of geometrical pattern; over the cenotaph is a wooden canopy inlaid with mother-of-pearl arranged in beautiful geometrical designs.

Among the noteworthy features of the buildings at Fathpâr-Sikri are the evidences of the influence of Hindu architecture, in construction and decoration, and the frescoes painted on the walls of the Khâbâgh and the Sûnâhrâ Makân, and the colour decoration of the Hammâm and other buildings.

FATIHA

FATIHA, "the opening (Sūra)", or, more exactly, Fātihā al-Kirāt ("the Sūra") which opens the scripture (of revelation)", designation of the first Sūra of the Qur'ān. Occasionally the terms ʿumm al-Kirāt (according to Sūra III, 7; XII, 30; XII, 4) and as-sab al-mafhdnl (according to Sūra XV, 87) are also found. With reference to the last-named term one must count the Basmala which comes before the Sūra as a verse on its own, to make up the total of seven verses (= mathānī).

While the other Sūras are arranged fairly accurately according to length (that is to say, the longer they are the nearer the beginning they are to the end), the shorter they are, the nearer the end) the Fātihā, despite its shortness, is prefixed to the Qur'ān as a sort of introductory prayer. Like the last two Sūras (al-muṣawwiḍhātīn), it is said not to have been preserved originally in the Codex of Ibn Mas̱ūd. It is markedly liturgical in character, as is also shown by the use of the first person plural (verses 5 and 6). Its chronological position (within the Meccan period) cannot be established more precisely. The Fātihā is an indispensable component of the prayer-ritual. It must be recited at the beginning of every rakā', that is to say at least seventeen times a day (twice at the morning ṣalāt, three times at the sunset ṣalāt, and four times at each of the other three hours of prayer). It is often said at other times too; it is recited in the Muslim prayer-ritual, not only at the hour of prayer, but at other important resolutions, almost all prayer formulae at the holy places are closed, and all joyful news is welcomed: while tradesmen who cannot come to terms over the price of goods seek in the united recitation of the fātihāh new strength for a decision" (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, 1931, 29). On many tombs there is an inscription asking the traveller visiting the spot to pray a ṣalāt for the soul of the dead man (H. Ritter, Meeer der Seele, 1955, 317). In some respects, therefore, the fātihā may be compared with the Lord's Prayer in Christian practice. However, H. Winkler's attempt to show that the one is derived from the other must be said to have failed (ZS, vi, 1928, 238-46). M. Gaster's guess that the Fātihā is an imitation of the Samaritan Ḥiṣā (XI, iv, 14, Samaritans) is equally unconvincing.

Bukhārī and Muslim tell of a sick man who was cured by exorcism with the ʿumm al-Kirāt. There are numerous examples of the fātihā being used as a powerful prayer in the making of amulets. The sawwīḥ al-fātihā, that is, the seven letters which are significant by their absence from the ṣalāt, play an important part in this. Al-Ḥusayn gives the requisite instructions in his book of magic Shams al-muḍārif.

In certain Arab countries, particularly in North Africa, the term fātihā (or fathā) is used to mean a prayer ceremony in which the arms are stretched out with the palms upwards, but without any recitation of the first Sūra (Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, 1931, 29, note; E. Westermarck, Ritual and belief in Morocco, 1926, i, 186, note). Phillip Vassei gives as a translation "prayer with open hands" (MSO, iv, 1902, ii, 188). But it seems probable that even this prayer-ceremony is called after the first Sūra, and that originally it involved a recitation of the fātihā which only subsequently and as a result of much repetition disappeared to be replaced by a silent prayer.

Bibliography: Bukhārī, Idgīra, 16; Tajīr al-Kurān, 1; Faḍdīl al-Kurān, 9; Tīb., 33 f.; Muslim, Salāt, 35-44; Sahīh, 65 f.; Tādrīr, Tajīr, 132 f., 35-66; Snouck Hurgronje, Kadhīda, Cairo 1373/1953, i, 1-15; Suyūtī, Иbdān, Cairo 1327, i, 54 f.; II, 152; Gesch. der Qor., ii, 1909, 110-7; Blachère, Le Coran, i, 1949, 125-7; A. Jeffery, A variant text of the Fātihā, in MW, xxix (1939), 136-62; al-Ḥusayn, Shams al-muṣawwiḍīn, Leiden 1925, 68 f., 71-95; F. E. Doutté, Magie et religion dans l'Afrique du Nord, Algiers 1909, 159, 2x1 ff.; Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka in the latter part of the 19th century, 1931, passim; E. Westermarck, Ritual and belief in Morocco, i and ii, 1926, passim; J. Jomier, La place du Coran dans la vie quotidienne en Égypte, in IBLA, xv (1952), 132-65, 149; H. Winkler, Fātihā und Vaterunser, in ZS, vi (1928), 238-46. (R. PARET)

AL-FATIK [see NADĪH, BANU]

FĀTIMA, daughter of Muḥammad and Khādīja, wife of ‘Ali b. Abī Talib, mother of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, was the only one of the Prophet's daughters to enjoy great renown. She became the object of great veneration by all Muslims. This may be because she lived closest to her father, lived longest, and gave him numerous descendants, who spread throughout the Muslim world (the other sons and daughters of Muḥammad either died young or, if they had descendants, these soon died out); or it may be because there was reflected upon her, besides the greatness of her father, the historical importance of her husband and her sons; or because, as time went on, the Muslims attributed to her extraordinary qualities. Throughout the Muslim world, as is well known, it is customary to add to her name the honorific title al-Zahrā, "the Shining One", and she is always spoken of with the greatest respect; but it was above all the Shi‘īs who surrounded her with a halo of beliefs and glorified her some centuries after her death. That Fāṭima—a woman who, unlike other women associated with the Prophet, remained on the fringe of the great events of the early years of Islam and hence receives little attention in the historical sources—should be exalted to the level of legend, presents no problem to the believer: Western scholars, on the other hand, have set themselves to recover the real Fāṭima from the haze which envelops her. Did she really possess merits so special as to explain her posthumous fame, or is this fame to be attributed to the human tendency to render extreme veneration to Woman? Two eminent European orientalists, Father Henri Lammens and Louis Massignon, have presented diametrically opposed judgements of Fāṭima. The former, in Fātima et les filles de Mahomet, has sketched, in sparkling and lively style, ingeniously but not without malice, a thoroughly gloomy portrait of the daughter of the Prophet: as he describes her, Fāṭima becomes a woman devoid of attraction, of mediocre intelligence, completely insignificant, little esteemed by her father, ill-treated by her husband, "caractère chagrin et perpétuellement voile de deuil", "ombre gemissante de femme", anaemic, often ill, prone to tears, who died perhaps of consumption. It is in certain respects, therefore, the Fāṭima, despite its shortness, is prefaced to the Sūra as a sort of introductory prayer. Like the last two Sūras (al-muṣawwiḍhātīn), it is said not to have been preserved originally in the Codex of Ibn Mas̱ūd. It is markedly liturgical in character, as is also shown by the use of the first person plural (verses 5 and 6). Its chronological position (within the Meccan period) cannot be established more precisely.
is only this method", he says, "which allows us to understand how Fátima's intuitive actions (hardly consciously performed) have, throughout the collective history of Islam, penetrated the tangle of deceptions, accommodations and theories". Fátima, as he conceives her, is the Woman whose soul was unappreciated during her lifetime, who enjoyed privileges (ḥassā'īs) accorded her by her father; she is Mistress of the Tent of hospitality, the Hostess of the Prophet's freedmen and of the non-Arab converts, and, as such, she represents the beginnings of universal Islam (La notion, 118 f.). To avoid any misrepresentation of Massignon's conception, we reproduce verbatim some of the concluding sentences of his ʿMuḥākala. According to him, Fátima had a "vie secrète ... voilée bien au delà de la jalouse de Ayisha, par une autre Jalouse, celle de Dieu. Vie de compassion intérieure, de larmes, prières pour les morts (al-ʿUḥd) et dans les citernes, veux de jalousie, choses de peu de poids pour des théologiens philosophes ou canonistes. Vie qui les survole et les surplombe en Islam, comme une menace, de plus en plus imminente, de la Grâce de Dieu: du Voeu secret de la Femme, Vierge ou Mère qui transcende tous les axiomes et serments des hommes. L'hyperrude des âmes en douleur, en Islam, pour Fátima, n’est selon le Coran lui-même qu’une figure de l’hyperrude mariale ...." This interpretation of the figure of Fátima is so illuminating, so satisfying the mystic who lives in a world of extraordinary religious experiences and, perhaps, the scholar concerned with religious problems, because it gives a psychologico-religious explanation for the origin and development of the legend of the daughter of the Prophet and bridges the gap between legend and reality, as Lammens's book fails to do; but it cannot escape the objections of the historian, who will consider that the author subordinates the facts to beliefs about Fátima which appeared only later.

In the following survey will be found, placed in chronological order, arranged schematically, and accompanied sometimes by a commentary, the references to Fátima which can be collected from the sources belonging to the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries and the first half of the 4th/10th century (particularly al-Baladhuri, ʿAnṣār, Ibn Saʿd and collections of ḥadīths regarded as canonical by the Sunnīs, for Ibn Ḥīṣām and the historians had little occasion to concern themselves with Fátima, so obscure was the life that she led; later sources such as Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr’s Istīḥāb, Ibn al-Aṯlr’s Usd al-Ḡaba, Ibn Ḥadīlar’s Ṣāra, the Taʾrīḥ al-Ḥamīs, and the Taʾrīḥ al-Ḥamīs, have purposely been ignored, the aim being to get as near as possible, if not to the reality, at least to the time when Fátima lived). In the survey some apparently trivial facts have been mentioned: this is because they had, particularly among the Shīʿīs, unforeseen developments; Fátima's trousseau, for example, became the subject of Persian religious dramas, the famous ṭawāṣyūs.

### The Historical Fátima

**Birth and childhood.** The date of Fátima's birth is uncertain; however that indicated as most probable is the year of the re-building of the Kaʿba, i.e., five years before the beginning of the Prophet's mission. This implies, as will appear, that the girl was married when she was over 18, a rather unusual age for an Arab bride. But if we take her birth as being a few years later (see al-Yaʿqūbī, li, 19) we encounter another difficulty—that when she was born her mother Khadijā would have been over fifty. The question of Fátima's age is treated at some length in Lammens’s book (8-14). There is also some uncertainty as to Fátima’s place in the sequence of Muhammad’s daughters, who are generally listed in the order: Zaynab, Ruqayya, Umm Kulthūm, Fátima. Of her childhood and her life at Mecca two episodes only are related: (1) she was overcome by grief at her mother's death, and the Prophet consoled her by saying that Dībrill had come down to tell him that God had built for Khadijā in Paradise a pavilion of brilliant pearls (ḥasāb; see Lane, s.v., 2529 f.), free of weariness and noise (al-Yaʿqūbī, ii, 35); (2) she removed the refuse which ʿUṭba b. Abī Muʿayt, one of the Kuraysḥ most hostile to Islam, had flung over the Prophet while he was at prayer, and her indignation led her to curse the offender (al-Bukhārī, ed. Kerehī, ii, 300).

**Journey from Mecca to Medina and betrothal.** After the Ḥijra, Muhammad moved his daughter Fátima with Umm Kulthūm and his wife Sawādah bint Zama’s (from Mecca to Medina, charging his adopted son Zayd b. Ḥārīta (q.v.) and Abū Rāfī to go and fetch them, giving them two camels and a sum of money. There is a completely different version of this: al-ʿAbbās escorted these women to Medina and the departure was not a peaceful one, for al-Ḥuwarrīrī b. Nūṣayb b. Waḥbprodled their camels, causing them to be thrown to the ground, for which act, it is said, he was killed after the occupation of Mecca. On the betrothal of Fátima and ʿAli the sources give much information, but, as usual, they do not completely agree. Both Abū Bakr and ʿUmar had asked for Fátima’s hand, but Muhammad had refused, saying that he was waiting for the moment fixed by destiny (ḥasāb: Ibn Saʿd, viii, 11). ʿAli did not dare to put forward his proposal because of his poverty, and it was Muhammad who made his task easier; he reminded him that he owned a breast-plate which, if sold, would provide him with enough money for the bridal gift (mahr). ʿAli, adding to the breast-plate some other objects and a camel or a ewe, raised the very modest sum of 480 dirhams or thereabouts. Of this money he spent, on Muhammad’s advice, one-third or one-fourth on perfumes, and the rest on objects necessary for the household. When Muhammad informed his daughter of the promise which he had made to ʿAli, Fátima (according to Ibn Saʿd) said nothing, and her silence was interpreted by the Prophet as consent (according to other sources, she protested and her father had to console her by saying that he had married her to that member of the family who was the most learned and wise, and who had been the first to embrace Islam).

**Marriage.** The accounts are at variance concerning the year and the month of the marriage and its consummation: the first or second year of the Ḥijra, more likely the latter. According to some sources the consummation was postponed for a few days or for a few months, and some say that it did not take place until ʿAli's return from the expedition of Badr. To celebrate their marriage, the bridegroom prepared a feast, Muhammad having told him that this was necessary; the ʿAnṣār gave their contributions in dūra, and ʿAli killed a sheep. Two wives of the Prophet, ʿAṣima and Umm Salama, arranged the house and prepared the wedding-feast. It is said that at this time ʿAli was 25 and Fátima between 15 and 21. The sources give a rather long account of a rite inaugurated by the Prophet: having warned the bridal pair to expect him, Muhammad went to their
house on the wedding-night, asked for water in a jar, washed his hands in it (or spat in it, or spat back into it before) and sprinkled it with water on the breast (the shoulders and the forearms) of All and Fātimā; finally he invoked God's blessing on them.

Poverty of the household. At night the newly-married pair lay on the fleece of an untanned sheepskin, which contained camel fodder during the day; for covering they used an old piece of striped Yemeni cloth, which was not large enough to cover both feet and head. The pillow was of leather stuffed with alf (palm fibres); the trousseau was indeed meagre: a goatskin bottle, a sieve, a duster, a cup. Muḥammad had made some wedding-gifts: a velvet garment (khāmla or khāmil), two pitchers, a leather bottle, a pillow and some bunches of fragrant herbs. Fātimā, having no maid-servants, ground the corn herself, which gave her blisters; ʻAll, to earn a little money, drew water from the wells and watered other people's land; because of this hard work he complained of pains in the chest. One day, the Prophet having received some slaves, ʻAll sent Fātimā to ask for one, and, as his wife lacked the courage to make this request, he went with her himself but met with a refusal. "I cannot allow the ʻahl al-qubba [q.v.] to be tormented with hunger", exclaimed the Prophet. "I shall sell the slaves and spend the money to help them!". To console his daughter and son-in-law, Muḥammad went later to their house and taught them some litanies (so many repetitions of Allāh akbar, so many of al-ḥamd lillāh, so many of subḥān Allāh), and ʻAll did not fail to repeat them every night before going to sleep.

There seems no reason to reject the ʻaddārīs which speak of the poverty of the household of ʻAll and Fātimā; only its duration must be limited to the first years of their marriage; many members of the community were just as poor and it was only after the occupation of Khaybar that the situation improved for ʻAll and Fātimā, as for a good number of Muslims, for they then received shares in the produce of the rich oasis and ʻAlī could exclaim: "Now we shall eat our fill of dates".

Fātimā's house after the marriage. ʻAll built a dwelling not far from that of the Prophet but, as Fātimā wanted to live nearer to her father, the Medinan al-Hārīqa b. al-Nuṣān gave up his own house to them.

 Sons of ʻAll and Fātimā. Al-Ḥasan was born in 3/624 (but in this case the consummation of the marriage cannot have taken place after Bādri) or in 4/625, in Ramadān; al-Ḥusayn was conceived 50 days after the birth of al-Ḥasan and born in 4/626, in the first days of Shaʿbān. Besides these two sons and a third, Muḥassin (or Muḥsin), still-born, Fātimā had two daughters, who were called by the names of two of their aunts: ʻUmm Kūlqūm and Zaynab [see furūj, ʻalādā].

Disputes between ʻAll and Fātimā, and Muḥammad's intervention. ʻAll and Fātimā did not always live in harmony. ʻAll treated his wife with too much harshness (ghidda, ghīda), and Fātimā went to complain to her father. There are some ʻaddārīs which are real vignettes of family life, describing in a vivid and fresh manner how the Prophet intervened and how his face shone with satisfaction after the reconciliation of those dear to him. The most serious disputes between the pair arose when the Banū Ḥāšām b. al-Muqḥira of the Kuraysh suggested to ʻAll that he should marry one of their women. ʻAll did not reject the proposal, but Muḥammad, when some of the tribe came to sound him on the matter, came to the defence of his daughter, and said: "He who marries me (or my daughter to whom any ʻaddārīs refers) and whoever offends her offends me" (al-Baladhuri, Ansāb, i, 403; al-Tirmidhi, ii, 319, etc.) or "what angers her angers me also" (this ʻaddārī has many variants which, however, do not much change the meaning). It seems that at the same time ʻAll was asking in marriage a daughter of Abū Dāḥi nicknamed ʻAwra (the One-eyed). Muḥammad protested from the minbar against ʻAll, who proposed to shelter under one roof the daughter of the Apostle of God and the daughter of the enemy of God (i.e., Abū Dāḥi). On this occasion also the Prophet pronounced the phrase: Innahd bacPa (she is indeed a part of me), and added that if ʻAll wanted to accomplish his project he must first divorce Fātimā (Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, Cairo 1373, iv, 326; al-Bukhari, ed. Kreidl, ii, 440, etc.). Some authors have deduced from this that monogamy was one of the khasāṣīs of the daughter of the Prophet.

The name Abū Turāb, "the man of dust", given to ʻAll has, among other explanations, one connecting it with the disputes between ʻAll and Fātimā: instead of answering his wife in anger, ʻAll would go out of the house and put dust on his head; Muḥammad, seeing him do this, gave him the famous nickname.

Historical events in which Fātimā was involved during the life of Muḥammad. The following is all that can be collected: (1) After the battle of Uḥd Fātimā tended Muḥammad's wounds and was charged by him and by ʻAll to clean their bloodstained swords; after this it became her custom to go to pray on the graves of those killed in this battle; (2) Abū Sufyān, foreseeing the occupation of Mecca, sought her and ʻAll's intercession with Muḥammad (al-Tabari, i, 1623); (3) she received a share of the products of Khaybar and ʻAll another, separate, share; (4) she went to Mecca while the town was being occupied, and on this occasion Abū Sufyān begged her to give him her protection, but she refused and suggested also to allow her child to do so, the Prophet having prohibited this (al-Wākidī, 324); in 10/632 she performed the ʻumra; (5) with her husband and her sons, Fātimā played an important part in the mubahala, an episode which had strong repercussions among the ʻAshīfī [see mubahala].

Fātimā as one of the five members of the Aḥl al-bayt. A verse of the Kur'an (XXXIII, 33) says: "God wishes only to remove from you the uncleanness, O People of the House" (Aḥl al-bayt [q.v.]). The preceding verses contain instructions to the wives of the Prophet, and there the verbs and pronouns are in the feminine plural; but in this verse, addressed to the People of the House, the pronouns are in the masculine plural. Thus, it has been said, it is no longer a question of the Prophet's wives, or of them alone. To whom then does it refer? The expression Aḥl al-bayt can only mean "Family of the Prophet". The privilege accorded by God to the latter (originally entirely spiritual, but later not merely so) naturally led all the relatives of Muḥammad—those nearest to him, those belonging to the collateral branches of the family, and beyond this such groups of the community as the Ansār, or indeed the whole of the community—to claim a place in the Aḥl al-bayt. But there is a story given in many traditions according to which Muḥammad sheltered under his cloak (or under a covering or under a sort of tent), in varying circumstances
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(including the occasion when he was preparing for the musâbahah), his grandchildren al-Hasan and al-Husayn, his daughter Fâtima and his son-in-law 'Ali; and so it is these five who are given the title 'Ali al-khâdîjî (q.v.) or "People of the Mantle". Efforts have been made to include among the latter Muhammad's wives; in general however the number of the privileged is limited to these five. Now according to the Shi'a, without exception, but also according to the pro-'Ali Sunnîs, the Ahl al-bayt are identical with the 'Ali al-khâdîjî. The verse quoted above (XXXIII, 33) is associated with Fâtima and 'Ali on one other occasion: it is related that Muhammad, rising early in the morning to perform the subûb, was in the habit of knocking on their door and using this verse to remind them of the duty of prayer.

During the Prophet's illness. Fâtima, who loved her father greatly, was much grieved by his illness and wept and lamented. During this period she received a confidence from Muhammad. It is 'A'isha who relates the episode in many badîlîs: she saw Fâtima weep when her father spoke to her in secret and then smile. After the Prophet's death, she asked her what her father had said to her on that occasion; Fâtima replied that Muhammad had told her that Diibril came down once a year to bring possessions included the property which Mukhavrik. that occasion; Fatima replied that Muhammad had which he was holding. It is not clear whether these were transferred to Abu Bakr. The verse quoted above with A hi al-kisd*.

After his election, Abu Bakr made his way with some Muslims; consequently they have tried to minimize the number of Ansar and of the Shi'a, without exception, but also according to choice of a successor to the Prophet in the capacity of head of the community: she went on horseback with 'Ali to the meeting-places of the ânâr to ask them to support her husband; but the ânâr replied that 'Ali had come to them too late, when they were already committed to Abu Bakr. We have spent some time on these episodes because (i) even if they have been expanded by invented details, they are based on fact; (2) they represent Fâtima's only political action; (3) to the motives for the hatred felt by the Shi'a for 'Umar they add one more, true or false: his treatment of the daughter of the Prophet.

Fâtima's claim to Muhammâd's estate. After the death of her father, Fâtima asked Abu Bakr to hand over the possessions of Muhammâd which he was holding. It is not clear whether these possessions included the property which Mukhayrik, the Jew converted to Islam, had given to the Prophet at Medina (see 'Umar al-basîs, p. 366): probably there was no dispute about this. It was over the land of Fadak [q.v.] and over the share of Khaybar [q.v.] that Abu Bakr met Fâtima's claims with a flat refusal, asserting that he had heard the Prophet say that he had no heirs and that everything that he left would be fadâka [q.v.]. Nor is it known whether the claim to the inheritance was put forward by Fâtima alone or together with al-'Abbas; the examination of many badîlîs leads us to believe that the attempt to gain possession of this property was made twice and with different arguments, on the first occasion probably by both of them, on the second by Fâtima alone. This dispute between such a prominent person as Abu Bakr and the daughter of the Prophet has always been disagreeable to Muslims; consequently they have tried to minimize its gravity by maintaining, for example, that Fâtima claimed Fadak intending to give the rents of it to the poor [Shi'a sources add: to the mawdûlîs]; they like to depict Abu Bakr as grieved by the duty of refusing a request of the daughter of the Prophet, but forced to act thus by the conduct of Muhammâd himself. The Shi'a naturally do not forgive the Caliph for having disbelieved Fâtima, who maintained that she had received Fadak as a gift from her father, and have continued for centuries to argue about this question.

Illness and death of Fâtima. Fâtima fell ill soon after her father's death. According to some sources she was reconciled during her illness with Abu Bakr, who had asked to visit her, but, according to the majority she remained angry to the end. There is an oft-repeated story about the last moments of her life: she prepared for death by washing herself, putting on coarse garments and rubbing herself with balm, and she charged her sister-in-law, Asmâ', b. 'Umays, the widow of Di'a'far b. Abî 'Umayr, who was helping her with these tasks, that no-one should uncover her after her death; then she lay down on a clean bed in the middle of the room and awaited the end. As she had complained about the custom of covering the dead with a material which revealed their forms, Asmâ' prepared for her a bier made, in the manner of the Abyssinians, of wood and fresh palm-leaves.
Fatima was content with this. Unfortunately these accounts which would allow us to assume that Fatima was healthy and of not too advanced age at death are contradicted by others: according to al-Ya’qubi (ii, 128-30), she rebuked severely the Prophet’s wives and the women of the Kuraysh who came to visit her during her illness; through Asmâ she prevented ʿAisha from entering; her anxiety to hide her form from people’s gaze was prompted by shame at her extreme thinness (al-Tabari, iii, 2436); it was ʿAll who washed the body, and it was she herself who begged her husband to perform this task. It is difficult, if not impossible, to choose among these different accounts.

There is the same uncertainty over the date of her death as surrounds other events of her private life: it was certainly the year 11, but the month is doubtful; the commonest report is that she died six months after the Prophet. Her death was kept secret and her burial took place by night. According to most versions, neither Abū Bakr nor ʿUmar was informed; but there are accounts which relate that Abū Bakr recited the ritual prayers over Fatima’s grave. Nearly all the sources agree that Fatima was buried in the Bakhâ, and some specify the place of her grave: near the mosque called, from the name of the woman who built it, ʿAisha Rukayya, at the corner of the dâr of ʿAkkîr (ʿAll’s brother), seven cubits from the road etc., but according to other sources, either immediately after the burial or some time later, the exact position of the grave was no longer known. Al-Masʿudi (Mauridi, vi, 165) asserts that there was a tomb which bore an inscription giving as the names of those buried there Fatima and three ʿAīds (he is however the only one to give this detail), but al-Mukaddasi (BiGâ, iii, 46) includes the tomb of the daughter of the Prophet in the list of places on which there is disagreement, for it was also possible that Fatima had been buried “in the room” (fi ʾl-budira). Nowadays ʿshr pilgrims, to pay homage to the sayyidat al-nisaʾ, visit three places: house her (IRT, 8), near the road called ʿAisha Rukayya, and of al-Bahram’s wife of Musa. Ten houris came with a bowl and a jug filled with water from the Kawthar, and the first of

Fatima was gentle, modest, and calm in the face of difficulties, if not impossible, to choose among these different accounts.

As no systematic study of this subject exists, we have limited ourselves to selecting the main themes of the Fatima legend from three early Shi’i works (see Bibli.) in which some chapters are devoted to the daughter of the Prophet. The authors are: (1) Ibn Rustam al-Ṭabarī who, according to the editor of his Dâlîʾ al-arâb, died in the 4th/10th century (siglum: IRT); (2) Husayn b. ʿAbd al-Wahhab, who began to write in 448/1056-7 the work which we have used and which was one of the sources of al-Madjli’s Bītār al-anwâr and of al-Bahram’s Madīnāt al-maṣâdi; he presents some stories about Fatima which differ strikingly from those of the other sources (siglum: H ʿAW); (3) Ibn Shahrashûb (he died in 585/1192). Of the three works, his Manâkib Āl Abī Ṭalîb yields the most information and quotes form the largest number of sources (siglum: ISh).

Khadija’s pregnancy and accouchement. Khadija was despaired of by the Kuraysh because of her marriage with a poor man from a social class lower than her own (IRT, 8). On going in to her, Muhammad told her that ʿIṣâr had informed him that she would bear a daugther, a pure and blessed soul, and that from this daughter would spring his posterity and the imāms destined to be the rulers on earth when his own inspiration ended (IRT, 8). Fatima, while still in her mother’s womb, conversed with her (IRT, 8; H ʿAW, 45, 51; ISh, 119). Because of their contempt for Khadija, the women of the Kuraysh refused to help her during her confinement. So four women came toPassword: Sâra, ʿAṣiya, Mary and Safūrâ, daughter of Shuʿayb and wife of Mūsâ. Ten houris came with a bowl and a jug filled with water from the Kawthar, and the first of
them washed the new-born child, wrapped her in perfumed fine linen, and handed her, pure, purified, fortunate, blessed also in her posterity, to Khadija, who suckled her (IRT, 9; H'AW, 48; ISh, 119). Fatima was given her children in a year (IRT, 9; ISh, 119). The women who had come to assist her mother departed as soon as they had completed their task, but before they went the new-born child was greeted by them with perfumed fine linen, and handed her, pure, purified, fortunate, ... In a dream
Fatima saw the bed, which now again had four feet (ISh, 118). After the death of her father, Fatima
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cession (tef'if) and from that day onwards it became

sunnah (H'AW, 51). But there is another and stranger

story concerning this takbir: Muhammad mounted Fatima on his mule and pushed the animal, while

Salmān led it; suddenly there was great confusion in the street: Djibril and Mikhāl, all, each at the head

of 70,000 angels, had come down for the ceremony and raised with Muhammad the cry "Allāhu akbar!"

(IRT, 23, 25).

Gifts from heaven. Djibril brought to Muhammad a clove and an ear of corn from Paradise, announcing that God had commanded him to adorn Paradise for the marriage of Fāṭima and 'Allāh (IRT, 12; ISh, 123).

Marriage of Fāṭima and 'Allāh. The Kurāvsh women criticized Fāṭima's marrying 'Allāh, a poor man, but Muhammad had destined her for him because he had learned through Djibril (or through an angel named Maḥmūd) not only that this was the will of God but that the marriage had already taken place in heaven, with God as wālī, Djibril as khitāb, and the angels as witnesses. The maḥr on earth was only about 500 dhūrāms because it had to serve as sunna for the community. Perhaps in order to save the expense and save the trouble, there are some references to a mithāl from 'Allāh, consisting of a fifth of the earth, two-thirds of Paradise, and four rivers: the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Nile and the Oxus. The tree Ṭūbā or the Sidrat al-
muntakhāb, at God's command, covered itself with

robes, pearls and precious stones, and scattered them in vast quantities; the houris gathered these jewels and will keep them until the Day of Resur-

rection, for they are Fāṭima's nīghtān. The same tree, according to some accounts, let fall also missives

written in light, which the angels gathered up because they are the safe-conducts of the supporters of the 'A自习s (IRT, 12 f., cf. also 14, 18, 19 f., 23 f.; H'AW, 48 f.; ISh, 109, 123, 128, 134 f.). When Muhammad learned this, he called to him 'Ammār b. 'Yazīr, Salmān, and al-'Abbās and in their presence told 'All what God's will was; on his advice, 'All sold his breast-plate to Dīhya [q.v.], who then made him a present of it (Dīhya = Djibril: IRT, 14). The marriage in heaven, according to two of our sources, took place forty days before the marriage on earth (or on the night of the isrā'). The angel Maḥmūd revealed also the reason for the union: light must be joined to light (ibid.).

Trouseau. Muhammad charged Asma bint 'Umayr, Umm Salama and a freedwoman, 'Ammār,

Abū Bakr and Bīlāl to make the purchases necessary for the household of Fāṭima and 'Allāh. The list of their purchases is recorded, in some cases with the prices (ISh, 123). Umm Salama bought the mattress-

cover of Egyptian cloth which was to be filled with lif; Bīlāl or 'Ammār saw to the perfumes (IRT, 14 f., 26).

The marriage ceremony. During the marriage ceremony on earth, Djibril cried from heaven "Allāhu akbar"; Muhammad heard him, and he too, with his Companions, cried "Allāhu akbar". This was the first takbir to be called during a wedding pro-

cession (tef'if) and from that day onwards it became

sunnah (H'AW, 51). But there is another and stranger

story concerning this takbir: Muhammad mounted Fatima on his mule and pushed the animal, while

Salmān led it; suddenly there was great confusion in the street: Djibril and Mikhāl, all, each at the head

of 70,000 angels, had come down for the ceremony and raised with Muhammad the cry "Allāhu akbar!"

(IRT, 23, 25).

Gifts from heaven. Djibril brought to Muhammad a clove and an ear of corn from Paradise, announcing that God had commanded him to adorn Paradise for the marriage of Fāṭima and 'Ali (IRT, 14, 20). 'Ali, told by Muhammad to look up into the sky, saw richly-clad maidens bringing presents: these were his own and Fāṭima's future servants in Paradise (IRT, 26). When 'Ammār brought to Fāṭima the perfume which Muhammad had sent him to buy for her, Fāṭima announced that the angel Rīdān had sent her some from heaven, brought by houris each of whom had in her right hand a fruit and in her left some basil; these gifts were intended for the people of her House and for her supporters (IRT, 26). Like Mary who, according to the Kurān (III, 52/57), received a necessary provision (rizāq), Fāṭima received pomegranates, grapes, apples, quinces, etc., and ate besides things which other creatures had never tasted since the fall of Adam and Eve (ISh, 135). One day Muhammad entered Fāṭima's house while she was at prayer, and saw behind her a steaming cauldron; he asked what this was and she replied: "Divine Providence" (ISh, 135). Another day 'Ali invited Salmān to the house because Fāṭima and two of her companions wished to share it with him. Three hours had brought it to her, with a message of sympathy from God while she was weeping for the death of her father. These three hours were called Dharra, Mikdādā and Salmā, because they had been created for Abū Dhār [q.v.], Mikdād [q.v.] and Salmān [q.v.] respectively. The gift was a dish of white dates, cooled and so fragrant that Salmān was asked, as he was taking five of them home, whether he had perfumed himself with musk. The dates had no stones; God had created them for Fāṭima beneath His throne from the prayers which Muhammad had taught her (IRT, 29).

Fāṭima wished for a ring, and asked it of God during the night-prayer, Muhammad having taught her that she should make her requests at those times. A mysterious voice informed her that the ring was under the prayer-rug. In a dream Fāṭima saw castles destined for her in Paradise and noticed that the ring had been made from the foot of a bed which was in one of these castles and which had had only three feet; but next day Muhammad told her that the family of 'Abd al-Mu'tālib should set their attention on the next world and not on earthly things, and ordered her to put the ring back under the rug. In a dream Fāṭima saw the bed, which now again had four feet (ISh, 118). After the death of her father, Fāṭima...
received from heaven a book with covers of red chrysolite and pages of white pearl, which contained nothing from the Kur'an, but instruction on all that had been and would be until the Day of Resurrection. No angelic books were given as a pledge to a Jew by the wife of Zayd b. Haritha, who died about 25 years after the death of Muhammad (IRT, 10 f.). The book was given as a pledge to a Jew by the wife of Zayd b. Haritha, who died about 25 years after the death of Muhammad (IRT, 10 f.).

**Physical privileges.** Having been born pure and purified (she was a houri from heaven: HAW, 50), Fátima was exempt from the physiological troubles of women: she did not menstruate, and lost no blood during her confinements. She gave birth through the left thigh, while Mary gave birth through the right thigh (HAW, 45, 51). Her pregnancies lasted only nine hours.

**Miracles.** Several miracles were worked by Fátima: the stone for grinding corn turned without anyone in contact with it: the tenth (Kūf) stone from Diibril, rocked her baby’s cradle. One of her garments, given as a pledge to a Jew by the wife of Zayd b. Haritha, gave forth light, and the Jew and eighty other people, astonished at this miracle, embraced Islam (ISH, 16 f.). When, after the election of Abú Bakr, those who wanted to tempt Ali to offer the bay’a made him leave the house, Fátima went to the mosque and, standing near her father’s tomb, threatened to uncover her head; at that moment Salámán saw the walls of the mosque rise up: “My mistress and my patroness”, he cried, “God sent your father in His mercy: you should not bring us misfortune!” The walls then returned to their place (ISH, 118). When Fátima was weeping for her father’s death, it was Diibril himself who consoled her. The miracles continued even after Fátima’s death, benefiting one of her servants and the descendant of one of her servants (ISH, 16 f.).

Fátima in Paradise. Fátima will be the first person to enter Paradise after the Resurrection (ISH, 110). All will have to lower their gaze when she crosses the Bridge (sīrāf) which leads across Hell to Paradise. She will be escorted by seventy houris. In Paradise she will proceed, mounted on a wondrous camel with legs of emerald, eyes of ruby, etc., under a dome of light. It will be Diibril who leads the camel up to the throne of God. There she will descend and the heavens were illuminated. Fátima was called al-Zahra’ because the horizon took its light from her (HAW, 45). This story is of particular interest because, with its description of successive divine emanations, it contains some features characteristic of Ismā’īlī beliefs. Another story collected by ISh (106) also speaks of light, but in a different way: God created Paradise from the light of His countenance; He took this light, and threw it; with a third of it He created Paradise; with another third Fatima, and with the latter bore Fátima, who was of that light: she knew what was, what would be and what was not (HAW, 47). This last account (the Light of Fátima lodged in the loins of Muhammad) would explain her kūnayy Umm Abīhā.

The Light and Fátima. Muhammad explained thus the reason for the preference accorded to the People of the House: God, he said, created me and Ali as light, and separated off from our light that of my descendants; then He separated from our light the light of the Throne, and from that of my descendants the light of the sun and of the moon. We teach the angels the tasbīḥ, the ṭakhkīl and the tahrīmd (i.e., the formulas for the praise of God). God then said to the angels: “By My power, My majesty, My generosity. My mercy, My bounty, I say it!” The angels repeated it. God then said, “I placed the light of Fatima in a tree of Paradise, and it is through her that the heavens were illuminated. Fátima was called al-Zahra’ because the horizon took its light from her (HAW, 46). This story is of particular interest because, with its description of successive divine emanations, it contains some features characteristic of Ismā’īlī beliefs. Another story collected by ISh (106) also speaks of light, but in a different way: God created Paradise from the light of His countenance; He took this light, and threw it; with a third of it He struck Muhammad, with another third Fátima, and with the remaining third Ali and the People of the House. Whoever is thus struck recognizes the wāliyya [q.v.] of the family of Muhammad.

Fátima’s names. Attempts have been made to see a significance in the name Fátima. As the root has the meaning of “weaning a child”, “breaking someone of a habit”, she has been said to be so called because she, her descendants and supporters, will be spared from Hell, or because she was exempt from evil (ISH, 110, cf. 107), or because she was removed from polytheism (IRT, 10). The list of her names in IRT (10 f.) consists of nine: Fátima, al-Siddika, al-Mubarakā, al-Tāhira, al-Zakīya, al-Radiyya, al-Muhaddathah, al-Zahra’. She was called al-Muhaddathah because the angels spoke to her as to Mary, and she to them; they told her “God has chosen you and purified you; He
FAJIMA

has chosen you from among the women of the world”. According to H\(^{2}\)AW (46), her names on earth are: Fāțimah (sic, in the masculine), Fāṭīr, al-Zahrā; al-Batūl, al-Hasan, al-Hawra; al-Sayyida, al-Šiddīqah, and Maryam al-Kubrā. Ibn Bāḥḍa (d. 379/991), who records in his work an account of 16 names for Fāțima on earth and three in heaven, and Ibn Shahrābūsh (133) who records them appends a list of 69 names and attributes which must have served as a litany, for they are linked by the rhymes in groups, usually of three. Among the names listed by H\(^{2}\)AW should be noted Fāṭīr, i.e., Creator, for not only is it masculine, but it is carried with it a glorification of Fāțima, which seems to be characteristic of the extreme Ismā’īlīs and of aberrant sects such as the Nasrūyīs (Bausani, 189) rather than of the Imāms. Have we here a borrowing by the latter from the former? The belief that Fāțima is Fāṭīr, Creator, would also explain her kunya Umm Abīhā.

References to Fāțima in the Kurān; her other merits. The Kurān too is made to contribute to the glorification of Fāțima, thanks to the exegesis of Shi‘i writers, who maintain that many verses allude to ‘Allī and his wife. When the Book speaks of women in general, a hidden reference to Fāțima is intended: thus in III, 193/195, “I shall not permit to be lost the work of one who works [well] among you, male or female”, the “male” is ‘Allī and the “female” Fāțima at the time of the hīdāra. Similarly they identify with ‘Allī and Fāțima the reference to the creation of man and woman in XCII, 3.

Twelve women are alluded to in the Kurān without their names being mentioned (e.g., Eve, Sarah, Pharaoh’s wife, etc.). There is such an allusion to Fāțima in LV, 19, which speaks of two seas which God has caused to flow together: this confluence is the reconciliation of ‘Allī and Fāțima after a dispute, for he is the sea of knowledge and Fāțima the sea of prophecy; the barrier between them, mentioned in the following verse, is the Apostle of God, who prevents ‘Allī from distressing himself over the life of this world and Fāțima from quarrelling with her husband over earthly things; the pearls and the coral of verse 22 are, since they come from these seas, a symbol of the reconciliation of ‘Allī and Fāțima. Ibn Bāḥḍa (d. 381/991) among the names of Fatima lists 11 names and attributes. Some information on Fatima can be drawn from the works of Massignon, and some more.
from the writings of Ivanow and of Corbin. Here some general observations may be made: Among the Imamis the Fatimah of legend preserves almost always with the Isma'is a host of other gnostic or semi-gnostic elements, and she is then to some extent overshadowed by these and all links with her historical self are generally lost. Among the Isma'is and the deviant sects there appear other beliefs, of which we have found no trace in the Imam sources, e.g., the identification of Fatimah with al-Masqijid al-Aqsa in Jerusalem, with the Cave of the Seven Sleepers, with the rock of Moses which gushed forth miraculous water (the ancestral motif of Water), and the idea that she conceived through the ear and gave birth through the navel, etc. Among the Isma'is and the deviant sects there has been a more extensive assimilation of the themes of the Christian devotion to Mary, the Mother of God. There is also, according to Massignon (La notion . . . , 151 f.), a tendency to identify the figures of Mary and Fatimah in the style of depicting them in icons (Fatimah enthroned in heaven, with a diadem, a sword, and ear-pendants).

Although the Umm al-kitsah, the curious holy book of groups of Isma'is of Central Asia (published and analysed by Ivanow, REI, 1932, 419-82; Isl., xxii [1936], 1-12), is of limited importance—it is almost unknown to the other Isma'is—we may summarize here its account of the Creation, noting that it bears a certain resemblance to that of Husayn b. Abd al-Wahhab summarized above. God, a being of light (shakhsh nurdni) before the Creation, with five limbs: hearing, sight, the senses of smell and taste, and speech (which on earth were to become Muhammad, 'Ali, Fattima, al-Hasan and al-Husayn), manifested Himself when the world began in 'Ali, and then in successive theophanies; that of Fattima took place in Paradise after the creation of primordial men as a figure adorned with thousands of colours and seated on a throne with a crown on her head (Muhammad), two ear-rings in her ears (al-Hasan and al-Husayn), and a sword carried in a shoulder-belt ('Ali); all the garden of Paradise shone upon the appearance of this radiant figure.

Conclusion. In preparing this article we have taken note of the gaps left unfilled, and therefore indicate here the course that should be followed by future students of the legend of Fattima. It would be advisable to collect all the references to the daughter of the Prophet in the Shi'i hadith-collections (e.g., that of al-Kulayni) and in the abhbar Fattima, which Agha Buzurg has listed in his Diirba (i, 243 f., 331) and, if they no longer survive, to reconstruct them, at least in part, from the numerous quotations from them in later texts; it will be necessary to establish, from al-Majdhisti, the beliefs accepted by the Safawids, to collect together the ideas of the Isma'is, and finally, with the help of al-Khaj al-Nu'man or other authors, to establish the esoteric beliefs of the Fattimids. Use should be made of the Persian lithographs (excluded from this study as being confused and difficult to consult) as a source for other information, e.g., in the case of Fatimah, the themes developed as time went on. Parallels in Sufi anecdotes should also be studied. Finally, the investigator will have also to interpret the themes, and to trace what connection they have either with beliefs which existed long before Islam, of which they could be a recreation, or with ideas which, although incompatible with Islam, survived in the countries conquered by the Muslims, or with details preserved in hadiths and with genuinely Islamic ideas.

In our view the last is likely in most cases to prove to be the real connection, even when the themes have expanded into stories which are completely fantastic.
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FATIMIDS, dynasty which reigned in North Africa, and later in Egypt, from 297/909 until 567/1171. 'Ubayd Allah al-Mahdi, 297-322/909-34. Al-K'am, 322-34/934-46. Al-Mansur, 334-41/946-53. Al-Mu'izz, 341-65/953-75. Al-Aziz, 365-86/975-96. Al-Hakim, 386-411/996-1021. Al-Zahir, 411-27/1021-36. Al-Mustansir, 427-87/1036-94. Al-Musta'in, 489-95/1094-1103. Al-Amir, 495-525/1101-30. Al-Hafiz, 525-44/1130-49. Al-Zahir, 544-9/1149-54. Al-Fazz, 549-55/1154-60. Al-A'zid, 555-67/1160-71. The dynasty takes its name from Fatiima, for the Fatimid caliphs traced their origin to 'Ali and Fatiima. It is also possible that another Fatiima, the daughter of Husayn, who transmitted some hadith of her grandmother and had foreknowledge of the Mahdi, played a part in the attribution of this name (see L. Massigon, Fatiima bint al-Husayn et Vorigine du nom dynastique "Fatimites", in Akten des XXIV. Intern. Orientalisten-Kongresses, Munich 1957, 368). It should also be mentioned that the mother of 'Ali was a Hashimite called Fatiima bint Asad (Ibn Hajar, Isaba, Cairo 1328, iv, 380) and that among the Abi-l Hasan she is connected with the legend of Salman (see al-Mokri, Le secret indicible . . .), in JA, ccl (1962), 375), who plays an important part in Fatimid tradition. According to W. Ivanow (Ismaili traditions concerning the rise of the Fatimids, Bombay 1942, Is. Res. Ass. Series, no. 10, 80), the Fatimid dynasty, which, according to al-'Tabari (iii, 2219, sub anno 280), had been adopted by the Bedouin Banu 'A'shagh of the Syrian desert whose leader was the Karma-

to Fatimids. But Massignon (op. cit.) reminds us that the name is already found in Bashshar b. Burd, Fatimita, a poem in a pejorative sense. The origin of the Fatimid movement, which in North Africa brought the Fatimids to power in the person of 'Ubayd Allah al-Mahdi, must be sought in Isma'ilism (see Isma'il-liyya), a Shi'i doctrine which was at the same time political and religious, philosophical and social, and whose adherents expected the appearance of a Mahdi descended from the Prophet through 'Ali and Fatiima, in the line of Ism'ili, son of Difa'far al-Sadiq. (L. VECCIA VAGLIERI)

GENEALOGY OF THE FATIMIDS

The Fatimids trace their origin to Ism'ili, but as they did not announce their genealogy publicly and officially for some time, and as, during the period of the Hidden Imams, the satr [q.v.], the names of the imams between Muhammad b. Ism'ili and 'Ubayd Allah al-Mahdi were intentionally left in the dark, several different genealogies became current: with the result that, even today, the origin of the Fatimids is still wrapped in obscurity. The enemies of the Fatimids denied their descent from 'Ali and declared that they were impostors. Following the ancient Arab habit of giving a Jewish origin to people they hate (Goldziher, Muh. St., i, 204), 'Ubayd Allah has even been presented as the son of a Jew.

According to the traditional Fatimid genealogy, 'Ubayd Allah was the son of Husayn b. Ahmad b. 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad b. Ism'ili b. Difa'far al-Sadiq. The general anti-Fatimid tradition has it that he was the son of Husayn b. Ahmad b. Muhammad b. 'Abd Allah b. Maymun b. Kaddah, that he was really called Sa'id, and that it was only in North Africa that he took the name of 'Ubayd Allah (or 'Abd Allah) and claimed to be of 'Alid descent and to be the Mahdi (on Maymun al-Kaddah and his son 'Abd Allah and their relations with Difa'far al-Sadiq and his grandson Muhammad b. Ism'ili, see 'ABD ALLAH B. MAYMUN').

On the genealogy of the Fatimids, the different forms, both anti-Fatimid and Ism'ili, in which it has been presented, and the complex problems which it raises and which seem to defy a satisfactory solution, information is to be found in various works: S. de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druses, Paris 1838; Wüstenfeld, Gesch. der Fatimidischen-Chalifen, Göttingen 1881; C. H. Becker, Beiträge zur Geschichte Ägyptens, Strasbourg 1902-3; De Goeje, Mémoire sur les Carmalites, Leiden 1886; P. H. Mavour, Polémics on the origin of the Fatimis Caliphs, London 1924. The question has been studied afresh in more recent works: W. Ivanow, Ismaili traditions concerning the rise of the Fatimids, 1942, 154 f., 223 f.; idem, Isma'ilis and Qarmatians, in JBRAS, 1940, 70 f.; idem, The alleged founder of Isma'ilism, Bombay 1946, 169 f. (Ism. Soc. Series, no. 1); B. Lewis, The origins of Isma'ilism, Cambridge 1940 (Arabic translation, Baghdad 1947). Still more recently have appeared: Husayn F. al-Hamdi, On the genealogy of Fatimid Caliphs, Cairo 1958, and W. Madelung.

We can do no more here than glance at the questions which are discussed in these works and the difficulties which are encountered in studying the origin of the Fātimids, considering the many divergences which are found in the sources and the very different standpoints taken by the authors who concern themselves with these questions—even by the Isma‘īlī writers, in considering whose works we must account for the different treatment they give to a question according to whether the work is exoteric or esoteric.

Here are a few of the difficulties which arise:

In the Isma‘īlī sources the series of imams preceding ‘Ubayd Allāh is not everywhere the same and the names do not always agree (see Ivanow, *Rise,* 46 f.).

Even the name of the father of ‘Ubayd Allāh varies; there is one tradition which presents him as the son of Husayn but of one Ahmad. ‘Ubayd Allāh appears sometimes as ‘Ali b. al-Husayn, but on the other hand another ‘Ali b. al-Husayn is considered as a fourth Hidden Imām, not found in the list given above. Was Husayn, the father of ‘Ubayd Allāh, the regular imām or was the imām not rather Muhammad b. Āhmād, uncle of ‘Ubayd Allāh? In that case the uncle would not have been able to hand down the imamate to ‘Ubayd Allāh, since the doctrine decrees that, apart from the case of Hasan and Husayn, it is transmitted only from father to son.

This Muhammad b. Ahmad bears also the name of Abū ‘Ali al-Ḥākim with the kunya Abu ‘l-Shala‘la‘ (or Shala‘la‘gh) and the surname Sa‘īd al-Khayr. He is also presented as the father of ‘Ubayd Allāh. As ‘Ubayd Allāh is also Sa‘īd, it can be seen what a source of confusion these different names have been (see *Rise,* 31, Madelung, *Imamat,* 56, 71, 75, and similarly S. de Sacy and De Goes).

‘Ubayd Allāh himself gave other versions of his origin than that of the Fātimid tradition mentioned above. In a letter to the Isma‘īlī community of the Yemen (see Madelung, 70), he claims to be descended not from Isma‘īl b. Dja‘far, but from another son of Dja‘far, Abū ‘l-Mahasin. In the interview which he had with Abūdān, the emissary of Ḥamdān Karmat, as it is reported by Aḥkāḥ Muḥsin (admittedly a strongly anti-Fātimid šarī‘a), ‘Ubayd Allāh claimed a Kaddābī descent (Madelung, 60).

A further uncertainty lies in the relationship between ‘Ubayd Allāh and the second Fātimid caliph, Muhammad Abu ‘l-Kāsim al-Kā‘im bi-amr Allāh. The latter bears the name attributed by tradition to the expected Mahdī who must have the same name as the Prophet; the Kā‘im is strictly the Mahdī (the two names are used interchangeably).

‘Ubayd Allāh took the title of al-Mahdī, but did he really in his heart consider himself as the expected Mahdī, given that he did not have the necessary characteristics? Al-Kā‘im may not have been the son of ‘Ubayd Allāh, although the latter always considered him officially as his son. According to the Ghayat al-mawdū‘id of al-Ḥāṣṭāb b. al-Ḥasan (6th/12th century), he was the son of that fourth Hidden Imām ‘Ali mentioned above (see Ivanow, *Rise,* texts, 37, and Madelung, 77).

‘Ubayd Allāh’s attitude to Abu ‘l-Kāsim al-Kā‘im in conferring on him when he entered Raḵkāda a rank apparently superior to his own (see the facts in Madelung, 66, and see also 72) seems to imply that he considered Abu ‘l-Kāsim as the awaited Mahdī. Similar doubts are raised by various other details concerning al-Kā‘im (see Ivanow, *Rise,* 50, 204 and the *Strat Dja‘far al-Ḥākim,* 304, tr. in *Hespérisc,* 1952, 120). However it is difficult to do more than speculate on this point.

Another difficulty is that arising from the contradiction between the official genealogy and that which links the Fātimids with Maymūn al-Kaddābī. Even in the reign of al-Mu‘izz, the fourth Fātimid caliph, an attempt was made in certain heterodox Isma‘īlī circles to reconcile the two genealogies by identifying ‘Abd Allāh b. Maymūn al-Kaddābī with the ‘Abd Allāh b. Muhammad b. Isma‘īl b. Dja‘far of the Fātimid genealogy and thus introducing a non-alid into the family (see Ivanow, *Rise,* 140; S. M. Stern, *Heterodox Isma‘īlism at the time of al-Mu‘izz,* in *BSOAS,* xvii (1955), 12 f.). B. Lewis resolves the contradiction by showing, on the evidence of Isma‘īlī and Druze works, how it was possible to consider the Kaddābī as Fātimid imām, as the result of a spiritual adoption. Among the Isma‘īlīs spiritual paternity holds an important place beside physical paternity. (It may be recalled that in his letter to the community of the Yemen, ‘Ubayd Allāh, who included in the list of the imāms his uncle Muḥammad b. Āhmād, stated that he himself was called ‘Abd Allāh b. Muhammad because he was fi‘l-bājnīn the son of this Muḥammad b. Āhmād, who transmitted the imamate to him: see Husayn F. Ḥamdāni, in *Madelung,* 71, 72-73.)

Apart from the real, true imāms, descended from ‘Ali and Fāṭima, and called mustawdār (literally ‘permanent’), there were, says B. Lewis, imāms called mustasada‘, trustees or guardians of the imāmate (on these two terms see Stern, *op. cit.,* 10), whose function was to “veil” the true imām in order to protect him, and who acted by right of an assignment (‘inṣafī) which so to speak allowed them to enter the family of the true imāms. Maymūn al-Kaddābī, who had received from Dja‘far al-Ṣadīq the charge of his grandson Muḥammad b. Isma‘īl, said that his own son ‘Abd Allāh was the spiritual son of Muḥammad b. Isma‘īl and his heir, and it is by virtue of this that he proclaimed him imām. Thus a series of Kaddābī imāms is found side by side with a series of alid imāms. The last Kaddābī of the series was ‘Ubayd Allāh Sa‘īd, the mustasada‘ of al-Kā‘im, the alid and mustawdār imām. Thus, in the person of al-Kā‘im, the imāmate returned to the alid family.

For all the questions which arise and which cannot be dealt with here, reference should be made to the very detailed and fully documented article of Madelung on the imāmate in early Isma‘īlī doctrine, to which we shall return when discussing the religious policy of the Fātimids.

From the historical point of view, that which concerns us directly in this question of the genealogy is the attitude of the Abbāsid, who naturally contested the alid origin of their rivals the Fātimids, to whom it gave great prestige. ‘Arīb (*sub anno* 302, 51 f.), following al-Soll, reveals that at Baghdad at this time it was said that the master of the Maghrib was descended from a freedman of Ziyād b. Abīlī’s [g.v.] chief of police. All the same, it was not until later that official documents appeared, signed by jurists and alids, one of 402/1011 and the other of 444/1052, which denied that they were of alid origin (see Ibn al-Djawzī, *Muntazam,* vii, 225; Ibn al-ʿAšír, *sub annis* 402, 444; Ibn Khālidīn, *Proleg.,* tr. de Siane, 276, tr. Rosenthal, i, 45, and *Hist. des Berberès,* ii, 55; al-Maḥārizī, *Ittiḥād,* Cairo ed., 58 f.; Abu ‘l-Mahāsinī, Cairo ed., iv, 229, v, 53; cf. Goldziher,
Die Streitschrift des GazdH gegen die Bdtinijja-Sekte,
Leiden 1915, 15).

The SunnI historians are in general not well disposed
towards the Fāṭimids. Hardly any of them except
al-Makrīzī and Ibn Ḥālūdīn pronounce their ‘Alī
descent to be authentic. Moreover, the argument
advanced by these two writers that ʿUbayd Allāh
would not have been persecuted by the ʿAbbāsids if
they had not been convinced of the ‘Alī descent of
the Fāṭimids is not very convincing, for, ‘Alī or not,
he represented ideas which were dangerous to those
in power and it was natural that the authorities
should harry him. While the supporters of the
Fāṭimids refer to their dynasty as ‘Alīd (al-dawla
al-Salawīyya: see e.g. al-Muʿayyяд fī l-Dir, Sīra,
passim), several Sunnī historians speak of them only as
ʿUbaydīds and the ʿUbaydī dynasty. Ibn Ḥamādū (Ḥammād [q.v.]) calls them mulūk Banī
ʿUbayd. Similarly Abu ʿl-Muḥāsib speaks of al-Muʿizz
al-ʿUbaydī, al-ʿAḍzī al-ʿUbaydī.

FOUNDATE OF THE DYNASTY

Whoever ʿUbayd Allāh-Saʿīd may have been, he
laid the foundations of the dynasty in North Africa.
He lived at Salamīyya in Syria, a centre of ʿĪsāʾī
propaganda. The way had been prepared for him by
the ʿālīs [q.v.], the ʿĪsāʾī missionaires. Ibn Ḥawgāb
Maṣʿūr al-Yaman, the ʿālī of the Yemen, where he
was firmly established, had sent missionaires into
North Africa, the last and most important of whom
was Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Shīrī [q.v.]. When ʿUbayd
Allāh decided to leave Salamīyya, either to escape
ʿAbbāsīd investigations, or as the result of the obscure
affair of a conspiracy against him within the ʿĪsāʾī
movement (that of the “three Karmaṭī brothers” as
Ivanov puts it in Rīs, 75 f.), he could have gone
either to the Yemen, or to North Africa, where the
missionaire Abū ʿAbbās Allāh al-Shīrī had been working
successfully among the Kutāmā Berbers since 280/893.
He went first to Ramlā in Palestine, thence to Egypt,
probably in 297/903; then when he was harassed by
the ʿAbbāsīd governor, and when his followers expected him to set off for the Yemen, he
decided to go to North Africa where Abū ʿAbbās Allāh
al-Shīrī was occupied in undermining the Aḥlabī
domination. Being unable to join the missionaire at
once, he went to ʿṢijdīlmasa where he was put under
house arrest, if not actually imprisoned, by the amīr
of the country. It was there that Abū ʿAbbās Allāh,
after having made himself master of the Aḥlabī
capital Raḵkāda and expelling Ziyādāt Allāh in Raḡāb
296/13 March 909, came to seek him to lead him
in triumph, on 29 Rābiʿ I 297/15 January 910, to
Raḵkāda where he publicly took the titles of Mahdī
and of Amīr al-Muʿāminīn (on all this, see, besides
the historians, the Sīrat Diaʾfar al-Ḥādījīh, one
of the faithful companions of ʿUbayd Allāh, mentioned
above).

THE AFRICAN PERIOD OF THE FĀṬIMID CALIPHATE

The first four Fāṭimid caliphs, ʿUbayd Allāh al-
Mahlī, al-Maṣṣūr and al-Muʿizz, lived in North
Africa, the last until, in 362/973, he left for
Egypt, which had been conquered by his general
Diaḥawār [q.v.].

During the African period, the Fāṭimid caliphs
encountered many difficulties. In North Africa, split
between Sunnīsm, mainly in its ʿĪsāʾī form, and
Khāriǧism, in its ʿĪbāḍī and Ṣufī forms, the new
dogma could not fail to bring trouble. The existence
in the Maghrib of two rival Berber groups, the Zenātā
in the west and the Ṣanḥāḍā (who included the
Kutāmā) in the east, was a further disrupting factor.
Settled in the centre and the west of the country were
two dynasties of eastern origin, the Khāriǧī Rusta-
mīds of Tāhirt and their principal (al-ʾĀṣid), the new
dynasty could not allow to remain independent.
The Umayyads of Spain were in possession of a
part of the Maghrib territory lying nearest to the
Iberian peninsula. Finally, if we consider that, from
the very beginning, the new masters of Ifriqiyya had
considered it only as a base from which to move on,
that they intended one day to move to the East,
to supplant the ʿAbbāsīd caliphs there, that in order to
this they had to keep up a powerful and expensive
army and a navy of some consequence, and that apart
from this they were to come into a troubled in-
heritance in Sicily, the full scope of the difficulties
with which they were faced becomes clear. To solve
all the problems which the situation presented to
them, Fāṭimid caliphs could rely only on a fairly
restricted number of supporters, apart from the
Kutāmā, who were not always tractable, and on
their own political skill and their energy. It is a wonder
that they succeeded.

Within his own party, ʿUbayd Allāh was not long
in coming into conflict with the dāʾī Abū ʿAbd Allāh,
either because the latter had doubts of his really
being the Mahdī, or because his master had limited
his power. When one day the ʿAbbāsīd dynasty to the
brink of ruin.

In the religious and politico-religious field, the
Fāṭimid had to struggle in North Africa against
both Sunnī and Khāriǧī opposition. The Mālikī
Sunnī opposition has been well explained by G.
Maqrīzī in his work La Berbérie musulmane et l’Orient
au Moyen Age, Paris 1946, in the chapter Les causes
du divorce, 136 f., which, although based on prejudiced
Sunnī sources, gives a striking picture of the mani-
festations of this opposition, which was sometimes
sterility quelled and at other times extinguished by
bribery. In M. Bencheneb, Classes des sarants de
l’Ifriqiyya, 288-304, is to be found the curious story
of a doctrinal controversy between some jurists and
the brother of the Dāʾī. This opposition, however,
bereaved those in power only when Kay-
rawān, although very orthodox, made a temporary
alliance with the Khāriǧī Abū Yazīd [q.v.]. Indeed,
on the Khāriǧī side, the opposition took a very
dangerous form with the revolt of this curious
personality, who took possession of several important
towns, laid siege for a year to Mahdīyya, and was not
defeated until 336/947. The revolt, which began in
332/943-4, exhausted al-Kāʾīm, who succumbed to
the fatigues of war at Sās, and it did not end until
the reign of al-Maṣṣūr. Abū Yazīd, supported by the
Umayyad ruler of Cordova, brought the Fāṭimid
dynasty to the brink of ruin.

The Zenātā of the west were another source of
difficulty. The Khāriǧī Rustamīds of Tāhirt had
been expelled in 296/909 by Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Shīrī,
but a revolt broke out and the place had to be re-
taken in 309/920, then of Sidjilmasa in 310/921. After the death of Maslla, his lieutenant and successor, Mūsā b. Abī 'l-ʿAṭiya, effectively subdued the Maghrib, taking Fez from the Idrisids, but he ended by defec-
ting to the Umayyad ruler in 320/932. Also al-
Kāʾīm, who had already conducted campaigns in the Maghrib during his father's lifetime and founded the fortress town of Maslla (Muḥammadīyya) in the Zāb, was obliged, after his accession, to send an ex-
pedition to reconquer Fez and all the western Maghrib from Ibn al-ʿAṭiya, as well as Tāhtēr. He re-
established the Idrisids in their domains, but under Fāṭimid authority. It was only al-Muʿūzī who,
through his wise and prudent behaviour and the military skill of his general Dīwāhār, subdued all the west and re-established peace there, as the result of a great campaign by Dīwāhār, extending as far as the Atlantic. The same caliph had also pacified the Aurès and defeated the maritime offensive of the Umayyads ʿAbd al-Rahmān III in 344/955.

In order to have a window open onto the East, ʿUbayd Allāh founded on the eastern coast of Ifriqiyah the town of al-Madhiyya, which he made his capital in 308/920. A few years after his accession he tried to establish himself in Egypt. But the two expeditions which his sons, al-Kaʾīm and explains, made in 301/913-5 and 307/919-21 were unsuccessful and, after initial successes which led him at one time as far as the gates of al-Fustāt and at another time to Fayyūm, they ended in heavy defeats. In the second expedition, the Fāṭimid fleet was destroyed. Barka, however, remained in Fāṭimid hands. After his accession, al-
Kāʾīm tried a third time in 323/925 to conquer Egypt, but again without success.

In none of these operations does the Fāṭimid ruler seem to have been helped by any campaign undertaken on their side by the Karmāṭī of Bahrain; this is contrary to the opinion advanced by De Goeje (on this subject see W. Madelung, Fatimidien und Bahrain-
garmeinen, in Isl. xxiv (1959), 46 f., who denies that there was a collaboration between Fāṭimids and Karmāṭī which maintains that the letter of ʿUbayd Allāh to Abū Tāthir after the taking of the Black Stone—for which see the historians sub anno 317—
is no proof of an alliance between Fāṭimids and Karmāṭīs.

The new power, as successor of the Aghlabids, could not be indifferent to Sicily. But two successive governors sent to Sicily had to withdraw, and the inhabitants elected a governor of their own, Ibn Kur̲ub. He declared for the ʿAbūsādīs caliph and twice sent a fleet against Ifriqiyah, but the second time the fleet suffered a serious defeat; finally the Sicilians rid themselves of Ibn Kur̲ub by giving him up to ʿUbayd Allāh, who had finally to pay death in 304/916. It was only after this that a new Fāṭimid governor was able to take possession of the island. But Sicily was later to suffer disturbances. In 336/946 al-Manṣūr sent as governor al-Ḥasan b. ʿAll b. al-
Kalbī, and from then on it was from this family that the governors of Sicily were taken, tending more and more towards autonomy.

The Fāṭimid caliphs of North Africa were naturally driven to fight against the Byzantines who were settled in Sicily and to exchange embassies with them. Several times his fleets and fleets were sent from Ifriqiyah against the Byzantines in Italy and in Sicily. During the time of ʿUbayd Allāh, at a date which is uncertain (between 914 and 918) the Byzantin
e emperor concluded a treaty with the governor of Sicily, by which he undertook to pay annually a tribute of 20,000 gold pieces; some years later the caliph reduced this to 2,000, to thank the emperor Romanus Lecapenus for having freed the African ambassadors whose ship had been captured when they were travelling to the court of the king of the Bul
gars, in the company of Bulgar emissaries who had come to Africa to propose to the Fāṭimid ruler an alliance against Byzantium. Because of this the projected alliance between Fāṭimids and Bulgars fell through. At about the same time an expedition was sent from Africa against Genoa, Corsica and Sardinia. In the time of al-Kāʾīm, during the revolt of Girgenti (see G. Wiet, L'imperialisme des Fāṭimides et leur propagande, in Revue des Études Byzantines, xix (1961), 284 f., and on the embassy of 346 and related events, S. M. Stern, An ambassador of the Byzantine Emperor to the Fāṭimid Caliph al-Muʿūzī, in Byzantion, xx (1950), 239-58; on other Byzantine embassies, see Amari, Storia, i, 314-22.

Some years later, in the time of Nicephorus Phocas, who had refused to continue to pay the tribute and had resumed hostilities in Sicily, the Fāṭimid army and fleet inflicted two defeats on the Byzantines (Battle of Rametta and Battle of the Straits) at the beginning of 965. The resulting negotiations ended in a peace treaty in 356/967, and this treaty was concluded all the more easily as al-Muʿūzī was engaged at the time in preparing his Egyptian expedition.

The conquest of Egypt

The success of al-Muʿūzī in North Africa had al-
lowed him to devote himself to the pursuit of an eastern policy, and to undertake the conquest of Egypt in which ʿUbayd Allāh and al-Kāʾīm had failed. The conquest, carefully planned in its practical aspects, and psychologically by skilful political propaganda (see G. Wiet, L'Égypte arabe, vol. iv of Hist. de la Nat. Égypt., 147 f., and M. Canard, L'impérialisme des Fāṭimides et leur propagande, in AIEO-Alger, vi, 167 f.) in a country which was in a state of internal chaos and ravaged by famine, was achieved without much difficulty by Dīwāhār, who entered al-Fustāt on 12 Shaʿbān 356/1st July 969. Egypt then became for two centuries a Shiʿī country, at least so far as the civil power was concerned. The ʿAbbāsid caliph suppressed in the kbūtha, but intro-
duced Shiʿī formulae only very gradually. He concentrated at first on taking measures against
the famine and on restoring order, and acted with considerable generosity. To house his troops he built a new town—Cairo—and laid the first stones of the al-Azhar mosque on 24 Džumādā I 359/1 April 970.

The Fatimids in Egypt

1. Territorial expansion: its vicissitudes.

Diawhar made great efforts to extend Fatimid domination beyond the frontiers of Egypt over the countries which were dependencies of the Ikshšidid emirate. The two holy cities of Mecca and Medina, where the gold liberally distributed by al-Muizz had achieved its propagandist purpose, surrendered readily in 359/970, and remained under Fatimid suzerainty, apart from a few interruptions over questions of money, until the reign of al-Mustansır. It was more difficult to establish a foothold in Syria, for there the Ikššidid governor had made a pact with the Karmatls of Bahrayn, who in turn had the support of the Buwayhid ruler of Baghdad. Diawhar’s lieutenant, Dja shameful Fatimid army was able to seize Damascus, but he was killed in a battle against the leader of the Karmatls, al-Hasan al-ʿAṣam, at the end of 360/1 August 971 (on the attitude of the Karmatls to the Fatimids see al-Maklawi, Ihjā, 248 f.; De Goeje, op. cit., 183 f.; Hasan lbrahīm Ḥasan and Tahā Sharaf, al-Muʾizz, 115 f.; Madelung, Fat. und Bahrainqarm., 62 f. and al-Ḥasan al-ʿAṣam). al-Husayn b. ʿAlī, the Karmati intended to proceed without delay as far as Syria, but he encountered a successful defense by Diawhar (end of 361/December 971) and fled. All the same Diawhar was able to re-occupy only a part of Palestine. Al-Hasan al-ʿAṣam returned to attack Cairo in 363/ beginning of 974, while al-Muʾizz, who had left Ifrīqiyah on 21 Shawwal 361/5 August 972, entrusting the government of the Maghrib to the Şāhīd al-Muʾizz Dja hilāl Dżawhar, was already in Cairo, which he had entered on 7 Ramadan 362/11 June 973. But the Bedouin auxiliaries of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAṣam, won over by Fatimid gold, abandoned him and he was routed. Following this the Fatimid army was able to reoccupy Damascus, but shortly afterwards Damascus fell into the hands of a Turkish adventurer, Altekīn, against whom al-Muʾizz, on the eve of his death in 365/975, was preparing to march.

The new caliph al-ʿAzīz succeeded in re-taking Damascus in 368/978, but in order to procure the withdrawal of the Karmatls, who supported Altekīn, he was obliged to pay them tribute. Possession of Palestine and Syria was necessary to al-ʿAzīz, whose ultimate plans also required the seizure of Aleppo, but there was continued trouble in Palestine and Syria, fomented either by rebels like the powerful ʿAYl family of Palestine, the Şāhīdīs (asv.), or by dissident governors or generals. The attempts of al-ʿAzīz failed in 373/983, 382/992-3 and 384/994-5, and his power barely extended as far as Tripoli. Nevertheless it was then that Fatimid sovereignty was recognized from the Atlantic to the Red Sea, in the Ḥijāz, in the Yemen (by the Yaʿfurī ʿAbd Allāh b. Kaḥṭān in 377/987 [see 447/28]), in Syria and even for a time as far as Mūsul, in the time of the ʿŪṣaylīd Abu Ṭ-Dawād b. al-Musayyib. But they were unable to reach any understanding with the Buwayhid of Baghdād, although he was a Shīʿī.

The troubles in Syria continued, and it is possible to say that this country was never a solidly Fatimid possession. In the time of al-Ḥakīm the amirate of Aleppo fell under Fatimid rule in 406/1015, and in 408/1017 received a Fatimid governor; but he was sometimes in revolt. In Palestine the Şāhīdīs of al-Muʾizz b. Dja hilāl Altekīn, who was able to have an anti-caliph proclaimed in the person of a šarif of Mecca, and it was only by buying Mufarrīdī off that al-Ḥakīm could rid himself of the danger which he had stirred up. Under al-Ẓahir, Fatimid domination was endangered by the alliance between the Şāhīdīs, the Kalbīs of central Syria and the Kilābīs of northern Syria. Aleppo fell into the hands of the Kilābī ʿAlī b. Mīdās [asv.] in 415/1025. The fact that the Kalbīs changed sides allowed the Fatimid general Anūṣhtekīn al-Duṣbarī to win the battle of al-ʿUkhwāna in Palestine, to re-occupy Damascus and to re-take Aleppo from the Müḥammadīs (in the reign of al-Mustansır). Thanks to Anūṣhtekīn, Fatimid domination extended as far as Ḥarrān, Şarādī and Raḵṣa, but he fell a victim to the intrigues of the vizier al-Djārdjarātī; his successor was a descendant of the Hamdānīs, Nāṣir al-Dawla [asv.], and Aleppo fell again to a Mīdāsī in 433/1041. In spite of two attempts to re-take it in 440/1049 and 441/1050 and its surrender to the Fatimids in 449/1057-450/1058, it returned into Mīdāsī hands in 452 and was then irrevocably lost to the Fatimids, for it surrendered to the caliph of Baghdād and to the Şāhīdī Sultan Alp Arslān in 452/1069-70, and had a Şāhīdī governor from 479/1086-7.

Nor did Syria and Palestine remain for long under Fatimid domination in the 5th/11th century. There was continual unrest in 455/1065-456/1066 and again in 458/1066-460/1068 to maintain Fatimid sovereignty in Damascus. In 461/1069, in the course of fighting between Muhribī and Eastern elements of the army, the Umayyad mosque was burned. In 468/1076 Damascus was occupied by a former Fatimid officer, the Tūrco Man Ṭasū, who threatened even Cairo in 466-70. The Armenian general Badr al-Djamālī [asv.] tried vainly in 455/1065-456/1066 and again in 458/1066-460/1068 to maintain Fatimid sovereignty in Damascus. In 461/1069, in the course of fighting between Mahribī and Eastern elements of the army, the Umayyad mosque was burned. In 468/1076 Damascus was occupied by a former Fatimid officer, the Tūrco Man Ṭasū, who threatened even Cairo in 466-70. The Armenian general Badr al-Djamālī [asv.] tried vainly in 455/1065-456/1066 and again in 458/1066-460/1068 to maintain Fatimid sovereignty in Damascus. In 461/1069, in the course of fighting between Mahribī and Eastern elements of the army, the Umayyad mosque was burned. In 468/1076 Damascus was occupied by a former Fatimid officer, the Tūrco Man Ṭasū, who threatened even Cairo in 466-70. The Armenian general Badr al-Djamālī [asv.] tried vainly in 455/1065-456/1066 and again in 458/1066-460/1068 to maintain Fatimid sovereignty in Damascus. In 461/1069, in the course of fighting between Mahribī and Eastern elements of the army, the Umayyad mosque was burned. In 468/1076 Damascus was occupied by a former Fatimid officer, the Tūrco Man Ṭasū, who threatened even Cairo in 466-70. The Armenian general Badr al-Djamālī [asv.] tried vainly in 455/1065-456/1066 and again in 458/1066-460/1068 to maintain Fatimid sovereignty in Damascus. In 461/1069, in the course of fighting between Mahribī and Eastern elements of the army, the Umayyad mosque was burned. In 468/1076 Damascus was occupied by a former Fatimid officer, the Tūrco Man Ṭasū, who threatened even Cairo in 466-70.
At the beginning of the reign of al-Zahir, in 414/1025, the regent Sinn al-Mulk ([q.v.], d. 415/1024-5) had re-opened negotiations but without success. They were not resumed until 423/1032, and were soon broken off because of the caliph's refusal to accept the return of Hassân b. al-Mufarrij (see ABBÂSHIYYA), when agreement had been reached on the rebuilding of the church of the Holy Sepulchre. It was not until 429/1038 that a peace of thirty years could be signed, at the beginning of the reign of al-Mustansîr: the Byzantines obtained permission to rebuild the church, and sent architects and money for this purpose.

From this time on begins a period of friendly relations between Fatimid and Byzantine. Although Byzantium had agreed to support a rebel Sicilian amir and had given him the title of magister in 1033-6 (Amari, ii, 434), yet when in 443/1051-2 the Zirid Mu'izz b. Badis had recognized 'Abbâsîd suzerainty, his ambassador returning from Baghêd was arrested in Byzantine territory and sent to al-Mustansîr. In 439/1048 the treaty of 1038 had been renewed.

Constantine Monomachus (1042-54) maintained excellent relations with al-Mustansîr, who asked him to supply Egypt with wheat after the famine of 446/1054. But the death of the Emperor and the demands of his successor, the empress Zoe, who wanted in return for a treaty with the Fatimids, the destruction of Tyre, and the conquest of its environs, led to a cooling of relations and even a resumption of hostilities. The rupture was aggravated when a Fatimid ambassador, al-Khâlîfâ at Tyre, whereas the Byzantines helped al-Abdhîkînsî to Fâtimid territory and sent to al-Mustansîr. In 439/1048 the treaty of 1038 had been renewed.

3. Relations with the Byzantine Empire. In their propaganda already in their African period the Fatimids claimed aloud that universal sovereignty was given to them by divine decree and that they were called to displace the Umayyads of Spain as well as the 'Abbâsîds of Baghêd and the Byzantine emperors (see M. Canard, L'imperialisme..., passim). We have seen above what their relations with Byzantium had been during the African period. Al-Mu'izz received several Byzantine embassies. In Egypt, in the very year of his death in 365/975, he received an embassy from John Tzimisces. Al-Azîz, in this attempt to take Aleppo, clashed with the Greeks as protectors of the Hamdânî amirate of Aleppo, who each time prevented him from achieving his object. Although al-Azîz did not succeed in his attempts, he nevertheless obtained in 377/987-8 from the emperor Basil II, who was threatened by the Fatimids and by the Sa'djîks, led to a cooling of relations and even a resumption of hostilities. The rupture was aggravated when an ambassador in Cairo that on his next visit he would find him in Baghêd. Al-Azîz b. Badîs had recognized 'Abbâsîd suzerainty, his ambassador returning from Baghêd was arrested in Byzantine territory and sent to al-Mustansîr. In 439/1048 the treaty of 1038 had been renewed.

Constantine Monomachus (1042-54) maintained excellent relations with al-Mustansîr, who asked him to supply Egypt with wheat after the famine of 446/1054. But the death of the Emperor and the demands of his successor, the empress Zoe, who wanted in return for a treaty with the Fatimids, the destruction of Tyre, and the conquest of its environs, led to a cooling of relations and even a resumption of hostilities. The rupture was aggravated when a Fatimid missionary at the mosque in the name of the Fatimid, but for the Sa'djîk sultan Toghrîl Beg, for the Emperor had entered into relations with the latter in 447/1054 in gratitude for his having freed the king of the Abhbîz, and it seems, to judge from the Siya of the Fatimid missionary al-Mu'ayyad ff 'l-Dîn (p. 95), that there had been a project for an alliance between the two against the Fatimid ruler. Relations were resumed however and the Byzantine writer Psellus states that they were excellent in the reign of Constantine Monomachus (ed. Renault, ii, 64) and were still so before the death of the Byzantine emperor in 459/1069.

The exchange of embassies continued, the more so because the same danger, the Sa'djîks, was threatening both Egypt and Byzantium. There was for example a Fatimid embassy during the reign of Romanus Diogenes in 461/1069, a letter from Alexis Comnenus to the vizier al-Afdal in about 1095, after Antioch had been taken by the Crusaders, and an embassy from the same emperor to al-Mafîj in 1105 to negotiate the ransom of Frankish prisoners. Manuel Comnenus also maintained good relations with Egypt and in 553/1158 requested the help of a Fatimid fleet against Sicily. In the same year, the vizier Taûbî b. Ruzzîf sent to Manuel the brother of the Count of Cyprus whom he had taken prisoner. Some years later however, in 1165, Manuel concluded a pact with king Amâric of Jerusalem for an attack against Egypt, which took place the following year, but failed.

4. Relations with the 'Abbâsîd East. Ibn Hâni' al-Andalusî, the eulogist of al-Mu'izz, tempts his master with the prospect of a Fatimid entry into Baghêd, and shows him, wide open, the old imperial Persian highway, the road to Khurâtân. One tradition has it that al-Mu'izz declared to a Byzantine ambassador that there was a pact on his behalf with the Fatimids, and that he would find him in Baghêd. Al-Azîz set himself to achieve this goal, but by means of negotiations, trying to
get himself recognized by the Buwayhid al-Dawla. An exchange of embassies took place in 369/979-80, but without result. Like the 'Abbasid caliph later, the Buwayhid al-Dawla, in the tradition of the 'Aliid genealogy of the Fatimids. Al-Hākim was no more successful with the Ghaznavid ruler in 403/1012-3, nor was al-Zāhir in 415/1024. The kiya sent were despatched to Baghdād and burnt. Al-Zāhir did not give up, and in 425/1034 sent missionaries to the Buwayhid capital to take advantage of the disturbances caused by the Turkish soldiery during the reign of the Buwayhid Djalāl al-Dawla [g.v.], and they made vigorous propaganda there. Al-Mustānisr [g.v.] cemented relations with several governments in the East. The activities of his missionaries spread as far as Sind (see S. M. Stern, [q.v.]). Al-Mustansir could believe that the Fatimid dream was about to become reality.

In 'Irāq the Turkish amīr al-Bāsāsār [g.v.] caused the sovereignty of the Fatimid ruler to be recognized in various places, at Mosul in 448/1057, then in Baghdād for a year in 451/1059. This extension of Fatimid sovereignty had been prepared in particular by the propaganda of the Fatimid ruler. He had fi 'l-Dīn [g.v.], who had even converted the Buwayhid Abū Kālidār [g.v.] at Şirāz to Ismā'īlīsm. The Sāljuqs, as Sunnīs, of course had no sympathy for the Fatimids. In 447/1055, Toghrīl Beg had announced his intention of marching on Syria and Egypt and of putting an end to the reign of al-Mustānisr. The affa of al-Bāsāsār strengthened the determination of the Sāljuqs to direct their policy towards Syria and the Mediterranean, especially as the vizier al-Yāsār [g.v.], who decided to abandon his support of al-Bāsāsār, had entered into correspondence with Toghrīl Beg (so at least certain sources allege). The fact remains that from then on the Sāljuqs did nothing but gain territory from the Fatimids: at Mecca the name of the Fatimid ruler was omitted from the Khutba, temporarily in 450/1059-60 and finally in 473/1080.

In his relations with the amīr Nāṣir al-Dawla appealed for help, in 462/1070-70, to the Sāljuq sultan Alp Arslān, asking him to send an army to help him to re-establish the 'Abbasid khilāfa. The Sāljuq sultan got as far as Aleppo the following year, and the Mirdāsār ruler abandoned the Fatimid khilāfa. Alp Arslān was unable to proceed further, because of the invasion of Armenia by the Byzantine emperor. Apart from this, we have already noticed the Sāljuq penetration into Syria and Palestine.

In the Yemen, the Fatimids found fervent supporters in the dynasty of the Sulayhids of San'a, which ruled from 429/1038 to 534/1139. The founder was a dā'i who established Fatimid domination in the Yemen. This dynasty included a remarkable ruler in the person of Sayyīdā Ḫurrā, and maintained uninterrupted relations with Cairo: the letters from the chancrey of al-Mustansir to the Sulayhids have survived (Al-Sīgīliīāt al-Mustansirīyya, ed. A. M. Magued, Cairo 1954).

5. The Fatimids and the Crusades. At the time when the Crusaders arrived in northern Syria the Fatimids no longer held any territory in Syria, and in Palestine they retained only 'Aškalān and a few coastal towns. They were less interested in the struggle against the Franks than in the Egyptian amirs of Syria. Ibn al-Athīīr, sub anno 491/1097-8, relates a tradition according to which the Fatimids, being uneasy over the plans of the Sāljuqs and their intentions against Egypt (for the amīr Atālā had already, in 469/1077, launched an unsuccessful attack against Cairo), requested the intervention of the Franks in the East. This does not seem very likely. Be that as it may, the Franks received a Fatimid embassy outside Antioch at the beginning of 1098 and sent delegates to Cairo, who set off with the Egyptian ambassadors. But the project for an alliance against the Turks, giving Syria to the Franks and Palestine to the Fatimids, did not come to anything, although the Fatimids were better disposed towards the Franks than towards the Turks, and in spite of the good intentions of the Franks, who were able to learn through Alexis Comnenus what was the Fatimid attitude to the Turks. In these circumstances the vizier al-Aldāl decided to take Jerusalem from Sūkāmān, succeeded in 497/August 1098 after a siege of forty days, and continued his advance to beyond Beirut. It is difficult in these circumstances to see why—for presumably he re-took Jerusalem in order to hold it—he did nothing to prevent the Crusaders from seizing it on 15 July 1099, and allowed himself to be surprised and beaten in August outside 'Aškalān in a battle which had been preceded by the capture of several places, including Yāfā (Jaffā). Following this, in 499/1099-1000, the Crusaders took in Palestine Ḫayfā, Ṭarsīf and 'Acre ('Akṭā) in 497/1104. The Egyptians took part in the struggle against the Crusaders but were unable to prevent the fall of Tripoli, which had called on them for help at the end of 503/1109, nor the fall of Beirut and Sidon (Ṣāyda) in 504/1110, nor the fall of Ṭyre in 518/1124; it is true that the Fatimid governor of Ṭyre had signed an agreement with the amīr of Damascus. The Franks were even able, at the end of 517/1122, to advance as far as Fārāmā. Yet it was not until much later that they turned their attention to Egypt and actively prepared to attack 'Aškalān [q.v.]. The Egyptian vizier, Ibn al-Sallār, entered into negotiations with Nūr al-Dīn [q.v.], master of Aleppo, in 543/1143, and the Egyptian fleet launched a great offensive against the Franks in the East. This does not seem very likely.

Next the vizier Tālāqī b. Ruzzik carried out some operations against the Crusaders and gained a victory near Ghazzā, then at Hebron (al-Khāliī) in 553/1158; but this had little result because Nūr al-Dīn, master of Damascus since 549/1154, when he was approached again, was still not willing to become involved because of the internal unrest in Cairo.

Tālāqī was assassinated at the instigation of the caliph al-'Āḍid in 556/1161; his son succeeded him and met the same fate in 558/1163. From then on, the relations of the Fatimid Egypt with the Crusaders on the one hand and with Nūr al-Dīn on the other were influenced by the rivalry between Ṣhawār, who succeeded Tālāqī's son, Ruzzik, and Dirghām [q.v.], and by the versatile and personal policy of Ṣhawār. The latter, when expelled by Dirghām, had taken refuge with Nūr al-Dīn and persuaded him to intervene in Egypt, particularly as the king of Jerusalem, 'Amlārīc I, had made a first incursion into Egypt in 1161 and exacted a payment of tribute from Tālāqī, had returned in 1162, but had had to retreat before the deliberate flooding of the Nile Delta. Nūr al-Dīn sent an army with Shirkhī [q.v.] and his nephew, Ṣalāh al-Dīn (ṢāḤālāt al-Dīn). Dirghām was killed in Rāmādān 559/August 1164.
Shawar resumed the vizierate. There is no room here to trace in detail the events which ensued, and the confused tangle of the existing indirect relations makes Shirkhūn and Afdalūrī. The main details will be found in the articles Shawar and Shirkuh. The result was Shirkhūn, finally answering a joint appeal by the caliph and Shawar, procured the evacuation of the country by the Franks in 564/1169, rid himself of Shawar by assassination, and was granted the post of vizier to the Fatimid caliph. He died soon after; Saladin succeeded, and put an end to the Fatimid caliphate in 567/1171, re-establishing Sunnism and Abbāsīd sovereignty in Egypt.

**INTERNAL POLICY OF THE FATIMIDS**

1. Caliphs and viziers. In the Sunnī system, the appointment of the caliph is the result of an election or of a nomination by the predecessor ratified by a pseudo-election. In the Ismā‘īlī system, the caliph is the successor of him who, by virtue of a Divine decree and nomination, has been chosen to be the heir (wasi) of the Prophet, namely ‘Ali, and the imāmāt is transmitted from father to son (with the exception of the case of Hasan and Husayn) within the family of ‘Ali. In these circumstances there could be no question of an election, nor of the conditions demanded by Sunnism for holding the office of caliph. This nomination of his predecessor, by the nass [q.v.], a manifestation of the Divine will (on this subject see al-Nu‘mān, Da‘ī‘tim al-Islam, i, 48 f.; the Tādī al-akhtād of ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. al-Walīd, d. 612/1215, in Ivanow, A creed of the Fatimids, Bombay 1936, paras. 30-32).

The succession of the imāms was thus governed by the nass. This nomination could be hidden from the people and known only to certain trusted persons and revealed only when desired (see examples in the Sirat al-ustadh, Dhau‘dhah). It was possible for the elder son not to be chosen. Already Dja‘far al-Šādīk had nominated Ismā‘īl, who was not the eldest of his sons. Similarly ‘Abd Allāh was preferred to Ta- nūm, the eldest son of al-Mu‘īn, mainly for moral reasons (see Ibn ‘Asim Sīrat). When ‘Abd Allāh died in 364/974-5, the successor nominated was his brother Nizār (al-‘Aṣīz). So far everything had been quite regular. But, after the disappearance of al-Ḥākim, the nominated heir, the caliph’s nephew ‘Abd al-Ḥāṣim b. Ilyās, was arrested and imprisoned on the orders of Sitt al-Mulk, who had the young son of al-Ḥākim, ‘Alī, proclaimed imām under the name of al-Ẓāhir. He was only 16, but there was no stipu-lation regarding age: al-Ḥākim himself had mounted the throne at 11 years of age. The throne often fell to a child, as in the cases of al-Mustansīr, aged 7, of al-Mustāṣir, who was only 8, al-Ḥāmid, who was 5, al-Ẓāhir, who was 17, al-Fa‘īz, who was 5, and al-‘Āḍid, who was 9 years of age. The result was that power was often in the hands of a regent (or a female regent like Sitt al-Mulk, or of a queen-mother, like the mother of al-Mustansīr), and that on various occasions it was generals or viziers who held the real authority, even after the new caliph had reached maturity, and that the caliphs were often powerless against their viziers and their generals.

The succession proceeded regularly without any serious objections until al-Mustāṣir, the first caliph whose nomination was violently contested and gave rise to disturbances. The vizier al-Afdal had caused the elder son of al-Mustansīr, Nizār, who had been nominated in the regular manner, to be passed over in favour of the younger son, al-Mustāṣir. As a result Nizār led a revolt, which ended in his death and produced a schism which still exists today in the Ismā‘īlī faith [q.v.], and which, in the case of al-Ḥāmid, the victim of a Nizārī plot in 524/1130, the succession was assured by completely irregular means. No nomination had been made, and al-Ḥāfīz [q.v.], the cousin of al-Ḥāmid, was at first only regent before he proclaimed himself caliph, following the precedent of ‘Alī, who was the cousin of the Prophet. With his reign began a tremendous crisis, with bloody periods of revolution and treachery, and with struggles of rival factions in the midst of military and civil disturbances in the capital and in the provinces.

The weakness of the caliphs showed itself as early as the reign of al-Mustansīr, who was reduced to penury and forced to sell his treasures to satisfy the demands of Nāṣir al-Dawla and of the Turkish guard which he commanded, and who only once showed a spark of energy. From the time of al-Mustāṣir, the real masters were the “Viziers of the Sword”. It could happen that the caliph was thrust aside by the vizier, and avenged himself by having the vizier assassinated when opportunity arose: it was thus that al-Ḥāmid had al-Afdal assassinated. After a certain period, even the idea of the legiti-macy of the Fatimids was less generally accepted. Already during the reign of al-Mustansīr there had been an attempt to restore ‘Abbāsīd suzerainty. In 462/1070, Nāṣir al-Dawla, at Alexandria, had the khalīfa said in the name of the ‘Abbāsīd caliph, and in 464/1072, when he was temporarily master of Cairo, he entered into relations with him. Al-Ḥāfīz had a vizier, Kutayfāt, who was openly Imamī; then followed a Sunni vizier, Ibn al-Sallār. We cannot give in detail here all the vicissitudes through which the Fatimid caliphate passed, but refer the reader to the articles on the individual caliphs. The Fatimid caliphate, beset by troubles, declined rapidly to its end, which was finally hastened by its inability to resist the Crusaders, and not only by internal disorder.

The evolution of the vizierate. In the history of the Fatimid dynasty, the viziers occupied a place of gradually increasing importance. During the North African period there were two viziers, the ministers bearing the title of vizier. In Egypt, the first to receive this title, from the caliph al-‘Azīz, was Ya‘qūb b. Killīs [q.v.], the organizer of the administration and the finances for the first two Egyptian caliphs. Thereafter the caliphs sometimes governed without the help of a vizier; sometimes they had a minister to whom they gave neither the title nor the office of vizier, but only the duty of acting as intermediary between them and their officials and subjects (safīra, wasīta, the one who fulfilled this function bearing the title of wasīta); sometimes they had a minister who did in fact bear the title of vizier. Up to a certain time these viziers, whatever their power and their influence over the caliphs may have been, were considered as agents for the ex-ecution of the sovereign’s will (called by al-Mawardi wazar al-tanfidhī), but from the second period of the reign of al-Mustansīr, when, in order to restore order and remedy a catastrophic situation, he appealed for help to the commander of the troops of Syria, Baḍr al-Dījamāl, the latter obtained from him full powers: that is to say he was the equivalent of what al-Mawardi calls wazar al-lajūfīd, vizier with delegated powers; and it is under this status he was called “Vizier of the Pen and of the Sword”, or simply “Vizier of the Sword”. From this time on all the viziers who followed, whether they were nom-
inated by the caliph or whether they had seized the position for themselves by force, had full powers and were Viziers of the Sword. The Vizier of the Sword was the head of all the armies, with the title of amir al-dawla, but the head of all the civil, the judicial and even the religious administration, for among his titles were those of chief kadi and of chief missionary. We have seen that the vizier often left no power to the caliph and even thrust him aside; from the time of Rūḍān, the vizier of al-Maḥfīz in 531/1147, it was made still clearer that the vizier had full powers by his taking the title of al-Malik, accompanied by a varying epithet, analogous to that in which the last Buwayhid amīr of Baghdaḍ had adopted in 440/1051. The importance of this event is that the title passed via Șhrkhāt, who assumed the vizierate in 564/1169, to his nephew Salādīn and hence to all the members of the Ayyūbīd dynasty.

One remarkable fact concerning the Fatimid vizierate is that several viziers, whether they possessed the title or not, were Christians. An example is ʾĪsā b. nastūr, vizier of al-ʾAzīz, and similarly Zurʿa b. ʾĪsā b. nastūr, who succeeded yet another Christian, Manṣūr b. ʾAbdūn. We do not know whether the Armanīn Yānis, who was for some months in 562/1169 the vizier of al-Maḥfīz and who was a freedman of al-Afdāl, had remained Christian. But there is yet a curious case of another vizier of al-Maḥfīz, an Armenian who remained Christian, and nevertheless was Vizier of the Sword with full powers and surnamed Sayf al-Islām [see Bahram]. On the other hand, it does not seem that Jews, al-Ṭayyib, and a new schism occurred (see Ivanov, Rise, 20, and S. M. Stern, The succession of the Fatimid imām al-ʾĀmir, the claims of the later Fatimids to the imamate and the rise of Ṣayyūbī Ismāʿīlīm, in Oriens, 1951, 193 ff.). In 543/1147 yet another rebellion was stirred up, by one who claimed to be the son of Nīzar.

There were numerous military disturbances, especially when the dynasty was declining, when factions of the army made and unmade ministers and fought continually among themselves. But long before this the very composition of the army provoked disturbances which sometimes took the form of racial rivalry. Berbers (Maṭḥūrīs, Turks who had been enrolled since the reign of al-ʾAzīz), Daylamīs (Maṭṭūrīs), and also black Sudanese slaves bought for the army (ʿabd al-ʾālār) and numerous since the regency of the mother of al-Munṣīr, herself a former black slave—all were jealous of and hated one another. These corps were generally undisciplined and they or their leaders either stirred up rebellions themselves or readily allowed themselves to become involved in them. Thus in the struggle between the Kutāmī Ibn ʾAmmār and Bardjawan at the beginning of the reign of al-Ḥākim, there were the Berbers on one side and on the other the Turks, the Daylamīs and the black slaves. The hatred between the Turks and the black slaves, stirred up by al-Munṣīr’s mother, provoked murderous battles in 454/1062 and 459/1067, in which the Berbers sided with the Turks. Nūsir al-Dawla, the commander of the Turks and victor over the black slaves, wrested all power from the caliph al-Munṣīr, who had to sell his treasures in order to pay the Turks with their ever-increasing demands. The disturbances provoked by the tyranny of Nūsir al-Dawla and aggravated by the famine (see below) lasted until the dictatorship of Badr al-Djamāl. From the reign of al-Maḥfīz onwards, the various corps of the army distributed their loyalties among the various claimants to the vizierate, some of whom, to forward their cause, raised special corps (e.g. the Barkiyya of Tālāʾī b. Ruzzīk) or recruited Bedouins (as did Ibn Maṣālī and Shāwar [pp.]).

Disturbances of religious origin arose when a certain group of missionaries wanted to have the divinity of al-Ḥākim recognized: in 411/1020 the mob massacred the missionaries, and this resulted in uproar and the burning of al-Fustāṭ on the caliph’s orders. In 531/1137, Rūḍān had no difficulty in rousing the Muslim mob against the vizier Bahram, an Armenian Christian. But it was the economic crises and famines (which Egypt has always suffered periodically when the Nile rises insufficiently) which in the Fatimid period

Under al-Ḥākim there was the revolt of Abū Rakkā, who claimed to be related to the Umayyads of Spain and whose aim was to re-establish the Umayyad dynasty. At the same time the reign of al-Muṣṭanṣīr, an impostor, al-Sikīn, claiming to be al-Ḥākim, gathered supporters and marched with them as far as the gates of the palace: they were all captured, brought to the gallows and riddled with arrows (434/1043). The revolt of Nīzar, the heir nominated by al-Munṣīr and ousted from the succession by the all-powerful vizier al-Afdāl in favour of al-Mustānṣīr, had tremendous consequences, for the famous Ḥasan-i Șabbâb [q.v.] had taken his side and started a movement which led to the foundation of the sect of the Assassins [see Ḥaṣṣa ściy, niẓārīs]. In 524/1130, the caliph al-ʾĀmir, assassinated by a follower of Nīzar, died without male issue. But some declared that he had a son, al-Ṭayyib, and a new schism occurred (see Ivanov, Rise, 2, and S. M. Stern, The succession of the Fatimid imām al-ʾĀmir, the claims of the later Fatimids to the imamate and the rise of Ṣayyūbī Ismāʿīlīm, in Oriens, 1951, 193 ff.). In 543/1148 yet another rebellion was stirred up, by one who claimed to be the son of Nīzar.

One remarkable fact concerning the Fatimid vizierate is that several viziers, whether they possessed the title or not, were Christians. An example is ʾĪsā b. Naṣīrūs, vizier of al-ʾAzīz, and similarly Zurʿa b. ʾĪsā b. Naṣīrūs, who succeeded yet another Christian, Manṣūr b. ʾAbdūn. We do not know whether the Armanīn Yānis, who was for some months in 562/1169 the vizier of al-Maḥfīz and who was a freedman of al-Afdāl, had remained Christian. But there is yet a curious case of another vizier of al-Maḥfīz, an Armenian who remained Christian, and nevertheless was Vizier of the Sword with full powers and surnamed Sayf al-Islām [see Bahram]. On the other hand, it does not seem that Jews, al-Ṭayyib, and a new schism occurred (see Ivanov, Rise, 20, and S. M. Stern, The succession of the Fatimid imām al-ʾĀmir, the claims of the later Fatimids to the imamate and the rise of Ṣayyūbī Ismāʿīlīm, in Oriens, 1951, 193 ff.). In 543/1148 yet another rebellion was stirred up, by one who claimed to be the son of Nīzar.

There were numerous military disturbances, especially when the dynasty was declining, when factions of the army made and unmade ministers and fought continually among themselves. But long before this the very composition of the army provoked disturbances which sometimes took the form of racial rivalry. Berbers (Maṭḥūrīs, Turks who had been enrolled since the reign of al-ʾAzīz), Daylamīs (Maṭṭūrīs), and also black Sudanese slaves bought for the army (ʿabd al-ʾālār) and numerous since the regency of the mother of al-Munṣīr, herself a former black slave—all were jealous of and hated one another. These corps were generally undisciplined and they or their leaders either stirred up rebellions themselves or readily allowed themselves to become involved in them. Thus in the struggle between the Kutāmī Ibn ʾAmmār and Bardjawan at the beginning of the reign of al-Ḥākim, there were the Berbers on one side and on the other the Turks, the Daylamīs and the black slaves. The hatred between the Turks and the black slaves, stirred up by al-Munṣīr’s mother, provoked murderous battles in 454/1062 and 459/1067, in which the Berbers sided with the Turks. Nūsir al-Dawla, the commander of the Turks and victor over the black slaves, wrested all power from the caliph al-Munṣīr, who had to sell his treasures in order to pay the Turks with their ever-increasing demands. The disturbances provoked by the tyranny of Nūsir al-Dawla and aggravated by the famine (see below) lasted until the dictatorship of Badr al-Djamāl. From the reign of al-Maḥfīz onwards, the various corps of the army distributed their loyalties among the various claimants to the vizierate, some of whom, to forward their cause, raised special corps (e.g. the Barkiyya of Tālāʾī b. Ruzzīk) or recruited Bedouins (as did Ibn Maṣālī and Shāwar [pp.]).

Disturbances of religious origin arose when a certain group of missionaries wanted to have the divinity of al-Ḥākim recognized: in 411/1020 the mob massacred the missionaries, and this resulted in uproar and the burning of al-Fustāṭ on the caliph’s orders. In 531/1137, Rūḍān had no difficulty in rousing the Muslim mob against the vizier Bahram, an Armenian Christian. But it was the economic crises and famines (which Egypt has always suffered periodically when the Nile rises insufficiently) which in the Fatimid period
caused most disorders: shortage of food, looting, crimes, acts of cannibalism, and horrors of every description. In 414/1024-415/1025, under al-Zahir, there was a famine which obliged the populace to eat all the domestic animals, so that the caliph had to forbid the slaughter of plough-oxen. This famine was accompanied by looting by the black troops, who carried off the dishes set out for the banquet of the Feast of Sacrifices in 415 (12 February 1025). But the worst crisis of all was the great famine in the reign of al-Mustansir. In 446/1054-5 the caliph was obliged to ask Constantine Monomachus to supply food for Egypt (see above). The dearth, followed by disease, was worse in the following year. For seven years from 457/1065 to 464/1072 there persisted a famine so terrible that people were reduced to eating dogs and cats, and even human flesh (see al-Maqrizi, Khita't, i, 337). Looting, and the kidnapping of men and women in order to kill and eat them, led to a general breakdown of order which was aggravated by the struggles between the Turkish and the Negro regiments of the army. The economic situation improved in the vizierate of Badr al-Djamali and his son al-Adal.

3. Religious policy. The religious policy of the Fatimids, so far as it is concerned with Isma'ilist doctrine and its evolution, cannot be treated here in all its details. Al-Nu'man, who carried off the dishes set out for the banquet of the Feast of Sacrifices in 415 (12 February 1025). But the worst crisis of all was the great famine in the reign of al-Mustansir. In 446/1054-5 the caliph was obliged to ask Constantine Monomachus to supply food for Egypt (see above). The dearth, followed by disease, was worse in the following year. For seven years from 457/1065 to 464/1072 there persisted a famine so terrible that people were reduced to eating dogs and cats, and even human flesh (see al-Maqrizi, Khita't, i, 337). Looting, and the kidnapping of men and women in order to kill and eat them, led to a general breakdown of order which was aggravated by the struggles between the Turkish and the Negro regiments of the army. The economic situation improved in the vizierate of Badr al-Djamali and his son al-Adal.

3. Religious policy. The religious policy of the Fatimids, so far as it is concerned with Isma'ilist doctrine and its evolution, cannot be treated here in all its details. Al-Nu'man, who carried off the dishes set out for the banquet of the Feast of Sacrifices in 415 (12 February 1025). But the worst crisis of all was the great famine in the reign of al-Mustansir. In 446/1054-5 the caliph was obliged to ask Constantine Monomachus to supply food for Egypt (see above). The dearth, followed by disease, was worse in the following year. For seven years from 457/1065 to 464/1072 there persisted a famine so terrible that people were reduced to eating dogs and cats, and even human flesh (see al-Maqrizi, Khita't, i, 337). Looting, and the kidnapping of men and women in order to kill and eat them, led to a general breakdown of order which was aggravated by the struggles between the Turkish and the Negro regiments of the army. The economic situation improved in the vizierate of Badr al-Djamali and his son al-Adal.

4. Organization of the State. The Fātimid state in North Africa, although it already surrounded itself by some ceremonial, was not yet a complex organization. But from the very beginning of the Egyptian period the caliphs al-Mu'izz and al-‘Adal laid the solid foundations of the power of the dynasty. The strict organization which they introduced in the administration and the finances, and which Djawhar had prepared together with Ibn Killis and Usādī, was the basis for a complex system of institutions which progressively developed, became modified, or were transformed, and whose functions have been studied in various works: Ibn al-Sayrafī, *Kāmān al-dīn al-raṣīl*, ed. Ali Bahgat, Cairo 1905, tr. Massé, in *BIFAO*, xi (1914); al-Makrīzī, *Khilāl*, i; al-Kalāqānī, *Subh*, iii (republished in *Les Institutions des Fatimides en Egypte*, Bibl. de I’Inst. d’Ét. Supér. d’Alger, xii (1937)); trans. by Wüstenfeld, *Calcasandhī’s Geographie und Verwaltung von Aegypten*, AKGW, xxv, Göttingen 1879. Some modern works also have been devoted to these questions: Dr. Abū al-Qāsim al-Maγīd (1914), *Djīdwans*, 2 vols., Cairo 1953-5; Dr. Aṭīya Muṣṭafā Musharrafā, *Naṣū‘ al-ḥukm bi-Misr fi ta‘ṣīr al-Fāṭimīyyīn*, Cairo, 2nd ed., no date. Again, one special chapter (ix) deals with the organs of the administration and another (xii) with ceremonial in *Hasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan’s Ta‘īwah al-dīwān al-fāṭimīyya*, Cairo 1958 (revised version of *Al-Fāṭimīyya fi ṣīr tāhir al-Fāṭimīyyīn*, Cairo, 2nd ed., 1953), 264-325, 638-73.

Fātimid administration was a strongly centralized system, having at its head the caliph and the vizier, either with executive or with delegated powers (from Badr al-Djamāl onwards, the vizier is a Vizier of the Sword). Everything was under the control of the central administration, the provincial organs of government having no real autonomy although some governors, such as the governor of Kāqī for example, were able at time to attain great power. Administration was carried on through the diwāns (offices or ministries), which were assembled sometimes at the palace of the vizier (as for example under Ibn Killis and al-Afdal), sometimes at the palace of the caliph [see diwan ii].

Officials, both civil and military (arbab al-aḥlām and arbab al-syawāq) both in the personal service of the caliph (khawās al-khalīfah) and in the public service (military, administrative, financial, judicial, religious), were strictly organized in a hierarchy, the degrees of which were marked not only by differences of pay but also by the insignia peculiar to each rank and the places occupied in receptions held at the palace and in public processions. Some of the military officers belonged to the public service, like the Vizier of the Sword, the Grand Chamberlain, the Isfakālār, the Bearer of the Umbrella, the Sword-bearer, the Grooms, etc., others belonged to the private service: these were eunuchs, those most exalted in dignity being the muḥanānun eunuchs, distinguished by a special style of turban, among whom were the Master of the Audience-chamber, the Message-Bearer, the Major-Domo, the eunuch responsible for arranging the caliph’s household. The dān al-tawfah, etc., the pen included the Vizier of the Pen (when there was no Vizier of the Sword), the heads of the chancellery and the various diwāns, the Administrator of the Public Treasury, some religious officials like the Chief Ka‘fīd, the Chief Missionary, the viziers from non-Muslim sources, in *JESHO*, 1964; see further Ch. Cahen, *Histoires copues d’un cadi medieveau*, in *BIFAO*, lix (1960), 133 ff.

5. Economic activity during the Fātimid period. ʿUbayd Allāh al-Mahḍī had found North Africa in a flourishing condition, thanks to the development of town life. This prosperity permitted the first Fātimids to dispose of valuable resources and to set about the establishment of a powerful fleet and army.

In spite of disturbances, rebellions and disorders, Fātimid Egypt in general enjoyed great prosperity, thanks to the stability of its administrative and financial apparatus, its rich revenues arising from taxes and dues, the income from state-owned shops, trade and customs duties, and the inflow of gold from the mines of North Africa in the annual rise of the Nile, enriched its soil and sustained its agriculture, so that numerous different crops were produced, and, except when the river failed to rise high enough or when the dams and canals were neglected, agricultural productivity was sufficient. The crops are listed in *Hasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan’s Op. cit.*, 576 f.: wheat, barley, various vegetables, sugar-cane, dye-plants, animal-fodder; yet wheat had to be imported. The chief industrial crops were flax, sugar-cane, and, to a lesser degree, cotton. Production of wood—and that only soft-wood (sycamore, acacia)—was inadequate. For this subject see the geographers, ʿAbd al-Lāṭif al-Baghdādī, *Al-Ifḍa wa l-iḥbīr bi-md fi Misr*, tr. S. de Sacy, *Relation de l’Egypte par Abd El-Latif Al-Baghdadi*, Müller-Wodarg, Die Landwirtschaft Aegyptens in der frühen Abbassidenzeit, in *Isl.*, xxxii (1955); Ali Bahgat, *Les fortifs en Egypte et leur administration au Moyen Age*, in *Bull. de l’Inst. d’Egypte*, 4e série, i (1901), 147-58.

Industry flourished. The first place was occupied by weaving, encouraged by the cultivation of flax and carried on in the region of Tinnis, Damietta, Dabīl [q.v.]. At Cairo also were manufactured silk-stuffs, with various names: it was into a ‘burbūlustustārī‘ silk, blue in colour, that al-Muʿizz had had the map of the various regions woven (*Khālīt*, i, 417).

For the textile industry in Egypt see *Serjeant, Islamic Textiles*, in *Ars Islamica*, xiii-xiv (1948), 110 ff.; Ali Bahgat, *Les manufactures d’étoffes en Egypte au Moyen Age*, in *Mém. de l’Inst. Egyptien*, 1903; H. Zaysāt, *Thiṣīb al-qibr*, in *Machriḥ*, xii/i, 137 ff. Among the other industries, should be noted the wood-industry (for ship-building: on the arsenals see *Khālīt*, i, 193 f.), glass and crystal at al-Fustāṭ and Alexandria, pottery, ceramics, mosaic; metalwork (iron and copper: making of knives and scissors at Tinnis), work in ivory and leather, paper-making, sugar, oil. For further details see H. Ibrāhīm Ḥasan’s chapter al-Ṣindā. In general, industry benefited from the luxury and pomp of the court, the liberal distribution of gifts and garments by the caliphs, and by the extravagance of viziers like al-Yārūrī and al-Afdal.
Trade, both internal and external, thrived, and Egypt carried on commercial relations with many countries. An important role in trade was played by the Jews, for the Fātimids do not seem to have imposed discriminatory customs tariffs, varying according to whether the traders were Jewish, Christian or Muslim. Trade with India was carried on through Kūş and Ayğhâb on the Red Sea, from whence the merchant-ships embarked. Cairo was in commercial relations with Abyssinia, Nubia, Constantinople (reached in twenty days' sailing), Italy—Amalfi, trade with which was particularly brisk (see Yāḥyā b. Sā'īd, PO, xxiii, 447; Rosen, The Emperor Basil Bulgarianos (in Russian), 293-6; Gay, L'Italie méridionale...), 585-6; Heyd, Commerce du Levant, i, 99, 104-6, Pisa, Genoa, Venice (which sent wood for ship-building, to the profound displeasure of the Byzantine Emperor)—, Sicily (twenty days' sailing), North Africa, Spain, and Europe, particularly via Sicily. These countries bought spices, clothes, etc., and sent in return the commodities which Egypt lacked or could not produce in sufficient quantities: wheat, iron, wool, silk (Fayyum produced only a little), wool, and cheese (which the Jews consumed in large quantities).

Details on trade will be found in al-Idrīṣī, in Nāṣīr-i Khusraw, in the articles by B. Lewis and S. M. Stern noted above for India, and in S. M. Stern, «Les documents de la Fātimide Chancery concernant les marchands italiens», in Méli. Levi Della Vida, ii, Rome 1956, 520-38. The studies of S. D. Goitein are particularly important in this connexion: Records from the Cairo Geniza, in Exhibition Amer. Or. Society, April 1961; From the Mediterranean to India: Documents on the trade to India, South Arabia and East Africa from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries, in Speculum, xxix; The Jewish India merchants of the Middle Ages, in India and Israel, 1953; New light on the beginnings of the Karimi merchants, in JESHÖ, i (1958); The main industries of the Mediterranean area as reflected in the records of the Cairo Geniza, ibid., i/v (1961); The Cairo Geniza as a source for the history of Moslem civilisation, in Studia Islamica, iii (1955), 75-90; the Documents of the Cairo Geniza, in J. Mediaeval and Medieval Society, ii, 1956, 256-60; B. Lewis, «The Sūfis in the Cairo Geniza» (see the Supplement of the Cairo Geniza, 1893), 291-155; B. Lewis and S. M. Stern, «The Cairo Geniza as a source for the study of the Geniza of Fustat» (in the Cairo Geniza, 1892), 131-55; al-Majriti, Oevres, éd. by A. Schacht, Cairo 1960, 133 f., 235 f. In North Africa too the kādī Abū Hanīfa al-Nūmān (p. 70) composed his historical, juridical and esoteric works, as did Dārār b. Manṣūr al-Yaman (p. 60), who left the Yemen for North Africa after the death of his father. The caliph al-Manṣūr and al-Mu’izz took part in these activities: some works of al-Nūmān, it is known, owe much to the collaboration of al-Mu’izz.


Cultural activity in the Fātimid period was still more vigorous. Poetry was cultivated by the caliphs themselves, and their court welcomed even non-Islāmī poets, such as ‘Umrār al-Yamanī (p. 70). There was vigorous encouragement of works on religion, on the exposition of Ismā’īlī doctrines, on the allegorical commentary of the Kūrān, on philosophy, and on the popularization of scientific learning. The Fātimid period is characterized by a burst of intellectual curiosity analogous to that of the 18th century in Europe.

In Egypt, cultural activity was still more vigorous. Poetry was cultivated by the caliphs themselves, and their court welcomed even non-Islāmī poets, such as ‘Umrār al-Yamanī (p. 70). There was vigorous encouragement of works on religion, on the exposition of Ismā’īlī doctrines, on the allegorical commentary of the Kūrān, on philosophy, and on the popularization of scientific learning. The Fātimid period is characterized by a burst of intellectual curiosity analogous to that of the 18th century in Europe. See H. Ibr. Hasan, ch. xi; Muhammad Kāmil Husayn, Fi adīs Misr al-fātimiyīya, Cairo 1950; Brockelmann, S, i, 323 f., 714 f.; Ivanov, Rise; and the articles on the philosophers Abū Hātim al-Rāzī, Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī, Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Nīsabūrī, al-Mu‘ayyad fi l-Dīn al-Shūrā, Ḥātim b. Ibrāhīm al-Hāmidī, etc., and on the Encyclopaedia of the Ikhwān al-Safā.

The Fātimid period was also distinguished by men of learning: the mathematician Ibn Haytham al-Baṣrī, invited to Egypt by al-Hākim; the astronomer described the extraordinary wealth of the treasures al-Fātimid al-Mustansir’s treasury of garments and his treasury of jewels, pearls and valuables (see the edition by M. Hamidullāh, Kuwait 1959, 249 f.). These treasures were described also in Magd, op. cit., ii, had earlier been studied by Quatremère, Mémoire sur l’histoire de l’Egypte, ii, 66 ff., by I. van Straten, Tastereynen veid fatimidskāh Khāliqof, St. Petersburg 1905, 92 ff. and by Kuhle, Die Schätze der Fātimiden, in ZDMG, xiv (1935), 329 ff. with trans. of Khaṭāb, i, 414-6. The inventory of the treasures of the palace of al-Adalī (Ibn Muyassar, 57 f.), which it took al-Āmir and his secretaries forty days to make, also testifies to the same luxury and economic prosperity.

The Fatimid period was also rich in authors on various subjects; the historians Ibn Zâlîkâ, al-Mu'sâbbîṭî, al-Kudâñî, the author of K. al-Dīyârîdî, al-Shâbûshî, the librarian of al-'Aţzî, al-Mu'ahallabî, the author of a geographical work composed for al-ʻAţzî, Ibn al-Ma'mûn al-Batâbî, son of the vizier, an important source of al-Makrîzî, the halfî al-Râqîdî b. al-Zubayr, the author of the al-Dhakhârâ wa 'l-tuhafî, Ibn al-Šâyrafl, al-Kudâsî the author of al-Mun al-Batatîhî, son of the vizier, Azîz, Ibn al-Ma'sîrî, the famous Ibn Ridwân, whose dispute with al-Marîzî and his son in the collapse of the Caliphate in 567/1171. To this period, as G. Wiet has also said, is "une des plus passionnantes de l'Histoire de l'Égypte musulmane". The dynasty, born of an original ideological movement within Shi'ite theological speculations, developed to a degree hitherto unknown and aroused extraordinary devotion for the triumph of the cause, established itself by force of arms in North Africa and formed a powerful empire in Egypt. To them were turned the eyes and aspirations of the Ismâ'îlîs throughout the whole of the Muslim world and their sympathizers. The history of this dynasty dominates the history of the Mediterranean Near East for two centuries. Having suffered from the prejudices and hostility of the Sunnis, it has not always been described by Sunni writers with understanding; but for some years now it has enjoyed a renewal of interest.

The Fatimid dynasty had periods of greatness, thanks to its administrative and financial organization, its economic development, the flourishing intellectual and artistic activity, in the production of coins and palace, which was, as William of Tyre testifies, maintained up to the end, the ceremonial and ostentatious feasts, which immediately provoke comparison with Constantinople and far surpass what had previously been known at Bagdad. But it suffered also periods of misery and famine, bloody struggles between military factions, and a disastrous end, among the intrigues of rival viziers appealing for the intervention of foreign powers. Its history is full of contrasts. Both its greatness and its decadence offer attractive material to the historian and confer upon the dynasty a niche of its own in history.


(M. CANARD)

**FATIMIDS — FATIMID ART**

The political history of the Fatimids forms an indispensable background to an understanding of the development of their art. It allows us to distinguish two successive periods in it: one Ikhâriyân period, which extends from 308/908, the date of the installation of the Mahdi in Kayrawân and of the foundation of al-Mahdiyya, until 362/973, which saw the departure of al-Mu'izz and the establishment of Cairo as the city of the Caliphs; then an Egyptian period, which lasts from 362/973 up to the collapse of the Caliphate in 567/1171. To this division in time a geographical division must be added. The art which the Fatimids transplanted into Egypt continued to flourish in eastern 'Barbary', thanks to the Zirids and the Hammadids, vassals of Cairo, and it extended its influence over both Muslim and Norman Sicily.

Al-Mahdiyya, the city of the Mahdi on the Tunisian coast, preserves, apart from the ruins of its Fatimid fortifications, a mosque and traces of the palace of al-Kâ'im. The mosque, very much altered, has a porch projecting in front whose central bay is framed on either side by two storeys of niches. The palace, which was much altered, has a porch projecting in front whose central bay is framed on either side by two storeys of niches. The motif, which reminds us of Roman triumphal arches, was to pass into the Fatimid style of Egypt. The palace, see M. Kaftory (222-34/332-44), which stood opposite the palace of the Mahdi,
his father, still keeps its beautifully constructed
walls, with an entrance jutting out from the ...
entrance of the inwād. A similar arrangement relates
this palace of Sabra, which is by Eastern
Fatimid, to the Tulūnī houses of Fustāt. It reveals
connections between Egypt and Irīkīya prior to the
departure of the Fatimid Caliph al-Mansūr.

Even before this departure took place, the Fatimid
general, al-Djwāhar, had undertaken the con-
struction in Cairo of the mosque of al-Azhār, which
was to be considerably enlarged later on and to
become the Muslim university which we know to-day.
The original sanctuary shows by its plan and deco-
rations the survival of the Tulūnī tradition; but
the influence of Irīkīya, whence the new masters of
the country came, is also to be found. The five
transversal aisles which make up the hall of prayer,
as in the mosque of Ibn Tulūn, are interrupted in the
middle by a perpendicular aisle which is wider,
bordered by small pillars joined in pairs and having
a cupola at each end, probably influenced by the
Great Mosque of Kayrawān.

The mosque of al-Hākim (384/997-1003) com-
bines in the same way elements imported from
Irīkīya and elements preserved from Tulūnī
architecture. The porch, projecting from the front
of the building and covered by a vault giving
entrance to the vast court-yard, was Irīkīyan,
inspired by the mosque of Mahdiyya. The influence
of the mosque of Ibn Tulūn shows itself in the hall
of prayer with its five transversal aisles, whose
arcs brisés rest on brick pillars cantoned with small
false columns. The two minarets which rise at the
front angles of the mosque have a cylindrical core
enveloped in a solid mass of square design. Like
that of the university, the ornamentation of these towers,
in very low relief employing geometrical and vegetal
designs marks a decisive step in the elaboration of
Muslim decorative art. One hundred and twenty-
two years later than the mosque of al-Hākim, the
little al-Akmar mosque (519/1125) is worth notice
for the ornamentation on its façade. The entrance
in the projecting forepart of the building is
ornamented with a great high-relief flanked by
two storeys of niches.

The mosque of al-Sāliḥ Tālīqān is the latest in date of
the Fatimid mosques (555/1160). Built above
shops, its façade is made up of two projecting
parts joined by a portico. The sanctuary has three
transversal aisles, the central passage which leads
up to the miṣrāb being distinguished only by a
wider separation of the pillars.

Apart from these mosques, the Fatimid period
saw the construction of a great number of mauso-
leums such as those of al-Djwāhar, Sayyida ʿĀtika,
al-Ḥasawwātī and Shawkīh Yūnūs. They consist tradition-
ally of a square chamber with a cupola. This
cupola is supported by squinches at the four corners.
In the 7th/12th century these squinches multiplied
and were superimposed upon each other, producing
corbes of mukarnas (= stalactites), whose original
model seems likely to have come from Persia.
A terrible disaster at any rate the essential element of the masjīhd of al-Djuyūsī, built in 478/1083 on the Muṣṭafām Hill by the wādir al-Djāmālī to hold his sepulchre. This building consists of four parts: a front portion, surmounted by the minaret, which terminates in a square base with a court flanked by two chambers with wagons-vaulted roofs; at the back there is a sanctuary of three aisles covered with herring-bone vaulting and a great cupola in front of the miṣrāb; finally there is the chamber of the tomb itself which is joined laterally to the sanctuary. Certain peculiarities may be observed in this monument which were to perpetuate themselves in the Egyptian art: the minaret formed of three towers on top of the other, two square in design and one octagonal which surmounts a cornice of mukarnas and is capped by a dome, a possible prototype of the future minarets of Cairo.

Equally worth noticing is the importance given to
the cupola in the sanctuary, the sharp-angled profile
of this cupola, and the outline analogous with the
so-called "Persian" arches whose two vertical sides are
to bent to form a right-angle at the summit.

Between 480/1087 and 484/1091, the same all-
powerful wādir, Badr al-Djāmālī, gave Cairo a new
city wall. Armenian by birth and surrounding
himself with Armenian troops, he brought from his
country architects to whom the Fatimid capital owes
three of its most beautiful buildings, the three gates
called Dāb al-Dawāyla, Sab al-Nṣr and Sab al-Futūḥ.
Construction started in 480/1087 and continued for six
years. The outline of the walls, the outline of the vaults and semi-
circular arches, everything in these majestic entrances to
the city springs from Hellenistic tradition.

Whereas the palaces known from manuscripts to
have been built by Fatimid Caliphs in the centre of
Cairo have disappeared, those of the ʿAlaʾ of the
Banū Ḥammad preserve, perhaps, the record of their
civil foundations. This Berber capital was built among the mountains of eastern Algeria at the
beginning of the 5th/nth century, but it profited greatly by the ruin of Kayrawān, victim of the
invasion of the Banū Hilāl, and at the end of this same century knew a brief period of splendour. A
mosque whose minaret dominates the vast field of
ruins, traces of palaces of which two, the keep of Kaṣr al-Maṣṣūr (the Castle of the Lighthouse) and the
Dār al-Bahr (the Palace of the Lake), were excavated in
1908 and a third is now being excavated, give us
knowledge of this North African architecture
nourished by oriental influences, inspired not only
by Egypt but also by ʿIrāq and Persia. It suffices
to remember the long niches which decorate the
front of the minaret and those of the palaces, a theme
deeply imprinted in the architecture of the Sasanids,
the mirror of water in the court-yard of Dar al-Bahr,
the inlaid ceramic work paving and lining the great
halls where faience with metallic reflections is used,
and finally the mukarnas ( stalactites), proved to be
an Iranian invention, whose first use in the Islamic
west is to be found at the ʿAlaʾ.

The excavations of the ʿAlaʾ have filled an
important gap in our knowledge. Bougie, to which
the Banū Ḥammad moved at the beginning of the
6th/12th century, does not provide a similar store of
riches. Only some parts of the city wall and the great
stone arch, which formed the entry to the harbour
and its boats, have survived out of the buildings of
the second Ḥammadīd capital.

Nevertheless we are inclined to regard Bougie as
an important step on the road taken by Fatimid art
in its penetration of Sicily: many indications
authorize this belief. It was from Bougie undoubt-
edly as well as from al-Mahdiyya, refuge of the last
Zirids, or from the Tunis of the Banu Khurāsān, rather than from Cairo, that Palermo received the ground-plan of the pavilions on its outskirts. The Hammadid palaces help us understand better the Ziza and Cuba of the Norman period.

Within the Maghrib and as far as Andalusia, there is no place that has not to some extent been influenced by Fatimid art. To this distant influence can be attributed the adoption by the Islamic west of mukarnas (stalactites) and inlays of enamelled clay in the Almohad period.

The propagation of these art forms can be explained by the journeys of artisans (the ruin of the cities of eastern 'Barbary' following on the invasion of the nomad Arabs must have provoked numerous departures among them) and also by the export of objets d'art from one place to another.

Fatimid Egypt produced indeed a remarkable amount of activity in the decorative arts and an amazing development of luxury. The opulence of the Caliphs and the high functionaries is vouched for by Arab authors such as al-Makrizi who describes the treasure of the Caliph al-Mustansir, or Ibn Muyassar enumerating the riches of the wāṣir al-ʾAfḍal, son of Badr al-Ijāmālī. The artistic creations of the Fatimid epoch above all in Egypt but sometimes also in Spain (the kinship between the works of the two countries leaves us sometimes in doubt of their origin) are the glory of European museums and church treasures.

In the 11th and 12th centuries techniques concerned with bronze, faience, glass and cut crystal, jewels and textiles were the most flourishing and show an extremely refined artistic taste. The same decorative elements were used as in monumental sculpture: lettering, interlacing, either star-shaped or geometrical or based on plant and occasionally animal motifs. Indeed, notwithstanding strict orthodoxy, there were many representations of living creatures both human and animal. Such in the Cairo Museum are the friezes in carved wood from a Fatimid palace displaying musicians, dancers and hunters, or the ewers and fountain motifs in bronze of which the most celebrated is the griffin in the Coptic Museum of Cairo.


Fatīn, pseudonym of Darūdī (1229-83/1814-67), Turkish biographer and poet, the last of the Ottoman tēghtkēre-writers. He was born in Drama, in Western Thrace, the son of the local notable ʿAbd Allāh Khaṭīb Bey. After spending several years in Egypt, where his uncle lived, he returned to Istanbul and occupied various minor posts in government offices.

His diwān, published posthumously by his son, shows him as a mediocre poet. His main work, the Khaṭīmat al-ṭāghkēr, is the continuation of the téghtkēr of ʾṢafāʾī (completed in 1132/1720) and that of Sālim (completed 1134/1721) and contains the biographies of poets from 1135/1722 to his own day. Completed in 1269/1852 and printed lithographically in Istanbul in 1271/1855, Fatīn's Tēghtkēr is of particular use for the biographies of his own contemporaries.
which all the “concepts” of the unique but varied “drama of love” of the classical Persian ghazal appear in the form of persons: Heart (dil), son of King Intelect (sâbî), Beauty (huzna), daughter of King Love (tâbî), Glance (nazar), Mouth (dakhân), Eyelash (mushâ), Body (badâna), Tresses (zulf), Rival (râbîb), etc., so much so that the poem has justly been called an “Index der Bildersprache der orientalischen Erotik”. The style is overloaded with rhetorical embellishments (particularly in the letters exchanged between the two lovers), and, despite its undoubted interest from the point of view of knowledge of the metaphorical language of Persian lyrics, the general effect of the poem finally becomes somewhat tedious as a result of the perpetual use of allegory. However, it is not accurate to speak of “decadence”, as certain contemporary Persian critics have done. It was a question of searching for new ways to escape from the “perfect” world of Hâfizian symbolism. The living symbol is here replaced by allegory by means of the personification of abstract concepts, a device also used by other poets of the period (e.g., Kâtîbî), which became one of the basic elements of what is called the “Indian style”. Another element of this style which was already in existence at that period and even occurs in Fâtâhî is the marked tendency to use hyperbole (in the description of the gap between the lover and his beloved) as in his famous lines: “the stones of their wall were so limpid that they reflected a hair several farsangs away”; moreover, the sophistication of the psychological study of the character (a matter in which Niçuâm excelled, but here carried to extremes), the use of bookish terms in metaphors (the letters of the alphabet, for example) or of words denoting objects and places (e.g., paradise, the ocean) in current use, are all elements which were applied in the “Indian style”, though functioning in a new way. More readable (and an excellent example of Persian prose intermingled with verse), but perhaps less interesting from the point of view of style, is the summary in prose of the same poem which Fâtâhî made under the title Ḥusn u-dil. In addition, the poet also wrote a Shabristân-i Ḧujâyî (Bedroom of Fantasy), again in verse and prose (completed in 843/1439-40), a short poem entitled Taḥrîr-nâma (Book of interpretation of dreams), a Kûdî-bî Aṣrârî wa-khumdri (unpublished, and of which only very few ms. exist); perhaps a discussion between a wine drinker and a hashish smoker, with ṭâfînîn (insertion of lines from famous poets). The titles alone suffice to show the new orientations for widening the content of poetry in this period which, far from being decadent, lays the foundations for possible new stylistic developments. But these developments continued along these lines perhaps more in “outer Iran” (meaning India, Central Asia and Ottoman Turkey) than in Iran proper. In fact, if it is true that Fâtâhî’s secluded life as a dervish left him comparatively little known in Iran, the success of his narrative, in which personified concepts took a dramatic part (this seems to be an invention and he himself was aware of its originality, as he was to state in his own poem) was very great: he was imitated in verse and prose in various Islamic literatures. For India, besides the Sabras of Wâdîn (1044/1635), in Deccan Urdu prose, we should mention Khâdja Muhammad Jâdi who, in 1046/1637, attempted an adaptation of it into elaborate Persian prose, while an unpublished matnâsî, also in Persian, is the work of a certain Dâwûd Elçi (1054/1644) and is preserved in the Bombay University Library. In addition, Dhâwkl (1108/1697),
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A mufti (1086/1675), Sayyid Muhammad Wall Allah Kadirl (about 1180/1766) imitated him in Deccan; the rapidly expanding empire was seen to demand a more unified system of legal practice, such authority was gradually conferred, in some way or another, on the holders of this office in order to influence the choice made by private individuals. Later, official posts of muftis were created, and it thus became a public office, ranking, like the judicial magistrate, in the category of religious functions. Holders of these posts, however, were still generally governed at the service of private individuals; but they were more directly attached to the public service. Thus in the Mamluk State, these muftis formed part of the Council of Justice (muḍjḏis al-muṣalām) of the Sultan and the provincial governors.

At certain periods and in certain areas, as in the Ottoman Empire, the function of muftis could be combined with that of magistrate; the holders of the office were merely forbidden to give fatawā in relation to a legal action which was brought in his court.

The public function of fudyā is without prejudice to the private exercise of the profession. However, with the introduction of codes and their provisions borrowed from European systems in almost all the Muslim states, the branches of the profession fell into disuse; even in those matters, which, like personal status and wakf, are still generally governed by the principles of Islamic law, the practice of fatawā seems to be becoming obsolete.

It remains only as a public office, rather in the manner of a historical survival, stamped with the Islamic character of the State. Furthermore, Islamic states with a modern political structure no longer have recourse to the holders of this office in order to establish the legitimacy of their legislative activities. In States where the Islamic community forms only a part of the total population—Lebanon, for example—the function of fudyā has undergone a remarkable transformation: the "Mufti of the Republic" has become "the religious leader of the community and its representative, in this respect, with the authorities"; he is the head of all the officials of the Muslim cult and the service of wakf; he is elected for life by a college composed of qualified members of the community (Legislative Decree 18, of 13 January 1955). There remain, however, muftis in the traditional sense, under the authority of the "Mufti of the Republic".


ii.—OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Among the early Ottomans the function of sfta appears to have been of the same casual nature it had hitherto exhibited in all other regions of Islamic domination: anyone prominent for his learning and piety could be asked to act as a mutually acceptable arbiter in a dispute involving a point of law and his opinion was allowed to be decisive. However, as the orderly administration of the empire was seen to demand a more unified system of legal practice, such authority was gradually con-
fined to a few individuals of public position (the kâddis, the preceptors of the Sultans, the hâtis of great cities like Bursa and Edirne, etc.) to whom appeal could be made against the decisions of lesser müttifs. But this, too, was unsatisfactory as it seemed to secularize the divine law and make it an instrument of the ruler's will; sometime, therefore, in the reign of Murâd II (824-55/1421-51) the right to issue fetwâs was vested exclusively in an individual known as the şaykh al-îslâm (q.v.), who, although appointed by the Sultan, had no part in the councils of the state, received no fees for the decisions he delivered, and was held to be above worldly considerations. He had no contact with the litigants or their advocates; every matter to be put before him was drafted in hypothetical terms by a clerk of the fetwâ odâsi known as the misâweddîni and examined as to correctness of presentation by another clerk of the same office, the mîmâyinc, so that ultimately it was only a pure question of law on which he had to decide. These decisions were recorded and preserved by the fetwâ emîni in a special records office (fetwâkhâne) where they could be referred to did the occasion arise. It was these three individuals who shared the fee charged for a fetwâ, which in the middle of the 17th century was eight âle (Paul Rycraft, The Present State of the Ottoman Empire, London 1670, section 13) and increased by an arbitrary margin according to the nature of the case. The şaykh al-îslâm expanded greatly to include numerous other departments and officials (cf. its organization under Mustâfâ Khayrî Ef. in 1914-6 as given in the 'Umiyye sâlîmîn, Istanbul 1334, 140 If.), the section concerned with the fetwâ remained substantially as described. Selections from the fetwâs of certain distinguished şayhâks were occasionally collected into book form, but neither these nor any of the decisions preserved in the fetwâkhâne were of value as legal precedents; case-law as such is unknown.

Individuals with the title of müttif are to be found acting along with the hâtis throughout all the provinces but they have no connexion with fetwâ other than in etymology. While in theory the müttif should be a man deeply versed in the canonized works of his madhâbah and of an unimpeachable character, in practice it was only the latter quality that was demanded in these provinces. For as the hâdi was usually a transient and a stranger to the district to which he was appointed, and was felt, moreover, to be the agent and the voice of the secular power, his judgments only achieved the authority of religion when they had the implicit sanction of some elderly person locally respected for his piety and somewhat above the very low average level of education. Occasionally a hâdi who had retired from office might serve in this capacity in his place of residence, as might a member of one of the local learned families in the larger cities, but otherwise the müttifs were not of the 'ulamâ class and their presence in the provinces was only necessary to satisfy the legalistic distinction between hâdi, “case judgment”, and iftâ, “interpretative judgment” (cf. Ö. N. Bilmen, Hukuki Isldmîye ve siltahats fikhiyye kamusu, Istanbul 1948-52, i, 258; vi, 487) and to avoid the expense and delay of constantly having to refer to Istanbul for rulings from the şaykh al-îslâm. Though these müttifs would hold a document of appointment from the latter, they were in no sense part of a centralized organization and their only income from the office was a share in the hâdi's fee for cases in which they participated. Such was the position in the “home-lands” of the Ottoman Empire (Rûmîli and Anatolia) where the Hanafi madhâbah was followed exclusively. However, in the Arab provinces (Egypt, Syria, North Africa) where hâtis were appointed from Istanbul only to a few prominent cities (Cairo, Damascus, Aleppo, Jerusalem, Mecca, Medina)—and these merely as sinecures on the road to higher office—earlier traditions and practices were allowed to remain in force; here the müttifs of the various other madhâbahs were frequently the chief religious and judicial dignitaries and were recognized as such by the şaykh al-îslâm who (for a price) issued their patents of office and by the civil authority who enforced their judgments.

The fetwâ document was of a conventional form and varied little over the centuries. It was headed by a pious invocation in Arabic, often written in a very involved and stylized manner and varying from period to period according to the preferences of the drafting clerk; after the middle of the 12th/18th century, however, the formula al-tauflî minhû, “guidance is from Him”, became invariable. The remainder of the document was in Turkish and was introduced by the words: bu mece'le (or hâсудî) beyâmînda el'mîne hânîfsüyenden âdâbî ve ne fîlîsîl kî . . ., “in what way is this problem answered by the Hanafi imams . . .”, and there followed an exposition of the matter in dispute, typically in the form of an answer, with the identity of the parties involved concealed behind aliases (Zayd, ‘Amr; Hind, Zaynab). The exposition concluded, the single point at issue was presented as a direct interrogative, and this was followed by some variation of the formula of petition: beyâmîn buyurulup mëhîbî ve me'dîjî oluna, “may this be explained, and may it (the explanation) be rewarded in the Hereafter”; which later was always abbreviated to beyâmîn buyurulb, “answer”, the characters of which were extended so as to mark a division between what preceded and what followed, the fallibility of all human judgement is immediately acknowledged by the phrase Allahu a'îlâm, “God knows best”, written on the same line. The title al-dâjûb, “defender”, was frequently a mere “yes” or “no” (olur, olmaz), never supported by reasons or citations from authority, and the document concludes with the signature of the şaykhî (the use of a seal was prohibited unless his physical condition made writing impossible).

The office of Şaykh al-îslâm was abolished in 1924, at the same time as the Ottoman Caliphate. It was replaced by a department for religious affairs, attached to the office of the Prime Minister, with a head appointed by him.

Bibliography: see şaykh al-îslâm.

(J. R. Walsh)
nature. Construction is of brick and stone masonry with lavish use of the locally available gypsum. Pottery indications, based on pottery, are that this settlement was in existence during the 2nd century B.C., and from other surface remains as well as from inscriptions in the vicinity it seems likely that it was once a Sabaean outpost. Surface finds also indicate that the settlement was, at least during a part of its existence, contemporaneous with that of al-Ukhdud in Wadi Nadjran.

Although subordinate to the provincial governor, the fawdjdar was a very important official. In all probability he was appointed directly by the emperor through fawjd (shikar) or the border (nahiya) fawdjdar or the commandant of a frontier outpost, consisting of several thanas, had direct dealings with the central government, and could call for help on the provincial government in cases of emergency. The duties of a border-fawdjdar were to keep watch over the frontiers falling within his jurisdiction, suppress turbulent and rebellious chiefs, punish agitators, collect tribute from the local jajdids and when possible to conquer or subjugate enemy territory. A class of border fawdjdars was known as ghaudios; but their posts were semi-military in character. They existed as late as the later part of the 12th/15th century when they were replaced by the new police force organized by Lord Cornwallis, the Governor-General of Fort William, Calcutta (1786-93). Although the district fawdjdar was a central official, yet the provincial governor had powers to appoint the fawdjdar-i gird (i.e., the fawdjdar of the environs) for the protection of the suburbs of the city. This officer in his turn appointed the fawdjdars of the nakids and the thandars. An echo of their official designation is heard in the former province of Sind in Pakistan where the city police-station is still known as the fawdjdar.

Apart from his police and administrative duties the fawdjdar also exercised judicial powers under the Sultans. He could try petty offences and take "security" proceedings, i.e., the binding over of potential or suspected criminals. In the early Mughal period he was frequently transferred from one place to another and was, like the modern Martial Law Administrators, sometimes deputed to conduct purely military operations (cf. Khiif Khan, Maw-jabah al-Lubab, i, 505). His judicial powers in criminal cases were enhanced by the later Mughals, who empowered him to try non-capital offences (cf. M. B. Ahmad, *The Administration of Justice in Medieval India*, Aligarh 1941, 165). The criminal courts in Pakistan and India are still known as 'Adilshahi-yi Fawdjdar and criminal cases as fawdjdari or fawdjdardars; the same fawdjdars were also appointed in certain parganas, as a purely temporary measure, and they enjoyed the same powers as the fawdjdar-i sarkar. In a few districts (sarkars) there were no separate fawdjdars; the same person performed the duties of the amin (controller of expenses and revenue assessor) as well as of the fawdjdar in addition to his own duties (cf. Shahnawaz Khan, *Mut'tajir al-umarah* (Bibl. Ind.), ii, 37, which mentions Dijanat Khan being appointed both as the amin and the fawdjdar of Sirhind on the reversion of Ray Khaghi Dars); while in certain cases the duties of the fawdjdar were performed either by the local shikhdar or the kowal.

**Bibliography:** Abu 'l-Fa'ðl, Â'in-i Akbari, Eng. transl. by Jarrett, Calcutta 1949, 41-2; emeritus through fawjd or fawjd-i gird, the border (nahiya) fawijdar or the commandant of a frontier outpost, consisting of several thanas, had direct dealings with the central government, and could call for help on the provincial government in cases of emergency. The duties of a border-fawjdari were to keep watch over the frontiers falling within his jurisdiction, suppress turbulent and rebellious chiefs, punish agitators, collect tribute from the local jajdids and when possible to conquer or subjugate enemy territory. A class of border fawjdars was known as ghaudios; but their posts were semi-military in character. They existed as late as the later part of the 12th/15th century when they were replaced by the new police force organized by Lord Cornwallis, the Governor-General of Fort William, Calcutta (1786-93). Although the district fawjdar was a central official, yet the provincial governor had powers to appoint the fawjdar-i gird (i.e., the fawjdar of the environs) for the protection of the suburbs of the city. This officer in his turn appointed the fawjdars of the nakids and the thandars. An echo of their official designation is heard in the former province of Sind in Pakistan where the city police-station is still known as the fawjdari.

Apart from his police and administrative duties the fawjdar also exercised judicial powers under the Sultans. He could try petty offences and take "security" proceedings, i.e., the binding over of potential or suspected criminals. In the early Mughal period he was frequently transferred from one place to another and was, like the modern Martial Law Administrators, sometimes deputed to conduct purely military operations (cf. Khiif Khan, Maw-jahab al-Lubab, i, 505). His judicial powers in criminal cases were enhanced by the later Mughals, who empowered him to try non-capital offences (cf. M. B. Ahmad, *The Administration of Justice in Medieval India*, Aligarh 1941, 165). The criminal courts in Pakistan and India are still known as 'Adilshahi-yi Fawjdari and criminal cases as fawjdari or fawjdardars; the same fawjdars were also appointed in certain parganas, as a purely temporary measure, and they enjoyed the same powers as the fawjdar-i sarkar. In a few districts (sarkars) there were no separate fawjdars; the same person performed the duties of the amin (controller of expenses and revenue assessor) as well as of the fawjdar in addition to his own duties (cf. Shahnawaz Khan, *Mut'tajir al-umarah* (Bibl. Ind.), ii, 37, which mentions Dijanat Khan being appointed both as the amin and the fawjdar of Sirhind on the reversion of Ray Khaghi Dars); while in certain cases the duties of the fawjdar were performed either by the local shikhdar or the kowal.


FAWRl (FEVRl), AHMAD B. ABD ALLAH, a 17th century Ottoman poet and scholar, was born a Christian. After his conversion to Islam he was called, in accordance with contemporary custom, 'Abd Allah-oghlu in the tadkhiras (v. Lātiff, Istanbul 1374, 269; Ėssān Ėssāli, Istanbul University Library, T. Y. 304, 253b).

Fawrī was deeply influenced by Naḳḳāsh 'All Bey, the father of his master Lāmī, and also by the mūḍerīrs Dursun Efendi. Fawrī's profound knowledge of theology and of Arabic, a language in which he wrote the bulk of his works, is attested in the content of the commentary on a hadīth which he rendered after a siege, and Sura LIX, 7-10 maintains that this result was not due to the assailants' having prevailed, but to God's interposition in favour of His Apostle, so that it was faywī to him exclusively to the ultimate benefit of Muslim society. In fact the same arguments are mentioned as for the khums, but those actually held in view were the destitute muḥādīrīn (Ibn Ḥīṣām, CAro ed. 1937, iii, 193 ult.). Traditions about Khaybar and Fadak are at variance, but it is certain that Muhammad also on these occasions followed his own equity (al-Baladhurī, Fūsīb, 23:33).

The theocratic explanation based on the meaning of al-fāy, "to bring back", as by right belonging to God and consequently to Muslim society (al-Bayḍawī ad Sūra LIX, 71 cannot be supported by another Kurʿānīc passage, Sūra XXXIII, 49. Kudāma derives the word in the same way, but understands it to denote anual return, namely of revenue. Otherwise, too, theorists found it difficult to define it as a tax on unoccupied land, or as a special object of the booty which attracted him, the safīyya (pi. safīdyā). Likely enough this right was very limited, or it could have been used by the Prophet after the battle of Badr, and Sūra LIX, 7-10 maintains that this result was not due to the assailants' having prevailed, but to God's interposition in favour of His Apostle, so that it was faywī to him exclusively to the ultimate benefit of Muslim society. In fact the same arguments are mentioned as for the khums, but those actually held in view were the destitute muḥādīrīn (Ibn Ḥīṣām, CAro ed. 1937, iii, 193 ult.). Traditions about Khaybar and Fadak are at variance, but it is certain that Muhammad also on these occasions followed his own equity (al-Baladhurī, Fūsīb, 23:33).

The theoretical explanation based on the meaning of al-fāy, "to bring back", as by right belonging to God and consequently to Muslim society (al-Bayḍawī ad Sūra LIX, 71 cannot be supported by another Kurʿānīc passage, Sūra XXXIII, 49. Kudāma derives the word in the same way, but understands it to denote anual return, namely of revenue. Otherwise, too, theorists found it difficult to define it as a tax on unoccupied land, or as a special object of the booty which attracted him, the safīyya (pi. safīdyā). Likely enough this right was very limited, or it could have been used by the Prophet after the battle of Badr, and Sūra LIX, 7-10 maintains that this result was not due to the assailants' having prevailed, but to God's interposition in favour of His Apostle, so that it was faywī to him exclusively to the ultimate benefit of Muslim society. In fact the same arguments are mentioned as for the khums, but those actually held in view were the destitute muḥādīrīn (Ibn Ḥīṣām, CAro ed. 1937, iii, 193 ult.). Traditions about Khaybar and Fadak are at variance, but it is certain that Muhammad also on these occasions followed his own equity (al-Baladhurī, Fūsīb, 23:33).

The theocratic explanation based on the meaning of al-fāy, "to bring back", as by right belonging to God and consequently to Muslim society (al-Bayḍawī ad Sūra LIX, 71 cannot be supported by another Kurʿānīc passage, Sūra XXXIII, 49. Kudāma derives the word in the same way, but understands it to denote anual return, namely of revenue. Otherwise, too, theorists found it difficult to define it as a tax on unoccupied land, or as a special object of the booty which attracted him, the safīyya (pi. safīdyā). Likely enough this right was very limited, or it could have been used by the Prophet after the battle of Badr, and Sūra LIX, 7-10 maintains that this result was not due to the assailants' having prevailed, but to God's interposition in favour of His Apostle, so that it was faywī to him exclusively to the ultimate benefit of Muslim society. In fact the same arguments are mentioned as for the khums, but those actually held in view were the destitute muḥādīrīn (Ibn Ḥīṣām, CAro ed. 1937, iii, 193 ult.). Traditions about Khaybar and Fadak are at variance, but it is certain that Muhammad also on these occasions followed his own equity (al-Baladhurī, Fūsīb, 23:33).

The theocratic explanation based on the meaning of al-fāy, "to bring back", as by right belonging to God and consequently to Muslim society (al-Bayḍawī ad Sūra LIX, 71 cannot be supported by another Kurʿānīc passage, Sūra XXXIII, 49. Kudāma derives the word in the same way, but understands it to denote anual return, namely of revenue. Otherwise, too, theorists found it difficult to define it as a tax on unoccupied land, or as a special object of the booty which attracted him, the safīyya (pi. safīdyā). Likely enough this right was very limited, or it could have been used by the Prophet after the battle of Badr, and Sūra LIX, 7-10 maintains that this result was not due to the assailants' having prevailed, but to God's interposition in favour of His Apostle, so that it was faywī to him exclusively to the ultimate benefit of Muslim society. In fact the same arguments are mentioned as for the khums, but those actually held in view were the destitute muḥādīrīn (Ibn Ḥīṣām, CAro ed. 1937, iii, 193 ult.). Traditions about Khaybar and Fadak are at variance, but it is certain that Muhammad also on these occasions followed his own equity (al-Baladhurī, Fūsīb, 23:33).

The theocratic explanation based on the meaning of al-fāy, "to bring back", as by right belonging to God and consequently to Muslim society (al-Bayḍawī ad Sūra LIX, 71 cannot be supported by another Kurʿānīc passage, Sūra XXXIII, 49. Kudāma derives the word in the same way, but understands it to denote anual return, namely of revenue. Otherwise, too, theorists found it difficult to define it as a tax on unoccupied land, or as a special object of the booty which attracted him, the safīyya (pi. safīdyā). Likely enough this right was very limited, or it could have been used by the Prophet after the battle of Badr, and Sūra LIX, 7-10 maintains that this result was not due to the assailants' having prevailed, but to God's interposition in favour of His Apostle, so that it was faywī to him exclusively to the ultimate benefit of Muslim society. In fact the same arguments are mentioned as for the khums, but those actually held in view were the destitute muḥādīrīn (Ibn Ḥīṣām, CAro ed. 1937, iii, 193 ult.). Traditions about Khaybar and Fadak are at variance, but it is certain that Muhammad also on these occasions followed his own equity (al-Baladhurī, Fūsīb, 23:33).
in the Banu 'l-Nadir case. The term, however, stuck to state domains as sawdfi ... as a Mahdawl (see A. S. Bazmee Ansari, Sayyid Muhammad Jawnpuri and his movement, in Islamic Studies, ii/i (1963), 68, remained in office until the caliphate of al-Hadi successor of Ya'куbi (ii, 483) makes Muhammad b. al-Layth the matter concerning some land and where the poet Abu '1-Asad Nubata praises his exceptional generosity. [q.v.], Ibn al-Djawzi, in the biog. of Abu '1-Asad); Ibn al-Djawzi, in

Burhan al-Mulk continued to stay in the same wazir by al-Mahdi after the dis-...he attracted attention by his al-Mukaffa [q.v.], which gave its name to the province of Awadh (Oudh) which was of Yamani extraction; [q.v.], one of his ancestors Shaykh Musa had migrated to Agra, where he married and his first child Faydl was born in 954/1547. He soon aroused the hostility of the orthodox ideas and heretical beliefs as a Mahdawl (see

by Shudja by al-Mahdi. Dja...pursuance of a Christian father, al-Fayd...in 100 N. and 8a ro E., 4 miles from the ancient town of Ayodhya, which gave its name to the province of Awadh (Oudh) and the Shift kingdom founded by Sa'dat Khán Burhán al-Mulk [q.v.]. The town grew up around a wooden lodge (bangla), surrounded by a large and expansive compound, which Burhán al-Mulk had built for himself on his appointment in 1132/1719-20 as the Nâdâb Nâsim of Awadh. Other buildings, mostly of mud, for the karem and barracks for the troops sprang up all around the caliphate inhabited into a respectable settlement. Even after his assumption of power as the Nawwab-Wazir, Burhán al-Mulk continued to stay in the same wooden lodge. On the accession of his nephew Abu 'l-Manşûr Sa'dar Djang [q.v.] to the masnad in 1752/1739 more buildings were added to the growing township which was given the name of Faydâbâd. (To the people of Awadh Faydâbâd is still known by its earlier name Bangla). Gardens were laid out and bâdzâs sprang up all around, resulting in the decline of Ayodhya which suffered both in population and prosperity. Shudjâ al-Dawla, the third Nawwáb (1720-80/1756-75), stayed chiefly at Lucknow but after his defeat by the British at Buxar in 1764 he moved to Faydâbâd and made it his head-quarters. He added many new buildings, and in order to strengthen the defences of the town dug a moat around the citadel and also built two mud-forts. Before the end of 1189/1775 Aśaf al-Dawla, the fourth Nawwáb, abandoned Faydâbâd and moved permanently to Lucknow, which thenceforward became the seat of government. The Nawwâbs of Awadh, however, both the mother and the widow (Bahâ Bêgum) of Shudjâ al-Dawla continued to live at Faydâbâd which soon declined in importance. It was his alleged maltreatment of these two Bêgums which led to the impeachment of Warren Hastings. After the death of Bahâ Bêgum in 1732/1716 Faydâbâd lost further in importance and glory. It continued to decay till the British annexation of Awadh in 1847, when an era of development opened and the general deterioration was arrested. The Urdu poet Mir Hasan in his mathnawî, Gulsûr-i Irâm praises Faydâbâd for its well-kept streets and wide roads. Shudjâ al-Dawla was responsible for constructing many of the historic brick buildings and monuments of the city. He lies buried in a beautiful tall mauso-lemum, which became famous during his life-time, in the centre of a charming rose-garden, the Gulsûr-bâdi, laid out by Sa'dar Djang. The tomb of Bahâ Bêgum, mother of Aśaf al-Dawla, on the south of the town is a fine domed building which cost Rs. 300,000 to build. The entire amount was paid out of the queen mother's personal property. The fortress constructed by Shudjâ al-Dawla is now in ruins, and so are the palaces built by the Nawwâbs and the nobles. The town was badly disturbed during the military uprising (Mutiny) of 1857 when Mawlawi Ahmad Allâh gained prominence for the deeds of valour performed by him. He came to be known and dreaded as the 'Mawlawi of Faydâbâd'.

Bibliography: Muhammad Fayd Bakhsh, Farâb-bâbûr, (Eng. transl., Memoirs of Delhi and Faizabad, being a translation of 'Faizabad', by W. Hoey, 2 vols., Allahabad 1888-9); Ghulâm Husayn Nakawi, 'Imâd al-Sâ'dât', Lucknow 1897; Nadjîm al-Ghânî Ramânî, Ta'rîkh-i Awadh, Lucknow 1919, i, 36-8; B. Carnegie, A History of Faizabad, (not seen); Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, xii, 110-1, 117-8; Mir Hasan, Gulsûr-i Irâm (Urdû mathnawî still in MS.); Munsäl Lâl-dî, Sultan al-Hikâyât (MS. in Persian); Storey, i/1, 706-8; S. N. Sen, Eighteen Fifty-seven, Calcutta 1958, 154, 186-7, 355, 402. (A. S. Bazmee Ansari) FAYDî (later Fayyядî), Abu 'l-Fayd b. Shaykh Mubârak al-Mahdawi, Persian poet, commentator of the Kur'ân, one of the nine jewels (naw ratan) of the court of Akbar, younger brother of the historian Abu 'l-Fadl Allâmî [q.v.], was of Yami extraction; one of his ancestors Shaykh Mîr had migrated to Sind and settled at Bâl, a small place near Siwastiân (modern Sehwan). His grandfather Shaykh Khîdr came down to Nâgor [q.v.], where Faydî's father Mubârak was born. In 950/1543-4 Shaykh Mubârak migrated to Ägra, where he married and his first child Faydî was born in 954/1547. He soon aroused the hostility of the 'ulama on account of his un-orthodox ideas and heretical beliefs as a Mahdawi (see A. S. Bazmee Ansari, Sayyid Mubârak al-Mahdawi and his movement, in Islamic Studies, i/i (1956), 68.
The Shaykh along with his grown-up sons, Faydi and Abu '1-Fadl, had a very hard time for several years. Unable to bear any extraordinary ability and achievements (cf. Faydi's *Kasida* in *A'In-i Akbari*, Eng. transl. by Blochmann, 1901). This marks the beginning of a long and brilliant career as a court-poet, statesman and a *mansabdar*, which brought him several honours and distinctions. In 984/1576 he was created Malik al-Shu'ara' by Akbar. In order to vindicate his claim to this high-sounding title he planned to compose a *khamsa* in 987/1579, after the famous *khamsa* of Nizāmî [q.v.]. The five poems to be included were:

(i) *Marhaz-i Adwar*, mostly composed in Fatehpūr Sīkri; (ii) *Sulaymān u Bilbīs*, commenced in Lahore but never completed; (iii) *Nāl-Daman*, his best known poem (ed. Calcutta 1831); (iv) *Haft hīkāyāt* and (v) *Akbar-nāma* on the lines of the *Sikandar-nāma*. Of these only (i) and (iii) were completed several years later at the persistent urging of Akbar while the remaining three, in spite of Abu '1-Fadl's assertion to the contrary (cf. *Akbar-nāma*, sub anno 39 regnal) remained incomplete.

An accomplished scholar, physician, and poet, he was appointed in 987/1579 tutor to prince Dānīyāl; he also claims to have instructed Dāhāngīr, and Murād (cf. *Akbar-nāma*, Bibl. Ind., ii, 331). Of these Dānīyāl was also a poet in Brādī-bhākā, suggesting that his tutor was a master of that dialect as well as of classical Arabic and Persian. In 993/1585 he was sent on an expedition against the *Vāsūfāzās* of Pēshāwār. Treated as a close companion, he was included in the royal *entourage* during Akbar's visit to Kāshmīr in 997/1588. In 999/1590 he was sent as an envoy to the courts of Rādāj 'Alī Khān, ruler of Khandesh, and Burhān Nizām Shāh, the king of Ahmadnagar. After the completion of his mission he returned to Fatehpūr Sīkri, the capital, in 1001/1592.

Generous and hospitable by nature, he even helped his enemies. When his worst critic Al-Bādā'ūnī [q.v.] fell from imperial favour in 1000/1588, Faydī, who was then on a mission to Gūḍārāt, wrote a letter to Akbar strongly pleading the case of the disgraced historian (see al-Bādā'ūnī, iii, 303-5). Yet he received very harsh treatment at the hands of Bādā'ūnī, who attributes to him every possible vice and depravity and even accuses him of open enmity towards the Muslims and making fun of Islam; he also holds him responsible for Akbar's anti-Islamic activities and practices. But most of these charges are ill-founded and seem to be the result of some personal grudge, as there are in Faydī's *diwan* poems in praise of the Prophet and his Companions. He died of asthma at Agra on 10 Safar 1044/5 October 1631.

Faydī's *Latīfa-i Faydī*, a posthumous collection of his letters, was compiled by his nephew Nur al-Dīn Muhammad Abd al-Hayy, which was denounced by the *ulamd* as an *'ulamd*. Al-Bādā'ūnī, šīr to Al-Badā'ūnī, bitingly remarks that he composed this book in a state of drunkenness and ritual impurity (al-*djanda*). In view of this the claim of the Mujačedīs that Ahmad Sirhindī [q.v.] collaborated in the composition of a part of this work seems wholly untenable (see Bibliography).

He also translated Līlāvati, a Sanskrit work on arithmetical (ed. Calcutta 1826), and some portions of the epic poem *Mahābhārata* into Persian at the express command of Akbar, in collaboration with al-Badā'ūnī and Mullā Shīrī. *Latīfa-i Faydī*, a posthumous collection of his letters, was compiled by his nephew Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad Abīllāh b. Ayūn al-Mulk (ed. Calcutta, 1261/1845). According to Shīrī these bobble were couched in a simple unornate language, in contradistinction to the high-flown bombastic style then in vogue in Persian letter-writing (*inshā*), of which his younger brother, the celebrated Abu '1-Fadl was a great master (cf. his letters to Faydī in the second *daftar* of his *Inshā*).

al-Faydi, Bombay 1324/1906, 79-81 (where his kunya is given as Abu '1-Fadl and his title as al-Fayyūm, which are both erroneous); M. Kudrat Allah Gopamawi, Tadhkira natīdī ul-afkār, Bombay 1334 solar, 533-7; Muḥ. Husayn Aṣād, Darbār-i Akhbarī (in Urdu), Lahore 1927, 359-418; Storey, ii/II, 540; Brockelmann, ii, 417, III 610; Sarkis, col. 1472 (where his name is given as Fayd Allāh and his kunya as Abu ʻl-Fadl, obviously wrong); JASB (1869), 137, 142; Āḏgāh Ahmad ʻAllī, Ḥafiʿ Asmīn, Calcutta 1873; Taḵī Kāḏbī, Khudāydāt-al-aqā (MS); Kānīrī Āḏrū, Madīna al-nafṣīs (MS Bankipur, viii, 955-16); Wālī Dāgbīstānī, Riyād al-ṣūrahā (MS Bankipur, viii, 693); Rieu, 450; M. G. Zubaid Ahmad, Contribution of India to Arabic literature, Allahabad/Jullunder 1946, index; A. Sprenger, Oudh Catalog, 401-2; Ibrāhīm Khān Khallī, Khudāyat al-halām (MS Bankipur); Binadrāban Dās Ḳ̲hʷug̲hā, Ṣaʿfīnā-ī Ḳ̲hʷug̲hā (MS Bankipur); Rāmālī al-Dīn Muḥ. Ḳhāṣb, Raṣūlāt al-Fāyūmīyya (MS in Persian), Urdu transl., Lahore 1344/1925, ii, 9-10; S. Muḥ. Ikrām, Rūdā-ī Kawthar, Karachi n.d., 87-98 (to be used with care); Z. A. Desai, Life and works of Faidī, in Indo-Iranica, Calcutta, xvii, (1963).

FAYDI (see FAYYUД)

FAYLASFĪ, philosopher: he who studies falsafa [q.v.], thence frequently used as an epithet for deep thinkers. The Arab philosophers know the literal meaning of this word as muḥbīl al-khīma (lover of wisdom). Al-Kindī [q.v.] was known for preference as the faylāṣī al-Arab (philosopher of the Arabs), presumably because he was a philosopher of genuine Arab origin in contrast to most Muslim philosophers who belonged to non-Arab nations (cf. the correct explanation of this name given to al-Kindī by T. J. de Boer in the Archiv fur Gesch. der Philos., 1899, iii, 154 ff.).

In popular language, faylāṣī is applied in an uncomplimentary sense to freethinkers or unbelievers. Even the Jewish king Jeroboam is called faylāṣī in this sense (Revue des Études Juives, xxx, 23 ult.). An idea of contempt is associated with the forms faylāfa, fulūṣ (also fulāṣn, Syr.), plur. fālaṣī, current in the popular language; this is applied to frivolous, imprudent people, good-for-nothings and charlatans (examples in ZDMG, xxxviii, 681; Volland, ibid. ii, 300, 4) gives fulūṣ. The verbal form yufulaṣī (Bāṣīm le forgson, ed. Landberg, 38, 5) is also connected with this: “he could not wriggle out”!

(F. GOLDZIHER)

FAYȘAL [see SAĐD, AL]

FAYȘAL I, of ʻIrāq, was born at ṬAfī in 1301/1883, third son of the Ṣāḥib (later king) Ḥusayn b. ʻAllī. After a boyhood of desert and oasis life, he accompanied his father to Istanbul in 1309/1892, there to pass 18 years. He married his cousin, Ḥazīma, in 1323/1905. Returning to Mecca with Ṣāḥib Ḥusayn in 1327/1909, he took part in expeditions against the Idrīṣī of Ḳarbī, was admitted to the League of Nations in 1351/1932. Faysal died suddenly in Switzerland in September 1352/1933, succeeded by his son, Ghaźl.

Bibliography: The Arabic and European literature of the 1914-8 war, the Mandates, and Arab and ʻIrāqí affairs between 1914 and 1933 is very extensive. For British and Arab views of Faysal see T. E. Lawrence, The seven pillars of wisdom, London 1926; Amin Rihānī, Faysal al-Āṣīl, Beirut 1335/1934; Ȣāṣī al-Ḥaṣrī, Yaṣām Maysālān, Beirut 1945. For German and Turkish views of his war-time role see Līmān von Sānders, Fünf Jahre Türkei, Berlin 1920 (Eng. tr. Five years in Turkey, Annapolis 1927; Fr. tr. Cinq ans de Turquie, Paris 1923) and Ali Fudār Ėrden, Birinci Dünya Harbinde Suriye Hâtataları, i, Istanbul 1954. For French views, see L. Jovelet, L’évolution sociale et politique des «pays arabes», in REI, vii (1933), 473-81; R. de Gontaut-Biron, Comment la France s’est installée en Syrie, Paris 1922, 232 sqq.; M. Pernot, L’inquiétude de l’Orient, Oxford 1922.

In general, see S. H. Longrigg, Syria and Lebanon under French Mandate, Oxford 1958; idem, ʻIrāq 1900 to 1950, Oxford 1953.

(F. H. LONGRIGG)

FAYȘAL II, of ʻIrāq, son of King Ghaźl and grandson of Faysal I [q.v.], was born in Baghdād May 1334/1915, and, aged four, became King under the Regency of his uncle the Amir ʻAbd al-Ilāh on the accidental death of his father in 1338/1920. Educated by an English governess and at Harrow, he passed an uneventful childhood, suffering intermittently from asthma. He assumed his royal functions in May 1933, and during his five-year effective reign showed excellent intentions, accepting guidance from his veteran statesman Nūrī al-Saṭīd [q.v.] and from his uncle. He appeared generally popular and travelled widely. Recently engaged to be married to a Turkish-Egyptian princess, Faysal was, with his uncle and most of his immediate family, shot by insurgent troops during the revolutionary coup of 14 July 1958.

(S. H. LONGRIGG)

AL-FAYYŪM, a geographical region of Egypt, which today, as usually in the past, forms an administrative province. The Fayyūm, which derives its name from the Coptic, Phiom ("the Sea"), is a roughly triangular depression, about 35 miles from north to south, and about 49 miles from east to west. It is in Middle Egypt, lying in the Libyan Desert, east of the Nile valley. The cliffs separating it from the river valley are breached at one point, thereby admitting a stream which branches off from the Nile near Assūyat. Now known as Bābīr Yūsuf, this stream was caused by medieval writers ẁallāḥi al-Maḥānā. Its entry into the depression of the Fayyūm has been controlled since Pharaonic times by sluices at Ilāḥūn. On entering the Fayyūm, the waters are channelized for irrigation, the surplus escaping to

an Arab monarchy in Syria (1317-9/1918-20) failed in the face of French opposition; he was expelled from Damascus in July 1339/1920. But British favour and ʻIrāqī election secured him the throne in Baghdād (August 1340/1921), and he could for the twelve years following play a conspicuous, indeed indispensable, part in the foundation, consolidation and ultimate liberation from the British Mandate of the young and aspiring kingdom. Faysal, holding a balance between British requirements and local patriotism, showed admirable qualities of patient leadership. ʻIrāq was admitted to the League of Nations in 1351/1932. Faysal died suddenly in Switzerland in September 1352/1933, succeeded by his son, Ghaźl.
form a permanent lake, now known as Birkat Karun.
The principal town and provincial capital is ... or, more
strictly, Zanaga, the Arabic adaptation of the Berber
plural Izndgen, sing. Azndg. Some Arabic authors

... because of underhand acts by some men of Fazara,
respective horses Dahis and Ghabra. The latter won
of Abs, and Hudhayfa b. Hish b. Hudhayfa. In Muhammad's
period at Medina 'Uyayna was the leader of Fazara and
joined in the siege of Medina (affair of the
Khandak) in 6/562 with 1000 men. Some months
later part of Fazara ambushed a Muslim trading
expedition led by Zayd b. Hāriṯa, and in 6/562 Zayd
made severe reprisals on Fazara. At the siege of
Medina, Muhammad had tried to bribe 'Uyayna
to abandon his allies, and made similar offers
during the expedition to Khaybar in 7/562, where
'Uyayna with a large force of Gaḥaṭaṇ is was supporting
the Jews. Though furious at the eventual failure of these
intrigues 'Uyayna came to terms with Muhammad,
joined the expeditions to Mecca and Hunayn (in
8/630), and received a hundred camels at al-Dīḍār
along with "those whose hearts are to be reconciled";
this seems to have been the share of the leader of
a non-Muslim contingent, though 'Uyayna is not said
to have had any following. Shortly after this he led
a Muslim expedition to the north-west and
conquered Taṃbar, but he was not a member of the deputation
(wafd) from Fazara.

After Muhammad's death most of Fazara joined
the ridda under Tulayba, but eventually had to submit
(cf. W. Hoenenbach, in Abhandlungen der Akademie
der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Geistes-
und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, no. 4, 1951, 242-6.
They are later heard of in North Africa (al-Kalkashandhi, Nīkayn al-arab, Cairo 1959, 345 f.).

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the article:
Mufaddalīyyāt, ed. Lyall, i, 38; n. 2; ii, 288-90; etc.; al-Hamdānī, See Index historicus;
al-Bakrī, Muđ'djam, Cairo, index; Aghanī, Tables; al-Tabarī, ii, 1351-90 (Fazara in revolt of 101); iii,
1342 f., 2008 (in Arabia in 231, 267); Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, Oxford 1916, 91-5,
etc. (W. Montgomery Watt)

FAZĀR, name borne in mediaeval times by the
north-western extremity of the Moroccan Middle
Atlas. This territory lay to the south of
Fez and Meknès. It was bounded to the east by
the upper course of the Wādī Subū (= Wādī Gīgī);
westwards, it extended as far as the upper course of
the Wādī Umm-Rabīt (= Wādī Wānsīf); its
southern boundary was the so-called Tīghānlīm,
pass, where the Malwiyya rises. It coincided with
the territory now occupied by the Berber-speaking tribes
called in Arabic: Banī Mīr, Banī Mūḍīl, Gerwān,
Zemmūr and Zāyān. It is a high plateau, with an
average altitude of 1500 m./5000 ft., from which
some mountains rise. Geologically, it is of the
"causse" type, with limestone flats and
there volcanic, and cut by numerous canyons;
it is covered by forests of oaks, thujas (arbor vitae)
and cedars, where are found monkeys and panthers (and,
as late as the end of the 19th century, lions).

Northwards and westwards this high plateau
shades off into lower foothills (penelplains).
The abundant rain and snow give rise to many copious
springs; here rise the three most important rivers of
Morocco, the Malwiyya, the Subū and the Umm
Rabīt, and many left tributaries of the last two.
As in the rest of central Morocco, the oldest known
population consisted of Sanhādja [q.v.], or, more
strictly, Zanāga, the Arabic adaptation of the Berber
plural Aznāg, sing. Āznāg. Some Arabic authors

In the long war which followed Dhubyān was led by
Hudhayfa, and then by his son Hīṣn (A. P. Cauzen
de Perceval, Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant
l'islamisme, Paris 1847, ii, 424-43, etc.). After peace
was made with Abs, Fazāra became involved in
fighting with 'Amīr b. Sa'ṣāf, Dhuḥṣam and other
tribes, the command being latterly in the hands of
'Uyayna b. Hīṣn b. Hudhayfa. In Muhammad's
period at Medina 'Uyayna was the leader of Fazāra and

... the principal town and provincial capital is Madīnat al-Fayyūm. The Fayyūm plays an important part
in the Judeo-Islamic legend of Joseph, who is said
to have constructed the canal of al-Manāh (hence
the modern name), the sluices of Ilaḥān, and the
canals which drained the great marsh (al-djawba)
formerly covering the region. Two variants of this
legend are given by Ibīn 'Abd al-Hakam, and it also
appears in al-Makīrī's Ḥaṣāfī and other sources.
With it is connected a folk-etymology of the name
al-Fayyūm: the Egyptian king, on seeing Joseph's
achievements, said, "This is the work of a thousand
days [al-fawm]". Abī Sāliḥ derives the name also
from an eponym. The intimate association of the
Fayyūm with the Joseph legend is perhaps due to the

... traces in the assertion, recorded by 'Ali Mū añak,
that Shavīṣh al-Rūbī, the wall of Madīnat al-Fayyūm,
was a descendant of Reuben; a possible indication of
an islamanized Jewish shrine. During the Arab invasion
of Egypt, the Fayyūm was occupied without
difficulty, although it lay off the main routes of the
conquerors: Ibīn 'Abd al-Hakam gives three variant
traders engaged in this enterprise; the

... all the territories associated with it have been preserved (cf.
yakut, index, s.v. Fazara). In the Djahiliyya the

... its main pasture-grounds were in Wadi
[ q.v.], whereas Drība was itself included in Ghatafan

... legend are given by Ibn
Abd al-Hakam, and it also

... its 360 villages, each of
which could provision the whole of Egypt for one
day. Rice and flax were among its chief products. It

... during the Nile flood, laid it open to the raids of
Arab and Berber tribes. The associated phenomenon
of the sedentarization of nomads in the Fayyum has

... that Shaykh al-Rubl, the
islamized Jewish shrine. During the Arab invasion
of Egypt, the Fayyūm was occupied without

... in the perception there of an ancient Jewish settlement, of
which documentary evidence exists as early as the
3rd century B.C. Jewish influence may perhaps also
be traced in the assertion, recorded by 'Ali Mū añak,
that Shavīṣh al-Rūbī, the wall of Madīnat al-Fayyūm,
was a descendant of Reuben; a possible indication of
an islamanized Jewish shrine. During the Arab invasion
of Egypt, the Fayyūm was occupied without

... in the perception there of an ancient Jewish settlement, of
which documentary evidence exists as early as the
3rd century B.C. Jewish influence may perhaps also
be traced in the assertion, recorded by 'Ali Mū añak,
that Shavīṣh al-Rūbī, the wall of Madīnat al-Fayyūm,
was a descendant of Reuben; a possible indication of
an islamanized Jewish shrine. During the Arab invasion
of Egypt, the Fayyūm was occupied without
difficulty, although it lay off the main routes of the
conquerors: Ibīn 'Abd al-Hakam gives three variant
traders engaged in this enterprise; the
call them also 'Banû Fazaz', as though the second element were the name of an eponymous ancestor; but this name must arise from a careless translation of the Berber eponym 'Ayt Fazaz' = A. ahi Fazaz, 'the people of the Fazaz'.

The geographers describe them as pastoral mountain-folk, raising cattle, sheep, and also very sturdy horses. They practised transhumance: they spent the summers on the high plateaus, but the winters of snow obliged them to move to the valleys of the Lower Atlas: to the north, those of Tâgrâgrâ (the Guerguerat of Leo Africanus, modern Tâgrira) and Aâsi (between Fez and Meknès), to the west, that of Aâdeghsân, on the upper Umm Rabîh. In 173/789, Idrîs I took possession of the Fazaz and applied himself to converting the population to Islam, for they had, for the most part, remained loyal to Judaism or Christianity. From the reign of his successor Idrîs II (188-213/804-28) there survive numerous dirhams, struck at Wazakkur. This mint must have been located on the present Bû-Úzeqkûr, a small tributary of the Umm Rabîh, some 3 km/2 miles south of Kinhira. When in 213/828 the domains of Idrîs II were shared out between his sons, the Fazaz was divided: the northern part was annexed to the principality of Fez whose amir, the eldest son Muhammad, struck dirhams at Tâgrâgrâ; the southern part fell to his elder brother Muhammad, who entrusted to another amir the task of subduing the rebel 'Îsa; he died in the Tâddîl, where his tomb is still venerated among the Ayt 'Îsâ ben Drls.

During the second half of the 10th/16th century, the Zenâta of the central Maghrib were pushed westwards by the Ṣâṇhâjjâ of Bulugûn, who was governing Ifrikiyâ in the name of the Fāṭimîm of Cairo; it is at this period that the Mâqrâwâna and the Banû Yafrân settled in Morocco. The latter carried out for themselves a principality whose boundaries corresponded to those of the principality of 'Îsâ b. Idrîs, with its capital at Shalla. One clan, the Banû Yâdîfîsh, occupied the Fazaz; their chief, Tâwâlâ, built there a kalâ—the famous Šaîl al-Mîdâh b. Tâwâlâ—which was inherited by his son Mahdi. In 452/1060 the Almoravid amîr Aabh Bakr b. 'Urma conquered the mountain district of the Fazaz, except for the Kalâ, which his successor Yûsuf b. Tâgûfîn was able to occupy, on terms, only after a nine-year investment (456-6/1063-72). For some months the luckless al-Mutamîd (q.v.) was held prisoner in the Kalâ before being finally interned at Aghmâût. Thereafter the Fazaz was conquered in turn by the Almohads and the Marinids. This district controlled the most direct route from Fez to Marrakush, that passing through the Tâddîl; it had also two silver-mines, at Awwâm and Wârkînâ.

From the 9th/15th century onwards the name Fazaz seems to have fallen out of use. Leo Africanus, who crossed the district in 1515, does not mention it. Indeed in the course of the 10th/16th century the land was overrun by new waves of Berbers (also belonging to the Ṣâṇhâjjâ group) who had come from the upper valley of the Malwiyya, following in the wake of the Arab tribes, the Banû Ḥâsan (ätz Bni Ḥyen) and the Zu'ayr (ätz Zê'ér) as they migrated towards the north-west of Morocco.

Thusforward the history of the Fazaz is the history of the marabouts of the šâ'īya of al-Dîlî and their Berber fellow-tribesmen the Ayt Idrîsâen (to the north) and the Ayt Ṣaṇmâlî (to the west), and their struggles against the 'Alawî sultans (especially al-Qâqîlî, Ismâîlî and Sulâymânî) and against the troops of the French Protectorate.

Two Idrîsid mints in the Fazaz, Wâskûtûr and Tâgrâgrâ, are (as has been noted) easily identified, but this is not true of the two other famous place-names of the district. As regards the silver-mine called Ma'dîn 'Awwâm, there exists nowadays a Džabal 'Awwâm, some 10 km/6 miles west of Mrîrt, and thus 120 km/75 miles south-west of Fez, where there is a mine of silver-bearing lead, but Leo Africanus, who passed that way, speaks of an iron-mine on the Bû Râgrâ. Still more difficult is the case of the famous Kalâ. Al-Bakrî does not mention it: indeed his route from Aghmâût to Fez via the Tâddîl passed some way to the west of the Fazaz; while al-Idrîsî locates it, on the same route, between Šufrîy (q.v.) and the town of Tâddîl, two stages (some 100 km/60 miles) from each, on a very high mountain.

The anonymous author of the Kitâb al-Istibsâr notes that when Al-Mu'tamîd was a prisoner there it was built of wood and the majority of its population consisted of Jewish merchants. But Leo Africanus, who saw it when it was ruined and calls it Ma'dîiyâ, says that it was built almost on the plain. He might be referring to a township built below a mountain-fortress, but he locates it 'ten miles' (15 km) from 'Ayn al-Asnâm (the present Aneour), i.e. 35 km/22 miles (barely one stage) from Šufrîy. It seems that the site of the Kalâ of Mahdi b. Tâwâlâ is to be sought for in the area between Timahdît and Mrîrt, perhaps at Timahdît itself.

The Fazaz has produced few famous men apart from the founder of the Kalâ, but the following may be mentioned: (1) the secretary of state and religious poet 'Abd al-Râhîm b. Yaqhaftân al-Fazâzî, who died in 627/1230 (see Brockelmann, I, 273, where he is called in error al-Fazâzî; S, I, 482); (2) the great historian al-Žayânî, who died in 1230/1815 (see Lévi-Provençal, Les historiens des Chorfa, 142).

Bibliography: See the indexes of al-Idrîsî, the Kitâb al-Mas'âkîn, and the Extant inscriptions on the Asnam (tr. Fagnan), Ibn Khaldûn (Histoire des Berbères, tr. de Slane), and Leo Africânus (tr. Epaulard), under the toponyms mentioned in the article.
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FALIS HUSAYN BEY [see FADIL BEY].

FALIZ [see FADIL].

FAZULULAH [see FADIL ALLAH].

FÁZQHILÎ, a region of the upper Blue Nile, within the modern Republic of the Sudan, and near to the Ethiopian border. Its historical importance is solely due to the presence of alluvial gold. The ruler (makhk) of Fâzqîhilî was a vassal of the Fundjî (q.v.) sultan of Sinnâr, and wore the horned cap (làliyâ umm ìnna'yî) as his insignia of office. This usage long survived the downfall of the Fundjî sultanate (see A. W. M. Disney, The coronation of the Fung king of Fazqhilî, in Sudan Notes and Records, xxvii, Khartoum 1945, 37-42, describing the investiture of a makhk in 1944). In 1327/1822-23 Fâzqîhilî was conquered by Ismâîl Kâmîl Pasha, ser 'asker of Muhammad 'Alî Pasha's invading forces, and a levy of gold was laid on its merchants. Muhammad 'Alî endeavoured, with the aid of European technicians, to exploit the gold of Fazqhilî, but had little success. Under 'Abbâs I Fâzqîhilî became a place of banishment. Thereafter it lost all importance.
Fezzan has been inhabited, even in what are now the most desert regions such as the hamādas, since the old palaeolithic age. Worked stones from the mid-palaeolithic age, which are much more numerous, are already concentrated in the depressions; this is even more the case with the plentiful and fine stone relics of the age of polished stone. Fezzan shared in the great Saharan civilization of the neolithic age, to which we must certainly attribute a notable part of the rock paintings, those of the “pre-camel” period which represent, in a naturalistic style, elephants, giraffes, rhinoceroses, bovines, and men armed with bows. The most recent and diagrammatic of the rock paintings, which depict camels (dromedaries), horses, various domestic animals and men armed with shields and lances, are thought to date from the end of the neolithic period and prehistory, perhaps even from the beginning of our own era. The Garamantes who are mentioned by Herodotus and with whom the Romans were in contact, were already a mixed race composed of white Berbers like the Touareg today, half-castes and negroes, as is shown in the great number of tombs that have been excavated, particularly by Italian scholars, and whose funerary furnishings include Roman ceramics and glassware from the 2nd to the 6th centuries A.D.

The Garamantes, living over 500 km. south of the Tripolitania frontier, were still a powerful and important force that Getuli, had to endure several “punitive” expeditions by the Romans under Cornelius Balbus in 20-19 B.C. and Valerius Festus in 69-70. However, they collaborated with Roman troops in two expeditions against the “Ethiopians”, their southern neighbours, and carried produce from their country and from Sudan to the Tripolitania ports (Leptis Magna, Oea and Sabratha). Draught oxen, donkeys, horses, and carts drawn by two horses were the forerunners of camels, the use of which spread only slowly, over the desert tracks. But only dromedaries had the ability to carry to the coast sufficient quantities of dates, precious stones, ostrich feathers, ivory and, no doubt, some black slaves from the Sahara and Sudan. From the end of the 3rd century the Garamantes came on several occasions to plunder the coast. The only Roman monument in Fezzan is a mausoleum at Djarma (Garama), surrounded by cremation tombs (probably of Roman or Romanized merchants). It is likely that the technique of joggaras (underground conduits for collecting water), possibly of Iranian origin, spread towards the end of the Roman period. Being independent and ignored by the Vandal and Byzantine Maghrib, Fezzan long remained outside the sphere of Arab expansion, though conquered by ‘Ukba b. Nāfi‘ in 46/666-7. We know only that the town of Zawila was founded in 306/918 in the Shergiya by a Berber, Ibn Khattāb al-Hawwārī; it was a flourishing caravan centre, particularly for the slave trade, a small open city with a mosque and baths, and from it the Band Khattāb ruled Fezzan. The country was then prosperous, irrigated by wells and numerous joggaras; Djarma (Garama), Sebba, Tsawa, and Tmessa were the principal centres. But as early as the 12th century “the Arabs spread through the countryside, doing as much damage as possible” (al-Idrisī, trans. 135); Zawila was surrounded by walls which are now falling into ruin. In 1190 the dynasty of the Band Khattāb fell before the attacks of Karakūsh al-Ghuzzī, a Turcoman adventurer from Armenia who had the support of the Arab tribes of Sulaym and was already master of Tripolitania.

Fezzan then passed under the domination of the
The negro kings of Kanem (13th-15th centuries); they were represented by a governor (mai) who lived in the new capital, Trâghen (70 km. east of Zawila); as a result there followed a widespread immigration of negroes (not slaves) and, no doubt, closer connections with the Sudan; but the abandonment of the foggâras appears to date from this period.

The negro domination finally declined at the beginning of the 16th century as a result of the wars of Kanem against the Bornu and the long struggles with the Awlad Muhammad dynasty, the founders of Murzuk and of Moroccan and Sharîfian origin. The Awlad Muhammad, when finally they became masters of Fezzan, certainly contributed to its Islamization and Arabization; Murzuk was made the capital of the country, remaining so until the 20th century, while it was also a busy caravan centre and a stopping-place for pilgrims from the west on their way to Mecca.

The Turks, who occupied Tripoli in 1551, attempted to establish their authority in Fezzan only in 1577-8. At times they had governors there, several of whom were assassinated; they sent punitive expeditions such as that of 1679 during which Murzuk was completely sacked. But for the most part they were compelled to recognize Fezzan's de facto independence, in return for payment of tribute in gold and negro slaves in various quantities.

The Karamâf dynasty which ruled over Tripoli from 1710 until 1855 was unable to keep control over Fezzan, in spite of armed intervention in 1716, 1718, 1731-2 and 1811. In the second half of the 18th century the country was, however, reasonably peaceful, under what was in practice a ruling family that paid tribute. But in 1831 Fezzan fell into the hands of the dreaded nomads, the Awlad Slimân, under their chief 'Abd al-Djalîl Sîf al-Nasr.

The Turks, returning to Tripoli in 1835, made themselves masters of Fezzan in 1842, after killing Sîf al-Nasr and driving back the Awlad Slimân into Kanem. They remained there until 1911. The country became a sandjak subordinate to the wilayet of Tripoli and was divided into districts (bâdâl) and sub-districts (bâdyâ) with Ghât in Touargeg as its capital. The Italian Government found Fezzan a convenient place of exile for the Young Turks, both civilians and military, whom it was anxious to keep at a distance; the tombs of several of them can be seen at Murzuk.

The principal halting place for trans-Saharan trade was Zawila, Trâghen and then Murzuk. But the story was only known in detail long after, from the correspondence of the French Consuls in Tripoli and explorations at the end of the 19th and in the 20th centuries. On their way from Sudan to Tripoli came caravans, their chief merchandise being black slaves numbering from 500 to 2,000 a year, and also gold (either dust or in ingots); less important were ivory, ostrich feathers, copper (from Bornu) and hides. Fezzan exported only dates and natron (carbonate of soda). In the opposite direction the caravans carried various manufactured articles from Europe or the East; Venetian glassware, brocades and brass and bronze, coarse cloth from Naples and Marseilles, cottons from England and silks from Lyons (19th century), arms, ironmongery and pharmaceuticals from Italy and France, oriental fabrics, carpets and spices. The Fezzanese had some share in this traffic, which was mainly financed by the merchants from the oases in the north, in Tripoli and Ghadames, the Tebou of Bilma, and the Bornu negroes; and the government of Murzuk levied duties on camel-loads and slaves. The suppression of slavery, progressively observed, and the occupation of the Guinea Coast by the European Powers brought about first the decline and then the almost total disappearance of trans-Saharan trade. In addition, the Fezzan suffered greatly from the banditry of nomads during the ten years of the Awlad Slimân's domination and, much more recently, between the two Italian conquests.

The Italians actually disembarked in Tripoli on 5 October 1911—taking over from the Turks in Libya as a result of the Treaty of Ouchy (10 October 1912)—but were not able to occupy Fezzan only between January and August 1914. The Miani force, coming from Syrte through Sokna, and outflanking Gibla which was occupied by hostile nomads, took Brâk, Sebha, Murzuk, Ubârî and Ghât in succession. But owing to the opposition of the nomads who were spurred on by the propaganda of the Sandûsiyya fraternity, and also to the outbreak of the first world war, into which Italy was to make her entry, the Italian troops were withdrawn, though not without difficulty, in December 1914 and January 1915, leaving the country unprotected against the brigandage of the nomads for fifteen years. In fact, the Italians only returned in December 1929; in a combined advance of three columns, under the command of General Graziani, they passed through Derdj, al-Gueriat and Hûn (Djelfa) and had no great difficulty in reoccupying Fezzan, including Ghât and the Gatrûn region (February 1930).

It was a ruined country which had to be organized and equipped. Fezzan became a military command dependent on the Governor General of Libya; later (1936) it was transferred to the South Libya Command, set up at Hûn. The Italians started to link up the different parts of the Fezzan and Ghât with Tripoli and Miṭrâta by motor roads; they set up a number of schools and hospitals, and regularized and controlled the traditional administration of the mudîrs. Fezzan enjoyed a period of peace that was sorely needed.

The peaceful atmosphere was scarcely disturbed by the arrival of the Free French troops under the command of General Leclerc who, coming from the south in December 1942, easily occupied Murzuk on 7 January 1943, and then Sebha and the rest of the country before linking up with the British 8th Army in the advance on Tunisia. As a result of the Franco-British Agreement of January 1943, Fezzan and Ghadâmes formed a territory placed under the direct authority of the Direction des Territoires du Sud de l'Algérie, while Ghât was annexed to the territory of Djînet (Fort-Charley). The French divided Fezzan into 3 subdivisions (Ghâtî, Sebba-Ulbârî, Murzuk), maintained the administration by mudîrs and continued the educational, medical and economic work undertaken by the Italians; in addition, they dug several artesian wells.

Since 24 December 1951, the date of the creation of the United Kingdom of Libya under the sovereignty of Muhammad Idrîs al-Sanîlî, Fezzan has been one of the three autonomous provinces of this now independent country. The French forces provisionally maintained in Fezzan evacuated it, together with Ghât and Ghadâmes, by the terms of the Franco-Libyan Treaty of 20 August 1955; Ghadâmes has subsequently been added to Tripolitania. The wâls, the governor who represents the king at Sebha, the chief town of Fezzan, is assisted by an executive council composed of minor ministers (ndzir) and a legislative council, three-quarters of
whose members are elected and whose chairman shares authority with the wali. The census of 1954 recorded 54,400 inhabitants in Fezzan province, three-quarters of whom are sedentary. Agriculture is in fact the main source of livelihood, in particular the cultivation of date-palms of which there are between eight and nine hundred thousand. To be accurate, the date-palms are, for the most part, neither cultivated nor even irrigated, but merely fertilized. The underground water-table is sufficiently close to the surface for the palm trees' roots to reach the level of moisture; but the annual production of dates is hardly more than 4 to 6 kg. per tree, whilst with irrigation it reaches from 30 to 50 kg., particularly in Şātī. Another characteristic: outside the palm-groves cultivation is for the most part practised by means of a balance well (gdashna), especially in the south, and in particular by means of a well operated by a man [see bi'lit] in which the goatskin water-container (dalw) is drawn up by a donkey helped by a man. Cereals—wheat and barley in winter, millet (gsob) and sorghum (gijat) in summer—are almost the only form of cultivation: they are grown in succession on the same piece of land which is then left fallow; the rotation of crops near the wells is thus carried on from one to the next; in consequence crops are taken in turn from one to the next. Cultivation strips are protected by temporary hedges of palm leaves. Trees (pomegranates, vines) are very rare and are always planted at the side of the wells (or springs). Fertilization of the date-palms, drawing of water and irrigation are undertaken by the proprietors themselves or by hired labourers, serfs by origin, former negro slaves or tribes of very mixed origin, former negro slaves or tribes of very mixed origin, the Shwashna (sing. Shashna): these are the Hardīn of other parts of the Sahara. The sedentary inhabitants possess only a few sheep and goats; donkeys and dromedaries are used for wells and for transport. The workers are very poor. Emigration, both temporary and permanent, is by tradition made mainly to Tripolitania, but also to Tunisia.

The villages are generally of wretched appearance. The huddled buildings, partly or wholly in ruins, testify to a state of insecurity either formerly or recently. The houses, built of dry stone or baked bricks, with flat roofs and opening onto a court which is also sometimes covered (kouda), are built close together in barely two-thirds of the villages. It is only in the chief centres like Brak (Şātī), Murzuk or the oases of Sebha and al-Bwanis that they assume a somewhat more comfortable and urban aspect. There are numerous hamlets. In the poorest regions habitations are merely huts of palm leaves (zarība), and are widely spaced for fear of fire. The placing of houses, either adjoining one another or at a distance, is the result of the degree of social cohesion of the villagers and of the types of dwellings, not of economic differences. Stockbreeding is almost the sole activity of the more or less nomadic shepherds in the outlying regions of the Fezzan. The Tebou in the south-east wander in small scattered groups, from the Tibesti to the Djabal Ben Guènëma and the neighbourhood of Gatrun; they have temporary oblong huts made of the ribs of palm-leaves and matting (bâgły). The Touareg Ajjer (Imanghassaten and Ubagai), from the neighbourhood of Ghardames and the Messak, drive their flocks as far as the approaches to Şαtī, on the edge of the Wādi 'l-Adaj, and the Murzuk region. They live in tents of hides or in little round temporary huts made of matting. The shepherds from the north, the "Arabs", are far more numerous. The Gdâdja, the Urfella, the Awlabl Basîf and the Zîntân from Qliba, and the Libyans from the region of the Mūtarja at the end of the summer at the time of the date harvest. But most of the Megërâ and the Ḥasâwûna own date-palms and land which they have cultivated by the Shwâshna: they are semi-nomadic, living alternately in houses and tents: the Ḥotmân, the Zwayd and Gwâyda, formerly semi-nomadic, are today almost completely settled in western Şātī. All the Arabs' tents are of the "block type" which is to be found from Afghanistan to the Atlantic.

Fezzan sells part of its dates to all the neighbouring shepherds, and part of its cereals to the Tebou and Touareg. The nomads in the north, who grow cereals in the Gibla depressions, are the largest purchasers of dates, consuming a good part of them themselves, while by tradition they take the rest to markets in Tripolitania, to be exchanged for manufactured goods landed at Tripoli; some caravans go to south Tunisia.

But the dates and cereals, and also the water brought by the Dawâdà from the small lakes south of the râmla of Ubârî, are now almost always carried by lorry along the roads linking Misrata and Tripoli. It is also by lorry that the manufactured goods that are increasingly needed are brought from Tripoli. New roads lead to the oil-drilling centres recently opened in west and north-west Fezzan; but they are on the fringe of the country. Sebha, the capital of Fezzan, which includes a certain number of administrative and modern business buildings, has on the other hand become an important aerodrome.

FEHIM, SÜLEYMAN (1203-8/1789-1846), a minor Ottoman poet who wrote in the first half of the 19th century, during the declining decades of the classical school. A government official in Istanbul and in the Balkans, he soon retired and devoted his life to study and writing, teaching Persian occasionally.

His little diwan (Istanbul 1862) contains poems inspired by the “Indian style” of Persian poetry. He is also the author of Safinet al-shu^ara? (Istanbul 1259), an expanded translation of Dawlatshâb’s Tadhkhirat al-shu^ara?.

Bibliography: Djedvet, Ta’rîkhî, xii, 184; Fatîn, Tadhkhirî, 336; Ibnûnîm Mahmud Kemal, Son asr Türk şairleri, 379-81; A. C. Yöntem, in IA, s.v.

FEHIM, UNDÜZMÜDUSTA (known as Fehim-î Kadîm (?-1058/1648), Turkish poet, one of the most appreciated of the minor poets of the 17th century. According to scattered information found in various tadhkires and in Ewilîa Celebi, he was born in Istanbul, the son of an Egyptian pastrycook. Without a regular education or settled position, stricken by poverty he left Istanbul, joining the suite of Eyyûb Pasha, governor of Egypt. Because of a colleague’s intrigue, he lost the favour of the Pasha and decided to leave Egypt, where he does not seem to have been very happy or prosperous. Thanks to the mediation of Newâlî Bey, the commander of the Janissaries in Egypt, he was allowed to join the caravan conveying the yearly tribute from Egypt to the Capital, but he died on the way in Iğdır in 1058/1648, apparently in his early twenties.

His diwan, his only work, which according to tadhkires he completed at the age of eighteen, shows that he was an unconventional poet of great promise and although fascinated by the work of the Persian poet ‘Urfi, in his lyrics he did not always follow the latter’s precise and bombastic style, but succeeded in developing, at that early age, a personality of his own. Especially in his ghashals, in the middle of hackneyed clichés, he succeeded in finding his own way. His position as head of the order does not seem to have been very happy or prosperous. Thanks to the mediation of Newâlî Bey, the commander of the Janissaries in Egypt, he was allowed to join the caravan conveying the yearly tribute from Egypt to the Capital, but he died on the way in Iğdır in 1058/1648, apparently in his early twenties.
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His brother (and not his son, as stated in
and the sources which derive therefrom), Muhyi al-Din Mehemmed, attained even
greater dignity. Having been kadi of Edirne (894/1586) and
in Eyyûb. He is mentioned (as Muhyî) among the poets of his age, and is said to have
built a mosque in the Topkâhi quarter of Galata. (The sources often confuse him with his brother
and should be used with caution: Mûstâkim-zade, 22; 'Him. sîl., 361; Danismend, ii, 432; Sehl, 29; Latifi, Tâdottere-i shu'ârâ, Istanbul 1314, 307;
Huseyn Ayvansarayî, 'Hâdâtât al-çevwâmi', Istanbul 1281, ii, 66, 133). Although descendants of this line appear as teachers and kâdîs down to the 12th/18th
century, none achieved outstanding prominence. (Cf. for example, Tashkoprûza, 400 (Zeyn al-Din Mehemmed), 486 (Fir Mehemmed); 'Atâ'î, Dîvûl-i Şakârî, Istanbul 1268, 13 (Hasan b. Zeyn al-Din), 35 (Abd al-Bâqî Efendi and Yusuf Efendi), 418 (Mahnûf Efendi).

FEHER — FENER

The most famous of his numerous works is the Fushâl
a compilation on the şâhiç al-îslâm of the Empire. He was born in Bursa in
751/1350-1, the son of a certain Shams al-Din, who, despite the impossibility of the dating, is said to have
been a pupil of the famous şâfi'i scholar Şadr al-Din Könevi (d. 672/1273-4); Brockelmann, I, 449.

Having studied under some of the most distinguished scholars of his age in Anatolia and Egypt, in 770/1368-9 he was appointed teacher at the Manastir melrese in Bursa and the following year made kâdi of this capital city. What the political influence was which he could manoeuvre a youth of twenty into such a position remains unknown, but that there was a special connexion with the dynasty is to be inferred from the great wealth he was able to amass, the distinction he was accorded among the state;...
(re-built in 1720), still the seat of the Orthodox Patriarchate. At quite an early period there settled in Constantinople, in addition to the ecclesiastical and secular officials of the Patriarchate, the few old Byzantine families that had remained in Istanbul and other distinguished and wealthy members of the community; in the school of the Patriarchate, conducted by the clergy, the ancient classical studies were cultivated. The prominent Greek families resident around the Patriarchate were known collectively as the ‘Phanariots’ (T. Feneriler). Thanks to their links with and knowledge of the Christian world (many of them were educated in Italy), the Porte, particularly in the 12th/18th and early 13th/19th centuries, drew on them to fill various influential employments. Members of these families acted as dragomans of the Porte and of the Arsenal (see TAYRÜMAN), and as contractors for the supply of furs and meat to the Saray, etc. Since they were regarded as more reliable than the native princes, for some of whom they had earlier acted as ‘agents at the Porte’ (kapî ketkûbâdis), it was from the Phanariots that were appointed, for over a century, the yoovodas (hospodars) of Moldavia (from 1123/1711, see BOGDAN) and Wallachia (from 1128/1716, see EFLAŞ). The best-known families were Karkanouzenos, Skarlatos, Maurokorodataos, Gikis, Karatzas, Koutsos, Khantzeres (Handjeri), Maurogenes, Hypsilantzes, Mourouzis, Kallimakhes, Mousourou, Aristarkhes, etc. In the second half of the 12th/18th century the Phanariot families began to move from Fener to the more salubrious villages along the Bosphorus—Kurutçühme, Arnawutköy, Tarabya; after the Greek War of Independence many of them migrated to Greece. Descendants of Phanarion families are still found in modern Romania.

Bibliography: M. Crusius, Türogracia, Basle 1578, 91, 497; de la Croix, État présent de la Nation et de l’Eglise grecque, 3 ff.; W. Eton, A survey . . . London 1798, 331 ff.; J. Dallaway, Constantinople ancient and modern, London 1797, 98 ff.; Le livre d’or de la noblesse phanariote . . ., par un Phanariote [= Eugène Rizo-Rhavgabe], Athens 1892; E. Karatay, Aşik Celbi and Hasan Celbi, Istanbul 2001; Komal al-akhbâr, Ankara Un. DTCF Lib. MS, f. 210a); another, Araydîfzade Hüseyin, died in 1225/1713 (Sâlim, 525); for MSS of his works see F. E. Karatay, Topkapî Sarayi . . . türkçe yazmalar kataloğu, Istanbul 1961, nos. 2449, 2597); a third, ‘Derwish’ Ferdi, died in 1225/1713 (Sâlim, 527); a ‘Kâtib’ Ferdi is also known (Babinger, 83, n.).

A detailed history in Turkish of the reign of Selim I (Latifi, 263; the hekkâres [in MS] of ʿAshik Celbi and Hasan Celbi; ʿAll, Komal al-akhbâr, Ankara Un. DTCF Lib. MS, f. 210a); another, Araydîfzade Hüseyin, died in 1225/1713 (Sâlim, 525); for MSS of his works see F. E. Karatay, Topkapî Sarayi . . . türkçe yazmalar kataloğu, Istanbul 1961, nos. 2449, 2597); a third, ‘Derwish’ Ferdi, died in 1225/1713 (Sâlim, 527); a ‘Kâtib’ Ferdi is also known (Babinger, 83, n.).

These attributions are without foundation. The word ‘ferdi’, appearing in a Persian poem in the 10th century, is not a proper name but bears its ordinary lexicographical meaning, ‘one person;’ the author’s mahbûlas in fact appears, in a poem at the end of the work, as ‘Bûstân’, and hence reveals him to be Mustafâ Bûstân b. Mehemmed, ‘Bûstân Efendi’, a hâdîfaster under Süleyman I, b. 904/1498, d. 977/1570 (see BOSTANZADE).


FERHAD PASHA (7—1004/1595), Ottoman Grand Vizier. One Venetian relazione of 1585 gives his then age as about 50 years, while other Venetian relazioni of 1590-4 describe him as a man of about 65 or 70 years. Ferhâd Pasha was of Albanian origin (some of the Venetian accounts refer to him as “di nazione siciliana”, “di nazione siciliana”) and, according to Lazaro Soranzo, a native of “Andronici Castello dell’Albania”. After he had gone out from the enderûn-i humâyûn towards the end of the reign of Sultan Süleyman Kânûnî (d. 974/1566), his career embraced the offices of Mir Akhor-i Kebîr, i.e., Grand Master of the Imperial Horse (while holding this appointment he was sent in 968/1563 to Budin (Buda) with orders to execute the Beglerbeg of Budin, Mustafâ Pasha, the nephew of the then Grand Vizier Mehemmed Şokollu) and also of Yehîideri Aghasl, i.e., Agha of the Janissaries (an office that he lost in 990/1582). Ferhâd Pasha became Beglerbeg of Rûmîli late in 990/1582 and not long thereafter was raised, with the rank of vizier, to the eminence of serdar, i.e., commander-in-chief, of the Ottoman forces engaged in the war which had broken out against Persia in 986/1578. During the campaigns of 991/1583-992/1584 he relieved with new supplies and reinforcements the Ottoman garrison at Tiflis in Georgia and in addition fortified Erivan, together with a number of strong positions on the routes leading into Georgia. The supreme command on the eastern front was assigned, for the year 985, to the famous ʿOthmân Pasha, then at the height of his renown as a soldier in view of the brilliant campaigns that he had waged in the Caucasus during the earlier phases of the war. After the death of ʿOthmân Pasha in Dhu ’l-Ka‘da 993/October 1585 the appointment as serdar was given once more to Ferhâd Pasha, who now retained it until the end of the long conflict with Persia in 998/1593. His solid achievement as a soldier was crowned in 996/1588, when he conquered Gandja and the region of Karabâgh in Persian Ahdarbâyân. Ferhâd Pasha became Grand Vizier in Shawwâl 999/August 1591, but a revolt amongst the Janissaries brought about his dismissal from office in Dümâdâ II 1000/March-April 1592. As second vizier, and during the first years of the long war of 1001/1593-1015/1606 between the Ottoman Empire and Austria, he was bâdî’mahbûl at Istanbul in the absence of the Grand Vizier Köşkâ Sinân Pasha on the Hungarian front. Soon after the accession to the throne of Sultan Mehemmed III in 1003/1595 Ferhâd Pasha became Grand Vizier for the second time (Dümâdâ II 1003/February 1595). His renewed tenure of the office was destined, however, to be brief—as he was preparing for a campaign against Wallachia (at that time aligned on the side of Austria), the intrigues of his bitter rival Köşkâ Sinân led to his dismissal in Shawâl
FERHAD PASHA — FERIDUN BEG

1003/July 1595 and not long afterwards to his execution, on the order of the Sultan, in Safer i 904/October 1595. Some of the sources describe Ferhad Pasha as a traitor from the plan, and an evil and profane nobleman (Kara Yllan), in the words of Lazaro Soranzo) as a rough and ignorant man, overbearing and avaricious in his conduct. None the less, on the evidence of a career not devoid of notable achievements, above all in the war against Persia, he has some claim to be regarded as one of the most able viziers of his time.

Life:— See Bibliography: Selânîki, Ta’rîh, Istanbul A.H. 1281, 67, 169, 172, 202, 204, 212 ff., passim; 220 ff., passim, 232 ff., passim, 243 ff., passim, 259-60, 268, 285-6, 295, 302, 308, 310-2, 320; Peçewî, Ta’rîh, Istanbul A.H. 1281-1283, i, 423 and ii, 19, 73, 86 ff., passim, 107 ff., passim, 122 ff., passim, 104 ff., passim; Hâdidî Khîlîfa, Fedilîche, Istanbul A.H. 1286-1287, i, 3, 46 ff., passim, 76; Na’imî, Ta’rîh, Istanbul A.H. 1281-1283, i, 66 ff., passim, 110, 117 ff., passim; Sölaküş-Zade, Ta’rîhî, Istanbul A.H. 1298, 605 ff., passim; I. H. Usunçarâ, Osmanî Tarihî, Ankara 1954, iii, Pt. 2, 347-9 and 608 (index); A. S. Levend, Gûzavat-nâmulere, Istanbul 1956, 89 ff. (information on the Ottoman campaigns of Ferhad Pasha can also be found in Iskandar Beg Munshî, Ta’rîh-i ‘alâm-i ‘Abbâdî, compiled on the order of the latter’s death (960/1553) he entered the service of Mehmed Pasha Sokollu, then begârbebi of Rûmî, as secretary. As Sokollu rose to supreme power, so Ferîdûn played an increasingly important part in state affairs, notably in the negotiations for the eleven Ottoman sultans to Sellîm II, contained 1880 documents, but no known MS approaches this length. The work has been printed twice (1) Istanbul 1264-5(1848-9), containing 735 documents, of which 259 dialects entitled Ta’rîh-i ‘l-tarassul, Ed. Fligel, no. 3790), prompt grave doubts on the authenticity of the whole collection (see J. H. Mordtmann in Isl., xiv (1925), 362n); but recent studies suggest that these were exaggerated: it is for the most part a highly reliable source.

The Munshî is introduced (i, 24-8) by a short treatise on ethics, Fıviq ê-ℇ integrates much Content and the events of the two years following; MSS: Leiden, Univ.-bibl. Warn. 277; Istanbul, Millet-Ali Emiri 330; Istanbul, Hazine 1339 (this, dated 976 and containing 20 miniatures [Karatay, no. 692], is recorded as having been given in marriage to Sokollu’s widow and promoted to service of Selâmî Pasha (q.v.) and Suleymân’s daughter Mihrîmâ (Selânîki, 162-3; the tradition that he was married to Sokollu’s widow is baseless, see Hammer-Purgstall, iv, 104, note b). He died in office, on a haemorrhage, on Wednesday 21 Safar 991/16 March 1583 (Selânîki, 172), and is buried in a türbe at Eyyûbî (Ewliyâî, i, 405; cf. Om, ii, 363-4).

Ferîdûn’s introduction to his work, Munshî al-salâlîn (chronogram for 982, the year of its completion) is a collection of state-papers—imperial letters, fermanîs, fethâmehes, berâtis, treaties, with some campaign-diaries. According to Selânîki (137), the presentation volume, of over 250 gatherings (dîwân) and divided into eleven sections for the eleven Ottoman sultans to Selîm II, contained 840 documents, many of which, however, are later than the date of presentation. From the examination of MSS in European libraries (the Istanbul MSS remain to be investigated) K. Holter concludes that Munshîî ‘alî and ii, 1-100 (525 documents) and perhaps also ii, 536-74 (30 docs.) belong to Ferîdûn’s original collection, while ii, 100-536 (282 docs. of the late 16th and the 17th centuries) reproduce a single separate collection, similar in scope to that represented in MS Göttingen Univ.-bibl. turc. 29. Mürkûmîn Khâlî’s demonstration that several of the documents purporting to belong to the reigns of 963/1654 and 964/1655 are spurious, being modelled on documents in a collection of confidential correspondence of the Khârizm-shahs entitled Ta’rassul ila ‘l-tarassul (Hâdidî Khîlîfa, ed. Fligel, no. 3790), prompt grave doubts on the authenticity of the whole collection (see J. H. Mordtmann in Isl., xiv (1925), 362n); but recent studies suggest that these were exaggerated: it is for the most part a highly reliable source.

The Munshî ‘alî is introduced (i, 24-8) by a short treatise on ethics, Fıviq ê-瘁 integrates much Content and the events of the two years following; MSS: Leiden, Univ.-bibl. Warn. 277; Istanbul, Millet-Ali Emiri 330; Istanbul, Hazine 1339 (this, dated 976 and containing 20 miniatures [Karatay, no. 692], is presumed as a presentation-copy). In 980/1572, as Fıviq ê-瘁, he caused to be translated, from French, a history of France down to the year 1563; MS: Dresden (H. O. Fleischer, Catalogus, no. 120).

Bibliography:— Ferîdûn’s introduction to his work, Munshî ‘alî (q.v.), i, 14-23; ‘Alâî, Hâdidî al-akbârî, 336-7; J. H. Mordtmann, s.v. in ETI (= IA, s.v.), followed by Babinger, 106-8 (with further references); Mûrûkûmîn Khâlî (Ymaq, 336-7).

FERman [see FARMAN].

Ferūz [see FERROZ].

Ferōḵān [see FERGUNKH].

FESTIVAL [see BAYRAM; flight]

FETWA [see FATWA].

FEUDALISM [see İSTÁT].

FEZ [see FAS, and for the head-gear (IIRAS)].

FEZZAN [see FEZ].


Fida’ī (or, more often, fidowī), one who offers up his life for another, a name used of special devotees in several religious and political groups. Among the Nizārī Ismā’īlīs it was used of those members who risked their lives to assassinate the enemies of the sect. They acted also on behalf of political allies of the Nizaris, sometimes at a price. At Alamut they may have become, in later years, a special corps; but normally tasks of assassination seem to have been assigned to anyone who was fit. The mediaeval Western tradition developed an elaborate account of them as highly trained specialists, evidently based partly on Muslim tales, partly on imaginative deduction. Mediaeval Muslim legends gave rise later to the idea that ḥaḍīdik was used in motivating the fidowī, but there is no evidence for this (see M. G. S. Hodgson, The Order of Assassins, The Hague 1955). In Algeria, fidowī is a narrator of heroic deeds, and fidowīyya is a tale or song of heroic deeds. During the Persian revolution fidowī was applied in the first place to the adherents of the republican party, later to the defenders of liberal ideas and the constitution.

Fida’ī was also the pen-name of Shāykhzāda Lāhduf, who was sent by the Ṣafawī Shāh Ḫusrav al-Muṣaddik to Muhammad Ḭān Shaybānī and afterwards retired to Shiraz where he died (Rida Kūli Ḫān, Madīṣa al-fusaha’, ii, 27). It was also the pen-name of Sayyd Mūṣīd al-Muṣaddik of Ardistan, who lived at Isfahan and was the favourite poet of Muhammad Shāh Kūli Ḫān (Rida Kūli Ḫān, ii, 385).

Bibliography: Ibn Khaldūn-de Slane, i, 122, 5; Lane, Modern Egyptians, ii, 147; H. d’Allemagne, Du Khorassan au pays des Backtiaris, Paris 1911, iv, 304 (photographs, 294, 299); Browne, ii, 206 ff.; idem, Persian Revolution, 127, 151; RMM, i, 49, iv, 176; v, 361; xil, 217.

[Cl. Huart-M: G. S. Hodgson]}

FIDA’ĪYYÂN-I İSLĀM, a small politico-religious terrorist group based in Tehran which during its two years of activity (1941-53) became notorious for its responsibility for numerous political murders. The Fida’īyyan proclaimed the government of "xenophiles" illegitimate, and called such men enemy spies whose blood must be shed. They demanded the revocation of all laws which they considered inconsistent with Shi’i law, and tried to re-establish the veil of women and other traditional Islamic practices.

The Fida’īyyan began with the abortive attempt by their young founder, Sayyid Muḥammad Mīrāwī, later called Nawāb-Ī Šafawī, on the life of the famous scholar and religious reformer, Ḥāmid Kasrawī [see KASRAWI], in March 1945. In February 1946 the Fida’īyyan assassinated Kasrawī during open court proceedings in the Palace of Justice in Tehran. Šafawī and a few associates were arrested, but none of those who had been present would testify against them and they were acquitted. Āyat Allāh Ḩāshāmī’s protection of the Fida’īyyan and their influence in the Tehran bāzīr played a part in the acquittal, as did the fear of reprisals, which now grew. In October 1949 the Fida’īyyan assassinated the Minister of Court, ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Ḥāshābī, whom they accused of having foreign connexions and of interfering in elections to the Majlis. This murder was a factor in the annulment of the Tehran elections to the 16th session of the Majlis, and in the new elections the National Front led by Dr. Muhammad Muṣaddik made gains. The hostility of the Prime Minister, Gen. Ḥādīrz-Ali Ṣalāh-ud-Dīn, to the National Front’s proposal to nationalize oil brought about his assassination in March 1951 by a fanatical Fida’ī, Ḥallī Ṭahmābsī. Threats from the Fida’īyyan soon led to the resignation of the next prime minister, Ḥusayn ʿAlā, after which Muṣaddik became prime minister. Nawāb-Ī Šafawī was arrested in June 1951 and Muṣaddik and his government faced threats to their lives from the Fida’īyyan unless Ṭahmābsī and Šafawī were released. Ḥusayn Fāṭimī, a member of the government, was shot and wounded by a Fida’ī in February 1952. Influenced by fear and by the claim of Ḩāshāmī and his followers that Ṣalāh-ud-Dīn’s assassin was a hero, the Majlis voted to pardon Ṭahmābsī in August 1952. As threats from the Fida’īyyan continued, however, the Muṣaddik government moved against them and banished some of their members to Bandar ʿAbbās, an insalubrious port on the Persian Gulf.

After the overthrow of Muṣaddik the activity of the Fida’īyyan decreased, and for a time they restricted themselves to issuing occasional harsh statements against the new government. Then an abortive attempt on the life of the prime minister Ḥusayn ʿAlā in October 1955 gave the government a basis for prosecuting them. The arrested Fida’īyyan, among whom were Nawāb-Ī Šafawī, Ṣāḥibīdī and Ṭahmābsī, were executed and no more was heard from the group.

The Fida’īyyan had ties with the Iḥlāwī al-Muṣlimīn [q.v.] in ʿIrāq and Egypt, and like the Iḥlāwī as well as many politico-religious groups of the past they called each other “brethren”. In the Arab-Israeli dispute they gave vocal support to the Arab cause. Their members appear to have been primarily very young men with a limited and traditional education. They drew on traditional ideas of the sacredness of self-sacrifice and of using force in combating irreligion. Their programme was chimerical, but in appealing to real resentments and frustrations they had an influence beyond their small numbers, while the fear they instilled influenced the acts even of their opponents, particularly in the years 1951-3. Although defended and protected by
Kāshānī, they were not directly led by him and at least once differed with him. In support of these conflicting views alleged sayings of the Prophet are eating purposes was condemned by Muslim tradition. Kunst Persiens unter den Buyiden, ZDMG, Die during the Buwayhid regime (cf. E. Kühnel, op. cit., 6 Schwei
gergetSource(521,335)zerische Zeitschrift du VHP au X (N. F. xxxi) (1956), 83 ff.), although their use for jewellery, metalwork and decorative incrustation were absorbed by trading regions of Eastern and exploitation of silver ore (cf. D. M. Dunlop, Sources of the mint in Cairo, BSOAS, xv (1953), 429). Its economic importance arose from the fact that silver, along with gold, constituted the basis for the official Muslim coinage (see Dirham). Under normal economic circumstances the value of silver, as against gold, was established at 10:1, which ratio underlay the legal principle of the exchange rate between the silver and gold coinage (cf. C. Cahen, Problems of currency in Islam, in: iEO, x (1952), 338). During the mediaeval period the needs of Near Eastern markets were adequately met by silver supplies of local provenance. Although mediaeval sources refer to many mining areas, the argentiferous districts of Khurasan and Trans-oxania were particularly famous for an intensive exploitation of silver ore (cf. D. M. Dunlop, Sources of the 8th Century A.D., in: Stud. Isl., viii (1957), 29-49; S. Bolin, Mohammed, Charlemagne and Ruric, in: Scandinavian Economic History Review, i/1 (1953), 19-23). Near Eastern silver resources seem to have been rich enough to afford an export of this metal to Europe. This was particularly true in the course of the 4th/10th century, when large quantities of Near Eastern silver in the shape of Muslim dirhams were absorbed by trading regions of Eastern and Northern Europe. (For different viewpoints on the significance of the circulation of Near Eastern silver in the Middle Ages, see S. Bolin, op. cit.; R. P. Blake, The circulation of the musulim East down to the Mongol epoch, in: Harvard Journal of A

As in the pre-Islamic period, silver was used in jewellery, metalwork and decorative incrustation (R. Harari, Metalwork after the early Islamic period, in: Survey of Persian Art, iii, 1476-529). Luxurious silver vessels were also in demand, particularly during the Buwayhid regime (cf. E. Kühnel, Die Kunst Persiens unter den Buwayden, ZDMG, cvi, 1 (N. F. xxxi) (1956), 83 ff.), although their use for eating purposes was condemned by Muslim tradition. Silver attracted the attention of Muslim alche-
mists who referred to it by a number of different names, e.g., the moon, mother, servant (cf. E. Wiedemann, Beiträge zur Gesch. der Naturwissenschaften, xxiv, 182; A. Siggrg, Decknamen in der arabischen alchemistischen Literatur, Berlin 1951). Albeit accepting the theory of transmutation of metals (cf. G. Sarton, Introduction to the history of science, ii, 2, 1045) Muslim alchemists were well acquainted with various chemical processes aiming at the extraction and refining of silver (E. J. Holmyard, The makers of chemistry, Oxford 1934, 77; D. M. Dunlop, op. cit., 46-8; A. S. Ehrenkreutz, Extracts from the technical manual on the Ayyubid mint in Cairo, in: BSOAS, xv (1953), 429). Finally, silver was used in Muslim medicine. It was applied in the form of filings which, when mixed with drugs, were effective against melancholy, palpitation of the heart, and similar afflictions (cf. Ibn al-Baytārī, ed. Leclerc, Notices et extraits, iii, 36). See also dāl al-barāb; metalwork; sikkah.

FIDJAR "sacred glowing"; ḥarb al-fidjar "the sacredious war" is the name of a war waged towards the end of the 6th century A.D. during the holy months between the Kuraysh and Kināna on the one side and the Kays-Áyān (without the Qatāfān) on the other. There were on this occasion eight days of fighting, the first three of which were passed together as the first three wars—were mere brawls. Of real importance was only the second (or, according to the second reckoning, fourth) war which lasted four years. It started when during the holy season ʿUrwa al-Rahbāl of the Banū ʿAmir b. ʿSaʿašaʾa, whilst escorting a caravan of al-Nurāmān III (eigend name, ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān) al-Harrān, was treacherously murdered by al-Barrād b. Kays al-Dāmāl al-Kināni. The patron of al-Barrād, Ḥarb b. Unayya, was at that time together with other chieftains of the Kuraysh at ʿUkāz. As soon as they heard of this misdeed, the Kuraysh and Kināna started for Mecca; they were overtaken by the pursuing Hawāzin and attacked at Nahjā, but the night enabled them to reach the sacred territory. This yaum Nahjā is generally counted as the first battle-day of the second Fidjar war, but sometimes added as the fourth day to the first war. A year later both parties—but without the Banū Kaš and Kilāb of the ʿAmir b. ʿSaʿašaʾa—not again at ʿShamā (v.i. ʿShamā) near ʿUkāz and the Hawāzin were victorious (yaum ʿShamā). The same happened next year at ʿUkāz (yaum al-ʿAbīb). It was only in the following year that the Kuraysh and Kināna carried the day (yaum ʿUkāz or yaum ʿShamār). A fifth engagement on the Ḥarrān near ʿUkāz (yaum al-Hurayya) resulted again in the victory of the Hawāzin. After this there were only some skirmishes and then peace was restored. Of the many poems which according to Wākidī (opus. Ibn Sād i/3, 81, 1) were composed about this war only a few verses have come down to us.

Whilst it is admitted that the Prophet was present at the Fidjar war, there is much controversy about the particulars. Some say that he took part in the fighting, and that at ʿShamā, where the Kuraysh were defeated, he was praised for his courage (Aghānī, xix, 75, 2). Others maintained that he only supplied his uncles with arrows (e.g., Ibn Ḥighām, l/7, 105; 177, 1, 1); but experts on the al-Arab knew that none of his uncles except al-Zubayr took part (Aghānī, xix, 81, 1). In support of these conflicting views alleged sayings of the Prophet are
adduced. Also the years given for his age range from 14 to 28 (Aghdnt, xix, 75, 1-3).

The Fidjar war was waged for four years in the holy season, when in normal times trade was flourishing unhampered by tribal feuds; it involved two great confederations including townsfolk of Mecca and al-Ta'hi, and it even gave its name to an era. The real aim of it was the control of the trade routes in the Nagid and consequently the benefit of the great gains which this trade offered. In this great contest the Kuraysh were leading; they procured the weapons for their confederates and defrayed all expenses. Amongst their opponents the Thakif together with the Banu Naṣr b. Mu'awiya offered the hardest resistance but had finally to give in and, worn out by years of war, left the victory to the Kuraysh.

**Bibliography:** Ibn Hisham, 171-9; Ibn Sa'd, ii, 80-2; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih, Fird (1316 H.), ii, 77-80; Aghdnt, xix, 73-32; Ya’kobi, i, 146; Mas'udi, Muradî, iv, 120, 125, 150 H.; idem, Tanbih, 208 f.; Bakri, Muqâm s.v. U'kaz; Suhayli, al-Rawd al-Uwaisi, i, 120; Yâkût, iii, 579 s.v. Zallâl; Ibn al-AhÎr, i, 439-45; Miyârîbarkî, Tarîh al-Khamîs (1302 H.), i, 288 f., 293; Halabi, Insan al-Uyûn (1308 H.), i, 137 ff. (with Zaynî Dahnîn's Sirah on the margin p. 105); Echeilho, L’islam, p. 34, 12; Sachau; Ch. Lyall, L’Islam et le Wâdî de la Médine, ii, 302-5; H. Lammens, La cité arabe de Téof à la veille de l’Hégire (= MUB viii, 4) 240/98; idem, Le Mecca à la veille de l’Hégire (= MUB ix, 3) 326/230; A. M. Watti, Muhammad at Mecca, 14 f. (J. W. Fock)

**FIDYA,** (which becomes, according to the area concerned, fadu, fado, fadwa and even fâlî) is a general designation among Syro-Palestinians for a blood sacrifice made for purposes of atonement. From this point of view, its meaning is close to that of dâhiyya. Indeed, in the Negeb and other parts of former Palestine, these two terms are sometimes used to designate one and the same thing. In fact, however, while the dâhiyya is essentially an offering used to the dead made on the occasion of ‘âd al-qubî, the fâlî is used in the interests of the living, without any limitation of time. It is offered up before Allah for the delivery of a man, his family, his cattle and his goods, from some imminent misfortune, such as an epidemic. See also HADJDJ.


(J. Cheliod)

**FIEF** (see DIâmil, IQTA', TIMAR).

**FIGHAÎ (BABA),** pseudonym of a celebrated Persian poet whose patronymic, like his first name, is unknown. He was a native of Shirâz where he started by helping his brother, a cutter by trade, and it was on that account that he first took the pseudonym Sakkaki when he began to write poetry. In his youth, which was spent at Shirâz, he lived a life of debauchery, and then made a journey to Herât where he became acquainted with the great poet Dîamlî, but his poetry was not appreciated by the poets of Khurâsân. From there he went to Aqhar-baydijân, to the court of sultan Ya’kub (884-96/1479-91), the Ak-Koyunlu dynasty, one of the greatest patrons of the age. At this prince's court in Tabriz he received every favour, and his protector called him Bâbâ-ye Sâ'îrâr (father of poets). There he continued with his life of debauchery, recklessly spending everything that he earned. While he was accompanying his patron on one of his campaigns, the manuscript of his diwân together with his baggage was looted. He wrote to his brother and asked him for a copy of the poems which he had left in his native town, and made a new selection. On sultan Ya’kub’s death he left Tabriz, after spending more than seventeen years there; he went to Shirâz and then to Khurâsân, living in the towns of Nasâ' and Abîward and following the same life. At the end of his life he repented and went to live in Mashhad, where he took to a life of devotion and died in 925/1519. Fighâî is one of the best lyric poets of his time and his ghâsals were highly esteemed by poets, who continued to imitate him until the 17th century. His diwân includes in particular some ghâsals and certain bâsîdân especially dedicated to the Shâh timâns. Ten of his ghâsals have been published by Bland in his “Century” (34-37). The Iranian scholar Husayn Azâd published a French translation of some of his poems under the title Les poésies de Baba Fighâni, traduites pour la première fois du persan avec une introduction et des notes par Hocéïne-Asad, Paris 1903. There are two editions of the Persian text of his ghâsals:

2. Diwân-‘âlî Baba Fighâni-ye Shirâzi with emendations by Suhayli Khânsârî, Tehran 1316 s.


(Said Naficy)

**FIGHÂNÎ, pseudonym of RAMÂDÂN (7-9/398/1332), Ottoman poet. Very little is known of his early life, except that he was a native of Trabzon and that after spending some years in the caravan trade he became a minor clerk in government offices in Istanbul, where together with his fellow-poets and boon-companions he frequented taverns and places of amusement, leading an irregular and dissolute life. He seems to have lived in near poverty and without proper patronage, in spite of the poems which he dedicated to the great. We are told of his extraordinary memory where he stored enormous amounts of Arabic and Persian verse and all his own compositions. At the start of a very promising poetic career he met a sudden and tragic end: a Persian epigram which he wrote (or which was attributed to him) subtly attacked the Grand Vizier Ibrâhîm Pâsha for the statues which he had brought from Budin and had erected in front of his palace in the Hippodrome: “Two Ibrahîms came to this world: one destroyed pagans, the other erected them”, and the unfortunate poet was hanged after an ignominious parade.

His ghâsals and bâsîdân are scattered in various mescâmâs and unmistakably show a great talent that was liberating itself from the influence of Persian models and his Ottoman predecessors. Most telhîre-writers agree that his bâsîdân in particular are outstanding.

**Bibliography:** The telhîres of Sehi, Latîfî, ‘Ashik Celebi, Râyâdî, Khûnsârî Hasan Celebi, Kâf-zâde, s.v.; Gibb. Ottoman Poetry, iii, 34 ff.;
Although the region has certainly been inhabited for a long time, as is proved by the rock engravings, the name Fadjidj appears only in the 8th/14th century. Ibn Khaldūn (Hist., i, 240) speaks of its being active and ruled by the Banū Sīdī al-Mulkī, a family of the Matghāra of the group of Banū Fātīm. These used to form the greater part of the population of Sidjīlīmās, a caravaneers’ market and capital of Taffālīt, then already waning in importance, and to whose position as a meeting-point of caravan tracks Figuig perhaps succeeded. In the 16th century, Leo Africanus (435) praises the fineness of the woolen stuffs woven by its women, the intelligence, commercial vigour and culture of its men; in the seventeenth century, al-‘Ayāqī draws attention to the flourishing condition and richness of its libraries (Voyage, tr. Berbrugger, 159). Figuig seems always to have been an independent territory, thanks to its isolated position. The expedition which Mawly Sulaymān undertook in 1809, like that of the powerful Mawly Isma‘īl, the end of the seventeenth century, was never followed up. Nevertheless, when the French began the conquest of Algeria, the Convention of Lālā-Maghnya (18 March 1845) left Figuig to Morocco. It was the refuge of the Awlād Sīdī Shaykh who rose against France from 1864 on, of the adventurer, Bū ‘Amānā, and the pillaging Zegdu. In 1883, the Sultan Mawly Ḥassān installed a representative there, who had, however, neither authority. Even after the Franco-Moroccan agreement of 1902 the Sultan was unable to command obedience in this region, and a column of French soldiers accompanying Jonnart, the governor-general of Algeria, to Beni-Ounif was attacked on 30 May 1903; a military counter-action forced the djemā’as of Zenāga to surrender the criminals and hostages. There were no more outbreaks and Figuig came with Morocco under the French Protectorate and was incorporated into the administration of the Makhzen.

The disappearance of the slave-trade and of commerce across the Sahara and the arrival of the railway between Oran and Colomb-Béchar, which had reached Beni-Ounif by 1905, contributed to the economic decline of Figuig. Moreover the region was often at war with her neighbours, especially those who set the two principal ksars, al-‘Awدلghir and Zenāga, against each other over the possession of ‘Ayn Thaddert, and also those which divided the two Hāmmām. The walls of the ksar were for protection against neighbours as much as nomads, and watch-towers still overlook the gardens. The Marabout families have continually done their utmost to keep or restore the peace.

Although so isolated and cut up into ksars, Figuig does not ever appear to have enjoyed political unity. Each ksar has traditionally its djemā’as of administrative subdivisions which bring together the heads of families, and also its own djemā’a made up of elected notables which judges according to its khánīmās (not very differently from one ksar to another). In matters of civil law, the khádī judged according to the khár and also the ‘ārīm of the powerful Figuig has been re-united with Morocco, the meetings of the djemā’a of the ksar are presided over by the representative of the king of Morocco and the khádī is nominated by the Makhzen. The people are at the same time pious and superstitious and are fervent adepts of brotherhoods (Tayyibiyya, Kerzāziyya, Zayyānīyya, Nṣirīyya, etc.). Habous (māfy) properties are numerous but their purpose is above all to deprive women of the right of succession. Sīdī ‘Abd al-Kādīr Muhammad, patron saint of Figuig, has his khāba to the north-east of al-Hammām.


FIHL (see FASL)

AL-FIHRI, Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm b. Abī l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Ahmad, composed in 632/1234 an anthology of the works of Spanish stylists and poets of the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries entitled Kanz al-
huttāb wa-muntakhab al-ādāb (see H. Krafft, Die ar., pers. und türk. Fäls. der k. k. orient. Akademie zu Wien, Vienna 1824, no. 147). (C. Brockelmann)

FIKH (A.), originally “understanding, knowledge, intelligence”, and applied to any branch of knowledge (as in fikh al-lughah, the science of lexicography), has become the technical term for jurisprudence, and in its widest sense covers all aspects of religious, political and civil life. In addition to the laws regulating ritual and religious observances (ibdād), containing orders and prohibitions, it includes the whole field of family law, the law of inheritance, of property and of contracts and obligations, in a word provisions for all the legal questions that arise in social life (muamallāt); it also includes criminal law and procedure, and finally constitutional law and laws regulating the administration of the state and the conduct of war.

All aspects of public and private life and business should be regulated by laws based on religion; the science of these laws is fikh.

In older theological language the word did not have this comprehensive meaning; it was rather used in opposition to ‘ilm. While the latter denotes, beside the Kur’ān and its interpretation, the accurate knowledge of the legal decisions handed down from the Prophet and his Companions (Ibn Sa’d, ii/2, 127, 17; ai-rīwāyat wa l-‘ilm, as synonyms), the term fikh is applied to the independent exercise of the intelligence, the decision of legal points by one’s own judgment in the absence or ignorance of a traditional ruling bearing on the case in question. The result of such independent consideration is ra’y (opinion, opinio prudencium), with which it is also sometimes used synonymously. In this sense ‘ilm and fikh are regarded as distinct qualities of the theologian (Nawawi, Tadhīb, ed. Wüstefeld, 703, 3); also fikh wa-rīwāya (Ibn Sa’d, v, 327, 7). The sum total of all wisdom is defined by Mudjahid (in explanation of Sūra ii, 269: man yuHa ‘l-frikma) with which fuftahd* wa-‘ulama*, i.e., those who were authorities on the transmission of hadith and āthār as well as those who were authorities on fikh and competent to give (independent) decisions, fatwād (ibd., ii/3, 126). Abū Thawr was abād ‘al-‘imām al-dunyā fikh wa-‘lim* (Dhahābī, Tabaḥāt al-buḥfas, vi, 106).

In the earliest period of the development of Islam the authorities entrusted with the administration of justice and the control of religious life had in most cases to fall back on the exercise of their own ra’y owing to the scarcity of legislative material in the Kur’ān and the dearth of ancient precedents. This was regarded as a matter of course by every-one, although they were naturally very pleased if the verdict could as far as possible be based on ‘ilm. When ‘Ata’ b. Abī Rabīḥ (d. 114/732) was giving a judgment, he was asked: “Is this ‘ilm or ra’y?” If it was founded on a precedent (athār), he said it was ‘ilm (Ibn Sa’d, v, 345). The ra’y was not, however, thereby discredited. It was considered an equally legitimate factor in the decision of a point of law and its results were destined in the near future to be regarded as the decisions of old authorities and in later times to be actually considered an element of ‘ilm. From the very beginning one could have recourse to it as soon as ‘ilm failed. According to an old story which certainly reflects the conditions of the Umayyad period, although it does not actually date from the time in which its scene is laid, Mu’awiyah finally applied to Zayd b. Thābit on a legal question, on which neither he nor other Companions to whom he propounded it could quote any ancient evidence (jalām yūgād ‘indah—or ‘indahum—fikh ‘ilm); the latter gave a verdict based on this own independent ra’y (Tabari, Taṣīr, ii, 250 ult., on Sūra ii, 228). The kūfan of Egypt asked the advice of the Caliph ‘Umar II on a point not provided for in Tradition; the latter wrote to him: Nothing has reached me on this matter, therefore I leave the verdict to you to be given according to your opinion (bi-ra’yik) (Kindī, Governors and Judges of Egypt, ed. Guest, 334; ed. Gottheil, 29) [cf. 1QTHRĀD].

This recognition of ra’y [q.v.] as an approved source of law found expression in the instructions attributed to the Prophet to the municipal governors in Egypt, in which they gave to the officials sent to administer justice in the conquered provinces, and in their alleged approval of the principles of their decisions which the judges whom they had sent out submitted to them (Goldziher, Zähirsien, 8 ff.; cf. Ibn al-Ṭāhir, Usd al-ghaṣba, i, 341; Mubarrad, Kāmil, 9 ff.; Ibn Kutayba, ‘Uyun al-ākhbār, 8). In the more elaborate versions of these reports which were developed from their original, rudimentary forms we find already mentioned explicitly the principle of deduction from decisions of similar cases (aṣbāh, nasār‘ir; cf. ‘Uyun al-ākhbār, 72), i.e., the use of analogy (biyāda, [q.v.]) as a methodological regulator of ra’y. In the investigation of the ʿišāt al-ṣāḥar, the motive of law (ratio legis), and the resulting reduction of doubtful cases to a rational point of view, we find this principle given systematic validity. At the same time—there is evidence of it at a very early period—a kind of popular element entered the number of constitutive sources for the deduction of laws: the conception of the general usage of the community (summa, [q.v.]) which had been established by general agreement or consensus (īgīma, [q.v.]) in wider circles of believers, independent of written (i.e., Kur’ānic), traditional or derived law.

This usage contained an appreciable amount of foreign elements. It was only natural that the
legal, commercial, and administrative practices which prevailed in the conquered provinces should have survived under Islam, just as ancient Arab legal and commercial practices had survived, and should have been adopted by the Muslims as far as they were compatible with the demands of the new religious ideas. That the retention of pre-Islamic legal institutions was the normal procedure is shown by a passage in Baladhuri: "Abū Yūsuf held that if there exists in a country an ancient, non-Arab summa which Islam has neither changed nor abolished, and people complain to the Calif that it causes them hardship, he is not entitled to change it; but Mālik and Shafi‘i held that he may change it even if it be ancient, because he ought to prohibit (in similar circumstances) any valid summa which has been introduced by a Muslim, let alone those introduced by unbelievers" (Futūh, 448). In this way, elements from Roman Byzantine (including Roman provincial) law, Talmudic law, the canon law of the Eastern churches, and Persian Sasanian law entered Islamic law during its formative period. The influence of Talmudic law manifested itself above all in matters of ritual and worship. Influences of Persian Sasanian law (and of the canon law of the Eastern churches) have been established in a few individual cases, but their full extent remains to be investigated. In the case of Roman law, the influence was extended not only to rules and institutions of positive law, but to legal concepts and maxims, to methods of reasoning (biyās, and conclusions a materiae ad minus and a minore ad maius), and even to fundamental ideas of legal science; for instance, the highly organized concept of the consensus of the scholars as formulated by the ancient schools of Hellenistic rhetoric had made the rationalism of the sources of legal knowledge, methodological principles from which legal rules might be legitimately derived [see USUL], the terms fiqh and jihāda gradually lost their original limitation to deductions not based on tradition. Fīkh came to mean the science which co-ordinated and included all the branches of knowledge derived from the four roots; similarly those who were masters of this science were called jihādī, i.e., jurists. Or fiqh was used for the result of deduction from the sources of positive law, the sum total of the deductions derived from them, e.g., wa-fi hādha 'l-haddīf durūd min al-fīkh (Mubarrad, Kāmil, 529, cf. WZKM, iii, 84). The Arabic sources contain numerous reports about scholars who arranged the 'ilm or summa in chapters and then deduced the fīkh inferences (Muh. Stud., ii, 211). Of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak it is said: dawān al-'ilm fi 'l-fidaw wa-'l-fīkh (Dhahabi, Tabākhat al-shufā, 21, 250); of Abū Thawr: sunna al-kutub wa-sarfā 'ala 'l-sunan (ibid., ii, 95). Little value can be attached to the statement ascribed to Ḥašām b. Uwra that many kutub fīkh of his father's perished in the flames on the day of the battle of the Harra (Biographien, ed. Fischer, 41). At that ancient period (Uwra died in 94/712, the so-called 'year of the jihādī', when many jihādīs died: Ibn Sā'īd, vi, 135) it seems improbable that Kutub still existed; the report can therefore refer, at the utmost, to rough notes only. We might also mention the statement that Zuhri's fatwās were collected in three, Ḥasan al-Bāṣrī's in seven books (asfār) arranged in the order of the ābdwāl al-fīkh (Ibn Kayyim al-Dhawāziyya, Ilām, i, 25).

In a still wider meaning, fīkh was used for religious science in general (al-Kurān wa 'l-fīkh al-Fihā in opposition to the study of poetry: Aghānī, vii, 55, 43; layasa bihim raghba fi 'l-āml wa-l raghba fi 'l-fīkh: Musnaz of Ahmad b. Hanbal, i, 155; cf. also the titles al-Fīkh al-Aḥbar and al-Fīkh al-Abat and the text of these treaties, on which see abū Manīfa). Fīkhāda was correspondingly applied to students of religion, theologians (not only students of law) e.g., Tābilī, Tāfirī, xii, 73, 78, 74; 'Abū sa‘īd ibn mādahkhiṇ (Ibn Kayyim, Al-Fihā, xii, 73), where Abū 'Ubayd al-Kāsim b. Sallām says with reference to an explanation by Abū 'Ubayda Ma‘mar of a word in the Kurān contrary to the traditional explanation: al-siyyāhā a‘īm bi ‘l-tawīl minhu, ‘the fīkhāda are more conversant with exegesis than he' (who is not a theologian but only a philologist); cf. also Ẕāhirīn, 19, 1 (I. Goldzimer/J. Schachter).

The traditional opinion of the Muslim scholars projects the origins of Islamic jurisprudence back into the generation of the Companions of the Prophet. According to it, the Caliphs of Medina and a few specialists in religious law among the Companions started to draw conclusions from the Kurān and the words and acts of the Prophet as they remembered them or as they had been reported to them, by independent reasoning; their conclusions were approved, explicitly or silently, by the other Companions and became thereby binding on the community; their Successors continued this activity and the generation following the Successors saw the foundation of the schools of religious law.

Recent historical research, however, has shown that Islamic jurisprudence came into being towards the end of the first century of the hiḍra (early 8th century, A.D.). During the last third of the 1st/2nd century, Islamic law, in the technical meaning of the term, and therefore Islamic juris-
prudence, did not as yet exist. As had been the case in the time of the Prophet, law as such fell outside the sphere of religion, and so far as there were no religious or moral objections to specific transactions or modes of behaviour, the technical aspects of law were a matter of indifference to the Muslims. Not only did Arab customary law, as modified and completed by the Kurān, survive to a considerable extent, but the Muslims did not hesitate to adopt the legal, commercial and administrative institutions and practices of the conquered territories, and even legal concepts and maxims, as far as they were compatible with the demands of the new religious ideas (see above). As supreme rulers and administrators, the Caliphs of Medina acted to a great extent as the lawgivers of the community, and they were followed in this by the Umayyad Caliphs and their governors; during the whole of the first century of Islam, the administrative and legislative activities of the Islamic government cannot be separated. The Umayyad governors also appointed the first kādīs who by their decisions laid the foundations of what was to become Islamic law. They gave judgment according to their own discretion or “sound opinion” (ra'y), basing themselves on customary practice and on administrative regulations, and taking the letter and the spirit of the law into account. Subsequent developments brought it about that the part played by the earliest kādīs in laying the foundations of Islamic law was not recognized by Islamic jurisprudence.

Towards the end of the first century of the hījra (early 8th century A.D.) only we encounter the first specialists in religious law whose activity can be regarded as historical, such as Ibn Hāthim al-Nakha'i in Kūfa, and Sa'd b. al-Musayyib and his contemporaries in Medina. They were pious persons whose interest in religion caused them to survey, either individually or in discussion with like-minded friends, all fields of contemporary activities, including the field of law, from an Islamic angle, to impregnate the sphere of law with religious and ethical ideas, and to urge upon the communities (ra'y, istihsān, iṣlāh; q.v.) the ideal practice of the local community and the

a considerable body of common doctrine but the essentials of a legal theory the central idea of which was that of the “living tradition of the school”. This idea dominated the development of Islamic jurisprudence during the whole of the 2nd/8th century. Retrospectively, it appears as sunna or “practice” (amal), i.e., the ideal practice, the practice as it ought to be, or “well-established precedent” (sunna mādiyya) or “ancient practice” (amr kadim). Synchronously, it is represented by the consensus (ijmā'1, al-amr al-mudjama'1 sālih), the common doctrine of the majesty of the representative religious scholars of each centre (cf. above). Originally, the living tradition of the ancient schools was anonymous; it was the average opinion of their representatives that counted, and not the individual doctrines of the most prominent scholars. From the first decades of the 2nd/8th century onwards, however, it began to be projected backwards and to be ascribed to some of the great figures of the past. The earliest specialists, such as Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'i, had not done more than give opinions on questions of ritual and perhaps on kindred problems of directly religious concern, cases of conscience concerning alms-tax, marriage, divorce, and the like, and technical points of law appeared only at the stage of doctrine represented by the teaching of Hāmid b. Abī Sulaymān al-Kūfī al-Madhar. This teaching, which found particular favour in Irāk, scholars used to put their own doctrines under the aegis of their masters. In this way, the main contents of the Kitāb al-Āthār of Abū Yūsuf and of the Kitāb al-Āthār of Shaybānī represent themselves as having been derived from Abū Ḥanīfah, “from” (amr) Hāmid, “from” (amr) Ibrāhīm. The Medinean followed suit, and projected their own teaching back to a number of ancient authorities who had died in the last years of the first or in the very first years of the second century, seven of whom were later singled out to form the group of the so-called “seven lawyers of Medina” (fukhād al-Madīna al-sab'a): Sa'd b. al-Musayyib, Umary b. Zubayr, Abī Bakr b. Abī al-Rahmān, Ubayd Allāh b. Abī Allāh b. ʿUthma, Khālid b. Sa'd b. Sa'd b. Dār biʿr, Yaṣār, and al-Kāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr). The transmission of legal doctrine in Hījāz becomes ascertainable at about the same time as in Irāk, with Zubrī (q.v.); d. 124/742) and his younger contemporary Rābi'a b. ʿAbī al-Rahmān for Medina, and with ʿAtā' b. Abī Rabāḥ for Mecca. At the same time at which the doctrine of the school of Kūfa was retrospectively attributed to Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'i, a similar body of doctrine was directly connected with the very beginnings of Islam in Kūfa by being attributed to Ibn Masʿūd (q.v.), a Companion of the Prophet who had come to live in that city, and Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'i became the main transmitter of that body of doctrine, too. In the same way, another Companion of the Prophet, Ibn ʿAbbās (q.v.), became the eponym of the school of Mecca, and the school of Medina claimed as its main authorities among the Companions of the Prophet the caliph ʿUmar (q.v.) and his son, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar. One further step in the search for a solid theoretical foundation of the doctrine of the ancient schools was taken in Irāk, very early in the second century of Islam, by transferring the term “sunna of the Prophet” from its political and theological into a legal context and identifying it with the sunna, the ideal practice of the local community and the corresponding doctrine of its scholars. This term, which was taken over by the school of Syria,
expressed the axiom that the practice of the Muslims continued the practice of the Prophet, but did not yet imply the existence of positive information in the form of "traditions" (hadith) that the Prophet by his words or acts had in fact originated or approved that practice.

It was not long before there arose movements of opposition to the opinions held by the majorities in the ancient schools. In Kūfah, where Ibn Mas'ūd had become the eponym of the school, the doctrines which were put forward in opposition to it and which do not cohere the condescending teaching of any one group were regularly attributed to the caliph ʿAll (q.v.), who had made Kūfah his headquarters, not indeed on account of any Shiʿi bias, which is absent from them, but because the name of ʿAll represented an authority equal to and possibly even higher than that of Ibn Mas'ūd. These opinions generally did not prevail in the school of Kūfah, but in Medina the corresponding doctrines succeeded in gaining recognition to a considerable extent. In contrast with the opposition in Kūfah, the opposition in Medina already reflected the activity of the Traditionists. The movement of the Traditionists (ahl al-hadith, [q.v.]) is the most important single event in the history of Islamic jurisprudence in the second century of the hijra; it opposed to the "living tradition" of the ancient schools, which was to a great extent based on raʾy, the authority of individual traditions (hadith, [q.v.]) from the Prophet which his adherents put into circulation in ever increasing numbers. According to the traditionists, fiqh had to be based exclusively on traditions from the Prophet, whom they reported as having said: "Luck to the man who hears my words, remembers them, guards them and hands them on; many a transmitter of fiqh is no fiqhi himself, and many a one transmits fiqhi to a person who is a better fiqhi than he is!" (Shāfiʿī, Risāla, 55, 65). Traditionists existed in all great centres of Islam, where they formed groups in opposition to, but nevertheless in contact with, the local schools of law, and the polemics between them and the ancient schools occupied much of the religious controversy. But the ancient schools had no real defence against the rising tide of traditions; they had to express their own doctrines in traditions which allegedly went back to the Prophet and to take increasing notice of the traditions produced by their opponents, and finally the outlines and many details of Islamic jurisprudence were cast into the form of traditions from the Prophet. Later Muslim scholars, who in the nature of things were unable to acknowledge such a fundamental change in the bases of Islamic legal thought, represented this struggle as a struggle between the aḥl al-hadith and the imaginary group of the asḥab al-raʿy ([q.v.]). The Traditionsists of the 3rd/9th century attacked the ʿIrāqians and the school of Abū Ḥanīfa with particular venom, and castigated their use of the formula araʾya yāta, "what do you think of . . . supposing . . . " as typical of the casuistry of the asḥab al-raʾy.

The literary productions of Islamic jurisprudence begin soon after the middle of the 2nd/8th century (the Madāʾīn al-fiqh attributed to the Shāfiʿī pretender Zayd b. ʿAll [q.v.], who died in 122/740, though of an early date, is not authentic; cf. Bergsträsser, in OLZ, 1922, 114-24; Strothmann, in ISL, xiii (1923), 27-40, 49), and from then onwards its development can be followed step by step from scholar to scholar. For ʿIrāk, and Kūfah in particular, successive stages are represented, after Ḥammād (d. 120/738; see above), by the doctrines of Ibn ʿAbī Laylā ([q.v.]; d. 148/765), of Abū Ḥanīfa ([q.v.]; d. 150/767), of Abū Yūsuf ([q.v.]; d. 182/798), and of Shabīb ([q.v.]; d. 185/809) respectively. Outside the line of doctrine represented by the ʿAshʿarīs, Abū Ḥamīd—ʿAṣkhārī stands another scholar of Kūfah, ʿUṣayn al-Ḥawārī ([q.v.]; d. 161/778); his doctrines are known to us through the Kitāb ʿIḥšāṣ al-fuḥahāʾ of Tabarī ([q.v.]; d. 310/923), which also contains information on other early lawyers. The Syrian Awaʾī ([q.v.]; d. 157/774) represents an archaic type of doctrine, which put us very near to the beginnings of Islamic jurisprudence. Mālik b. Anas ([q.v.]; d. 179/795) in his Muwattaʾ aimed at expounding the average doctrine of the school of Medina in his time. Much information on the opinions of Mālik himself, of his disciple Ibn al-ʿĀṣim ([q.v.]; d. 191/806), and of the older authorities of Medina is contained in the Mudawwana of Ṣaḥmūn ([q.v.]; d. 240/854).

Shāfiʿī ([q.v.]; d. 204/820) belonged originally to the school of Medina, but he accepted the thesis of the Traditionists on the overriding authority of the traditions from the Prophet, identifying their contents with the sunna, defended it in vigorous polemics with the followers of the ancient schools, elaborated on its basis a new body of doctrine by which he cut himself off from the continuity of doctrine in the ancient schools, and composed in his Risāla the first treatise on the method of legal reasoning, becoming thereby the founder of the science of usūl al-fiqh (see USUL). (In contrast with the usūl, the "roots" or sources of legal knowledge, the body of positive rules derived from them is called furiʿ, plural of furʿ, "branches"; the earliest existing work of pure furʿ, presented in a didactic manner, is Shabībīn al-ʿĀṣim. Shāfiʿī's writings, which to a great extent are cast in the form of dialogues with unnamed opponents and most of which were brought together by his disciples in a collection which received the name of Kitāb al-Umm, are an important source for the history of Islamic jurisprudence in the second century. Shāfiʿī was not a mere Traditionist; on the contrary, he deplored the relaxation of their faulty reasoning, and himself excluded their reliance on traditions from the Prophet by systematic legal thought (ʾaḥl, matḥal) of exceptionally high quality, excluding raʾy and istiḥsān and insisting on strict biyās. It happened, however, that some of his disciples, and in particular Ahmad b. Ḥanbal ([q.v.]; d. 241/855), emphasized the traditionist element in his doctrine and derived their legal teaching exclusively from traditions, avoiding human reasoning as far as possible. This avoidance of drawing conclusions was erected into a principle by Dāwūd b. Khalaf ([q.v.]; d. 270/884), called al-ʿZāhirī because he relied exclusively on the literal meaning (ẓāhir) of Ḥarām and Ḥadīṣ and rejected not only raʾy and istiḥsān but reasoning by biyās as well.

About the middle of the 2nd/8th century, groups or circles within the ancient schools of law began to form themselves round individual masters, such as the "followers of Abū Ḥanīfa" within the school of Kūfah, and the "followers of Mālik" within the school of Medina. Several factors favoured this process, and by the middle of the 3rd/9th century the ancient schools of law had transformed themselves into "personal" schools, which perpetuated not the living tradition of a city but the doctrine of a master and of his disciples. In this way, the bulk of the ancient school of Kūfah transformed itself
into the school of the Ḥanafīs, another group of scholars into the school of Sufyan al-Thawri, the ancient school of Medina into the school of the Mālikīs, and the ancient school of Syria into that of Awzāwī. Although Shāfiʿī had disclaimed any intention of founding a school, his disciples, being neither mere Traditionists nor members of another school, became his personal followers, and the doctrinal movement started by him has always been known as the Shāfiʿī school. The school of legal thought originated by Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, too, became known as the school of the Ḥanbalis; this school never absorbed its parent movement, that of the Traditionists, as completely as the Ḥanafī and Mālikī schools absorbed theirs. The followers of Dāwūd b. Khalaf al-Zāhirī formed the only school of law whose name, Zāhirīyya [q.v.], is derived from a principle of legal theory. These and some other later schools of law (such as a short-lived one founded by Ṭabarī) are called madhhabī (pl. of madhhab, "way of thinking, persuasion"). Since about 700/1300 four of them only have survived in orthodox Islam, the Ḥanafī, Mālikī, Shāfiʿī and Ḥanbali schools (cf. Ḥanābilī, Ḥanafīyya, Mālikīyya, Shāfiʿīyya); they are regarded, and regard one another, as alternative and equally valid interpretations of the religious law of Islam. Notwithstanding their divergent doctrinal roots, the orthodox scholars share a common legal theory (cf. usūl), which asserted itself in the 3rd/9th century, and which accepted Shāfiʿī's (and the Traditionists') principle of the overriding authority of the traditions from the Prophet as the only evidence of sunna but subordinated its practical application to the consensus of the scholars. The theory of the usūl al-fikhl is therefore of little direct importance for the positive doctrines of the schools of law. From the middle of the 3rd/9th century, too, the idea began to gain ground that only the great scholars of the past had the right to independent reasoning in law (idīthkād [q.v.]), and in the 4th/th century a consensus gradually established itself in orthodox Islam to the effect that all future activity would have to be confined to the explanation, application, and strengthening of the usūl. This is why the doctrine of the fātahān, or the omission of tashuq, had to be laid down once and for all (tāḥīd [q.v.]). This implied the obligation to join one of the existing schools. Even under the rule of tāḥīd, Islamic jurisprudence did not lack manifestations of original thought in which the several schools competed with and influenced one another. But this original thought could express itself freely in nothing more than abstract systematic constructions which affected neither the established doctrine of positive law nor the theory of the usūl al-fikhl. New sets of facts, too, constantly arose in life, and they had to be decided by the specialists with the traditional tools of legal science; such a decision is called fatwa [q.v.], and the scholar who gives a fatwa is called muftī. Once recognized as correct by the common opinion of the scholars, the decisions of the muftis became part of the doctrine of each school. The activity of the muftis is essentially of the same kind, though carried out against a different background, as that of the first specialists in religious law.

The legal doctrines of the Khārijīs [q.v.] and of the Shīʿa [q.v.], which split from the orthodox or Sunni majority on political grounds about the middle of the first century of Islam (ca. 660 A.D.), differ from those of the Sunni in the question of the leadership of the community [see imām] and consequential questions of usūl, but on other questions they do not differ from those of the orthodox schools of law more widely than these last differ from one another. From this, it must not be concluded that the features common to Khārijīs, Shīʿa, and Sunni law are older than the schisms which split the Islamic community within its first century. For a considerable period, and during the 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries in particular, these ancient sects remained in a sufficiently close contact with the Sunnis for them to adopt the doctrines which were being developed in the orthodox schools of law, introducing only such superficial modifications as were required by their particular political and dogmatic tenets. Certain doctrines which in themselves were not necessarily either Shīʿa or Sunni became adventitiously distinctive for Shīʿa as against Sunni law.

When the Umayyads were overthrown by the ʿAbbāsids in 132/750, Islamic jurisprudence, though still in its formative period, had acquired its essential features. For reasons of dynastic policy, and in order to differentiate themselves from their predecessors, the ʿAbbāsids posed as the protagonists of Islam, recognized Islamic law as it was being taught by the pious specialists as the only legitimate norm in Islam, and set out to translate their doctrines into practice. They regularly attracted specialists in religious law to their court and made a point of consulting them on problems that might come within their competence. At the request of the Caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd, Abu Yusuf wrote his Kitāb al-Kharājī, a long treatise on public finance, taxation, criminal justice, and connected subjects. The ʿkādās, who under the Umayyads had been appointed by the governors, were now appointed by the caliph, they had to be specialists in religious law, and they had to apply nothing but the sacred Law, without interference from the government [see kāf]. But this effort to translate into practice the ideal doctrine which was being elaborated by the specialists, was short-lived. The early specialists who had formulated their doctrine not on the basis of but in a certain opposition to Umayyad popular and administrative practice had become adherents of reality, and now they had to yield. The ʿAbbāsids and their religious advisers were unable to carry the whole of society with them. The ʿkūdās, theoretically independent though they were, had to rely on the political authorities for the execution of their judgments, and, being bound by the formal rules of the Islamic law of evidence, their inability to deal with criminal cases became apparent, so that the administration of the greater part of criminal justice was taken over by the police (ṣūrta [q.v.]). The administrative "investigation of complaints" [see māzālim] very soon led to formal Courts of Complaints being set up, which by the very existence show the breakdown of a considerable part of the administration of civil justice by the ʿkūdās as well. [See also siyāsā.] In this way, a double administration of justice came into being, and it has prevailed in most Islamic countries, the competence of the ʿkūdās' tribunals being restricted to matters of family law, inheritance, and washā. [See maḥkāmah.]

This is one aspect of the tension between theory and practice (ṣūda, ʿurf [qq.v.]), between jurisprudence and customary law, which existed in Islamic law from its very beginnings. The most remarkable and, for a time, the most successful effort on the part of a state of high material civilization to bridge this gulf, was made in the Ottoman Empire [see ʿarb l-suʿūd, kānnūn-nāme, šaykh al-islām]. Islamic
jurisprudence, too, took notice of the practice which it could not overcome, and tried at least to control and regulate it in the works on *amal, on *muqaddasat, and on *shari'a, which form an important branch of its literary productions.

Until the early Abbasid period, Islamic jurisprudence had been adaptable and growing, but from then onwards it became increasingly rigid and set in its final mould. This essential rigidity helped it to maintain its stability over the centuries which saw the decay of the political institutions of Islam. Taken as a whole, it reflects and fits the social and economic conditions of the early Abbasid period. If it grew more and more out of touch with later developments of state and society, in the long run it gained more in power over the minds than it lost in control over the bodies of the Muslims. The *fikr is, in the words of Snouck Hurgronje, a "doctrine of duties", the interpretation of a religious ideal not by legislators but by scholars, and the recognized handbooks of the several schools are not "codes" in the Western meaning of the term. Islamic law is a "jurists' law" par excellence: Islamic jurisprudence did not grow out of an existing law, it itself created it. [See also *GAHARIA.]

In British India and in French Algeria, Islamic jurisprudence, being fused with Western legal thought, was a recipient of Fikr legislation, Fikr being the general formal principles which were elaborated by the early Islamic jurists. Both tendencies are inspired by the desire to put a new Islamic jurisprudence in the place of the old one. [See KANUN.


FIKR, pl. *afkār, thought, reflection. The Kur'ān employs the 2nd and 5th forms of the root *fbr, to urge men "to reflect". In the vocabulary of falsafa and *ilm al-halām, the *masdar *fikhr denotes the intellectual faculty in the act of thought, reflecting upon an object of intelligibility. It is distinguished from *idrāk, the intellectual faculty of grasping, of perception. The result of the operation of *fikhr is expressed by the noun of unity *fikra.

In tasawwuf, *fikhr is used habitually in contrast to *dhikr [q.v.], recollection. *Fikhr can thus be translated by reflection or meditation. In the performance of *fikhr the *Ṣūfī, concentrating upon a religious subject, meditates according to a certain progression of ideas or a series of evocations which he assimilates and experiences; in *dhikr, concentrating on the object *fikhr is recollected as a part of the *idrāk field of consciousness. But in the reply of Iblis upon an object of intellection, he allows his field of consciousness to lose itself in this object: hence the importance granted to the technique of repetition, at first verbal, later unspoken. The "meditations" of al-Ḥallāj on the "night-journey" and "ascension" (miʿraj) of the Prophet, or on the meeting of Moses and Iblis, can be taken as examples of *fikhr. Another instance of it will be found in the "scrutiny of conscience" (*khisb) advocated by al-Muḥāṣibī.

The problem of the respective merits of *fikhr and *dhikr confronted the *Ṣūfīs of the first centuries. Al-Ḥasan al-Ṭasawi argued that upon *fikhr is, he said, "the mirror which makes you see what good there is in you, and what evil". The Muʿtazila, the Karrāmiyya and the Imāmīyya taught that reflection must precede recourse to *sunnah, scriptural or traditional authority; hence, in their view, the superiority of *fikhr to *dhikr. Al-Ḥallāj, notes L. Massignon, "does not make a decision": he considers both methods to be legitimate, since both must lead to the Goal, but only on the condition that the "initiate" (ṣīḥ) should not cling to his approach as an end in itself. In a celebrated passage of his meditation on the miʿraj̱, he speaks of the "garden of *fikhr" which Muhammad visited "without deviating", and of the "process of *fikhr" which he followed without "passing beyond".

However, al-Ḥallāj also seems to have given his preference to *fikhr rather than *dhikr. Some of these texts follow this trend. But it is evident that in these texts *fikhr must not be rendered solely by "discursive meditation", the effort of the spirit following the human method of procedure, as distinct from the "passive" state of recollection in prayer. *Fikhr is clearly distinguished from *ḥads, just as reflection is distinguished from an intellectual flash of illumination or intuition. But in the reply of Iblis to Moses, the Kitāb al-Tawāsīn contrasts al-fikra (*"pure thought", following Massignon's translation) with *dhikr: "O Moses, pure thought (*fikra) has no need of recollection (*dhikr)". The fact is, al-Kalbāḏjī explains in commenting on a passage of al-Ḥallāj, that the passive *fikhr are recollected for the soul, while meditations (*afkār) guide the initiate towards the single divine majesty, the reverential
fear of God, His favours and His gifts. Dhikr appeals to the organs of the senses (the tongue, the physical heart), fikr purely to intellectual concentration. By means of dhikr and its rhythmical use of oral prayers the Şafi‘ is almost certain to succeed in attaining subjective spiritual “states” (akhūd); fikr tends to put him within the possibility of experiencing transcendent truths.

But in the event, it was the superiority of dhikr to fikr which was to be most generally affirmed. There was distrust of the illusions which the practice of fikr could engender: as early as the 3rd/9th century, Khaṭṭābī Nīsārī said that, “some, by force of ‘meditation’, claim to enjoy in this world the spiritual life of God, the angels and the prophets, and to feast with the jāhīr” (quoted and trans. Massignon); whilst dhikr, though appealing as it does to the organs of the senses, at least has the merit of depriving the spirit of everything other than the object recollected. Monographs were written on dhikr, its techniques and achievements, but not on fikr and its methods.

There remains the fact that the gnostic soarings of those who profess wakādat al-‘uṣūdīd (“Unity of Being”) can be regarded as deriving from a fikr in which the use of typified symbols replaced the “process” of discursive reasoning.


(L. Gardet)

Fikret, Teyfik [see Teyfik Fikret]

Fikrī, ‘Abd Allāh Pasqa, an Egyptian statesman, poet and prose-writer, regarded as one of the authors who have helped to give a simpler, more modern character to Arabic literary style. Born in 1250/1834 in Mecca where his father, an Egyptian officer, was serving, and later brought up in Cairo, he studied at al-‘Azhar and consorted with the Sūfis. From 1267/1851 he was an administrative official and attracted the attention of Khudive Isma‘īl who, in 1284/1866, chose him to teach Arabic and Persian and conducted his son’s Tawfik, Hasan and Husayn. His biographers reveal him to be a man of integrity, with sincere religious beliefs, and distinguished by his family’s piety (his paternal grandfather ‘Abd Allāh taught at al-‘Azhar). He often visited Istanbul on official missions. In 1870 he took part in founding the Khedivial library, as the subordinate of AH Pasha Mubarak C. In 1871 he was serving, and later brought up in Cairo, he studied at al-‘Azhar and consorted with the Sūfis.

After his death, his son ‘Amm Pasqa Fikri published a collection of his father’s poems, letters, etc. under the title al-Al‘īr al-Fikriyya, Cairo 1315, and a description of his father’s travels under the title al-Buld al-‘Arabī ilā misrādūn ilmūk, Cairo 1892. The list of his other writings is given in Brockelmann, II, 474 ff. and Suppl., and also in his biographies.

talks to it in an Indian language. It possesses a curious gift for imitation and has the ability to choose the best moment to wreak its vengeance. It takes to flight at the approach of the rhinoceros, which is thought to be able to lift it up with its horn; similarly, the lion utterly terrifies it, and the cat profits from its resemblance to the king of beasts, so much so that one way of effectively dealing with a lion containing war-elephants is, on their approach, to release a battery of cats which have been kept in readiness in sacks. Its worst enemy is, however, a small creature called the sobrah, which kills it by spraying it with its urine.

The Arab authors are aware that the elephant lives in Africa also, but in the wild state, and al-Mas'udi (Muradji, iii, 5-7) relates how the Zandj set about killing it and taking its tusks. Al-Dimaghj, for his part, gives details of the way in which a wild elephant is captured by trapping it in a pit; men wearing brightly coloured clothes maltreat it and strike it, but a trainer, dressed in white, drives them away and starts to tame the animal by giving it food; after a certain time the hunters return, and the same manoeuvre is repeated until the elephant has enough trust in the fayyds to allow itself to be ridden.

To judge by the tales of travellers, geographers and historians, the various Indian sovereigns used by tradition to keep a varying but very large number of elephants for ceremonial use and for war. With the body shielded by bands of iron and cork, and the trunk protected by a curved saber (kartal), each war-elephant was accompanied by 500 men who in turn preceded 5,000 horsemen. Ibn Battuta says that he had seen some trained for executions.

The existence of certain elephants in Irak is attested by the texts; thus, it was on a grey elephant offered by an Indian king to al-Ma'mun that al-Mu'tasim in 223/838 had his prisoner Babak (q.v.) carried to Samarra, before handing him over to the executioner; similarly, at about the same period, al-Dhahbi was able to see some for Baghdad, and he takes part in conversations in which the respective merits of the camel and the elephant were debated. In general, however, this animal remained purely an object of curiosity throughout the Muslim world west of India, with the possible exception of East and West Africa. On the other hand, ivory was well known and was used in the making of various articles (see 416).

When seen in a dream, the elephant generally presages some important business, it is capable of more varied and subtle interpretations.

**Bibliography:** Dihtr, Hawayn, index; Mas'udi, Muradji, index; Damiri, Hayat al-hayawun, s.v.; Kazwini, ed. Wustenhof, ii, 400; Dimaghj, ed. Methren, 156; Ibn Bata'la, ed. Defrémery and Sanguineti, iii, 330, 354, iv, 45; Ibn al-Baytrj, Traité des simples, ed. Leclerc, iii, 51; M. Perron, Nacér, ii, 404-17, 465-74; R. Mauny, Tableau géographique de l'Orient africain au moyen âge, Dakar 1961, 264-5.

(J. Ruska-Ch. Pellat)]

**As beasts of war.** The use in western Asia of elephants for war stems from India. They were used in the warfare described in the Mahabharata and their tactical use is discussed in Kautilya's Artakhadatra. From this treatise we learn certain facts which remain valid in the Indo-Persian world of the Islamic period: that elephants were regarded as a royal monopoly and private possession of them was forbidden, and that they might be provided with armour plating and have mounted on their backs archers, swordsmen and mace-bearers (cf. B. P. Sinha, The art of war in ancient India 600 B.C.-300 A.D., in Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale, iv, 1957, 132-6, and S. H. Hidivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, Bombay 1939, 139-40). From India, their use passed to Achaemenid Persia. Alexander the Great first met Persian elephants when he defeated Darius III at Arbela in 331 B.C.; the Greek rulers in Bactria used them; Seleucus I introduced them to Syria, and the later Seleucids used them against Rome.

The Sassanids regularly used war elephants (Mas'udi, Muradji, ii, 230; Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, 208). At Kadijsiyiya in 14635, the Persian general Rustum deployed thirty of them in his centre and on his wings, and their appearance spread terror amongst the Bedouins; the Arabs finally stopped them by cutting their girbs and dislodging the troop-laden howdahs, and also by attacking vulnerable parts like the eyes and trunks (Sir W. Muir, The Califate, its rise, decline and fall, Edin- burgh 1915, 102 ff.). Despite new contacts with the Persian world, the military use of elephants did not spread during the Umayyad and early 'Abbâsid periods. They were imported into the Caliphal lands from the fringes of the Indian world, the Indus, Makrân and Sind (cf. Tabari, i, 2708, and Ibn al-Ajurir, vii, 89), but they were mainly used as stately mounts on ceremonial occasions; the Caliph al-Manşûr is said to have favoured them for this (Muradji, iii, 18-20). The Buwayhid 'Aqûd al-Dawla had a number of war elephants, fuyûl makâhî, which he used in battle, but it is not recorded that they played any significant part in the fighting (Miskawayh, Eclipse of the 'Abbasid Califate, ii, 368, tr. v, 402).

It was the Ghaznavids, the first Islamic dynasty whose empire spanned both the Persian and northern Indian worlds, who first used elephants in large numbers for military purposes and who first assigned them a definite place in their tactical theory. The next two centuries, the 5th/tenth and the 6th/eleventh, were the heyday of the elephant as a military weapon in the Islamic world. Sebûtqîtin and Mahmûd of Ghazna captured elephants in hundreds from the Indian princes. These beasts fell within the Sultan's fifth of plunder. Their use was jealously guarded by the Sultans and by their successors in northern India, the Ghorids and the Slave Kings of Delhi, and only as an exceptional mark of favour were they bestowed on great men of state. Armour plating was often placed over their heads and faces. In battle, they were usually placed in the front line; their metal accoutrements and ornaments were jangled to make a terrifying din, and they were then stampeded towards the enemy. This tactic was used with demoralizing effect on the Karakhânids in 398/1008 and 416/1025 (cf. C. E. Bosworth, Ghaznavid military organisation, in Der Islam, xxxvi (1960), 61-4, and M. Nâzîm, The life and times of Sultan Mahmûd of Ghazna, Cambridge 1931, 139).

Influenced by Ghaznavid practice, the sporadic use of elephants is recorded in the empire of the Great Saljuqs from the time of Berk-yâruk onwards, especially in Khurasan and the east. At the battle outside Ghazna in 310/1116-17, Sandjar's Saljuq troops were initially thrown into confusion by the sight of the fifty elephants of the Ghaznavid Arslân Şâh, but they dealt with the beasts by ripping open the soft under-belly of the leading elephant and
stamping it back into its own camp (Bosworth, op. cit., 64). When Sangjar defeated his nephew Mughammad b. Mughammad at Siwa in 513/1121, he had in his forces forty elephants with troops mounted on them (Ibn al-Djawal, al-Manasad, ix, 205; Ibn al-Athir, x, 387). The Ghurids used elephants in their warfare with the Kh'azirim Shàhs, and beasts captured from the Ghurids were used by 'Ala' al-Din Mughammad for the defence of Samarqand against the Mongols in 617/1220 (Diuiwany, tr. Boyle, i, 117, 322-3). Although the Kara Khitai used elephants captured from the Kh'azirim Shàh for their assault on Balsàghân, the use in war of these slow-moving and cumbersome beasts did not commend itself to the swift-moving Mongol cavalrymen. After he had taken Samarqand, Cingiz Khàn refused to allot fodder for the elephants captured there, and they were turned out in the steppe to die of hunger (Diuiwany, tr. Boyle, i, 290, 360).

Outside Muslim India, elephants never thereafter regained their popularity as tactical weapons of war, although they were still used in the Persian world for ceremonial occasions.

Bibliography (in addition to the references given above): B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit, 492-3; C. E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids: their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040, Edinburgh 1963, 115-18. (C. E. Bosworth) Iconography. The earliest known representation of an elephant in Islamic art is the so-called Elephant Silk, perhaps from Khuràsân, which was originally in the church at St. Josse-sur-Mer, Pas-de-Calais, and is now in the Louvre. In company with other decorative motifs, it shows elephants in yellow confronting each other which have been reproduced in terms of inlay. The colours are a deep purple for the ground, with clear blue and tan which may have once been red. Each elephant bears elaborate trappings and a saddle-cloth. Although the colours are sumptuous enough, the design of this piece of silk is rather crude. The Kufic inscription in yellow below the two elephants mentions the name of Abu 'l-Mansûr Bahgît-efnî, an Amir of Khurâsân whose death took place in 997. Part of a similar elephant pattern is found on a fragment of silk at Siegburg which is of uncertain date. The treatment is again very stylised, the elephant having an excessively thin trunk and jointed legs. Met (Renaissance, 437: English trans., 465) mentions that elephant designs were used in the decoration of carpets made at Hira. In this connexion some fragments of a carpet bearing an elephant's head are now in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs at Paris.

Elephants appear only very rarely in Islamic metal work. Some bronze incense-burners, supported by small figures of elephants, are known. In the Pennsylvania Museum of Art is a panel from Rayy showing a king seated on a throne which rests on the backs of elephants. This may possibly represent Toghrîl (d. 590/1193-4).

Several early examples are known of the elephant in its role as one of the pieces in the game of chess. These ivory chessmen can be paralleled by a small ivory casket from Cordova are in the Victoria and Albert Museum. A panel on one of these represents a person of rank travelling in state upon an elephant. This bears the date 359/969-70. Another, which is probably early 9th/11th century, has a number of circular panels each bearing a pair of different animals facing each other. One panel contains elephants with bushy tails upon the backs of which peacocks are resting.

In contrast to most of the elephants mentioned above, those depicted on Islamic pottery are more faithfully drawn. Examples are fairly numerous, the majority showing a king with two or more attendants riding in an elaborate howdah. This may represent Bahram Gur's return from Sindh. One plate in the Possession Moussa is dated 616/1219-20. Others, with the same scene, are in the Freer Gallery at Washington, the Possession Rabenou and the Collection Allan Balch. These are mostly miniatures, some from Rayy, belonging to the first half of the 7th/11th century. A spotted elephant with rich caparison appears on a star-shaped basin in a Kâşân lustre ware. Other ceramic objects of artistic merit with elephants are a basin from Amul with some Chinese characteristics now in the Art Institute of Chicago, a bowl and a pitcher in the Louvre, and a plate in the Kelekian Collection which was formerly on exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum.

Copies of the Mânasîf al-khâ专业人士' (ib Bukhtubî who with their wealth of animal paintings provide us with several pictures of elephants in which an attempt has been made to show every detail. The older copies were made and illustrated in the 7th/13th century. A bluish elephant with gilded saddle and a trunk composed of a series of loops (Pl. xx) appears in a British Museum manuscript of this work (OR. 2704, f. 136v). Another, better known, is the famous Elephant in a manuscript illustrated towards the end of the 7th/13th century for GÂhân Khàn at Marâgha which is now in the Morgan Library at New York. The two elephants, each adorned with gold circlets bearing bells around their trunks, are barely able to bear the weight of animal paintings which give us an accurate representation of an elephant encountered.

The best sources of elephant miniatures are the illustrated copies of the Shâh-name of Firdawsi. Scenes like Rustam killing the White Elephant or lassoing the Kâshân of Çin, the death of Tâhland (Pl. xxii), and Iskandar's battle with Fûr have all provided much scope for the portrayal of elephants, ranging from exact drawings to figures of somewhat bizarre appearance, like those in mediaeval bestiaries (e.g. B.M. MS. Harl. 3244 f. 39r°). In some Shâh-name illustrations the heroes bear the device of an elephant on their banners. Other literary themes in which elephants appear—but rather less frequently—are the story in the Mathnawî of Rûmi of the elephant who trampled to death the travellers who had eaten his call (Pl. xxii), the 'Aâdîb al-mahdîhât of Kâzêmîn, and the Court of Solomon (Sulàmûn) where an elephant sometimes appears among the animals grouped around the throne with angels and djinn.
The earliest appearance of an elephant in the Islamic art of India is probably an ivory chessman bearing an Arabic inscription on its base in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale. This piece was reputed to have been sent by Hārūn al-Rashīd to Charlemagne, and certainly formed part of the Treasure of St. Denis as early as 1505. The elephant is shown in battle, unhorning an enemy rider. On its back a king sits in a howdah, the exterior of which is fashioned in the form of a wall, guarded by soldiers with swords and round bucklers. Although some authorities have dated it much earlier, the latest study suggests that it was made in Gudjarāt in the 8th/14th or 9th/15th century. Two stone elephants which were discovered in the Red Fort of Dihili now flank one of the doorways. It is thought that they were made in the reign of Akbar.

With the flowering of Mughal painting which began during this period, elephants appear with increasing frequency. Several of the finest examples from the artistic point of view are in the Akhbar-nama at the Victoria and Albert Museum. One shows Akbar crossing a river mounted on an elephant. A painting of the reign of Dīghāṅḍrī depicts elephants fighting and is in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

Even though elephant heads are found in one of the Fāṭiḥ Albums at Istanbul, these have been proved by Ettinhausen to be Timurid work of the 9th/15th century. One example is known of a very life-like elephant's head as a gold marginal ornament in a British Museum manuscript (OR. 2708) which was apparently painted during the third quarter of the 10th/16th century. Otherwise most of the relatively few Ottoman drawings of elephants resemble more or less that upon which Sitt Khātun, the wife of Meḥmemmed (Muhammad) II, is seated in a Byzantine miniature now in the Bibliotheca Marciana at Venice. This elephant is closely akin to those depicted in mediaeval Western manuscripts. A very similar elephant is to be seen in the Hūmūyūn-nāme of 'Alī Celebi (B.M. ADD. 15153, f. 385v, dated 997/1589) illustrating the story of King Hilar of India.

In the field of sculpture, there is a stone slab at Konya showing an elephant being pursued by a griffin. This was built into the wall of the Saldjukid citadel, dating from the early part of the 10th/16th century.

Bibliography: Survey of Persian Art, iii, 2002-3; pl. 186, 60a, 603, 671, 692a-b, 758b; G. Wiet, L'exposition d'art persan, Cairo 1935, pl. 28; E. Rüknel, Islamische Kleinkunst, Berlin 1925, 194; J. Beckwith, Caskets from Cordoba, London, H.M.S.O., 1960, 29, pl. 19. See the article 'Alī, pl. 2, fig. 2; B. Gray and D. Barrett, The painting of India, Lausanne 1963, pl. 91; Ajit Ghosh, Some old Indian ivories, in Rupam, No. 32 (Oct. 1927); Oriental Art (New Series) ii/2 (1955), 51; T. Arnold and A. Guillaume (edd.), The legacy of Islam, Oxford 1937, 134 and fig. 43. (G. M. Meredith-Owens)

AL-FIL, is the title of the early Meccan Sūra cv which deals with God's judgment on the "men of the Elephant." This is an allusion to a story which must have been very familiar to the Meccan contemporaries of the Prophet; the background of the allusion is explained by the commentators and historians as follows. The Yemenite king Abraha [q.v.], bent on a policy of destroying the power of the Meccan sanctuary, led an expedition against Mecca, hoping to destroy the Ka'ba, and the expeditionary troops were supported by an elephant (some versions say more than one). But on arriving at the frontier of Meccan territory, the elephant kneeled down and refused to advance further towards Mecca, although when his head was turned in any other direction he moved. Flights of birds then came and dropped stones on the invading troops, who all died. The authority of 'Ikrima [q.v.] is given for the rationalizing explanation that they were in fact smitten by an epidemic of smallpox. Abraha himself is said to have been afflicted with a loathsome disease and carried back to Yemen to die. For the student of Islam, the main relevance of the episode is that the birth of the Prophet is said to have taken place at this time, in the "year of the Elephant". And according to the commonly accepted chronology of the Prophet's life, this event would have to be dated in or around 570 A.D.

Not unnaturally, the South Arabian inscriptions contain no direct reference to this disaster. The possibilities involved are, however, illustrated by an earlier occasion described in the Murayghan inscription, Ryckmans 506. This records that while Abraha was campaigning in central Arabia against Ma'add, who were subject to the suzerainty of the kingdom of Hira, another part of the South Arabian army was operating in the Ḥijāz and inflicted a defeat on a tribal confederation of the ʿĀmir b. ʿAṣaʿa [q.v.] at the oasis of Turaba (approximately 100 km. due east of Taʾif). This is dated in 662 of the Sabean era, i.e., the late forties or early fifties of the sixth century A.D.; in any case it cannot be later than 554 A.D., since it mentions al-Mundhir (who was assassinated in that year) as king of Hira. How much later than this we can reasonably date the "year of the Elephant" is problematical. But the fairly substantial cluster of texts from the decade or so preceding the Murayghan inscription, coupled with the complete cessation of South Arabian records from shortly thereafter (our latest being a private text of 665 of the Sabean era), tend to suggest that it is somewhat unlikely that Abraha and his kingdom continued so to flourish as to be able to stage a full scale attack on Mecca, until so late as 570 A.D.

A striking proposal advanced by C. Conti Rossini (J.A., xi 660-74, 30-2) deserves a passing mention, although it has not been endorsed by general approval. This is that the story as we know it is a contamination of two records of South Arabian attacks on Mecca: that by Abraha, and a much earlier one led by the Aksumite king Afīlas, whom numismatic evidence assigns to around 300 A.D. It was at or shortly after this time that the kingdom of Aksūn did in fact exercise a short-lived hegemony over South Arabia, and a military enterprise further north is not impossible. Conti Rossini appeals to this event in order to suggest that a conflated story of this nature was the one known to the Prophet's contemporaries, and that al-fil in this context is a later corruption of the name Afīlas.

Bibliography: See the bibliography cited under ABRAHA.
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sufficiently established (see Arabica, iv, 14-5 and Traité, 23-4). Acquaintance with the latter would have given Arabic grammar a different organization, something like this part of speech referred to above, which in essence derive precisely from this Greek grammar through the intermediary of the Latin grammarians. Besides, a division which establishes the noun and the verb as the principal categories finds its justification in general linguistics (see Traité, § 53).

The Kitāb of Sibawayh (i, ch. I) starts with the exposition of this part of speech: ism, ḥarif. Its definition of the verb (a) on the one hand stresses the origin of the personal forms of the verb: amma 'lis-fāl fa-amthālat hadāthīt min lafṣ ʿabādāt al-ʿasmmā'; these are the forms 'taken from the word expressing the "happenings" of nouns' (the infinitives); this is already the Başrī theory of the infinitive-masdar, that is, the 'origin' of the verb; hadāth, pl. ʿabādāt (int. of hadathāt (wīl "to happen, take place") can be well translated by "happening", a meaning very close to the idea of "process"), used in modern general linguistics to define the verb; (b) on the other hand expresses the temporal value of the verb: buniyāt (they have been constructed) li-mā ʿammad (past), wa-li-mā yaḥkin wa-lam yabā (future), wa-mā huwa kābīn lam yankūt (present).

Thus, from the very start, so far as can be traced, a temporal attribute is attributed to the verb as something self-evident, requiring no justification. We have here the indication that this was an accepted doctrine, accepted as something established, and not the fruit of the personal investigations of the Arab grammarians; for the latter, always so ready to explain or legitimize everything, would have advanced. Weil). But the whole grammatical tradition challenged by grammarians of the Kufa tradition (see Arabica, iv, 25). The theory of the infinitive-masdar has been challenged by grammarians of the Kūfīa tradition (Ibn al-Anbārī, K. al-ʿAfnādī, disputed question no. 28, ed. Weil). But the whole grammatical tradition teaches the temporal value of the verb, regarding this as the feature that distinguishes it from the noun (ism) (likewise Ibn Yaʿṣīfī, according to 26, l. 10-1, in spite of what is said later).

The definition given by the Mufṣājāl of al-Zamakhsharī is clear: al-fāl mā dalla ʿalā ʿktirān hadāth bi-ṣamān muhaṣṣāl (§ 402) "the verb that is indicates the connexion of an event with a [determined] time"; for the noun (ism), the contrary (§ 2).

Ibn Yaʿṣīfī blames the vagueness of mā: for a strict definition by closest genus and specific difference, he requires a more precise word, kalima or lāfṣa (912, l. 2). As for muhaṣṣāl, put by us in brackets as a reminder of the insistence of certain writers (according to 911, l. 6), on the need to distinguish the infinitive from the personal forms of the verb, Ibn Yaʿṣīfī states that this is needless: the masdar is clearly enough distinguished in itself; it too is verb but it expresses time in another way (min ḥārīṣ, min lauḏasmīh): see 911, l. 8-13.

He also finds fault, in the definition, with the predominance allowed to the connexion with time in regard to ḥādāth. This is to say that things are the ḥādāth and the time of its existence (911, l. 9), but the verb was not established to indicate this very connexion: it indicates a hadāth in connexion, the latter comes secondarily, wa-l-ṣūriʿun waḏidā tabāṭān (912, l. 5-6). However, Ibn al-Ḥāfizī, Ibn al-Kūfī, in the Sharḥ al-Kūfī, li-waḥ, l. 23, had said: al-fāl mā dalla ʿalā mānā fī naṣīh muṭrān bi-ḥaḏ al-ʿasmmā al-thālīḥa, without mentioning hadāth; and at Astarābdīhī repeats: kull ism fa-huwa ghaẓr muṭrān, kull fāl fa-huwa muṭrān (ibid., l. 26 and 30), "a noun of any kind has no connexion [with time]"; "a verb of any kind connects the connexion [with time]".

The present results spontaneously from the absence of this mark, e.g.: li-matābki "Why are you weeping?"
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For the past, a distinction must be made: the accomplished gives the tense of the narrative for historical accounts; the verb then expresses the past tense, corresponding to the French passé simple. But this mode is also the accomplished form, and the language possesses only this one single form for historic narrative and conversation, according to the distinction formulated by E. Benveniste (Les relations de temps dans le verbe français, in BSL, liv/1 (1959), 69-82). It often indicates something resulting; it may be merely a resultative or a simple accompaniment without any temporal value. It therefore cannot be called purely and simply a tense, a mǎdi (see Esquisse, 85-8; Études, 3: Temps et aspect, 170-7). The examples quoted can be examined in the light of the above distinction (published only in 1959), and the part played by the phrase and the verbal indicators will be noted.

As to the division of the verb, Arab grammarians teach: ma'allām-majdīl = known/unknown; this referring to the agent. In fact, the Arabic verb falls into two divisions: the verb with agent (the subject being considered as the agent) and the verb of quality (the subject being simply the thing qualified). The verb with agent is subdivided:

a) agent pure and simple: fā'ala yaf'īlula, like daraba (i) "to strike", yaf'ala (u) "a simple verb", fā'ila yaf'īlula, like rubība (a) "to gain", sakīra (a) "to get drunk". This category includes part of fā'ila.

b) agent unknown: fā'ila yaf'ali, like duriba, rubība.

Agentive is a good term for the first two as opposed to the third: the majdīl, to turn to the Arabic designation for lack of an appropriate English term. While referring to the second specifically, one can use the term "verb with interested agent".

The verb of quality (or qualitative verb) includes the whole form of fā'ila yaf'īlula (with two exceptions), e.g.: karuma (u) "to become generous" and fā'ila yaf'īlula, like karuma (u) "to become old".

The verb of quality is not static. It signifies: "to acquire a quality", or "to become such and such" (according to the quality in question), karuma "to become harīm (generous)"; or else as a consequence of the acquisition: "to have a quality", or "to be such and such", it is a resultative, karuma "to become harīm (generous)".

The majdīl is the verb whose agent is not known or, if known, unexpressed and cannot be expressed: it is the fi'hui lam yassumā fā'īlul, according to the expression of Muf. (116, l. 5). If it is used with a person as the subject, e.g., duriba Zayd, from the fact that Zayd is the subject of the verb, attention is concentrated on him, the idea of enduring takes shape to some extent; it may predominate and in that case we are led to translate by a passive: "Zayd was beaten", instead of "One has beaten Zayd", which would have revealed that the agent was unknown. This is to be judged according to the context. But none of the less the Arabic verb remains the majdīl. It cannot be coupled with "a complement of a passive verb", contrarily to its morphological character. One sees how deceptive it is to call fā'īla "passive".

The impersonal verb exists in classical Arabic, although the Arabic grammarians have not always recognized it; it exists, it can be constructed on any transitive indirect verb with agent (this being very widely interpreted, see the examples, Esquisse, 160), giving it the form of majdīl which remains invariable in the 3rd person singular. This is the impersonal majdīl, which provides the perfect example of the "verb whose agent is unknown". With the personal verb we can say: kharadīn min al-dār "I left the house", nazalitū 'alā Amr "I went down to 'Amr's"; in the impersonal, khurrajīn min al-dār, musalā 'alā Amr: "they went out of the house", "they went down to 'Amr". These verbs are often difficult to translate exactly, because for each of them we need to find the corresponding impersonal expression; in its absence "they" is used, as in the preceding examples.

Some verbs have come to the point of acquiring an impersonal usage without taking the form of the majdīl: kafā, badā, rūba, habba (see Brockelmann, Grundriss, ii, 124-5; A. Spitaler, mā rā'ā-hū illā bi-transparent verbandes, in Sertia Monacensis, Leiden 1952, 171-83); an example: wa-kafā bi 'llāh gāhdīn (Kūr'an, IV, 81-79), "it suffices with Allah as witness".

Arab grammarians have recognized a djiḏiḏ or ghiyar mutassāriif verb, like karim, nīma, laya, as opposed to the mutassāriif verb which possesses all its verbal forms: majdīl, etc. or nominative-verbal forms: n. ag., etc. (Dict. of T. T., 1143, l. 7-9). But these numerous derived forms have one thing in common, their different parts are not all used, and their usage is limited.

The verb presents contrasts: on the one side, great simplicity, on the other side complexity. Simplicity: in personal moods only two verbal forms, one accomplished, one unaccomplished, which are sufficient to give an opposition of aspect, the one active (1st person), the other passive (2nd person): one conjugation, "the common conjugation" (Esquisse, 80-5), which employs the same prefixes or suffixes for verbs of all kinds, triliteral and derived forms, quadriliteral and derived forms, variations resulting from phonetic accidents arising from the combination of these prefixes or suffixes with the verbal root. The simplicity of the internal flexion of vowels which, by an interplay of contrasts between the three vowels a, i, u, characterizes the verb in its divisions agentive/majdīl, not only in the simple triliteral or quadriliteral verb in all derived forms for every agent verb; moreover, the simplicity of the external flexion of vowels which determines the moods: yaf'ul-a (indicative), yaf'ul-a (subjunctive), yaf'ul (jussive). Complexity: the multitude of derived forms: 14 for the triliteral verb, 3 for the quadriliteral verb; the multitude of forms of the infinitive or noun of action for the simple triliteral verb: Wright (Ar. Gr., 11-2) lists 44 of them, either rare or common. But these numerous derived forms have one advantage: they allow one to express synthetically notions which, in French, must be enunciated separately in accordance with its analytical character, e.g.: farrasa "to cause to be deceived" (a prey), farrasa "to allow his flock to be devoured" (shepherd), taddārābī "they fought each other", etc. They con-
tribute considerably to the synthetic character of the Arabic language.

Affective language expresses itself through the Arabic verb. Briefly, we may mention the 2nd fathâla intensive form and the 5th lafaâla which is correlative to it; the so-called "rare" forms, with gemination (12th form) or repetition (12th and 13th forms), a procedure that was abandoned; quadriliteral formations, especially by repetition of a biliteral element (type 1212) (Esquisse, 102-3).

In addition, the energetic.

The energetic forms a part of the "common conjugation". It is formed by the suffix -amna or -amma, most often used, added to the unaccomplished in its jussive (or apocopated) form and to the imperative. It gives a vigorous expression to a personal feeling: conviction in an affirmation or negation, astonishment or impatience in interrogation. It is used especially to express an act of will: an order, prohibition, threat, promise, wish.

After an oath the energetic always occurs (if one uses the unaccomplished form, and in addition the corroboration lam (examples, Wright, ii, 42A).


(F. H. Fleisch)

Fi'tl, pl. afâlî, actuation, act, and sometimes the result of an act, that is to say effectuation, effect. From its current usage in Arabic, this word very quickly became a technical term (isfâlî), not only in grammar but also in falsafa and in 'ilm al-kalâm.

If 'amal (q.v.) designates the realms of 'doing' and 'acting' (whence 'work', human acts, and moral action), and thus has at least in its last meaning an ethical connotation, fi'tl refers above all to noetic and ontological values: the fact of actuating, of passing (or causing to pass) to the performance of an act. Hence the translation by R. Blachêre of Kurân, xxii, 73: 'et Nous leur révélâmes la réalisation des bonnes œuvres' (fi'tl al-hâyâlî). It should be noted that the distinction between 'amal and fi'tl often becomes less marked: akhâlah wa-afâlî, 'human mores and actions', says Ibn Sînâ, for instance, (Âbsâm, 107), in order to define ethics.

Falsafa.

Fi'tl belongs to the language of logic and noetics.

(a) In logic it is one of the ten categories, actio opposed to passio, infi'sâlî. It is worth mentioning here that the suppleness of its verbal forms allows Arabic to emphasize the connexion, at the same time opposed and complementary, of the mahdâl pair, action and passio. It is forming the verb root, fi'tl, in the first active form and in the seventh passive. In consequence, the active element is al-fâlî and the passive element, al-munfaîtî. This use of fi'tl and its derivations may be found over and over again in all treatises on logic, both in the philosophical introductions of the al-'ilm al-kalâm and also in falsafa.

(b) In noetics and metaphysics, the complementary opposition is no longer fi'tl-infisâlî, but fi'tl-kâmawâ, act-potentiality (faculty, in posse). Potentiality, in so far as it is the principle of change and becoming, may be in its turn either 'active' (fi'tlîyya) if it resides in the agent (fi'tlî), or passive (infisâlîyya) if it resides in the passive element (munfaîtî). The expression bi 'l-fistl, 'actually', which is used for every faculty of the human spirit, is of especially wide and well-known usage in noetics, where it is used to designate one of the states of the intellect, al-âsâb bi l-îsâfî, the intellect in action or the active intellect, as distinguished from al-âsâb bi l-'ûwama, the intellect in posse, or potential intellect. Moreover, al-âsâb bi l-fâlî must be distinguished from al-âsâb al-fâlîŷî, the acting intelligence, i.e., continually in action, which is the last of the separate Intelligences and the same for all men. The âsâb bi l-fâlî, in becoming more and more actual, receives the illumination of the âsâb fâlî and becomes similar to it. The hierarchy of the intellects according to al-Kindî, al-Fârâbî, Ibn Sînâ and Ibn Rushd, and the differences of meanings applied to these terms by the several authors, is well-known. For the âsâb bi l-fâlî according to al-Fârâbî and Ibn Sînâ, see âsâkî; contrary to what is suggested by the Latin translations referred to by F. Rahman in this last article, it does not seem necessary to translate differently the meaning of al-âsâb bi l-fâlî according to al-Fârâbî (in effectus) and Ibn Sînâ (in actu). The real differences of thought between the two philosophers can perhaps best be expressed, whether in translation or in Arabic, by the use of an identical terminology. The ancient Latin translations, in fact, often prefer effectus for fi'tl, while the modern ones (such as that of Mgr. N. Carame) are more in favour of actu. The difference which can be noted between act (or action) and effect diminishes when we go back to the more specifically appropriate technical terms 'actuation' and 'effectuation'.

'Ilm al-Kalâm

The mutakallimûn use fi'tl and bi l-fâlî in the same sense as the falsîfî when they in their turn speak of the subjects of logic, noetics and metaphysics.

But the term, above all in its plural form, afâlî, comes up frequently when they discuss 'questions concerning God' (îhâyâtî). Fî'î then designates the action of God ad extra, 'what it is possible (not necessary) for God to do'. Thus al-Âsh'ârî writes in his Kitâb al-Luma': 'the fact that God wills a thing, signifies that He does it' (fâlîlahû; ed. McCarthy, Beirut 1953, 15-6; cf. English translation, 21).

Later on, the subject of the treatise concerning the effects of Divine Omnipotence ad extra is thus called afâlîhû ta'dilî, 'the Acts of God, the Most High'. It is essentially the problem of secondary causes (asâbî), the relations of God with mankind, the divine pre-determining decree (bodar and hadâd), and human free-will (îbâhîyyah). For the details of the problems dealt with, and the solutions of the various schools, see allâmî, 412 ff.

The treatise on afâlîhû ta'dilî is preceded by a treatise on the divine attributes, sjidât Allâmî. One of the subdivisions of this last is concerned with the sjidâf al-afâlî, the explanation of the 'attributes of action' and which refer to what God
may or may not do: visibility, creation, commandment, decree (loc. cit., 411). These discussions of the 'actions of God' do not supersede the normal usage of *fīl* and *afūl* to designate the act or the act of God. Sometimes almost as synonyms of *amal* and *anamal*, more often with the psychological and legal background meaning 'an act which must be performed', leaving to *amal* the wider background meaning of 'human behaviour in general'. Thus *fīl* is distinguished from *tarā* lack of action, action to be avoided. It is thus also that at the beginning of the Ḥikāya *wā‘ām al-dīn* (Cairo 1355/1355), i. 135), al-Ghazālī teaches that many under Law is, in order to guide his conduct (*amal*), under the obligation of knowing: the creed of the faith (*ištīḥād*), the act (al-*fīl*) which must be performed at a given moment (e.g., the times of prayer), and what it is obligatory not to perform (*tarāh*). These terms, moreover, are reminiscent of the vocabulary of *hadīth*, since the text of a *hadīth* relates a saying or an action or the absence of an action on the part of the Prophet.

**Bibliography:** Apart from the references given in this article, reference should be made to the well-known treatises and chapters of the great philosophers (a) on the categories, (b) on *šabī*; also the various treatises of *išām al-halām* (e.g., Falāhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, Muḥyay, Djiurdjānī, Sharīk al-Mawākiṭ, etc.), in the treatises Siṣāt Allāh and Asfālū hu taṣālī. (L. GARDET)

**FILĀHĀ, agriculture.**

Fālīk, the act of cleaving and cutting, when applied to the soil has the meaning of "to break up in order to cultivate", or "to plough". Fālūd *"ploughman", fīlāhī "ploughing". But from pre-Islamic times the word *filāh* has assumed a wider meaning to denote the occupation of husbandry, agriculture. In this sense it is synonymous with *sitāra*, to which the ancients preferred *filāh* (all the earlier writers called their works on agriculture Kitāb al-Filāhī). At the present time this latter word is very widely used in Northern Africa, both in official language and in everyday speech. Thus, in Morocco, the Ministry of Agriculture is called *sitārat al-filāh*, whilst in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and 'Irāk it is called *wistārat al-sitāra*. It is only since the last century that the word *sitāra* has taken precedence in official and literary circles in the Arab East; but the word *filāh* is still very widely used in the language of agricultural workers. The following articles will deal primarily with agricultural methods and techniques. (See further, for settlement and sedimentation, *iskān*; for irrigation, *kanāt, māz*; for land tenure, *ikṭā*; tenure of land, and the articles listed under ARD.)

1. — MIDDLE EAST

1. — Technical and historical survey. — Agriculture in the Arab countries is under the influence of two different types of climate: in the south of the Arabian peninsula (Yemen, Ḥaḍramawt and ʿUmān), and also in the Sudan, the Indian monsoon brings abundant rainfall in summer which enables various tropical plants to be cultivated (coffee, date-palms, custard-apples, mangoes, pawpaws, bananas, *catha edulis*, tamarinds etc.). Throughout the rest of the Arab world the mediterranean climate prevails. This climate is characterized by a cold wet winter season, followed by a long summer period which is hot and without rain. The further one goes from the Mediterranean coast the more the rainfall diminishes, until it ceases entirely in certain hot deserts in Arabia and the African Sahara. This basic climatic system divides the zones of Arab countries into two distinct categories; in the first, the extent and distribution of the rainfall favour the economic cultivation of zibbus crops. In the second category the winter rains, though not sufficient to allow of economic cultivation, nevertheless permit the natural growth of certain grasses and various succulent, bulbous and halophytes which constitute the pasturages of the desert steppes. In order to make use both of their agricultural land and of the steppes, the Arabs have at all times lived in two sorts of lives—a pastoral nomads.

Nomadism is a necessity in the desert steppes where the winter rainfall varies in extent between 50 and 150 mm., but the Bedouin tribes are not opposed to a sedentary existence. It is in this way that the Yemeni tribes, long before Islam, founded their civilization on irrigation and intensive cultivation of the land. After the Islamic conquests, the Arab tribes soon intermingled with Aramaeans from Syria and ʿIrāk, Copts from Egypt and Berbers from North Africa, and with the Ibero-Latin of the Spanish peninsula, in order to exploit together the vast territories of the present Arab countries and of former Muslim Andalusia.

The mediterranean climatic system being every-where the same, we find throughout these territories three agricultural climates. Firstly, in most of the coastal plains (the coasts of Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco), thanks to a mild winter temperature and an annual rainfall of from 500 to 1,000 mm., it is possible without irrigation to cultivate cereals, annual leguminous plants, various vegetables, tobacco, olives, in particular, and even cotton. With the help of irrigation, a vast number of annual and perennial agricultural crops can be successfully grown—citrus fruits, bananas, pomegranates, loquats, early vegetables, aromatic or ornamental plants, etc.

Secondly, in the plains, hills and inland plateaux of Syria, Upper Mesopotamia and North Africa, where the density of rainfall varies between 250 and 500 mm., dry-farming is the dominant system of cultivation for vast areas of non-irrigated land. Of the chief annual plants cultivated in these regions we may mention wheat, barley, sorghum, lentils, chick-peas, vetch, gherkins, melons, watermelons and sesame, while the principal fruiting trees and shrubs are olives, vines, figs, hazelnuts and pistachios. In these regions, irrigation is indispensable for the cultivation of most fruit trees, ornamental trees, vegetables, leguminous and industrial plants—apples, pears, apricots, peaches, eggplant, tomatoes, gumbo, artichokes, potatoes, luscene, clover, cotton, hemp, groundnuts, poppies, roses, jasmine, etc.

Thirdly, in regions with a desert climate (Lower Mesopotamia, central Arabia, Egypt, inland regions of Libya and North Africa) where rain is rare and the average annual temperature reaches or exceeds 21° C. it is only by means of irrigation that such plants as date-palms, mangoes, orange trees, cotton, rice, sugar-cane and others can be successfully cultivated.

During the Middle Ages, the Arabs were familiar with and cultivated most of the agricultural plants now known to the Arab world. It was they who introduced Seville oranges and lemons from India to ʿUmān, and thence to Baṣra, Egypt and the coast of Syria and Palestine (cf. al-Masʿūdī, *Muṣāṭī*, ii. 438, viii. 336). From Andalusia and Sicily they disseminated throughout the Mediterranean basin
the cultivation of cotton, sugar-cane, apricots, peaches, rice, carobs, water melons, eggplant, etc. (cf. De Candolle, L'Origine des plantes cultivées, Paris 1912). Moreover, the European names of many cultivated plants are of Arabic origin, that is to say borrowed directly or indirectly from words either purely Arabic or long Arabized.

2. — Works on agriculture. — The oldest Arabic work on agriculture which we know is al-Filha al-nabatiyya (Nabataean agriculture) of Ibn Wahabiyya (q.v.), written (or translated from the Nabataean) in 291/904. A little later there appeared a work entitled al-Filha al-rumiyya (Greek or Byzantine agriculture). This book, published in Cairo in 1293/1876, bears the names of Kusís al-Rumí as author and of Sarçís b. Hilyá al-Rumí as translator from Greek into Arabic. According to Hadídí Khalífa (Kádí al-panúní, ii, 1447), the author's full name was Kusís b. Askúrákína, and we think that this is the name of Cassianus Bassus to whom agronomic works collected from Greek and Latin authors are attributed. Hadídí Khalífa names three other translators of this book, one of them being said to be Kusís b. Lúká (q.v.). From another source we know that the agronomic work of Anatolius of Berytos (4th century A.D.) had been translated into Syriac by Sarçís Rásáín (d. 536 A.D.), and there is reason to believe that this text was also translated subsequently into Arabic and that no manuscripts of it have survived (cf. BIE, xiii, 47). In any case, in the two Arabic works that we know (al-Filha al-nabatiyya and al-Filha al-rumiyya), we find a reasonable knowledge of agricultural practice, side by side with superstitious advice.

In Egypt, the best presentation of agricultural questions at the time of the Ayyúbids is to be found in a work of Ibn Mammáf (d. 606/1209), entitled Kádmí al-dawdáwí (published) book entitled Mabdhídi al-fikar wa-

3. — Legislation relating to land. — The Arabic language is rich in agricultural terms, particularly in relation to date-palms, vines, cereals and desert plants (cf. the Mukhásas of Ibn Sída), and the imagination of the poets of antiquity has endowed it with a vast and original literature on the nature of plants and their connexions with human beings. Not only flowers (roses, narcissi, jasmine, violets, pinks, irises, anemones, etc.) and fruit (dates, apricots, apples, pears, pomegranates, jububes, Neapolitan medlars, quinces, Seville oranges, lemons, etc.) but also a great quantity of cereals, legumes, vegetables and wild plants of the fields, pasturages and prairies are mentioned or described in verse.

4. — Legislation relating to land. — The code on landed property (Kínán al-arádi) and the civil code (al-Mádáila), which were in force in the Arab countries that were separated from the Ottoman Empire after the 1914–8 war, are based on Muslim law (shári'a) and Arab jurisprudence. (fikh). The Madáila divides land into five categories: ard mamíká, land to which there is a right of ownership; ard amíriyya, land to which the original title (rababa) belongs to the State, while its exploitation (tasarruf) can be conceded to individuals (this is the case with most agricultural land); ard márúká, land placed at the disposal of corporate bodies; and lastly ard masálá, waste land, defined as free land, situated away from inhabited areas and out of ear-shot of houses. For details see TENURE OF LAND.

The Madáila also defines and codifies questions relating to metayage (muúsíra), leases for orchard-planting (muúsádá), the repair and clearing of communal watercourses used for irrigation, reclamation of waste land (tákáí al-mamúsí), the enclosure (harím) of wells and subterranean watercourses (banaúsí), etc.

At the present time, the land laws of most of the Arab States, while incorporating substantial improvements, still uphold the principles respecting either the distinction between categories (and sub-categories) of land, or else their legal status and the rights based on them.

According to Muslim jurisprudence, it is the duty
of the State to construct and maintain dams, and also to excavate and clear the main irrigation channels. In former times, this work was carried out either directly by the governors of provinces or by holders of fiefs. The history of the Umayyads and also of the repairing of several ancient dams on the Tigris, Euphrates, Khabur, Orontes and Barada.


**Mustafa al-Shihabi**

**ii. — Muslim West**

So far as we know at present, it was exclusively in the Iberian peninsula, the home of the celebrated Latin agronomist Junius Columella of Gades/Cadiz, that an agricultural literature in the Arabic language was created and developed, particularly during the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries, in the brilliant period of the satraps 5ih/12th and 6th/12th centuries, in the brilliant period of the satraps.

The principal centres of this literature were Cordova, Toledo, Seville, Granada and, to a lesser extent, Almeria. In Cordova the great doctor Abu‘l-Kásím al-Zahráwí, who died in 404/1010, known as Albuscasis in the Middle Ages, is reputed to be the author of a Compendium on agronomy (Maḫbás or kīdāb al-filāḥa) which Professors H. Fértés has recently discovered and intends to publish. In Toledo, at the court of the renowned al-Ma’mún [q.v.], the great “garden lover”, lived the celebrated doctor Ibn Wāfīd (d. 467/1073) known as Aben-guefith in the Middle Ages. He also recounts his personal experiences in al-Sharaf. There he became acquainted with the physician Abu ‘l-Khayr al-Iṣhābili, who wrote a new royal garden.

In Toledo, at the court of the renowned al-Ma’āmūn [q.v.], the great “garden lover”, lived the celebrated doctor Ibn Wāfīd (d. 467/1073) known as Aben-guefith in the Middle Ages. He also recounts his personal experiences in al-Sharaf. There he became acquainted with the physician Abu ‘l-Khayr al-Iṣhābili, who wrote a new royal garden. In Toledo, al-Ma’mūn created his royal botanical garden (Dīnānat al-sulţān). Among other works, he wrote a treatise (maḏmīn) on agronomy which was translated into Castilian in the Middle Ages. Another inhabitant of Toledo, Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm Ibn Baṣṣāl, devoted himself exclusively to agronomy. He performed the regular pilgrimage, travelling via Sicily and Egypt, and brought back many botanical and agronomic notes from the East. He also was in the service of al-Ma’mūn, for whom he wrote a lengthy treatise on agronomy (dīmān al-filāḥa); this work was subsequently abridged into one volume with sixteen chapters (bāb), with the title Kitāb al-Kād wa l-bayyin “Concision and clarity”. This work, which was translated into Castilian in the Middle Ages, was published in 1535 with a modern Castilian introduction. The treatise by Ibn Baṣṣāl is singular in that it contains no reference to earlier agronomists; it appears to be based exclusively on the personal experiences of the author, who is revealed as the most original and objective of all the Hispano-Arabic specialists.

The name of this writer’s father has not been established conclusively. Writers who quote from him give the name with or without the definite article; the initial bā is sometimes replaced by fā (subpunctuated in Maqrizi orthography), or the fā by ū. Traditionally, the form Baṣṣāl/Baṣṣāl seems to be the most probable, but it is not certain that it is a name with any etymological connection with baṣṣāl “onions”. It might be a Romance diminutive in -el of the adjective bāzolbāzo (Castilian base), “brown”, a name borne by several Muslims in Spain; and Baṣṣāl then would be synonymous with the well-attested name of Mawrī.

Towards the end of the 6th/12th century or in the first half of the 7th/13th century (the capture of Seville by the Christians took place in 464/1268),
Abū Zakariyyā Yahyā b. Muhammad Ibn al-'Awwām of Seville wrote a lengthy Kitab al-Fīlāḥa in 35 books (būb). We know nothing of his life. To orientals as an abridged version of al-Fīlāḥa al-nabātīyya [see Ibn Wahḥīyya]. He is, however, far from being the most important of the Arabo-Hispanic agronomists. His work is essentially an extensive and useful compilation of quotations from ancient writers and from his Hispanic predecessors, Ibn Baṣṣāl, Ibn Ḥaṣdīḍā, Abu 'l-Khayr and al-Hāḍī al-Gharnātī. It is only occasionally at the end of a chapter that he records his own personal observations (introduced by the word LI “this is my own”), made in the neighbourhood of Seville, especially in the district of al-Gharaf. For Ibn al-'Awwām, see C.C. Moncada in Actes du 8e Congrès des Orient., Stockholm 1889, ii, 215-57; E. Meyer, Gesch. der Botanik, iii, 260-6; Brockelmann, S. I, 903.

Finally, towards the middle of the 8th/14th century, a scholar of Almería, Abū Uḥmān Sa’d b. Abū Dī’far Aḥmad Ibn Lūyūn al-Tudjīlī (d. 750/1349) wrote his Kitāb Ḳādaʾ al-malākhā wa-inḥūq al-radjdā hī waṣ’l šinad’ul-fīlāḥa. The work of an amateur, it is an abridgement in verse (urdūzā), based essentially on Ibn Baṣṣāl and al-Tiqnārī; but it also contains certain valuable information which the author recorded in the words of local practitioners (mīmām ḥaḍāḥahū bih aḥl al-ṣadīrāb wa l-‘imtiḥān). These treatises on fīlāḥa contain far more than their titles would indicate; in fact, they are true encyclopaedias of rural economy, based on a plan closely in line with that followed by Columella in his De re rustica. Naturally, the essential feature is of course agronomy (fīlāḥat al-arādīn): the study of types of soil, water, manure; field cultivation of cereals and legumes; but arboriculture is also dealt with at length (particularly vines, olives and figs), with additional matter on pruning, layering and grafting; and also horticulture and floriculture. Zootechny (fīlāḥat al-bayawawdīt) also takes a leading place: the rearing of livestock, beasts of burden, fowls and bees; veterinary practice (bayfara). All these fundamental questions are completed by chapters on domestic economy: farm management, the choice of agricultural workers, storage of produce after harvest, etc. Some writers also provide information on measurement of land (takṣīr) and the seasonal agricultural calendar.

We may imagine that specialists of many sorts were led to contribute to such encyclopaedic works. To start with, there were practitioners and professional workers: farmers (jallāhān), fruit-growers (ṣabīḏārān), horticulturists (djamānān); but there were also “scientific workers”—herbalists (ṣakḥāḏīrān), botanists (nabātīyyān), doctors interested in medicinal plants (muṣfrādāt) and dietetics; and there were also pure theoreticians (bukmādān, muṭakallimān).

On the other hand, Hispano-Arab treatises on fīlāḥa, which are mainly written by many-sided writers (muṣḥārīkān, muṭāfānānān). Beside Ibn Baṣṣāl who was essentially an agronomist, Ibn Wāfīd was primarily a doctor. Ibn Ḥaṣdīḍā was described by Ibn al-'Awwām as imām and khaṭīb. Al-Tiqnārī and Ibn Lūyūn are well-known poets. Finally, the essential oriental botanist Ibn 'Abdūn of Seville, the author of a treatise on bīṣa [q.v.], published and later translated by E. Lévi-Provençal. In this connexion one is reminded of Aristotle, both philosopher and naturalist and creator of a botanical garden, and Virgil, author of the Georgics.

The Hispano-Arab agronomists were familiar with and made wide use of ancient writers. A list of them (in which the names are often inaccurate) will be found at the beginning of the translation edition of Ibn al-'Awwām by Banqueri. Among the Arab sources, they made use of Kitāb al-Nabātāt of the polygraph al-Dīnawārī [q.v.] and, in particular, the Fīlāḥa nabātīyya of Ibn Waḥḥīyya [q.v.], though for the most part leaving out his farrago of magic recipes. However, in this branch of instruction they have not confined themselves to repeating their precursors’ writings. They made their own personal observations and experiments, in order to adapt their works to the realities of the Spanish soil and climate. They also introduced original chapters on the cultivation of new plants—rice, sugar-cane, date palms, citrus fruits, cotton, flax, madder, apricots, peaches, pears, watermelons, eggplant, pistachios, saffron, etc.

As we have seen, two Arabo-Hispanic treatises on agronomy were translated into Castilian. In this way, Ibn Wāfīd’s work was widely used by the Spanish agronomist Alonso de Herrera in his famous Agricultura General (1513). Finally we should note that it was in Muslim Spain, during the 5th/11th century, in Toledo and later in Seville, that the first “royal botanical gardens” of Europe made their appearance, both pleasure gardens and also trial grounds for the acclimatization of plants brought back from the Near and Middle East. In the Christian world we have to wait until the middle of the 16th century to see the establishment of gardens of this sort, in the university towns of Italy.


iii.—Persia

Agriculture in Persia was from earliest times regarded as the fundamental basis of the prosperity of the country. From early times also there has been a dichotomy between the agricultural and the pastoral elements of the population. The Avesta was unequivocal in its approval of the settled life and the dichotomy between the agricultural and the pastoral elements of the population. The Avesta was unequivocal in its approval of the settled life.

Δείτε τον ελεγχόμενο στην ιστορική και στην αρχαιολογική βιβλιογραφία.
Rulers were urged by mediaeval Islamic theorists to foster agriculture in order to ensure a full treasury and thus prevent the decay of the kingdom. To this end irrigation works were to be carried out, security established, and extortion against the peasantry prevented. The philosophers and encyclopaedists similarly regarded agriculture as the basic industry, upon which the good order of the world and the perpetuation of the human race depended (cf. Mahmud Amuli, Nafa'is al-funun, Tehran, ii, 159).

Invasion and dynastic struggles have been the cause of frequent interruption in, not the decay of, agriculture. For example in Khuzistán, where there had been considerable development under the Sasanians, the agricultural economy failed to return quickly to its previous level after the Arab invasion in the first half of the seventh century A.D. and there was until modern times a cumulative, though not uninterrupted, decline (R. A. Adams, Agriculture and urban life in early south-western Iran, in Science, vol. 136, no. 3511, 13 April 1962). The quartering of soldiers on the population in Byzid times appears to have materially contributed to agricultural decline (cf. Ibn Miskawayh, Eclipse, ii, 96, and Ibn al-Athir Ta’rikh, viii, 342). It has always been the practice of government officials, civil and military, to live upon the country, a custom highly detrimental to agriculture. At times the tribal officials, and to a lesser extent the municipal officials, played a similar role. The wills of the irrigation system reach greater heights than under the Ilkhâns (cf. Rashid al-Din, Gesch. Gâsân Hân’s, ed. K. Jahn, passim). In the Kâdjar period the evil was also widespread. In times of war, continuous or intermittent, it was sometimes the practice deliberately to lay waste frontier areas. Thus the Turco-Persian frontier area in Șafawid times was reduced to a desert (cf. chronicle of the Carmelites in Persia, London, 1939, i, 140). Many examples at different periods of Persian history could be cited of local officials imposing such severe contributions on the cultivators of the soil as to cause their dispersal and thus lead to the ruin of their land.

Tribal warfare and raiding was another major cause of agricultural decay. Such raiding was common whenever a provincial government collapsed, and further, whenever the tribal population, and its flocks rose above the level which could be maintained by the limited pasture available, either because of a period of drought or because of natural increase, there would be a movement, violent or otherwise, into the settled areas. The balance between the settled and semi-settled elements of the population was extremely precarious, and inevitably adversely affected agriculture on the borders of the tribal regions. Various tribal groups, notably in Fârs, during the course of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries became settled and practised agriculture. Rîdâ Shâh made an abortive attempt to settle the nomadic population of the country, notably in Fârs, the Bakhtiyârî, and parts of Kurdistân. Since about 1936 there has been a movement by Turkomans and others to reclaim the Gûrgân steppe.

Another factor militating against agricultural development has been insecurity of tenure both as regards the peasant and the landowner (see tenure of land).

Agriculture is also subject to interruption by the capricious nature of the climate. Drought, due to insufficient spring or winter rain, causing partial or complete crop failures, and floods, with the accompanying destruction of irrigation channels and imâns, are of common occurrence. Earthquakes have also been a contributory factor causing local and temporary dislocation. Ravages by pests, notably the sunn pest and locusts, not infrequently cause heavy losses. High winds in many areas and violent hailstorms are other detrimental factors. Deterioration of the soil because of a change in the water table due to over-lavish irrigation or inadequate drainage, or both, is a major problem in some parts of the country, especially Khuzistán and Sistân; and in some places on the central plateau the soil is salty and the water too saline to be used for irrigation. On the south and south-east borders of the central desert there is a natural tendency for the desert to encroach upon the surrounding area (cf. Hamd Allah Mustawfî, Nuzhat, 142, Ta’rikh-i Sistân, ed. Bahâr, Tehran 1936-8, 21). Soil erosion is widespread, notably in Adharbâyjân. Its primary causes are climatic and geological, but uncontrolled grazing by goats and the destruction of forests for fuel have steadily increased the tendency towards erosion. Little attention has been given to its control or reduction by modifying existing practices of arable and animal husbandry, or by contour ploughing, which is made difficult by the relatively small size of the holdings. Terracing in mountain valleys, however, is often carried out with considerable skill.

Irrigated and dry farming are both practised, the latter in large areas of Adharbâyjân and Kurdistân, and in the south and north-east, to the end of March.

The average rainfall in the coastal district of Persian Balúchistân is 3-4 inches; Bushire has an average rainfall of about 5 inches on the northern slopes of the Elburz. The natural vegetation is thick deciduous forest, found up to a height of 7,000-8,000 ft.; where this is cleared fruit, rice, cotton, and other crops thrive. The eastern end of the Persian Gulf littoral comes under the influence of the south-west monsoon. The average rainfall in the central district of Persian Balúchistân is 2 inches, and the average annual rainfall only 27 1/2 inches. It is estimated that only 10-14 per cent of the total area of the whole country is under cultivation. Some 30
to 35 per cent is desert and waste. The remainder is grazing-land and forest.

Grain crops. Wheat and barley are the staple crops and are grown as irrigated (daymi) and unirrigated (daymi) crops up to an elevation of about 10,000 ft. Maize and millet have also been widely grown throughout the country since early times (cf. B. Spuler, Iran in früh-islamischer Zeit, Wiesbaden 1952, 357). Wheat is mainly grown as a winter crop; but in the high valleys of the Zagros and Elburz it is also grown as a spring crop. The regions with the greatest production of wheat are the neighbourhood of Mashhad in Khorasan, western Azerbaijan, Hamadan, Kirmanshah, and Isfahan. In south Persia wheat and barley are sown between the first week in November and the first week in January, and in central Persia between the end of October and the end of November; and spring wheat between the end of February and the end of April. Wheat is harvested in the south about the end of April or the beginning of May; in the upland areas of Fars about a month later, and on the plateau some two to two and a half months later. Barley is harvested about three to four weeks earlier than wheat (cf. Mirzâ Husayn Khan, Dughrâfiyd-yi Isfahan, ed. M. Sutudheh, Tehran 1953-4, 55 ff.). The yield on wheat varies greatly in different parts of the country; in general it is low. The peasant normally saves part of his crop for the following year's seed.

Rice. The main rice-growing area is in the Caspian provinces. Some rice is also grown in the Lindjan and Alindjan districts of Isfahan (Dughrâfiyd-yi Isfahan, 55 ff.) and, on a small scale, in Fars, Khuzistan, Kordistan, and other districts (Spuler, op. cit., 387, 389). Hamd Allah Mustawfi, Nuzhat, 162, 163, Sanî al-Dawla, Ma'dîbîr al-dîhar, Tehran, lith. 1888-9, 113). According to tradition rice was originally imported from India (Kitâb-i 'ilm-i fîhâat wa zîrdâyat dar 'aâdi ghânân Khan, ed. 'Abd al-Ghaffar Nadjin al-Dawla, Tehran 1905-6, 86). In some rice areas it is sown broadcast, but in the main rice-growing areas such as Mazandaran and Isfahan it is sown in nurseries (khazâda) and transplantation (mishâ) takes place after a month. In Mazandaran the land is ploughed in April and then ploughed twice more. A fortnight after transplanting weeding (vidgin) begins, the weeds being trampled into the mud. The rice fields are kept permanently under water for two to three months. Rice is reaped in September. The main varieties are known as sadri, girdz, dum-i siyâh and 'ambarbâ (see also J. B. Fraser, Travels and adventures in the Persian provinces, London 1826, 119-20).

Sugar cane. This was mainly grown in Khuzistan in early Islamic times and in the middle ages (cf. Spuler, op. cit., 388, Kitâb-i 'ilm-i fîhâat wa zîrdâyat, 102); and to a minor extent in Mazandaran. In the later middle ages its cultivation in Khuzistan died out. An attempt was made in Kâdîr times to revive it (Wakdîy-i itâtikyrya, Tehran, no. 53), and also to cultivate sugar cane in Gilan (Ma'dîbîr al-dîhar, 118) and Isfahan (Dughrâfiyd-yi Isfahan, 58). In recent years the cultivation of sugar cane in Khuzistan has begun on a more extensive scale as a result of new irrigation developments. Planting takes place in March or April and the cane is cut in November.

Sugar beet. An abortive attempt was made to introduce sugar beet by a Belgian company at Kahrizk near Tehran in 1886-7. Under Rîdâ Shâh the cultivation of sugar beet was encouraged and it is widely grown in Mazandaran, especially in the Tehran, Tabriz, Kirmanshah, Shahr-e Kirmân, and Mashhad regions.

Cotton. This appears to have been widely grown on the plateau in early Islamic times (Spuler, op. cit., 389; Hamd Allah Mustawfi, Nuzhat, 52, and Jâmiy). American sea island cotton was first introduced into the Urmîyya region about the year 1852 from whence its cultivation spread (Letters from Persia written by Charles and Edward Burgess 1828-1855, ed. B. Schwarz, New York 1942, 117). During the reign of Rîdâ Shâh a long stapled variety was introduced and came to be known locally as filistânî (from the village where it was first cultivated). This variety is grown in Ahar, Khoy, Kirmanshah, Fars, and Khuzistan. A shorter stapled American variety is grown in the Caspian provinces, including Gurgân, and a native short stapled variety of inferior quality but hardy growth is grown in marginal areas. Cotton is grown as an irrigated crop up to an elevation of about 5,000 ft. It is sown in April or May and reaped in the autumn. The land is normally watered once before sowing and the crop is irrigated several times during the period of vegetation. Cotton is the main cash crop of Persia. It is also grown extensively for its seed, which yields an edible oil (cf. Dughrâfiyd-yi Isfahan, 56).

Tobacco. This is grown in many districts for local use and especially in the north-west and south-east Zagros and in the Caspian provinces. It appears to have been introduced into the country earlier than wheat (cf. Mirzâ Husayn Khan, Ta'rikh-i kishâvarzi-i Irân, Tehran 1951-2).

Opium. It is difficult to establish when the opium poppy was first cultivated in Persia. Muhammad b. Zakariyâ (Rhazes) refers to the wild and cultivated poppy. By the end of the 12th/13th century opium cultivation was well established (cf. Kaempfer, Amoenitas Exoticae). It spread in the nineteenth century as an alternative to the declining silk industry. It was first introduced into Fars in 1868-9 (Mirzâ Hasan Fâsi, Fîrâs nâmâ-î Nâsirî, Tehran 1894-6, ii, 3). The main opium-growing areas, until the prohibition of the cultivation of the opium poppy, which was first made in 1955 and became effective in 1956, were Isfahan, Fars, and Khurâsân; it was also grown in Hamadân and Kirmânsâh. The best opium came from AAbâda, Kirmân, Yazd, Burû-djîr, and Varâmân. The seed is sown from October to December, or more rarely in spring. The crop is weeded and thinned in spring; and irrigated during May and June. The collection of the sap begins in May, or a month earlier in the hotter districts of the south, and continues until August. A vertical or diagonal incision is made in the seed capsule in the evening; the sap oozes from the incisions during the night, partially dries, and is scraped off with a blunt knife the next morning. This operation is performed twice or, if the crop is exceptionally good, three times at an interval of several days (A. R. Neligan, The opium question with special reference to Persia, London 1927).

Tea. An abortive attempt was made by Şâni al-Dawla to introduce the cultivation of tea into Mâzândarân in the late nineteenth century. Subsequently there was some cultivation on a small scale; in 1928-9 seed was imported from the Far East, since when there has been a great expansion in tea cultivation in western Mâzândarân.

Silk. This is a traditional product of Persia. In the 9th/10th century and cotton was first introduced into the upland areas of Fars and Kirmân; in the 11th/12th century. In the nineteenth
century production declined because of a disease among the silk worms, which began in 1864. New strains were subsequently introduced (Taši Bahrām, op. cit., 99 ff.). Mulberry trees, on the leaves of which the silk worms feed, are widespread throughout the country, especially in the north. In northern Persia a curious custom exists for the hatching of the eggs of the silk worm. These are attached to a piece of paper and exposed to the warmth of the human body by being worn next to the skin (Hanway, *An historical account of the British trade over the Caspian Sea*, London 1792, i, 189 ff.; Curzon, *Persia*, i, 369; see also Harīr).

Minor crops. Pulses and oil seeds are widely cultivated; and some fodder crops, such as lucerne and clover. A great variety of vegetables is grown especially near urban centres. Potatoes were introduced into Persia by Sir John Malcolm during the reign of Fath 'Alī Shah (Ma'dīr al-dā'ār, 112; Kaye, *Life and correspondence of Major-General Sir John Malcolm*, ii, 47-8). Dye-plants, mainly in the central Zagros region and Kirmān, and other plants used in industry such as saffron, hemp, flax and, in the Dīzful and Shūhtar areas, indigo (which was introduced by the Bāyūd, 'Aḍjud al-Dawla, see Ibn al-Aḥṭīr, *Tārīḵ, viii, 531), madder, and, round Yazd and Kirmān, henna, and, in Māzandarān, jute, hemp, and flax. (Spuler, *op. cit.*, 389). Vegetable gums, including gum tragacanth and asafoetida, are cropped mainly for export. The latter was known in early Islamic times (cf. *Huddād al-dīlam*, 108-19). Oak-gall is produced mainly in Kūrdistān. A variety of flowers and a kind of willow were cultivated for scent (Spuler, *op. cit.*, 389-90); the former also contributed to bee-keeping.

Vegetables. Persia has been famous for fruit-growing since early times (cf. Spuler, *op. cit.*, 388). Many varieties of vine are cultivated and found up to an altitude of 4,500 ft. Vine cultivation is mainly by irrigation, except in some areas of Kūrdistān. On the plateau the vines are covered with earth in the winter. Apricots, peaches, nectarines, figs, melons, pomegranates, plums, cherries, pears, and apples are widely grown. Citrus fruits are important in the Caspian provinces and south Persia, especially in Kūhūzistān and southern Fārs. Recently citrus cultivation has been extended to Banāt. Dates are widely cultivated in south Persia and on the coastal plains bordering the Persian Gulf. The female plant is impregnated by the male in March or April, some two males going to a plantation of fifty (cf. Nasīr al-Dīn Tūsī, who was aware of this peculiarity of the date palm, *Aḥkām al-Nasīrī*, Tehrān n.d., 25-6). Nut trees, especially almonds and pistachios, are of importance. Olives were cultivated in early Islamic times in Nīshāpūr, Gurgān, Daylam, and Fārs (Spuler, *op. cit.*, 387). The main area of cultivation at the present day is Rūdbār in Māzandarān, where cultivation increased after the decline of silk production in the middle of the nineteenth century (T. E. Gordon, *Persia revisited*, London 1896, 163; Curzon, *Persia*, i, 368). The grafting of vines and other fruit trees has long been practised (cf. Fakhr al-Dīn Rāżī, *Dīkmā al-dīlam*, B.M., OR. 2972, ff. 132a-133b and Čahārdāh risāla, ed. Sāyīyīd Muḥammad Bākīr Saḥzawārī, Tehrān 1962, 146-51). At the present day in Kirmān and Fārs almonds and pistachios are planted in addition to the willow tree (*bāmeh*).

Although large landownership has been the dominant form of land tenure, large-scale farming was not (and is not) practised, except exceptionally. The agricultural unit was the ploughland (*gīyf, bīkh, zawāf*) and agriculture was carried on mainly as subsistence agriculture; this is still predominantly the case. Broadly the ploughland consists of an area which a pair of oxen can cultivate annually; but it varies in size according to the nature of the soil, the type of agriculture practised (dry or irrigated), practices with regard to fallow, the kind of crops grown, the draught animals used, and the pressure or otherwise on the land. The average ploughland ranges from some 60 to 20 acres; but in some areas holdings are much smaller, as for example in Mārbīn, one of the districts of Isfahān, where cultivation is mainly carried on by spade. The relation between the peasant and the landowner was formerly usually regulated, and to some extent still is, by a crop-sharing agreement (*muzāra[q.v.]*). The ploughland or peasant-holding is usually run as a family concern by the peasant and his sons or other members of the family; extra labour may be required at harvest time and at certain other seasons of the year. In some areas three or four ploughlands are run together as a unit (*bunā*). Periodical redistribution of the plough-lands among the peasants of a village used to take place, usually by lot, in some districts.

The main draught animal used on the plateau is the ox. Donkeys and, especially in Kūhūzistān, mules, and in the Persian Gulf littoral, Miyāndōbī (in Adhambāyqīdh, Bālucī and Mahbāb) and buffaloes, and in Persian Balūstān, the camel, are also used. In some areas, notably Sīstān, oxen are hired for ploughing to the cultivators by graziers. Where the soil is still more than one pair of draught animals may be required (cf. Morier, *Second journey through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to Constantinople in the year 1810 and 1816*, London 1818, 304). Donkeys and camels are the main pack-animals. Small bullock carts are found in western Adhambāyqīdh and some of the Armenian villages in Firaydān.

The plough (*ābīq*) is used of the hook type having a large or small steel share. The plough beam is linked to the yoke by means of a rope sling. There is no mould board and the soil is ripped open leaving an open, coarse, cloddy tilth. There are slight differences between the plough (*fārs*), Kirmān, and Sītān, (ii) Isfahān, Hamadān, Tehrān, and Adhambāyqīdh, and (iii) Ghīlān and Māzandarān. Seed is sown broadcast.

In addition to the plough, a kind of harrow (*māla*) is used; it differs slightly in shape in south and central Persia on the one hand and north-west Persia on the other. Two kinds of levelling board are in use, a relatively large board drawn by a draught animal, and a smaller board (known in central Persia as *katar*), which is used for the preparation of irrigation check banks, and operated by two men, one pulling and the other pushing. Three types of spade are used, one in Fārs, which has a wooden cross bar, the second in central Persia, which has a turned footrest, and the third in Adhambāyqīdh, which has a rolled edge.

Grain is cut with a sickle (*dād*) which has a plain cutting edge; scythes are used in northern Adhambāyqīdh, where they were introduced from Russia at the end of the nineteenth century. A small toothed sickle is used for cutting grass and lucerne, etc. Corn is tied into sheaves and left to dry or carried straight to the threshing floor (*kharmāngād*). Pod crops, such as peas, beans, linseed, and carraway seed, are mainly threshed by beating with rods; and in those parts of the country where draught animals are scarce, corn is also threshed in this way. A threshing board, the bottom surface of which is studied with sharp
pieces of flint stone held in position by wooden wedges, is used to thresh grain. It is attached by a rope to a yoke and drawn, while a man stands on it, in a circle by an ox or other animal over the threshing floor. A threshing wheel or wain (tūn, ?tūn) is used, especially in north-eastern, central and south Persia. This is a saddle-like carriage, usually drawn by two oxen with two sets of rollers, which turn round as the sledges beams slide over the sheaves. The rollers carry sharp-edged steel discs, sometimes with fine saw teeth, or have steel edges or prongs with sharp edges, one roller having the edges parallel to the axis, and the other having them right at angles. In some parts of Aḏharbāyjān the wain has wooden spokes. The third method of threshing is for the grain to be trodden out by strings of oxen, donkeys, or horses driven round the threshing floor. Winnowing is done by wooden forks, the grain being thrown six or seven feet into the air. The grain drops straight down while the chaff is carried by the wind and settles on a separate heap. A second winnowing done by wooden shovels is sometimes necessary. Finally the grain is sifted to separate it from the stones and earth with which it may have become mixed during threshing and winnowing. Two men can winnow and sift 20-25 cwt. of corn a day. Donkeys and other pack animals take the grain in sacks to the granaries. The chaff is removed in nets and used as fodder for oxen, donkeys and oxen (H. E. Wulff, Agricultural implements in Persia, in Power farming and better farming digest, Sydney, Oct. 1958).

Sheep and goats are commonly grazed on stubble fields, which thus receive a slight benefit from their manure. For the most part, however, animal dung is used as fuel. In some dry farming areas there is insufficient rainfall to rot the manure even if it were used. Household sewage mixed with earth is used as fertilizer in some areas, especially round urban centres. Earth from old walls and ruined buildings is also broken down and spread on the fields (cf. J. B. Fraser, Winter’s journey, London 1838, ii, 65). Gardezi tend to be manured more regularly than fields and to be cultivated annually. Pigeon limes, collected in pigeon towers, is used in the Isfahān district for the cultivation of melons and pear trees (cf. Chardin, Voyages, Amsterdam 1711, ii, 75). Faḵhr al-Dīn Rāzī mentions the use of bird lime and weed-killers (Ljāmī al-ulām, f. 132a). Fish manure is used in Kīrmān for pistachio trees. Chemical fertilizers have been introduced in recent years but their use is comparatively rare.

Practices in fallow, during which the land may or may not be ploughed, and crop rotation vary very widely. Unirrigated land tends to be left fallow for long periods. Irrigation is usually by inundation. In vineyards, melon land, and market gardens the water is let into the land by irrigation trenches. In land watered by bandās the tendency is to cultivate more intensively the land nearest the mouth of the bandā to avoid water loss while that at the end of the bandā is less frequently cultivated.

In many parts of Persia the crops have to be guarded, especially at night, to prevent depredations by wild pig and other animals. Scarecrows (matarsak) are erected in some districts (cf. C. E. Yate, Khurasan and Sistan, London 1900, 168, 283).

In recent years there has been some development in mechanization. An increasing number of tractors and combine harvesters have been in use especially since 1952, but the numbers are still relatively small except in Dagh-i Gīrgān, where cultivation in the grain-growing areas has been wholly, and in the cotton-growing areas, partially mechanized.

The state did not interest itself in the conduct of agriculture except so far as crown lands (ḵhlīša) were concerned, although it was interested in the prosperity or otherwise of agriculture from the point of view of taxation. A Ministry of Agriculture, Commerce and Public Welfare, was first founded in 1879; at the same time an Agricultural Council was set up. In 1891-2 the department of agriculture and commerce was transferred to the Ministry of National Economy and Roads. The following year departments of agriculture, commerce, and industry were set up. In 1893-4 agriculture and industry were once more united in one department, but were subsequently again divided. In 1897-8 the Ministry of Crown Lands (wisdār-i ḵhlīšagān va rakhābār-i dār al-ḵhlīša) became the Ministry of Crown Lands and Agriculture. Subsequently crown lands (ḵhlīša) were transferred to the Ministry of Finance. During the constitutional period agriculture suffered various vicissitudes administratively. The first agricultural magazine to be published was a fortnightly journal of agriculture and commerce issued in 1880 by the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce.

The first agricultural school in Persia was the Madrasa-i Muṣafār at Tehrān which was opened in 1901-2. It closed after six years. The next attempt to open an agricultural school was at Karaj near Tehrān in 1929. This became a high school in 1933-4 and a college in 1943-4. In 1948-9 it was transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture to Tehran University and in 1952-3 separated into two colleges, the college of agriculture and the college of veterinary science, which were fully incorporated into the university. Experimental work is done in government agricultural stations, notably at Karaj.


iv. —Ottoman Empire

During the period between the 8th/14th and 11th/17th centuries, when the Ḳimārī (q.v.) system prevailed in the Ottoman Empire, the rēhbe, i.e., the freehold
ownership of agricultural lands was regarded as vested in the State. The tenure of lands held as wakf and mukdta^a by the aghas: in this state of affairs is to be found the basic reason for the cultivation. Every celtikdii was obliged to sow a definite amount of seed on a definite area, both prescribed by the State. The irrigation-canaels were kept in operation under the supervision of the resm-i cift. From the harvested rice, after seed had been set aside, the State took one-half (in some areas two-thirds). As compensation for this, the celtikdijiler so organized were exempt from certain taxes (mainly the resm-i cift, resm-i ghanem, 'awwârî; for the celtikdijiler see Barkan, Kanunlar, 54, 202-3, 205; for a celtik hâmis and his ankara Un, DTFC library, Ismail Saij collection MS 5120, 130-9). The cultivation of rice was introduced into Rûmeli by the Ottomans, and extensive rice-fields under State control appeared in the valleys of the Merîç (Maritsa), Karasu, Vardar and Salambria (see M. T. Gökbilgin, Edinme ve Paşa Liûâ, İstanbul 1932, 125-50). A similar system of State participation prevailed in those valleys, in order to ensure the food-supply of Istanbul, were created in the vicinity of the city by the settlement of prisoners of war, 'ortakdî kullar' (see Barkan, Kanunlar, 86-109, and idem, XV ve XVI. asrîlarda Osmanlîs imператорîlîlînda topârạch işçîlînîn organizasyonu şekilleri, in İktisat Fak. Mecm., i (1939), 29-74, 198-245, 397-447. On the food supply of the capital see further W. Hahn, Die perlverpflegung Konstantinopel und der ottomanische Staatsapparat, Stuttgart 1926; R. Mantran, Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle, Paris 1962, 179-213).

Thus the principal characteristic of the classical Ottoman land-system was direct State control of the peasant and the soil, a system which had grown up to meet the military and financial needs of an absolutist administration, and in which the State's main concern was to ensure the revenues of the timars. This timar organization and the Ottoman land-system broke up in the period of anarchy which began at the end of the 10th/16th century (see Koç Beg, Risâle, ed. A. K. Aksüt, İstanbul 1939, 24-56). Lack of settled conditions and heavy taxes caused the peasant to abandon the soil in droves: in the first half of the 11th/17th century this movement from the land reached disastrous proportions and was called the 'bûyûk ka^bûn' (see M. Akdağ, Türkâyênin ikitsadî vasyeti, in Belleten, xiii/51 (1949), 553-64, xiv/55 (1950), 319-405). In many districts local dignitaries and Janisâries turned the abandoned agricultural land into pastures for their flocks of sheep (M. Akdağ, Belleten, xiv, 374, 394). The new kânâns concerning the use of land and the râ'dîyê which were promulgated in the early 11th/17th century (they are found together in MÔM, i (1331), 49-112, 305-48) are the result of efforts to solve this problem.

In the 11th/17th and 12th/18th centuries the most important change in agricultural conditions was brought about by the spread of the systems of mubiîa'sa and ihisâm (qq.v.). There arose a new class of aghas, a'ydâns and derebeyûs (qq.v.), in Rûmeli and Anatolia who, holding possession of the land for life, became in practice great land-owners (for Western Anatolia see Ç. Uluçay, 18 ve 19. yüzyûllarda Saruhan da ekîyâlî vek halî harekâtleri, İstanbul 1955; see further A. F. Miller, Mustafa Pasha Bayraktar, Moscow 1947). Although Mahmûd II succeeded, after 1227/1812, in putting down the great a'ydân and derebeyes (qq.v.) in Rûmeli and Anatolia who, holding possession of the land for life, became in practice great land-owners (for Western Anatolia see Ç. Uluçay, 18 ve 19. yüzyûllarda Saruhan da ekîyâlî vek halî harekâtleri, İstanbul 1955; see further A. F. Miller, Mustafa Pasha Bayraktar, Moscow 1947). Although Mahmûd II succeeded, after 1227/1812, in putting down the great a'ydâns and derebeyes (qq.v.) in Rûmeli and Anatolia who, holding possession of the land for life, became in practice great land-owners (for Western Anatolia see Ç. Uluçay, 18 ve 19. yüzyûllarda Saruhan da ekîyâlî vek halî harekâtleri, İstanbul 1955; see further A. F. Miller, Mustafa Pasha Bayraktar, Moscow 1947). Although Mahmûd II succeeded, after 1227/1812, in putting down the great a'ydâns and derebeyes (qq.v.) in Rûmeli and Anatolia who, holding possession of the land for

The Ottoman response to that situation meant that agricultural products were in general disposed of in local markets. Cereals were distributed further afield only in areas near the coasts or in the vicinity of cities or along the great military routes. In the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries Venice bought large quantities of cereals from Western Anatolia, Thrace and Thessaly (see F. Thiriet, Régnes des délibérations du Senat de Venise concernant la Romanie, i-iii, Paris 1958-60). In the same period cotton and dried fruits were exported from Western Anatolia to countries in the north (this appears particularly from the customs-registers of Akkerman and Kili, Bayvekalı Arşivi, Malıye no. 6).

From the 9th/16th century onwards increased trade with Western Europe led to an increase in the export of the cotton and coffee goods of Western Anatolia (P. Masson, Histoire du commerce français dans la Levant, Paris 1896-1911, appendix VIII; E. Arup, Studier i Engelsk och Tysk Handelshistorie, Copenhagen 1907, 109 ff., 191 ff.). In the 19th century, as was observed by P. de Tichatchef (Asie Mineure, 3 vols., Paris 1867), G. Perton (Souvenirs d'un voyage en Asie Mineure, Paris 1867) and A. Ubicini (Letters sur la Turquie, Paris 1851, 244-65), the agricultural methods and peasants' practices were, as previously by tradition, in this field ethnographical observations (e.g. Hämni Z. Koşay, Türkiye halkının maddi kültüründen daire ayardırmalar, in Türk Ethnografi Dergisi, i, 1956, 7-55; Contribution à l'étude de la culture matérielle des Bulgares, in Bulletin du Musée Nat. d'Ethnographie a Sofia, viii, 1957, 109 ff., 130-65, xii, 62-85) can be supplemented from the registers of effects and deeds (e.g. Hamit Z. Kosay, Tarih arastırması, Ankara 1941, 237-63).

The Ottomans were naturally acquainted with much material—as yet unstudied—on the crops grown in various areas and their productivity; the various agricultural implements are to be found listed in the kişadı registers of effects (metrukdt). The actual cultivation of crops and the methods employed in the 12th/18th century were inadequate (see O. L. Barkan, Difficulties of communication meant that agricultural methods employed in the Ilkhanid period in Anatolia were adequate (see H. Inalcik, Tanzimat nedir?, in Tarih ayardırmalar, Ankara 1947, 237-63).

The cultivation of crops and methods employed in the 12th/18th century were inadequate (see H. Inalcik, Tanzimat nedir?, in Tarih ayardırmalar, Ankara 1947, 237-63).

The cultivation of crops and methods employed in the 12th/18th century were inadequate (see H. Inalcik, Tanzimat nedir?, in Tarih ayardırmalar, Ankara 1947, 237-63).
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lenders, the maximum interest was fixed by law at 15% (Başyevkelet Arşivi, Mühimme def. no. 253, 8-10), and the sum of 20 million burlaş per annum was set aside to provide credits to peasants. The measures taken to improve agriculture in the Dobrudjâ (q.v.) deserve particular mention. A French expert was called in to survey the agricultural situation and make recommendations (see A. Gaudry, Recherches scientifiques en Orient, Paris 1860). The distribution of good varieties of seed to the peasants, tax-exemption granted to promote the culture of olives and mulberries, encouragement to use modern implements—all these sprang from the adoption of the new outlook, whose effects are best exemplified in the activities of Midhat Pasha (q.v.) in the Danube province (northern Bulgaria): he was the first to import from Europe reaping- and threshing-machines, he founded a model farm, and set up ‘Memâfi sandıkları’ to supply credit on easy terms to farmers (see ‘All Haydar Midhat, Midhat Pasha, kayâl-i siyásiyësî...’, Istanbul 1325/1909, 29). In this period the export of agricultural products to Europe, especially to Great Britain, increased greatly (see K. Renell’s Atlas of Bengal, 1781, Map X). All descriptions and accounts of many of the phenomena of mediaeval agricultural practice apply equally well to the traditional practice in Indian villages today. There existed the same combination of simple and crude tools with certain ingenious methods and devices. While the fitting of the “iron point” to the wooden plough is referred to in a work as old as the Manusmriti (x, 84), Frier (1672-81) found that in fact the “coulters” of Indian ploughs were “unarmed mostly, Iron being scarce”, and that hard wood was being used instead. Yet on the other hand, Amâl Allah ‘U’saynî (early 18th century) notices the use of dibbling in sowing cotton, and Thévenot in Gujjarât observed the use of fish manure in planting sugar-cane.

Rainfall was generally supplemented by artificial irrigation, from wells, tanks and canals. Bâbur has described how he had two most large method of lifting water out of wells. One involves lifting water in a leathern bucket (Karâs) pulled out of the well by yoked oxen drawing a rope passed over a wooden wheel, “a laborious and filthy method”. The other (the raikâl or arkal), which deeply interested Bâbur, is called in English the Persian wheel (Bâburnâmâ, tr. Beveridge, i, 388; ii, 486). The dhekîl, based on the use of weights, has been described by Frier. Large tanks for irrigation purposes were usually constructed by damming streams and rivulets. Firuz Shâh (752-90/1352-88) is said to have built several tanks by means of such dams (bandâs) (‘Afdî, Ta’rikh-i Firuz-shâhî, Bibl. Ind., 330). The Udaypûr lake, created by a huge dam in the 16th century, was originally about 40 miles in circumference (A’tim, i, 509). Abandoned channels of rivers, which became active during the inundations, served as natural canals and were important sources of irrigation in the Indus basin. Human effort was often needed to keep them in use by clearing silted sections. In addition there were some big man-made canals. The best known of these was Firuz Shâh’s West Jamunâ Canal, re-excavated and re-aligned by Shâhjahân. Among other important mediaeval works were the East Jamunâ Canal (early 18th century), a long canal drawn from the Sutlej by Firuz Shâh, a network of Muggal canals drawn from the Râîv near its entry into the plains, the Sidhnâi (which the Râîv took as its main bed in or before the 16th century), the Begarwâh in upper Sind (17th or 18th century) and the Shânwâh in the Indus delta (early 16th century). Most of the major crops raised today were also raised in mediaeval times. A few new crops were introduced during the mediaeval period itself. Tobacco cultivation became well established throughout out the country during the earlier part of the 17th century. Coffee cultivation had its beginnings late in the same century, while the cultivation of capsicum spread rapidly in the earlier part of the next. Among the purely modern crops may be counted maize, potatoes, tea and groundnuts.

The geographical distribution of the crops in the 17th century (and so presumably earlier) was different in some important respects from that...
prevailing today. There was the same broad division into rice and wheat zones marked by the 40- or 50-inch isohyets. But the cultivation of cash crops, notably opium and hemp, was far more widespread in mediaeval times, the conditions of transport prohibiting concentration. Indigo claimed a large area, in mediaeval times as well as till late in the 19th century; but its cultivation has now practically disappeared. Similarly, opium and hemp were more widely cultivated than now. On the other hand, jute, though known to have been cultivated in certain localities in Bengal, was far from being an important cash crop during mediaeval times.

Sericulture, which has undergone a great decline since, flourished mainly in Bengal and Kashmir. Among fruits the most prominent were the mango and the coco-nut. The pine-apple was introduced during the 16th century through the agency of the Portuguese, and was rapidly acclimatized. The practice of grafting seems to have been widely applied in Mughul times. Dhihângr't describes its application to cherries and apricots in Kashmir (Tâzuk, ed. Sayyid Ahmad, 299). Aman Allah notices its use in planting mangoes, and a history of Shâhdjahân's reign declares that great improvement in citrus fruits resulted from grafting (British Museum MS, Or. 174, f. 102a). The Emperors and their nobles and generally Rajahs, as also laymen in their orchards, Firdw Shâh is said to have planted 1200 orchards around Delhi (‘Affi, 295). The Mughals have given their name to a particular type of garden, laid out in squares and criss-crossed by channels of flowing water obtained by various devices (see BUSTAN II).

2. Mediaeval Works on Agriculture. Very few works seem to have been written on agriculture in mediaeval India, to judge from their extreme paucity in modern collections. There exists in some MSS, e.g., India Office Library I.O. 4702, Aligarh, Lytton Farsiya Wâlam 31, and Brit. Mus. Or. 1741, ff. 25a-48a, a tract on agriculture which is really Chapter XI of an encyclopaedic work, the Gand-i Bâd-i-ardw, of Amân Allah Husaynî, Khân Zamân, d. 1064/1657. This tract embodies, with acknowledgment to the Kitâb Shâhgâr al-nihdî, a work mainly concerned with horticulture and written in Persia or Central Asia in the 15th century (Brit. Mus. Add. 1771, ff. 157b-269b, etc.). But Amân Allah has introduced considerable additions, including detailed descriptions of the cultivation of Indian fruits and notices of various crops grown in India. Yet, despite certain interesting statements, Amân Allah’s work is much too superficial, and he follows the Kitâb Shâhgâr al-nihdî in recommending a number of quack-practices. Abûl-Fadl in his famous work on Akbar’s administration, the Â‘in-i Akhbari (ed. Blochmann, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta, 1867-77), gives much information relating to agriculture. In its detailed accounts of the provinces of Akbar’s Empire, the book contains lists of prices of agricultural produce, tables of revenue-rates on the various crops, and area statistics and sundry information on cultivation and irrigation.

Bibliography: Modern works only. Moreland’s India at the death of Akbar, London 1920, also contains a description of the system of agriculture. On Mughal gardens there is a charming book by C. M. Villiers Stuart, Gardens of the Great Mughals, London 1913. Irfan Habib’s Agrarian system and sugar-cane, was far more consulted for a fuller treatment of several points touched on in this article.

Watt’s Dictionary of economic products of India, 6 vols., is a monumental work of reference, giving detailed historical, technical and other information on almost everything produced in India. For an examination of Indian agricultural practice see J. A. Voelcker, Report on the improvement of Indian agriculture, London 1893; see also the Royal Commission on Indian Agriculture, Report, London 1928. Modern agricultural statistics, given by districts, are available in the volumes of The agricultural statistics of India, issued by the Department of Revenue, etc., Government of India, at irregular intervals since 1884-5. (Irfan Habib)

FILÂLÎ [see tafîlây].

FILASTÎN, colloquially also Filastîn, an Arabic adaptation of the classical Palestine (Greek Παλαιστίνη, Latin Palaestina), the land of the Philistines. The name was used by Herodotus (i, 105; ii, 106; iii, 91; iv, 39) and other Greek and Latin authors to designate the Philistine coasts and sometimes also the territory east of it as far as the Arabian desert. After the suppression of the Jewish revolts in 70 and 132-3 A.D. and the consequent reduction in the Jewish population the name Syria Palaestina, later Palaestina, was adopted by the Romans in place of Judaea. The Roman province of Palestine was later extended by the annexation to it of other, adjoining territories. By the 6th century there were three provinces of Palestine, Palaestina Prima, with its capital at Caesarea, including Judaea, Idumaea, Samaria, and part of Peraea, Palaestina Secunda, with its capital at Scythopolis (Baysan), including the valley of Esdraelon, Galilee, and parts of the Decapolis and of Gaulanitis, and Palaestina Tertia or Salutaris, with its capital at Petra, including the Negev, Nabataea and part of the Sinai peninsula. (Ed.)

I.—PALESTINE UNDER ISLAMIC RULE.

The name of Filastîn was applied first to the administrative and military district (djund [q.v.]) established by the Arab conquerors on the territory of the ancient Byzantine province known as Palaestina Prima. The latter comprised roughly Samaria and Judaea with the coastal area stretching from Mt. Carmel in the north to Gaza in the south. This corresponded with a fairly varied region from the geographical point of view, the largest part of which was made up of a mountainous chain of medium height, with summits rarely exceeding 1,000 metres (mountains of Samaria in the north, with Mt. Gerizim, the mountains of Judaea in the centre, and the mountain of Hebron in the south), extending, toward the west in a series of hills bordering the coastal plain and to the east in expanses of steppe, of which the most important was the desert of Judah. It is difficult to reconstruct with accuracy the story of the conquest of Palestine by the Arabs. The expedition sent out by Abû Bakr and commanded by ‘Amr b. al-‘As invaded the region of Gaza in Dhu’l-Hijjâd 12 or Muḥarram 13/February or March 634. After the fall of Gaza, ‘Amr marched on Kaysariyya (Caesarea by the sea) and began to besiege it in Dju‘mâdâ I 13/July 634, but he was forced to retreat on the approach of a new Byzantine army, which he was ready to confront only after uniting his troops with those brought by Khâlid from Syria. After the victory over the Byzantines of Adjnadayn in Dju‘mâdâ I 13/July-August 634, ‘Amr occupied most of the towns of Palestine: Sabâstîya (Samaria), Nâbulus, Ludd (Lydda), Yubnâ,
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It was only after the battle of Yarmuk [q.v.] that Filastin (Palestine) was occupied by the Arabs. Amwas (Emmaus), Bayt Djibrin and Yafa (Jaffa), whose inhabitants are said to have refused to submit to anyone but the Khalifa himself. 'Umar b. al-Khattab then visited Syria for this purpose (6/637). As for the town of Kaysariyya, 'Amr took up the siege again, but left it shortly afterwards to go to Egypt, leaving as his successor Yazid b. Abi Sufyan, who, soon dying, was succeeded by his brother Mu'awiya. It was Mu'awiya who obtained possession of the town by betrayal in 19 or 20/640 or 641 and completed the conquest of Palestine by occupying 'Askalon (Ashkelon).

The Arab conquerors permitted the previous administrative organization to continue, transforming the former Palæstina prima into giund Filastin; they set up the capital first at Ludd, and then at al-Ramla, a new town which was founded by Sulayman b. 'Abd al-Malik when he was governor of Palestine and in which he continued to reside after he had become caliph in 96/715. The giund Filastin, still mentioned as such by Ibn Shaddād, survived until the Mongol invasion as an administrative district, but its territory appears to have been extended from the 4th/10th century onwards, both to the north and south, and to the south-east from the 5th/11th century onwards.

The geographer al-Mukaddasi in fact counts Arība (Jericho) and 'Ammān (the ancient Philadelphia) among the towns of this district, and is followed in this by Yākūt. Al-Īstakhri and Ibn Hawkal, for their part, join to Palestine the south of the Ghawr [q.v.], al-Dhibāl [q.v.] and al-Sharāt [q.v.], that is to say, on the one hand the lands situated to the north of the Dead Sea, and on the other those to the south of it on the other side of the rift-valley which extends as far as the gulf of al-Ākaba. Further, the vast area called al-Tīh, covering the present day Negev and Mt. Sinai, was also in practice attached to Palestine. Under the Mamlūk sultans, Palestine received a new administrative organization. It was attached more or less directly to the miyāba of Damascus, and comprised six districts, those of Ghazza, Ludd and 'Akkūn on the one hand (these three districts being sometimes considered as forming a separate mamelāka) and those of al-Kuds (Jerusalem), al-Khālīl (Hebron) and Nābulus on the other.

Palestine was particularly honoured in the Umayyad period. Mu'āwiya is reported to have had himself proclaimed caliph at Jerusalem and it was under one of his successors that the ancient court of the Temple, called the karam, received its two principal monuments, Kubbat al-Šākhra and al-Masqūd al-Ahkā, both built by 'Abd al-Malik (65/868/870). This caliph had the interior of the Dome of the Rock decorated with mosaics evoking the superiority of Islam over Christianity and the domination of the world by the Muslim rulers. In the 6th/12th period Palestine reverted, with Syria, to the rank of a mere province; its official capital continued to be al-Ramla, but the monuments of Jerusalem maintained sufficient renown for the caliph al-Ma'mūn, inspired by hostility by the Umayyads' memory, to feel the need to substitute his own name for that of 'Abd al-Malik in all the inscriptions commemorating the latter's foundations.

Palestine was occupied by the Fātimids immediately after Egypt (359/966) and thus broke free for some time from the authority of the caliphs of Baghdad, which had already become nominal under the Tūlūnīs [q.v.] and then under the Ikhshīdīs [q.v.]. But Fātimid rule was never firmly established there, and brief revolts ensued, of which the most spectacular was the one which led to the installation of the new 'Abīd caliph at al-Ramla by a Bedouin amir of the Banū 'I-Djarrah [see QARRĀHĪDS]. Jerusalem, on the other hand, was the victim of the violent measures adopted against the Christians by al-Hākim, and at his command the Holy Sepulchre was destroyed. In the late 5th/11th century, Palestine was briefly occupied by the Turcoman chief Ṭūṣ b. Uvak [q.v.]; shortly afterwards a minor Turkish dynasty, founded by Arūṭ [see ARTUKIDS], occupied Jerusalem, but it was soon expelled by a Fātimid counter-attack (479/1068-477). This Fātimid success was nullified by the arrival of the First Crusade, which achieved the foundation of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and led to the Crusaders' occupation of the Holy Places for nearly a century (492/1099-1187).

The Arab geographers provide some scattered information on conditions in Palestine during the period between the Arab conquest and the arrival of the Crusaders. In the 3rd/9th century Palestine was occupied by a numerous population of Arab origin (belonging to various tribes). There was, however, also a certain proportion of non-Muslims, Christians, Jews and Samaritans, the size of which we naturally cannot estimate; al-Ya'qūbī refers to the presence of non-Arabs in the town of al-Ramla. At this period the region was crossed by the pilgrimage route from Damascus; at Ayla, near the gulf of al-Ākaba, this met the route followed by pilgrims from Egypt and the Maghrib; it was also a trade-route used long since for traffic with Egypt or Arabia. There was also a route connecting Jerusalem with 'Ammān via Jericho. In the 4th/10th century Palestine was one of the most fertile regions of the province of al-Shām, since it was well watered with rain and, in the Nābulus region, boasted abundant streams. Al-Mukaddasi informs us of its principal products, among which agricultural produce was particularly copious and prized: fruit of every kind (olives, figs, grapes, quinces, plums, apples, dates, walnuts, almonds, jujubes and bananas), some of which were exported, and crops for processing (sugar-cane, indigo and sumac). But the mineral resources were equally important: chalk earth (al-hawwārā), marble from Bayt Dījrīn, and sulphur mined in the Ghawr, not to mention the salt and bitumen of the Dead Sea. Stone, which was common in the country, was the most generally used building-material for towns of any importance. Al-Mukaddasi also gives us brief indications of the main Muslim religious trends; there were some Shī'īs at Nābulus, no Mu'tazilis openly confessing their beliefs, and some well organized Karrāms at Jerusalem; at the end of the 4th/10th century the judicial schools followed were the Shī'ī and the Fātimi. The mediaeval geographers also notice briefly the places of pilgrimage, which were especially numerous in Jerusalem and Hebron (the town of Abraham al-Khalil).

During the period of the Crusades, Palestine was the scene of battles and ambushes, periodically interrupted by the truces which were from time to time established by treaties; such a treaty is that of 626/1229 by which the Ayyūbid al-Kāmil restored the demilitarized city of Jerusalem to the Franks of Acre for ten years. This situation, which in any case became more settled after the recovery of Jerusalem by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, did not, however, prevent the continuation of economic interchange between Egypt and Syria; the caravans were merely subject to "transit tolls" imposed by the Franks or, in certain
circumstances, were the victims of hostile raids. Nor did it prevent the establishment of fruitful commerce, particularly under the successors of Salāh al-Dīn, even on the part of non-Mulsim merchants (Italian, French or English), living mainly at Acre, and the Muslim towns of the interior. It was also at this time that Palestine was celebrated by certain Muslim writers as the especial land of Prophets, and the places of pilgrimage experienced their greatest popularity; whether at Jerusalem or at Nabulus or A lI, [q.v.], head of al-Husayn b. Ghazza of Hashim, grandfather of the Prophet.

At the end of the 7tth/13th century (690/1291), the Franks, from whom the Mamlūk sultan Baybars had already taken the stronghold of ‘Aṣḵalān in 668/1270, were expelled by al-‘Aṣrāf Khāli from their last possessions, Caesarea and Acre; thus all Palestine and the neighbouring provinces were again under Muslim rule. The territories west of the Jordan continued thus during the Mamlūk period to play an important part as a trunk route, followed as much by the merchants as by the official couriers who linked Cairo with Damascus and Aleppo along a post-road adopted and improved to permit greater despatch.

After 1751/1516, after the battle of Dābīs, the region fell under Ottoman rule, which was last to almost without interruption until 1917-18. During the 16th century Palestine consisted of the sandjaks of Ghazza, Jerusalem, Nābulus, Ladjdjun and Saḍaf, all forming part of the eyālāt of Damascus. The sandjak of Ladjdjun was not under an Ottoman governor but was held by the local Bedouin clan of Turābbī, who revolted on more than one occasion. From the late 16th century there is a noticeable decline, due to falling standards in the administration, frequent changes of governors, attempts by local chieftains to gain independence, and the campaigns carried out on the soil of Palestine originating in neighbouring regions. As early as the end of the 16th/17th century, indeed, the little Druze state of Fakhr al-Dīn in which controlled the districts stretching from Beirut to Mt. Carmel, attempted, between 1595 and 1634, to make itself independent of the Sublime Porte; following this episode, in about 1660 a new province distinct from that of Suḥrān was created, named Saydā and including the lands of Saḍaf and al-Ladjdjun. This measure did not prevent the continued activities of local chieftains the most notable of whom, Zāhir Al Umar [q.v.], a chief of bedouin origin, established himself round ‘Akkā between 1750 and 1775. Shortly thereafter it was the turn of Ahmad al-Diāzār to attempt to emancipate himself from Ottoman tutelage in the same region, though not without vigorously resisting the attacks of Napoleon Bonaparte who, although he had captured Yāfā in 1221/1799, was unable to make himself master of ‘Akkā. In the 19th century, the son of Muhammad ‘Ali, Ibrahim Pāghā [q.v.], was another who desired to take Palestine and Syria from the Ottomans and thus assure his mastery over the lands of the Arabs. He captured ‘Akkā and Damascus in 1832, but in 1840 Palestine was returned to the sultan ‘Abd al-Majīd in consequence of the intervention of Britain and Austria.

During the later Ottoman period Palestine became a subject of increasing interest to the Great Powers of Europe, on economic as much as religious grounds. The custody of the Holy Places there had been acknowledged as in the hands of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem in the 16th century and was reaffirmed at the request of Russia by firmans of 1853; the Latin clergy there also had, since the 16th century, been under the protection of France. This situation was the occasion for frequent intervention by the European States in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire. But Palestine also had European commercial factories, mainly French, such as those of Acre and Ramla, and here, as well as at Jerusalem, there resided Consuls charged with protecting their nationals by virtue of the agreements known as the Capitulations [see IMTIYAZAT].

From the 18th century onwards, European economic penetration increased in Palestine as elsewhere in the Arab East. European products were sold there either by European merchants themselves or by Christians or Jews native to the area who sometimes, by taking a European nationality, succeeded in enjoying the advantages conferred by the Capitulations, avoiding part of the 'asnas' to which those merchants who were Ottoman subjects were exposed and thus obtaining practically a monopoly of important trade [see BERATL]. In the 19th century, Christian missions, both Catholic and Protestant, contributed in Palestine as in the Lebanon to the raising of the general level of education, while with European help modern technology began to spread; thus a French company completed the building of the first railway line, that connecting Jaffa with Jerusalem, in 1892.

Palestine had some Jewish inhabitants throughout the period of Islamic rule, though their numbers were much reduced during the Crusades. They were from time to time reinforced by immigration from other countries, notably in the 16th century. A new type of immigration began in the late 19th century, with the establishment of the first Zionist agricultural settlements in the eighteen eighties. Despite attempts by the Ottoman government to restrain it, this movement gained force. It found its ideology in Zionism, whose official beginnings may be dated 1892, when the congress inspired by Th. Herzl was held at Basle; at the beginning of the 20th century it became clear that so much so that the number of Jews resident in Palestine rose from 25,000 in 1880 to 80,000 in 1914.

Turkish rule in Palestine ended with the First World War, which led to the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire, ratified in 1920 by the abortive Treaty of Sévres, and again in the Treaty of Lausanne of 1923. Great Britain, who had occupied Palestine during the war (General Allenby entered Jerusalem on 9 December 1917), had asked the League of Nations as early as 1919 to entrust her with the administration of the territory under the form of an international mandate. The British proposal, which was amended in 1920, was approved by the Council of the League in July 1922, and it came into force in September 1923, after the conclusion (July 1923) but before the entry into force (August 1924) of the Treaty of Lausanne, which regulated the future of the territories split off from the Ottoman Empire. Although the Mandate covered the areas on both sides of the Jordan, direct British administration was established only in the region to the west of the river. That to the east formed the Amirate of Transjordan, with an autonomous government, whose powers were limited by a treaty with Britain.

The policy of the British mandatory government in Palestine was from the beginning influenced by the promises made by Britain to the Jews to establish a Jewish National Home in Palestine. In August 1897 the Basle Congress had defined Zionism in the following formula: "the object of Zionism is the establishment for the Jewish people of a National Home in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine". The execution of this programme was undertaken by a "Zionist Organization", which committed itself to political action, with especial encouragement from Great Britain, and which achieved a great success in 1917, when the latter declared officially that "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine" (Balfour Declaration, 2 November 1917; France, Italy and the U.S.A. subsequently accepted the policy set out in the British declaration. Parallel with the obligations Great Britain had assumed towards the Zionist Organization, she was bound by the promises of independence she had made to the Sherif Husayn to encourage him to revolt against the Turks (Husayn-McMahon correspondence, 1915). The British Government subsequently declared that Palestine was excluded from the territories promised to the Arabs for their independent State; in the Churchill Memorandum of June 1922, accepted by the Zionist Organization, it further stated that "the terms of the Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home, but that such a Home should be founded in Palestine", and gave the Arabs various assurances that an autonomous government would be established in Palestine. But the Arabs, disappointed in their hopes and disturbed by the massive immigration of Jews, who in 1939 already numbered 400,000, refused to cooperate with the Palestine administration and, under the inspiration of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, directed by al-Haddi' Anin al-Husayn, mujt of Jerusalem, reacted with violence: in 1928, 1929, 1933, 1936 and 1939 bloody disturbances broke out in Jerusalem, Jaffa and Haifa.

In spite of the Arab reaction, the Zionists pursued their efforts with success; they consolidated their international position by the creation (Zurich Congress 1929) of the "Jewish Agency", which included also representatives of non-Zionist Jews. The situation in Palestine disturbed the League of Nations Permanent Mandates Commission, which in 1930 severely condemned the British administration for failing to meet and reconcile Arab and Jewish needs. The British Government gave assurances that no more land would be put at the disposal of Jewish immigrants; this measure was, however, mitigated by an assurance given to the Zionists that there was no question of an absolute prohibition but rather of the imposition of controls on land purchase. Nevertheless, faced with unshakeable opposition from the Arabs, and obliged continually to reinforce the garrison in order to put down the disturbances, Britain was forced to give an ever more restricted interpretation to the Balfour Declaration. After a fruitless attempt to bring Arab and Jewish delegates together to settle their differences (British Mandate Conference, London, February-March 1939), the British Government published a White Paper (May 1939) which restricted Jewish land purchases and immigration and envisaged the establishment after ten years of a Palestinian State in which Arabs and Jews would share the government. The solution proposed by the British Government excluded the establishment of a Jewish National Home, and the publication of the White Paper was followed by an outbreak of Jewish violence. The situation grew steadily worse during the Second World War. The Jews surviving the holocausts gazed with hope towards Palestine; the British authorities began to force the immigrants back; and the Jewish secret organizations entered on a campaign of terror against the British, who in 1946 proclaimed martial law.

Great Britain's efforts at conciliation had failed and she therefore referred the question to the United Nations Organisation. The U.N. General Assembly appointed a ten-member Special Committee in 1947. Its report was then considered by the Palestine Committee of the whole Assembly, which produced a partition plan, adopted by the Assembly on 29 November 1947, and envisaging the creation of two independent States, Arab and Jewish, and of an international zone covering the Jerusalem area under U.N. control.

The plan was accepted by the Jews but rejected by the Arabs. Arab volunteers attacked the Jewish forces, who were making efforts to occupy the areas assigned to them by the partition plan. Fighting broke out in the Jerusalem area, in which the Jewish forces gained an initial advantage but were then stopped by this to call for the intervention of the Arab regular armies; but divergencies of opinion arose in the Arab League and between the Arab governments.
On giving up the Mandate on 15 May 1948, Britain withdrew her troops from Palestine. The day before, David Ben Gurion had proclaimed the birth of the State of Israel. The Arab armies advanced, but the Jews confronted them everywhere. The Security Council imposed a truce, accepted by both Arabs and Jews, but the United Nations' efforts at conciliation ended in failure. In December 1948, the battle recommenced, but Egypt was the only Arab State fighting, for Iraq, Syria and Transjordan withheld their troops from the operations. Despite their numerical superiority the Egyptian forces withdrew before the Jews, whom the ceasefire imposed by the Security Council halted 20 km. beyond their borders. The armistice between Israel and Egypt, signed at Rhodes on 24 February 1949, and those signed successively thereafter between Israel and Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria, put an end to the fighting between the Arabs and the Jews and established the partition of Palestine.

FILIBE, Ottoman name for the town of Plovdiv in Bulgaria, situated on and around six syenite hills in the Thracian plain along the Maritsa. Called Pulpudeva by the Thracians, Philippopolis by the Greeks, Trimontium by the Romans, and Pludin by the Slavs, it was an important fortress throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages, being held successively by Byzantines, Bulgarians, and Ottomans between the 6th and 14th centuries A.D. At the time of the Ottoman invasion of the Balkans it was in the hands of the Bulgarians. The Ottoman chroniclers record the conquest of Filibe immediately after the fall of Edirne, i.e., in about 765/1363-4. According to Sa'd al-Din the governor of the town attempted to resist but, not risking an open battle, was obliged to retreat to the fortress; the besiegers made a fierce onslaught and the governor was compelled to cede the town to Lâlâ Şahîn. According to Ewliya Çelebi, Filibe was besieged at seven points, bridges having been built across the Maritsa, and was taken by assault after heavy fighting. There is no doubt that the town offered stubborn resistance, but it was probably taken on terms (cf. Chalocondyles, Bonn ed., 32). It is said that the town was taken by Sultan Lâlâ Şahîn with Lâlâ Şahîn as the first beglerbegi. In registers dating from the end of the 15th/16th century, Filibe is referred to as the chef-lieu of a mahalle, and a Jewish and a Gypsy community, while in the nth/i7th century it had 9 mahalles, and a Jewish and a Gypsy quarter. In the nth/i7th century it was settled here by Mehemmed II. According to de la Broquiere, the population was predominantly Bulgarian and Tatars was begun by Murad I. Bayazid I transferred here nomads from Sarukhan, and Mehemmed I the Bulgarians. The Ottoman chroniclers record the conquest of Filibe immediately after the fall of Edirne, i.e., in about 765/1363-4. According to Sa'd al-Din the governor of the town attempted to resist but, not risking an open battle, was obliged to retreat to the fortress; the besiegers made a fierce onslaught and the governor was compelled to cede the town to Lâlâ Şahîn. According to Ewliya Çelebi, Filibe was besieged at seven points, bridges having been built across the Maritsa, and was taken by assault after heavy fighting. There is no doubt that the town offered stubborn resistance, but it was probably taken on terms (cf. Chalocondyles, Bonn ed., 32). It is said that the town was taken by Sultan Lâlâ Şahîn with Lâlâ Şahîn as the first beglerbegi. In registers dating from the end of the 9th/15th century, Filibe is referred to as the chef-lieu of a mahalle, and a Jewish and a Gypsy community, while in the nth/i7th century it had 9 mahalles, and a Jewish and a Gypsy quarter. In the nth/i7th century it was settled here by Mehemmed II. According to de la Broquiere, the population was predominantly Bulgarian and Tatars was begun by Murad I. Bayazid I transferred here nomads from Sarukhan, and Mehemmed I
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FILORI, Ottoman name for the standard gold coin of Europe (see H. Sahillioglu, Bir müllitstem zimem defterine gore XV. yüzüyl sonunda Osmanli
The tax of one filori per household which the Ottomans exacted in Hungary was nothing but the continuance of a tax formerly paid to the kings of Hungary (see the Kanun for Lippe, of 961/1554, in Barkan, 322); this tax too was regarded as the equivalent of the džiýa (ibid., 304, 316). The resm-i filori was usually paid in ačes, so that the number of ačes which it represented increased with the increase in the relative value of gold (45 ačes in 873/1468, 50 under Süleyman I, 70 in 974/1664, 80 in 976/1568). In view of the lightness of this tax the Ottomans imposed military service on the Eflak (cf. in connexion the Yürük [q.v.],) every five households supplying one voynub (from Slavonic voynik, 'soldier').

The Ottomans imposed the filori tax, sometimes under the name of Eflak şadi, on other groups who rendered services to the state. Thus the rašiya miners in the Rudnik district paid one filori per household instead of bharadž (i.e., džiýa) and ispredjic (q.v.) (Kanun i Kanun-name, 15-6; for the Eflak employed as guards of passes (derbenđidi), ibid., 62); towards 936/1530 the Cingene in the sandjak of Semendire (Smederevo) also paid 80 ačes per household under the name of resm-i filori (Barkan, 250); but these groups may have been included with the Eflak.

In general the resm-i filori was collected by an official called filoriç (Kanun i Kanun-name, 78, 130, 147), to be paid direct into the treasury of the Sultan, although sometimes it was allocated to the sandjak-bég. In the 17th/18th century this subject to the filori tax were called filoriçi paša, or filoriçiyân; in Kanun of this period (Kanun-name, Ankara Un. DTC Fakültesi Library, I. Saip collection, MS 5120, 141) the filoriç is defined as a person who is exempt from the 6şâr [see 6şûr] and the rašiya raşûmu [q.v.] and pays only a fixed sum annually. The resm-i filori was paid (in ačes) in two installments, on the day of 6şâr-îlaş [q.v.] (23 April, O.S.) and on 6sâm günü [q.v.] (26 October, O.S.).

Bibliography: in the article.

(H. [NAlcik])

FILS [see fals].

FINANCE [see BAYT AL-MÁL, DAITARDAR, MÁL, MÁLÝYA].

FINDIKLI [see İSTANBUL, and SIKKA].

FINDIKLILI MEHMED [see SILAHĐAR].

FINE [see ZORN].

FINE ARTS [see PANN].

FINÝANA, Sp. FiŇANA, a small town of some 5,000 inhabitants engaged in agriculture. It is situated in the province of Almeria, about 30 km. from Guadix, in the partido judicial of Gérgal. It lies on the southern slope of the Sierra de Baza, which joins the Sierra Nevada on the west. It is overlooked by an ancient fortress of which only ruins remain. Within the town there was a mosque, now converted into a church where services are held. The Muslim inhabitants were muladies of Hispano-Roman origin and had nobody of Arab descent among them. They lived peacefully occupied in agriculture, preferably the cultivation of mulberry trees and the rearing of silkworms. An industry grew up of which the products were highly esteemed: the manufacture of türan—handkerchiefs and shawls of silk and brocade. These were exported even to Christian territory and were much sought after in León, where they were known as alfíns from their mark of origin. But already in the 14th century this industry and the culture on which it was based had disappeared and today no trace of it remains. During the rebellion of Ibn 6şâfün the inhabitants of Finyâna showed a disposition to join him but 'Abd al-Rahmân III, when he occupied the kâra of Baza during his campaign of 300/913 against eastern Andalusia, made a diversion against Finyâna and there, on 4 Shawâl 300/14 May 914, captured the emiress, whom Ibn 6şâfün had sent to them. No more details of its mediaeval history until it was taken by the Catholic Monarchs when they won Baza are known.

Bibliography: Idrîş, Descr., text 201, tr. 246; Himyari, al-Ra6n al-miâr, ed. Lévi-Provençal, text 143-4, tr. 172; Lévi-Provençal, Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane, ii, io; iii, 317; Sánchez Albornoza, Estampas de la vida en León durante el siglo X, 11-4. (A. HUCI MIRANDA)

FIRABR, early (e.g., Hûdûd al-şam, 313) named also Firab (Fararb), in Xudâna (BGA vi, 203) as well as Xîlân (iii, 867) also called Karyat 'Ali or Ribât Tâhir ibn 'Ali, is a town opposite Âmûl (q.v., 2). It lay a parasang north of the Ouxus (Âmû Daryâ, [q.v.]) on the road to Bukhârâ and was the centre of a fertile region with many villages as well as the seat of an inspector for water-control (Mir-i râhi: Hûdûd, see above). The city was protected by a fortress and possessed a Friday-mosque and an open space for the sale of market wares (muqaddas). It had a hotel for travellers who were also boarded there (Muqaddas, 291; Ibn Faštân, ed. Z. V. Togan, 1939, 4, § 4; written Âf.r.r; cf. trans. Canard, in AEJÆ Alger, xvi (1958), 54). According to a presumably legendary account by
Abu '1-Hasan 'Abd al-Rahman ibn Muhammad al-Naysaburi (Nishapuri) in his Khazdb in al-'alam in his Khazdhn in al-'alam (continuator and editor of Narshakhl's description of Khazdhn, ed. C. Scheler, 6, also in his Chresto-
mathie persane, 13; tr. R. N. Frye, 1954, 8, and 119, note 97) the founding of Firabr followed the con-
quest of Paykand by the Kkdk Turks towards the end of the 6th century (conjectures regarding this report in J. Markwart, Wehrot und Arang, Leiden 1938, 145-8; and Franz Altheim-Stiehl, Finanzgeschichte der Spätantike, Frankfurt 1957, 257-62, who object to an interpretation of Naysaburi, 235 f., and other works of Tolstow mentioned there).

Bibliography: Ištahhir, 314; Ibn Hawkal, 2nd ed., 489; Ibn Khurrdadhbih, 25, 173; Yɒbɒt, Beirut 1957, iv, 245 ff. (with the index of the scholars of this town); Le Strange, 403 ff., 443.

FIRASA, a technique of inductive divination which permits the foretelling of moral conditions and psychological behaviour from external indications and physical states: al-istiddil bi-al-khalk al-
şahir "ala'l-khalk al-bihin (cf. al-Rażl, Firasa, ed. Mourad, 4; H (;; al-Khalifa, ii, p. VIII; iv, 388 ff.; al-Kazwini, i, 318; cf. Ps.-Djahiz, irdja, ed. Ino-
straçteg, 17 ff.). This is provided by colour, form and movements of the body, and from these it reveals to experts the secrets of characters and minds. "Peculia-
rities of character cannot be concealed even if a man does his utmost to keep secret about them and to hide them; for nature unveils them and lets them show through. Sooner or later, God reveals them through the actions, movements and gestures of the man. Indeed the Kurân (XLVII, 30) says: 'And if We wish it, We shall make thee see them (= the false Muslims); thou shalt recognize them by their physio-
gnomy (simr-hum); thou shalt recognize them by their lapsus linguæ (lahn al-basal)" (Ps.-Djahiz, op. cit. 17). 'Ali is related to have said: "No-one considers something within his conscience without its being revealed by the slips of his tongue or the expression of his face" (al-Ibshlhl, Mudfur, tr. R. N. Frye, 1954, 8 and 119, 257-62, who object to an interpretation of Naysaburi, 235 f., and other works of Tolstow mentioned there).

Firasa is an Islamic science whose Arab ancestor is biyafa (sometimes confused with 'iyafa which is essentially concerned with portents drawn from the behaviour of birds).

The classification of the sciences which are included under the name of firasa bears witness to the breadth of territory which this technique of divination covers. In fact, it includes (H (;; al-Khalifa, i, 34; cf. al-Rażl, op. cit. 10 ff.; al-Djahiz, Hayawan, v, 93; Ps.-Djahiz, irdja, 16): birth-marks and beauty spots (al-shadat al-fil, or "the marks with which God causes to penetrate their hearts"; if there is one to be found in my nation it can only be "Umar (b. al-Kha'tatb)" (Tashkoprizade, Miftah al-ssada wa-misâb al-siyâda, i, 272; see also Ibn al-Atfi', Nikhîa, i, 240; Ibn Khaldun, Muhaddima, i, 200, tr. de Slane, i, 228, tr. Rosen-
thal, i, 223; Harîfr, Mahâmet, ed. de Sacy, 601).

Finally, firasa preserves the main meaning of Arab biyafa, the recognition of signs of paternity.

The far-reaching development which separates firasa from biyafa is due on the one hand to the psy-
chological and religious elements introduced by Kurân and Tradition, and on the other hand to the tradi-
tions of Greek treatises on physiognomy whose characteristics strongly influenced firasa. The most important of these were the treatise of Pseudo-
Aristotle called Sirr as-arzr, used by al-Rażl and al-Dimâshqî (cf. M. Steinschneider, Die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen, Leipzig 1897, 79 ff.), that of Polemon (al-Djahiz, Hayawân, iii, 46, 83, 87 ff.; likewise H (;; al-Khalifa, iv, 388 ff.; cf. Steinschneider, op. cit., 107 ff.; a Kitâb al-Firasa under the name of Fillmûn was edited at Aleppo in 1929; on this person and his work, see the excellent article by W. H. Le Strange in Encyclopaedia Britannica, xi, 2 (1952), col. 1320-57 (cf. col. 1345 ff.)) and that of Menas (Minas—Mîwak) al-Rûmî (7), Kitâb al-
Khayaldn and Kitdb al-Shdmdt (Fihrist, 314). In another connexion, Ps.-Djahiz (clrdfa, 120) quotes believers among them are saved. In the fragmentary elements may be detected, the chief ones being the who in the end are severely punished, while the Jawbar al-Hindi as the author of a treatise on "master of 9/10 and XXXVIII, 11/12) is given the name (LXXXIX, following. Fir an, the history of Pharaoh is seen in relation of Moses and Aaron [see HARUN], the hardening of which, at the time of the first Meccan period, in- one disregards certain verses of Umayya which are "to behave like a hardened tyrant".—Ifawn gave rise to a verb Arabic form of the name may derive from the Exodus, the crossing of the Red Sea and the drowning of the Amalekite kings [see 1929 by Muh. Raghib al-Tabbakh, then re-edited, translated and annotated by a bibliography, by Yousef Mourad in his Roman and annotated by K. Inostrantsev, Russian and annotated by K. Inostrantsev, Pharaoh. The extends beyond that of the inspired book, and it deals with the kings of Egypt both before and after the Firawn of Mūsā, connecting them with the "Amaelitkn" and also, later, drawing on the stock of local legends. Thus the Firawn of Ibrāhīm [q.v.] and Yūsuf [q.v.] is discussed; he is given the name al-Rayyān b. al-Walld (or al-Walld or even Dārīm b. al-Rayyān) and his successor Kābus b. Mūsāb (al-Masūdī, Murādī, i, 92, but written al-Walld b. Mūsāb). Isolated traditions, regarded with utter disdain by the author of al-Bad wa l-taґrīkh, attribute an Iranian origin to Firawn and Hāmān (al-Tabarl, Tafsir, xx, 28: Firawn was a native of Istakhr; R. H. Mason, iii, 9; F. H. Montgomery, Firawn a native of Balkh and Hāmān of Sarakhs). The New Testament theme of the massacre of the innocents is introduced into the account of the birth of Moses, and the Midrashic legend of the proving of Moses by the crown and burning coals came into the account of the education of the future liberator of Israel who was brought up at Pharaoh’s court. Similarly, it was with the Jewish Aggada (Abd of Rabbi Nathan, recension A, ch. XXVII and Pirkey Rabbi El’i’eser, ch. XLI) and through it possibly to an ancient Egyptian related form that is connected the legend of the mare ridden by Gabriel which led Firawn’s army into the abyss, the vanguard of the army being commanded by Hāmān. After the drowning of Firawn, whom Gabriel prevented from making his profession of faith until the very end by cramming his mouth with sea slime, Mūsā sent to Egypt a military expedition commanded by Joshua and Caleb. The Bad wa l-taґrīkh (iv, 3736) is aware that the Jews celebrate the feast of unleavened bread in memory of their delivery from the hands of Firawn (cf. also al-Birrūf, Aḍḥār, ed. Sachau, 281, Chronology, 273), but certain traditions also exist which give the same motive for the celebration of the fast of Ṭʿārīkh by the Jews (texts quoted from G. Vajda, Hebrew Union College Annual, xii-xiii (1957-8), 374, but
whose authenticity is rejected by al-Biruni, ibid., 330 ff./327 ff.).

A later Fir'awn bears the name Arajdī "the lame"; this, no doubt, is Necho (Neko, II Chron. xxxv and xxxvi), whose name is thus interpreted by the Jewish Aggada (Targum, also Peshitta, Leviticus-Rabbba xx/xi, ed. M. Margulies, 442); al-Mas'udi, Murājidī, ii, 410, however, calls him Bilūnāh.

—The theological problem of the "hardening of heart" of Fir'awn did not fail to occupy the attention of the Mu'tazila (see Badī', i, 106/97 ff.). The Mystics and in particular al-Hasan meditated in their fashion on the revolt and the conversion in extremis of Fir'awn (see L. Massignon, La Passion d'Al-Hallaj, 337, 416, n. 1, 615, 935-936).

 resources by devoting them to his work, he made no approach to the rulers of his day. The writing of the Shāhnāma was undertaken no doubt after the assassination of Daḵšī (ca. 370/980); before this he had tried out his talents in composing some epic passages and some lyric poems, of which a few have survived. At the beginning of his epic he speaks of how Daḵšī had begun to put into verse an ancient book, of how this work was prematurely interrupted by Daḵšī's death, and how a friend had procured the book for him (ed. Mohl, i, 16-20). For several episodes he had other sources, for the story of Bijen and Manja he probably took a manuscript (for which he followed a manuscript which a woman-friend read to him, ed. Mohl, iii, 293-4), and for the death of the hero Rustam (following a redaction by Azād Sarw, ed. Mohl, iv, 701). In spite of great political upheavals, recounted by the historians, his Shāhnāma was undertaken by 370/980-1 at the latest.

In the course of the 4th/10th century, the Iranians, reviving a pre-Islamic custom, had applied themselves to gathering the historical facts and the legends concerning their national history. Collections were made in imitation of the Pahlavi Khā*tāyāt-nāma (Book of Rulers) composed towards the end of the Sāsānīd period (Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, 54), which is lost, as are Arabic translations of it. Ancient tales were assembled in other collections. The oldest and most famous of the redactions of the 4th/10th century is the Shāhnāma of Abu 'l-Mu'ayyad Ballāh, a collection of heroic traditions which is echoed here and there in Firdawsl's epic and in some historical works (notably a fragment in the Ta'rīkh-i Sistān, Tehran ed., 35). Another Shāhnāma is that of Abū 'Ali Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Balḵi, praised by al-Biruni (al-Athdr al-bdkiya, Cairo 1370/1951, especially the 3rd/9th chapter), then by Firdawsi, then by al-Tha'labī (d. 429/1038). Besides these, there existed other documents and traditions which were treated by epic poets who came after Firdawsl (notably on the heroes Garshasp, Bāzarkhā, Sām [see HAMASA]).

At Tūs, various persons whom Firdawsl names had supported him in his work, but he was looking for a more powerful protector to whom to dedicate his work. Finally he chose the greatest monarch of the age, Sultan Mahmūd of Ghur; this was probably when he was about 65 years old (ed. Mohl, iv, 4). He was an ally of his vizier, Abū Mansūr Muhammad al-Mā'marī (preface to Abū Mansūr's Shāhnāma, dated 346/957, published by Muhammad Kāzvīnī in Bist makāla, ii, Tehran 1313/1935, 24-25); their work was used by Daḵšī (about a thousand of whose verses were incorporated by Firdawsl in his Shāhnāma), then by Firdawsl, then by al-Tha'labī (d. 429/1038). Besides these, there existed other documents and traditions which were treated by epic poets who came after Firdawsl (notably on the heroes Garshasp, Bāzarkhā, Sām [see HAMASA]).
FIRDAWSI

give on the last leaf the date 384/994, and not that of the final completion (400/1010).

Mahmud was a man of little erudition, but gathered at his court, even by force, men of learning and letters and particularly panegyrist. His attention was perhaps first drawn to Firdawsi by Abu 'l-Abbas Faḍl b. Ahmad al-Isfarayini, who was his first vizier (from 384/994 until 401/1010) and whose kindness is praised in the Shāhnāma (ed. Mohl, iv, 7-8). No doubt Firdawsi had composed various sections of his work, not in a systematic order but as inspiration came to him and inclination prompted; afterwards he linked them together by passages of transition; he then, as his fame spread, set about revising and polishing his epic. At the end of his poem (ed. Mohl, vii, 500) he states: "When I had passed the age of 65 years, the care of my sufferings increased; I was occupied always with the history of the kings; great men were having copies of his epic made, "but I received in return only praise" (He adds that three noble inhabitants of Tūs provided him with material help and encouragement). In the course of this revision, followed by the making of a fair-copy by a copyist, he probably inserted or amplified the passages in which Mahmūd is praised (one of these eulogies, for example, was inserted after the composition of the account of the Battle of Rustam). For the poet speaks in it of his old age and his infirmities: ed. Mohl, iv, 702). At this point his protector, the vizier Faḍl b. Ahmad al-Isfarayini, was dismissed; the poet was left without a supporter and his work was ill-received when he presented it to the sultan. Various stories have been handed down concerning his journey to Ghazna and the presentation of the poem, but they are not reliable: all that is to be accepted is that the journey took place and that it resulted in a disappointment, expressed by Firdawsi in the words: "Such a monarch, so generous, shining among the sovereigns, did not cast a glance at my poem: the fault lies with slanderers and with ill-fortune" (ed. Mohl, vii, 294). According to a tradition frequently repeated (it is given by Nizāmī 'Arūḍī), Mahmūd had promised one dīnār for each verse of Firdawsi's poem, and Firdawsi offended at the contrast between this reward and those heaped on the panegyrists living at the court, divided the sum he received among three persons before abruptly leaving Ghazna. One of his biographers claims that he worked on his epic for some months at the court of Mahmūd, who loaded him with honours; this report, like other similar ones, is not to be accepted: Firdawsi travelled to Ghazna simply to present his work. On reading the biographers, one is led to presume that the chief cause of Firdawsi's dissatisfaction was the inadequacy of his reward. But the causes of misunderstanding between the sultan and the poet were more serious. In the first place, Firdawsi was a Shi'a and Mahmūd a Sunni—each enthusiastically; according to Nizāmī 'Arūḍī, the poet was accused of being a Mu'tazilī and a Rāfdī (a 'rejecter' of Sunnism), and he quotes in support some verses of Firdawsi (op. cit., 56); as for his Shi'ism, Firdawsi does not announce it directly but allows it to be inferred in the introduction of his poem (ed. Mohl, i, 14-6). Futhermore, he had in his poem praised a vizier who had fallen out of favour, thus laying himself open to misrepresentation by his detractors. Finally, and most important, the poet could not tolerate the sultan's lack of interest ("Such a monarch . . . did not cast a glance at my poem"): Mahmūd appreciated only lyric poems, and particularly those devoted to his praise—slight and frivolous works in comparison with a vast and powerful epic.

According to Nizāmī 'Arūḍī (p. 57), Firdawsi, on leaving Ghazna, spent six months at Herāt, returned to Tūs, and then went to Tabaristan to the court of the prince Shahrīyar. It is impossible to confirm the truth of this. Moreover a legend gradually grew up on the relations between Mahmūd and Firdawsi, but it is impossible to give credence to its account of how the poet, loaded with honours, stayed for a long time at the court of Mahmūd, and of the sultan's belated charity, expressed by the poet in a few verses of the Shāhnāma (written by the Timurid prince Baysunghur (829/1426), used by Macan and Mohl in the prefaces to their editions. Firdawsi is said to have written a satire against Mahmūd (published in the editions and translated by Mohl, i, introd.); it is said that Shahrīyar pacified him and advised him to leave intact the passages of the Šahānmā composed in praise of Mahmūd, and that of his satire there remain only six authentic verses, quoted by Nizāmī 'Arūḍī; but the text of it as given in the manuscripts varies in length up to as many as a hundred verses, including some borrowed here and there from the Shāhnāma. These satirical verses, examined as a whole, show the same qualities of style and composition as the Šahānmā, so that it would be rash to affirm that they are not authentic (cf. Nöldeke, Cr. I. Ph., ii, 155 ff.).

The date when he finally completed his epic is recorded on its last page: "When I was 71 years of age the heavens paid homage to my poem; for 35 years, in this transient world, I composed my work in the hope of a reward; as my efforts were spent for nothing, these 35 years were without result; now I am nearly 80 and all my hope has gone with the wind. The last episode of my epic was completed on the day of ard of the month of isfendaremād, five times 80 years of the Hidjra having elapsed" (therefore in 400/25 February 1010). In other words, he had completed his poem at the age of 71 (in 400 A.H.), and when he was nearly 80 he added to it a note of the date of composition. He spent his last years at Tūs. According to Dawlatshāh, he died in 411/1020. Perhaps, as Nöldeke assumes (loc. cit.), the satire against Mahmūd was found among his papers and communicated to various people who spread copies of it around. According to Nizāmī 'Arūḍī, he was re-fused burial in a Muslim cemetery because he was a Rāfdī; he was buried in a garden which belonged to him (on his grave and on his present mausoleum, see TUS). In a manuscript in the British Museum (text and tr. in Nāṣir-i Khusraw, Safar-nāma, ed. and tr. Cr. Schefer; text reproduced with emendations in Firdawsi, Shāhnāma, Tehran 1935, vii, 3019), it is related that Firdawsi made in 354/994 a journey to Isfahān and Başhādād, and that he offered to the amir of 'Irāk his poem Yūsuf w-Zalikhdh (q.v.): Nöldeke (Gr. I. Ph., ii, 229 ff.) and S. H. Takhtādā (in the review Kl.ve., 1921, no. 10) have praised this poem, whose attribution to Firdawsi is now questioned (Z. Safa, Tavt numérique, ii, 477) for several reasons, notably the presence of many more Arabic words than are found in the Shāhnāma, apart from peculiarities of style. In any case this journey to 'Irāk seems doubtful. The death of a son at the age of 37 (the poet being then 63) inspired some sublime verses (ed. Mohl, vii, 190). Nizāmī 'Arūḍī says that he had a devoted daughter, of whom however he makes no mention. Such are the generally accepted facts and dates of the life of Firdawsi.
It is impossible to give more than a brief outline of the vast Shāh-nāma (amounting in several manuscripts to some 60,000 verses). It begins with the creation of the world and the seven days of creation; it tells how the first kings of Iran were reigning, benefactors of humanity for which they established the various elements of social life, at the same time struggling against the demons which infest the world. For more than a thousand years these good and evil powers confronted each other in an unrelenting duel full of dramatic episodes. At last one of these mythical kings established a general peace for half a century; but after his death his three sons, among whom he had shared out the civilized world, could not agree, and one of them, who ruled over Iran, was treacherously assassinated by his brothers. This murder begins an endless cycle of revenge: a merciless war is waged for several centuries between the settled Iranians and the nomadic Turanians of Central Asia. Whether he is describing pitched battles, skirmishes or single combats, the poet exhibits an unequalled skill in varying the situations, and in maintaining a note of the most ardent patriotism, which does not however lead him to belittle the bravery of the enemy: throughout the poem the adversaries are worthy of each other. This cycle of wars is divided into several "gestes", corresponding to the exploits of the heroes who dominate the action—heroes of superhuman power and stature. Among them the famous Rustam stands out. This epic, while dealing mainly with war, contains some splendid love-stories, by which Firdawsī, the incomparable creator of the national epic, became at the same time the founder of the romantic narrative poem which was to have such a brilliant future in Persia. His sensibility, as lively as it is deep, shows itself in a series of sentimental episodes where paroxysms of passion alternate with those of despair. While two-thirds of the poem are essentially heroic and legendary, the last part is more historical and recounts poetically the reigns of the Sāsānīd kings; this part is the product of the poet's old age, whence the numerous moral reflections and the digressions on politics and metaphysics. Firdawsī's ideas would demand a lengthy study. His view of the universe is entirely pantheistic; an implacable fate, the sister of that which dominates Greek tragedy, hangs over the principal actors of the epic until the final catastrophe in which ancient Iran perishes. Yet man must ceaselessly struggle against fate: Firdawsī's moral philosophy (which corresponds, though not deliberately, with that of the Avesta) vehemently preaches action and the love of good, which uphold in man reason—his unique privilege and his true claim to superiority over all other beings. Reason must always guide us: it teaches us to accept the (sometimes only apparent) injustice of fate and enables man to retain that feeling of tender sympathy which Firdawsī himself so often shows for luckless heroes and for suffering animals; for the character of this poet as a man is in harmony with his exceptional gifts as an artist—nobility and purity of heart, family affection, complete self-sacrifice for the sake of his work, love of glory, kindness to the weak and the defeated, ardent patriotism, religious tolerance and a profound sense of the Divine. In short, he combines harmoniously what he drew from his sources with what he owed to personal inspiration and he made magnificent use of the gifts which he possessed. As for his style, which was never used in the same way by Firdawsī, the poet who created the romances of the great Turanian cycles, it is simple language, firm but eloquent, and remarkable for the aptness of the terms used and the nobility of the thoughts. The level of expression is always equal to that of the ideas, which does not preclude the generous use of images; he varies his expressions according to the type and rank of the characters; he sometimes uses the different rhetorical figures common in the East, but not to excess, and his style remains sober even among the exaggerations proper to the epic genre. There are very few Arabic words in the poem: he wanted to revive the ancient Iran, but to do it in the Iranian tongue, remaining faithful to his sources; it is in the story of Alexander the Great that most Arabic words are to be found (for he was using a non-Iranian source, translated into Pahlavi [see ISKANDAR NAMA]). His influence on Persian literature and indeed on the spirit of the people of Iran has been as profound as it has been lasting, and in itself would merit a serious study; in particular it led to the writing of numerous epics which, though not the equal of his own, are of real (and still insufficiently recognized) interest from the points of view both of literature and of folklore [see HAMĀSA].

Bibliography: A full bibliography would itself constitute a detailed study. Complete editions of the Shāh-nāma: Turner Macan, The Shah-Nāma . . . , Calcutta 1829, 4 vols.; J. Mohl, Le Livre des Rois . . . , text and French translation, Paris 1838-78, 7 vols., and translation alone, Paris 1876-8, 7 vols.; J. A. Vullers and Landauer, Liber Regum . . . , Leyden 1877-84, 3 vols. (incomplete). These three editions were used for the Firdawsī Millenary edition (with notes and variants, Tehran, Beroukhim, 1931-6, 9 vols.), which is now the most easily accessible (it gives the pagination of the Calcutta and Paris editions at the head of each page). Parts i and ii of a critical text prepared under the editorship of E. E. Bertels appeared in Moscow in 1960 and 1961. Besides Mohl's translation, it has been translated into Italian verse by Pizzi (Turin 1886-8), into German by F. Rückert (Berlin 1852), into Russian by J. Modl (Bombay 1897-1904), into English by A. G. and E. Warner (London 1905-12), into Danish (selections) by Arthur Christensen (Copenhagen 1931); many sections have been translated into various languages. An Arabic prose version was made by A-BUNDART (g.v.). The essential study on the poet and his work (still of value although out of date on certain points) is Nöldeke, Das Iranische Nationalpos, in Gr. Phil., ii, Persian translation, Hamāsa-i millī-i Irān, Tehran 1937, to which is to be added Ėthē, Firdawsī als Lyriker, in München. Sitzungsberichte, 1872, 275-304, and 1873, 623-53.

In Persian there are the notable works of Z. A. Safa, Hamāsa-sarādyār dar Irān and Taṛkh-i adabiyāt dar Irān, ii. Finally, numerous articles and studies assembled in volumes or dispersed in periodicals, published in Iran and other countries. See further IA (Firdevsi, by H. Ritter), and Pearson 774-5.

(C. Huart-[H. Massel])

There are three principal translations of the Shāh-nāma in Ottoman Turkish: (1) a prose version, completed by an unidentified writer in 854/1450-1 (Fügel, Die . . . Handschriften des Kais.-hön. Hofbibl. zu Wien, i, 495; F. E. Karatay, Topkapı Sarayları . . . , Istanbul 1953, no. 2155; cf. Blochet, Cat. des manuscrits turcs, ii, 220); (2) a verse translation (in ḥasād metre) made in Egypt
by a certain Sherif or Sherifi, a member of the entourage of Prince Diem, who spent ten years on the task before presenting his work to Sultan Kâşim Şahî (see Retzsch-C., 152; D. Smirnow, Manus- 
crits turcs ... St. Petersburg 1897, 78-82; the presentation-copy, completed in 916/1510, is in the Topkapi Sarayi at Istanbul, MS Hazine 1519, see 
Karayat, no. 2155); (3) another prose version made early in the 11th/12th century for Ömânî II by 
Derwüns Hasan, Medhî [g.o.] (see Blochet, i, 314; 
Smirnow, 82-7). There is a translation into modern 
Turkish (in the series Dânya edebîyyatından terceme-
lar') by N. Lâgul and K. Akyüz, 3 vols., 
Istanbul 1945. There are at least two translations into Özbek 
Turkish (see Blochet, ii, 129; Firystals Celebration ... ,
ed. D. E. Smith, New York 1936, 93 f.). For the 
information of the Shâhnâmâ upon Turkish popular 
literature see Irène Mâlikoff, Abâ Muslim ... ,
Paris 1962, ch. i.

To compose Shâhnâmâ's in praise of the Ottoman 
and the second half of the 10th/11th century the 
of historiographer-pageantrists of the court 
were known as 'Şehnâme-çehän' [see Lokmân, 
Sayyid]. (V. L. Menage)

FIRDEWSI, called Rûmî also Uzun or Tâwîl, 
(857/1453 ?). Turkish poet and polymath, 
author of the voluminous Sûleymanname, the Book 
of Solomon. He was probably born in Aydîndîk, 
where he spent his childhood, and educated at 
Bursa, where he had as master the poet Melûhî, and 
lived for a while at Balkesir. According to infor-
ination in the introduction of a Sûleymanname copy, 
seen by M. Fuad Köprüli (see Bib.) but now 
available, his ancestors were all illustrious men of 
arms who served the Emirs from 'Ohmân I onwards, 
and his father Hâdîddî Gênek Bey was given the 
fief of Aydîndîk for his services at the conquest of 
Istanbul. He is the author and translator of many 
books of very diverse subjects of which only some 
have come down to us. But he is particularly known 
for his Sûleymanname, an encyclopaedic work in 
verse and prose which includes all contemporary 
knowledge on history, geography, philosophy, 
geometry, medicine, etc. and all the classical 
anecdotes, found in religious literature, concerning 
Solomon. In its 80th volume he himself tells how he 
came to write the book: in the year 676/1277 he 
translated a portion of Firdawsi's Shâhnâmâ into 
Turkish verse and presented it to Mehmed II 
through Mahmûd Pîşgîh, the Grand-Vizier. The 
Sultan, remarking that the Shâhnâmâ was widely 
known and that it was unnecessary to repeat it, 
encouraged the poet to write a book on Solomon. 
Firdawsi searched for sources in the Imperial 
Library and toured Anatolia. He based his first three 
Volumes on the biblical David legend and the next 
three on a Persian book of Solomon which he 
had bought from an Arab at Nîkîs. He presented 
the first six volumes of his work to Mehmed II, who 
promised a reward when the work was completed. 
The Sultan however died while Firdawsi was writing 
the seventh volume. Eventually Bayezid II came to 
hear of this and asked for a copy. The first 82 
Volumes were submitted to the Imperial Library except for 
this 81st volume which somehow, owing to the 
copyist's error, was not. It was eventually sub-
mitted to Selim I (Sûleymanname, 81st Volume, 
Millet Kütüphanesi, Tabrîz, son of 317, 
3b-4a and 123a).

Firdawsi had planned his enormous work originally 
in 366 volumes divided into 1830 medûsîs, as he 
states at the end of certain early volumes (see 
for instance Topkapi Sarayi, Hazine K. no. 1525, 287b), 
and asked God for health and long life to be able to 
complete the work. His plan to 99 volumes from the 
original 366 was duly presented to the Imperial Library. Uzun 
Firdawsi continued to write at Bayezid II's order 
(whom incidentally he refers to as İlâhirîm) and 
speaks of himself as an aged man (pir). He says that 
he has devoted 40-50 years of his life to the 
compilation of the book, writing most of it at Balkesir 
(Topkapi Sarayi, Köşşülî K. 892, 83a). From these 
circumstances no doubt springs Latifî's tradition, 
later repeated by most sources, that Bayezid II 
Chose only 80 parts and had the rest destroyed.

At the end of the 79th volume Firdawsi reduces 
his plan to 99 volumes from the original 366 (Topkapi 
Sarayi, Hazine K., no. 1537, 387a). This revised plan 
is repeated at the end of volumes 80 and 81. There 
is also reference to intrigues and rivals. We have no 
indication whether he was able to write the re-
mainng 17 volumes. No library possesses a complete 
set. The best set is at the Topkapi Sarayi Library. 
The style of the Sûleymanname is very much like that 
of popular story books of the period though 
more repetitive and less vivid.

Bibliography: Latifî, Teddîhî s.v.; Bursall Tâhir, 
Öhmanî Mu'âlifleri, i/ii, 357; Babinger, 
GOW, 3, ii, 232; Melihâni Tarih-Cografya 
yazmaları Kataloğu, Istanbul 1944, ii, 147; 
M. Fuad Köprüli in IA, s.v. (with critical 
bibliography and list of works); Fahmi Edhem Karatay, 
Topkapi Sarayi Muâziye Kütûphanesi Türkçe 
(Fahik Iz)

FIRE [see NAK], GREEK FIRE [see BAKOD and NAFT].

FIREWORKS [see MELNIK].

FIRISHTA, by-name of Muhammed Kasim 
Hindî Shâh Astakâbâdi, Indo-Muslim historian, 
writer on Indian medicine and servant of the 
Ahmadnagar and Bijâlpûr sultanes. As Storey 
(whose account of Firishta's biography is followed 
here) states, the date and place of his birth remain 
conjectural but the context of Gülâm-i Ibrâhîmî, 
Bombay 1888, suggests that Firishta was probably born a few years before 980/1572. His 
father was one Gülâm 'Ali Hindî-Şâh. That 
Firishta was to be found among the gharîbân and 
gharîb-zadahd the 'foreigners' and their descendants 
who migrated for safety to Bijâlpûr in 997/1589 
(Gulâm-i Ibrâhîmî, ii, 295) suggests that his family 
was of recent domicile in Ahmadnagar. He was a 
Shi'î (Gulâmî, i, 27). Entering the service of Murdâd 
Nizâm-Şâh (972-976/1565-88) [q.v.] Firishta was 
employed as a member of the royal guard. Com-
misioned by Murdâd Nizâm-Şâh to discover why 
an army, gathered by the wakilî and pîşgîh Mirzâ Kâhîn ostensibly to resist invasion by Bijâlpûr, had 
remained immobile, Firishta discovered a plot 
between Mirzâ Kâhîn and the Bijâlpûr 'regent' 
Dîlawar Kâhîn to dethrone Murdâd Nizâm-Şâh in 
favour of his son Mirzâ Hasûn. Firishta warned 
Murdâd but was unable to save him from assassi-
nation. Firishta himself only escaped death through 
Mirzâ Hasûn recognizing his claims as a former 
school-fellow. A forced migration of gharîbân from 
Ahmadnagar to Bijâlpûr in 997/1589 followed the 
murder of Mirzâ Hasûn and on 19 Safar 998/28 
December 1589 Firishta was presented at the 
Bijâlpûr court and on 8 Rabî' 1 998/1 January 
1590 took service under Ibrâhîm 'Alî Şâh. Later 
that year Firishta acted as a go-between for Burhân
Firishta

Nizam Shah who was seeking Bidiapuri support for the deposition of his son Ismail. In the subsequent struggle between the forces of Bidijapur and Ahmadnagar, Firishta was wounded and captured, but escaped. In Radjab 998/May-June 1590 he accompanied Ibrahim ʿAbd Shah on his night excursion to remove the 'regent' Dilawar Khan. In Safar 1013/July 1604 Firishta accompanied Bega Sultan, daughter of Ibrahim ʿAbd Shah, upon her journey to marry Akbar's son Daulat. At the beginning of Daulat's reign, Firishta was sent upon some unspecified mission to Lahore. Under the reference to the death of Bahadur Khan Farkhli at Ágra in 1033/1623-4 was inserted by a later hand, Firishta was still alive in that year.

Firishta's reputation rests upon his well-known historical work the Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmi, extant in two recensions, the first dated 1015/1606-7 and the second, with a new title, Taʿrikh-i Nawras-nama, dated 1018/1609-10. The Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmi sets out (i, 4) to narrate the annals of the pāhārān-i Islām and the biographies of the masādīkh who have been connected with the ordering (nizām) of the countries of Hindustān (mamālik-i Hindustān) from Sebuktīgīn of Ghazna onward. The annals (nābūsī) are prefaced by a mubāhādima giving an abstract of Hindī history and are followed with a khitima on the geographical regions of the country, and on the great Hindī rādīs of Firishta's time who keep their territories, Firishta says (ii, 788), on payment of tribute.

The typical genres of Indo-Muslim historiography in Firishta's day were the general history of Muslim rulers from the time of the Prophet and the regional histories of the sultanates. Thus Firishta's abstract of pre-Muslim Hindu annals (wdffidt) of Hind, that of Baranī (264-5) than to that of the Tabakdt-i Akbari, appears to have been more of a historical rather than a biographical work. Firishta himself, in his account (i, 238) of Muhammad b. Sam of Ghor at Dāmak in 602/1206-7, followed by the numismatic evidence. Firishta copies (i, 122) Nizam al-Dīn's misstatement, that of Baranī (477), and following him Nizam al-Dīn (1001/1592-3). Firishta himself, in his use of data, shows independence. His account (i, 183) of the dialogue between the kōfūl of Dīlī and Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Khālidī (i, 183) is textually closer to that of Baranī (264-5) than to that of the Tabakdt-i Akbari (145). Firishta glosses his sources without explanation. Thus he speaks (i, 240) of Muhammad b. Tughluk's intention to conquer the wīsāyi-ī Ĉīn when Baranī (477) speaks of the Tughluk's assumption of royal titles by Sultan Kuli Khutba. In his use of data, Firishta draws upon oral tradition independently. His account (i, 238) of the origin of Ghiyath al-Dīn Tughluk is based on personal inquiries at Lahore during his visit there at the beginning of Daulat's reign.

Firishta evinces the same characteristics as an annalist of the Muslim sultanates of the Deccan. The story of the Ottoman origin of Yūsuf ʿAbd Shah of Bidjāpūr is given as 'the best of tales' (ii, 1) but without a personal affirmation of its authenticity. (See algārā). His report (ii, 6) that Yūsuf ʿAbd Shah assumed the title of ʿAbd Shah and had the kūha read in his name in 685/1289 is not consistent with the evidence of Rafīʿ al-Dīn Shīrāzī, Tabakdt-i Akbari, B.M. Add. 23,383, fols. 32a-33b, a work contemporary with Firishta and by re-creating a great regional history—Abū 'l-Fadl's Akbar-nāma, Abu 'l-Fadl's Rawdat al-safd (c. 905/1490-4) through Khudsi's Rawdat al-safd to Akbar in 993/1585, and from the Tabakdt-i al-mulūk, al-Dīn Shirāzī, (c. 930/1524) to the Tabakdt-i Akbari (c. 1015/1606-7) follows Nizam al-Dīn Ahmad's Tabakdt-i al-mulūk, al-Dīn Shirāzī, (c. 1001/1592-3). Firishta himself, in his account (i, 238) of the origin of Ghiyath al-Dīn Tughluk is based on personal inquiries at Lahore during his visit there at the beginning of Daulat's reign.
He states (i, 575) that the fifth Bahmani sultan was Mahmood and not Muhammad as the coinage (O. Codrington, *Coins of the Bahmani dynasty*, in *Numismatic Chronicle*, xvi (1899), 330-2), and ʿAll b. ʿAzaż Allah Tabātābā, Būrān-i maʿālīgh (1003/1594), Haydarābād 1355/1936, 36-8, and Shīrāzī's *Tāghkhārat al-mulūk*, fol. 16a-b, suggest. On the discrepancies between the Gūlgān-i ʿIrākīmī and the Būrān-i maʿālīgh in other respects see Sir Woleseley Haig, *The history of the Nizām Shāhī kings of Ahmadnagar*, in *Indian Antiquary*, xvi, 1935-6, 282-5; ii, 1937-8, 290-3; 1938-9, 39-53, 1920-3. The differences between the accounts of Deccan and Gūgārāt history by Niẓām al-Dīn Aḥmad and Fīrīzhītā have been exhaustively noticed in the translation of the *Tākhābat-i Aḥbār* by Brajendranath De, i/ii, *Bibl. Ind.*, Calcutta 1939.

Criticism of *Fīrīzhītā* as a historian, often by anachronistic criteria (e.g., S. H. Hodivala, *Studies in Indo-Muslim history*, i, Bombay 1939, 294-5), has perhaps been the more severe by reason of the reputation and status of an 'authority' which he enjoyed among European writers on Indo-Muslim history from the middle of the 18th century. Alexander Dow, *The history of Hindostan*, 2 vols., London 1768, introduced the *Gūlgān-i ʿIrākīmī* (makālas i and ii only), to a European public in the form of an interpretation in which there is little to distinguish a very free version from transliteration. Dow's translation was the basis of a general annalist of Muslim rule in Hindustān. Fīrīzhītā provided a basis for that general history of India before the attainment of political authority by the East India Company for which Dow hoped his countrymen were, by reason of their growing involvement in India, ready. A translation of the eleventh makāla on Māllbār in the *Āṣāsitīk miscellanea*, 2 vols., 1824, 1827-9, from the Persian of Jonathan Scott, *Fīrīzhītā's history of Deshkan*, 2 vols., Shrewsbury 1794, further established Fīrīzhītā as an 'authority' and Thomas Maurice, *History of Hindostan*, 2 vols. and 2 parts, London 1802-10, David Price, *Chronological retrospective*, 3 vols., London 1811-21, and James Mill, *History of British India*, 3 vols., London 1817, drew more or less heavily upon the text; Jonathan Scott published his own translation of all the *Gūlgān-i ʿIrākīmī* except the part containing the biographies of the maghālīk (on hunting); (on Ottoman literature) the dictio-
Firuz Shah Tughluq

Firuz Shah, son of Muhammad b. Tughluk, was the fifth sultan of the Tughluq dynasty. He succeeded Muhammad in 738/1338 and ruled until 767/1366. He was known for his humanistic and liberal policies, which contrasted with the harshness of his predecessors.

Firuz Shah's reign was marked by a number of significant events. He is credited with the construction of the Qutub Minar in Delhi, which remains one of the city's most iconic landmarks. He also promoted education and culture, founding universities and libraries. His policies were oriented towards the welfare of the people, and he attempted to reduce the burden of taxation.

However, Firuz Shah was not free from internal and external challenges. Internal conflicts and divisions within his court, along with external threats from the Muslim kingdoms in the Deccan, and the Berber states in North Africa, strained his resources and capabilities. His reign saw a decline in military power and the weakening of the imperial state. Despite these challenges, Firuz Shah's reign contributed significantly to the cultural and intellectual life of the Delhi Sultanate.

Bibliography:
1. Himayarl, al-Rawd al-miftâr, ed. Lévi-Provençal, text 143, tr. 171-2; Dozy, Descr., ii, 255; Desv., Isp., ii, 294; Lévi-Provençal, Histoire de l'Espagne musulmane, i, 218; idem, L'Espagne musulmane au Xe siècle, 117; Yâkut, Mu'djam, iii, 889-90.

(A. Huici Miranda)
stratification. Indeed, some of his own measures contributed to corruption and inefficiency. The Sultan's weakness was to some extent balanced by the wisdom and firmness of his wazir, Khân Djahan Makbûl (a convert, from Telingânâ in South India), whom he trusted implicitly and who served him with rare loyalty. Another buttress which Firuz Şah built up to offset his weakness was the large body of personal slaves he acquired and maintained. These slaves, known as the bandagân-i Firuz Şahî, though loyal to their master, created much trouble towards the end of the Sultan's reign and after his death.

In religious matters Firuz Şah was strongly orthodox. He suppressed extremist sectarian manifestations and outbreaks of what he considered heretical movements in his kingdom. On the advice of the ulama (whom he frequently consulted), he extended diyya to the Brahmans, who had so far been exempt from the tax, though he allowed them to pay it at the lowest rate. Firuz Şah was the last Sultan of Dehli to receive investiture from the Abbâsîd caliph, himself by now a powerless pensionary in Cairo.

Firuz Şah was a prolific builder. He founded several towns, including a new city of Dehli named Firuzâbâd, and Dwânpûr, named after his late imperial cousin Dwânpûr Khân (afterwards Muhammad b. Djawna Khân). He spent his own fortunes and the wealth of his court in many public and private buildings, architectural undertakings in all, that have not been surpassed in the city.

Firuz Şah died in Ramaḍân 790/September 1388 and lies buried in a simple and dignified mausoleum at the Hawd Khâs outside Dehli. The ease and plenty of his reign, the widespread distribution of charity, the corruption in the civil as well as the military administration, and the very peace and tranquillity which made the people "forget the profession of arms" (Fârîd, mentioned above, 277), were not of a high order. He also showed interest in preserving old monuments and repaired many of these, including the Kutb Minâr. His transplanting of two Asokan pillars from their original sites to the city of Dehli was a creditable feat of mediaeval engineering. The operation in all its phases—the uprooting of the pillars, transporting them across the river Djamunâ and refixing them in the sites where they stand to this day—is described in elaborate detail in the Sirât-i Firuz Şâhî (see Asiatic Memos., no. 52, cited in Bibl. below). The many gardens Firuz Şah laid out around Dehli substantially increased the supply of flowers and fruits to the city.

Firuz Şah died in Ramaḍân 790/September 1388 but was not buried in a simple and dignified mausoleum at the Hawd Khâs outside Dehli. The ease and plenty of his reign, the widespread distribution of charity, the corruption in the civil as well as the military administration, and the very peace and tranquillity which made the people "forget the profession of arms" (Fârîd, sapped the vigour of the ruling community and thereby contributed to the rapid decline of the Sultanate after him. The invasion of Timûr a decade after the Sultan's death only hastened the process of decay which had already begun.

Bibliography: Among the Persian sources, ʿAffî's Taʿrîkh-i Firuz Şâhî gives the fullest account of the reign. Though professedly favourable to Firuz Şah, ʿAffî seldom slurs over his faults. Firuz Şah's own brochure, the Futuhât-i Firuz Şâhî (inscribed in a dome, no longer extant, in the Masjid-i Firuz Şahî in Firuzâbâd) is a revealing document. See Elliott and Dowson, i, 265-388, for translations of excerpts from Persian accounts. For modern writings, see articles by Riazul Islam, B. N. Roy, K. K. Basu and others listed in Pearson, Index Islamicus, pp. 631-2, Supplement, p. 203. The more important articles are given below.

Original sources: Diyaʾ al-Dîn Barâni, Taʿrîkh-i Firuz Shahi (Bibl. Indica), Calcutta 1862; Ayn al-Mulk Mâhrî Multânî, Musâvât-i Mâhrî, Asiatic Society of Bengal MS, Cat. No. 338, Ivanov, pp. 145-58; Anon., Sirât-i Firuz Shahî, Oriental Public Library, Bankiâpur, Catalogue, vii, 28-33, MS No. 547; Firuz Şah, Futûhât-i Firuz Şahî, (i) B. M. MS Or. 2039, see Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS., ii, 920 (ii) text with translation and introduction by Sh. Abdur Rashid, Aligarh 1945; Shams Sirâdî ʿAffî, Taʿrîkh-i Firuz Şahî (Bibl. Indica), Calcutta 1890; Muhammad Bihâmid Khânî, Taʿrîkh-i Mahommâdî, B. M. MS Or. 137.


FIRUZABAD (formerly Piruzabad, ‘the town of victory’, and originally known as Gür or Ėir) is situated in 28° 50’ N. Lat. and 52° 34’ E. Long. (Greenwich); it is 1356 m. above sea level. The present town, which had 4,340 inhabitants in 1951, is 3 km. to the south-east of the ancient site. Firuzâbâd, besides being one of the chief centres of the state, had four gates, one at each cardinal point; these gates were called Mihrâ (the Sun), Bahârm (Mars), Hormuz (Jupiter) and Ardashir. In the centre of the town was the lofty tower (now in ruins) on the top of which was a fire-altar; near by was a large fire-temple. North of the town are the remains of the palace which Ardashir built shortly before his successful revolt; it is thus the oldest Sásâni building in existence (see F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, Iranische Felsreliefs, Berlin 1910, 128). Gür was the capital of the province of Ardashir-khurma (‘Glory of Ardashir’). According to al-Baladhuri (315 and 359), Gür and Iṣkâhûr were the last two towns in Fars to surrender to the Muslim Arabs. In the 3rd/9th century Gür was as large as Iṣkâhûr, but smaller than Shâhêr. The district produced excellent rose-water which was exported far and wide; it was also celebrated for its fruit. The Buwayhid ruler ‘Adud al-Dawla (q.v.) used to frequent Gür; his courtiers, disliking the name (which means ‘grave’ in Persian), persuaded him to change it to Firuzâbâd (‘the town of victory’). Ėirâd Allâh Mustawfî (Nusha, 137) stated that the inhabitants were noted for their piety and honesty.

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text, see Mukaddasî, 432; Ibn al-Balkhî, Fârs-nâmâ (ed. Le Strange and Nicholson), 137-139; Yêkót, iii, 146; Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire
de la Perse, 174-176; T. Nödeke, Araber und Perser, 11, note 3; Flandin and Coste, Voyage en Perse, vol. i, 36-45 and plates xxxv to xlv; Oscar Reuther, Sassanian Architecture, in A Survey of Persian Art, vol. i, 493; A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, 87, 93, 94, 114 and 168; R. Ghirshman, Iran from the earliest times to the Islamic Conquest, 320-21, 323-24, 328; Rahnami-yi Irān, 180 (with town plan on 181); Razmārā and Nawtāsh, Farangī-hang Daryāgtāš-yi Irān, vol. vii, 168.

(L. Lockhart)

Al-Fīruzābādī, Abū 'l-Tāhir Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm Maḥmūd al-Dīn al-Shāfī'ī al-Sīrāzī, from his father's town Fīruzābād, was born at Kāzārūn, a town near Shīrāz (Iran) in Rabī' II or Dhu 'l-Qa'da II 729/February or April 1329. From the age of eight he was educated in Shīrāz, then in Wāsi't, and in 745/1344, in Baghdād. In 750/1350 he was attending the classes of Taṣlī al-Dīn al-Sukhālī in Damascus (Brockelmann, II, 106).

His long life can be divided into three main periods, spent in Jerusalem, Mecca and in the Yemen.

In the same year 750 he accompanied al-Sukhālī to Jerusalem where he stayed for ten years as a teacher and then, while still a young man, became a master. Subsequent travels took him to Cairo and Asia Minor.

The information to be found in his biographers in regard to his journeys varies very greatly (see Brockelmann, II, 232 n.). We have here followed, like Brockelmann, ibid., the account given in the K. al-Ra'sūl al-'itīr of al-Nūmānī, which seems to be the most trustworthy. According to al-Saljākhāwī's account (Daw, x, 85 foot), a long biography of al-Fīruzābādī is given in the 'Ubdb of al-Makrīzī; this must be the Durar al-'Ukūd al-farīda fi tarādīm al-'a'sīn al-mufrīdā; the MS Gotha 1771 cannot include this, but perhaps it is contained in MS Mawṣīl 1864, no. 5 (Brockelmann, S, III, 37), which should correctly be 264, no. 5. From al-Makrīzī interesting details might be expected. The ms. is at the present time in Baghdād, in the possession of the al-Djālī family who do not allow it to be consulted.

In 770/1368 he went to live in Mecca, breaking his stay there to travel to India and spending five years in Dīlīh; after that came more travelling.

In 794/1392 he went to Baghdād at the invitation of Sultan Aḥmad b. Uways, and afterwards to Persia. Timūr Lah, after taking Shīrāz (795/1393), greeted him with the greatest respect. But his native land, ravaged by the Mongol invasion, could no longer keep him: from Hormūz he set sail for the MS Gotha 1771 cannot include 'Ayun al-mufrīdā', in Dihli; after that came more travelling. Who do not allow it to be consulted. Subsequent travels took him to Cairo and Asia Minor.

He bought many books, the necessary equipment for the work of compilation, as practised in his time. A spendthrift (but see Daw, x, 81 l. 23), he used to sell during a famine and buy back when times of plenty returned. His works were concerned with tafsīr, hadīth and history, but lexicography remained the branch in which he excelled.

He had certain pretensions: born near Shīrāz, he claimed to be a descendant of the celebrated Shīfi'ī Abū Iṣāḥāk al-Shīrāzī (Brockelmann, I, 484) who had, however, died without issue. After achieving his brilliant position in the Yemen, he called himself and wrote by the name of Muhammad al-Siddīkī, as though a descendant of the caliph Abū Bakr al-Siddīkī (Daw, x, 85 l. 12-3; al-Nūmānī, Rawd, 218 r.), no doubt the eccentricity of a man who enjoyed great renown. He had more serious ambitions: he wished to compile a dictionary in 60 (Kāmūs, Preface, 3 l. 13) or, it is even said, in 100 volumes: al-Lāmī' al-muṣallam al-'aṣ̄īb al-qā'im bayn al-Muḥkam wa l-'Ushūb, which only reached the 5th volume (Ibn al-Tamād, Shaghadīrī, vii, 128; T. A., Preface, 14, l. 10). He made a summary of it, his Kāmūs, its full title being al-Kāmūs al-muṣallam wa l-'aṣ̄īb wa l-qā'im bayn al-Muḥkam wa l-'Ushūb, which only reached the 5th volume (Ibn al-Tamād, Shaghadīrī, vii, 128; T. A., Preface, 14, l. 10).

The Preface to the T. A. (i, 134) provides a biography of al-Fīruzābādī and a list (incomplete) of 45 works; Brockelmann (S, II, 236) must have referred to it, for the Preface to the Kāmūs does not include a comparable list. 49 works, according to Daw (x, 81-3): taṣfīr 6, hadīth and history 27, lexicography and et alia 16, but 61 in the 'Ubdb al-dawwar of Dāmil Bey al-ʿAzm (i, 302-6), lists, however, that are open to criticism.

Al-Fīruzābādī is "the author of the Kāmūs", his name remains connected with this famous book. The work is preeminently a compilation of the Muḥkam of Ibn Sīdā and of the 'Ubdb of al-Saghānī. He venerated al-Saghānī as a model (Daw, x, 83). But from whom did he take the taṣfīr? It
would be helpful to discover if he is indebted for certain elements to the Shams al-Tulûm of Naṣîḥân al-Ḥimyarî (a first vol. published by K. V. Zetter- stein, Leiden to 1933). The Kingârî completed in Mecca in his house ʿala l-tāfâf (end of K., iv, 415) during the second main period described above (cf. Daw, x, 83 and 85), before his stay in the Yemen. But it is hardly likely that such an expert lexicographer as he would have been unacquainted with this dictionary which incidentally devotes so much space to matters concerning the Yemen.

Very brief definitions or explanations allowed him to present an extremely rich vocabulary in a volume of modest size. This brevity has given rise to innumerable misapprehensions (see Lane, Lexicon, Preface, XVII t. 14-6 and ZDMG, iii (1849), 95 ff.). It was the subject of numerous glosses and criticisms, and commentaries of every sort, both by admirers, in particular the Tâdi al-ʿarâs of al-Sayyid Murtaḍâ al-Ẓabîdî (d. 1205/1791), 10 vols., Bûlâk 1306-7, who in this commentary incorporates the work of his master Abû ʿAbd Allâh al-Fâṣî, the ʿIdât al-ʿarâs, and by detractors, including the ʿShâk al-dârâh; see I. Goldzâher, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachgeschichtsmethode bei den Arabern, Vienna 1872, ii, 602 ff. and the judgement of al-Sûyûtî, Mushîrî, iii, 1001 f. I. Goldzâher, in his analysis of the criticisms of Ahmad Fâris al-Shîdîyâk (d. 1205/1887), al-ʿDîjâsâr ʿala l-ʿKûmus, Istanbul 1299 and, more recently, the Taṣhîkh al-ʿKûmus (Cairo 1343/1925) of Ahmad Taymûr Pâsha.

The ʿKûmus was published for the first time in Calcutta (1720-2) and Üskûdûr (1230), and on very many occasions subsequently. The 4th edition (Cairo 1357/1938) in iv, of the Mathâbat al-Dâr al-Maʿâtir (cited in this article), is well presented typographically.

The ʿKûmus has been translated into Persian (see Brockelmann, S II, 234), and also into Turkish by ʿĀṣim Efendî (d. 1235/1819 or 1248/1832): al-ʿUbîyânîs al-basîl fi tâjîrânat al-ʿKûmus al-muṭîh, published in Bûlâk 1250, Istanbul 1305, etc. This Turkish edition was favoured by nineteenth-century orientalists and is often quoted, e.g., by Fleischer and Goldzâher.

In the West the Thesaurus linguae Arabicae of A. Giglius (Milan 1632, 4 vols.) was based on the ʿKûmus. For his Lexicon (Leiden 1653), J. Goliûs added to it the ʿShâkîh. Freytag (Kazimîrî) and Belot did the same. The two rivals were associated together to provide a dictionary for European orientalists; and Lane took as the basis of his great Lexicon the Tâdi al-ʿarâs, the commentary on the ʿKûmus referred to above.


The ʿKûmus, the turquois, a well-known precious stone of a bright green or “mountain green” colour with a glossy like wax; in composition it is a hydrated clay phosphate with a small but essential proportion of copper and iron. The colour is not permanent in all stones, and is said to be particularly affected by perspiration. It is almost always cut as an ornament en cabochon, i.e., with a convex upper surface; only stones with an inscription are given a flat upper surface. The provenance of serviceable stones is limited to a few places whose history may be traced back for thousands of years. Turquoise mines were worked by the kings of Egypt in the peninsula of Sinai. Major Macdonald discovered them again in 1845 in the Wâdî Maghâra and its neighbourhood and worked them again for a number of years. No mention of the stone or the mines has survived from the Hellenistic period; on the other hand in addition to marvellous details of the method of procuring the pale green callais in Carmania (east of Persia), Pliny knows a good deal about its properties, and his description can only refer to our turquoise; for the statement that the callais loses its colour when affected by oil or ointment is found in al-Kindî on the fīrûzâdî and in almost all mineralogical works. It can hardly be doubted that the turquoise was obtained in the Sâsânî period and even earlier in the mines around Nishâpûr. Al-Tîfâshî (d. 657/ 1253) says of the kings of Persia that they adorned their hands and necks with turquoises, because they averted danger of death by land or water; but we often meet with the assertion that the turquoise detracts from the majesty of kings. It was considered to contain copper and to be formed in the vicinity of copper mines. Different kinds are distinguished according to the different colours (sky-blue, milk-blue, green, spotted); the best kind is considered to be the bûshâkî (i.e., Abû Ishâkî) and the finest variety of this is the sky-blue az-hârî. Large pieces are very rare and are correspondingly costly, small pieces on the other hand are very common. The best specimens retain their colour, apart from the influences detailed below; after 10-12 years many lose their colour entirely and the stone is then said to be dead. All stones, however, show a certain variation in colour. They are brilliant in a clear sky and dim when the sky is clouded; they alter their colour with the state of health of the wearer, and when affected by sweat, oil or musk; fat is believed to restore the colour again.

Taken internally it is a poison, but in collyrium it is useful for clearing the sight, also if it is stared at for some time. Gold takes away its beauty (unlike lapis lazuli), i.e., probably, the greenish blue colour does not harmonize as well with the yellow of the gold as the dark blue of the lapis lazuli.

Ibn al-ʿAkâfî (d. 749/1348) explains the name fīrûzâdî as “stone of victory”; whence it is also called ḥādîr al-ṣâhâbî. The word fīrûzâdî is found in many corrupt forms in the Latin translations of the middle ages (farsaquem, febrongus, provseque etc.), but none of these can be considered the original of
the word turquoise; for as early as the 13th century we find the form turcos, turquesia and turquesia, and it may safely be assumed that this remarkably limited. Ibn al-A’fani quotes on the authority of Hermes a talisman made of it. In the great magical work "Ghayat al-hakim" the turquoise appears in the list of stones among those belonging to Saturn; but only one single talisman engraved on turquoise is mentioned.

General Sir A. Houtum-Schinder who was governor of the mining area and director of operations at the mines in the "eights" of last century has given a detailed account of the Persian turquoise mines at Mas’had in Khurāsān, which is quoted in Bauer’s "Edelsteinkunde" (2nd ed., 490 et seq.).


(F. RUSKA-M. PLESSNER)

FIRCUZAD — FIRCUZPUR

1. The capital of the Ghurid [q.v.] kings, in the mountains east of Herat on the upper Hari-rūd ca. 64° 22’ E. Long. (Green.) and ca. 34° 23’ N. Lat. The site has been identified with the present Djam al-Din (q.v.) where a large minaret of the same name still stands. The town was conquered by ‘Ala al-Dīn Khārṣāzī Shāh in 607/1210, and it was finally destroyed by Ogōdei son of Čingiz Khań in 619/1222. The Firuzkūh nomads probably derived their name from this site.

2. The name of a castle in Tabaristan near Mt. Damāwand in a district called Wānīma. We do not know when the castle or town of Firuzkōh was built and Casanova’s attempt to identify it with Fīrm, capital of a dynasty of Īṣāḥābdūr in the 4th/10th century, was refuted by Kazwīnī (Djuwanī, iii, 381). Firuzkūh is mentioned as an important stronghold under the Khārṣāzīs and especially under the Mongols. It was taken by the Mongols in 624/1227 (Djuwanī, ii, 210). Afterwards the Ismā’īlīs of Alamut obtained possession of it. It fell again to the Mongols under Hülegü in 654/1256. The area was a summer resort for the Il-Khāns, and the name appears in accounts of Tīmūr’s conquests. The town is now linked to Tehrān by rail (202 km.); it has over 5,000 inhabitants and is the centre of a district of the same name.


FIRZPUR (FIRZPUR). A district in the Panjab which takes its name from the principal town. It forms part of the Dīlanārdī divi-
sion, lying between 29° 55’ and 32° 9’ N. and 73° 52’ and 75° 26’ E. Area 3202 sq. m. Until 1947, the principal town was Fīrūzpur. After his conversion in 674/1277 (Djuwanī, ii, 213). The town was refounded by the Il-Khāns and to it were brought the spoils of the conquests of the Ghurids. It was a cultural centre where writers and poets flourished. After the death of Ghiyāth al-Dīn in 593/1202 the empire fell to pieces and Firuzkūh lost its importance. Ghiyāth al-Dīn built the minaret which still stands.

The town was conquered by ‘Ala al-Dīn Khārṣāzī Shāh in 607/1210, and it was finally destroyed by Ogōdei son of Čingiz Khań in 619/1222. The Firuzkūh nomads probably derived their name from this site.

2. The name of a castle in Tabaristan near Mt. Damāwand in a district called Wānīma. We do not know when the castle or town of Firuzkōh was built and Casanova’s attempt to identify it with Fīrm, capital of a dynasty of Īṣāḥābdūr in the 4th/10th century, was refuted by Kazwīnī (Djuwanī, iii, 381). Firuzkūh is mentioned as an important stronghold under the Khārṣāzīs and especially under the Mongols. It was taken by the Mongols in 624/1227 (Djuwanī, ii, 210). Afterwards the Ismā’īlīs of Alamut obtained possession of it. It fell again to the Mongols under Hülegü in 654/1256. The area was a summer resort for the Il-Khāns, and the name appears in accounts of Tīmūr’s conquests. The town is now linked to Tehrān by rail (202 km.); it has over 5,000 inhabitants and is the centre of a district of the same name.


FIRZPUR (FIRZPUR). A district in the Panjab which takes its name from the principal town. It forms part of the Dīlanārdī divi-
sion, lying between 29° 55’ and 32° 9’ N. and 73° 52’ and 75° 26’ E. Area 3202 sq. m. Until 1947, the principal town was Fīrūzpur. After his conversion in 674/1277 (Djuwanī, ii, 213). The town was refounded by the Il-Khāns and to it were brought the spoils of the conquests of the Ghurids. It was a cultural centre where writers and poets flourished. After the death of Ghiyāth al-Dīn in 593/1202 the empire fell to pieces and Firuzkūh lost its importance. Ghiyāth al-Dīn built the minaret which still stands.

The town was conquered by ‘Ala al-Dīn Khārṣāzī Shāh in 607/1210, and it was finally destroyed by Ogōdei son of Čingiz Khań in 619/1222. The Firuzkūh nomads probably derived their name from this site.

2. The name of a castle in Tabaristan near Mt. Damāwand in a district called Wānīma. We do not know when the castle or town of Firuzkōh was built and Casanova’s attempt to identify it with Fīrm, capital of a dynasty of Īṣāḥābdūr in the 4th/10th century, was refuted by Kazwīnī (Djuwanī, iii, 381). Firuzkūh is mentioned as an important stronghold under the Khārṣāzīs and especially under the Mongols. It was taken by the Mongols in 624/1227 (Djuwanī, ii, 210). Afterwards the Ismā’īlīs of Alamut obtained possession of it. It fell again to the Mongols under Hülegü in 654/1256. The area was a summer resort for the Il-Khāns, and the name appears in accounts of Tīmūr’s conquests. The town is now linked to Tehrān by rail (202 km.); it has over 5,000 inhabitants and is the centre of a district of the same name.


of pilgrimage, where a 3 days' festival was held in January. Round it the important town of ...

The decisive battle of Aliwal was fought outside the...

The Muslim population of the city, and of the district, have been fixed by his position as the second in a chain of five philosophers (between Empedocles and Socrates) (see Anabādūkīs), or to have fallen in the reign of an Artaxerxes (Saʿīdīd [Eutychios], Annals, i, 77). The customary dating “in the time of Sulaymān” used for men and events of great antiquity is occasionally mentioned (Shahrastānī), as he was also supposed to have been in touch in Egypt with followers (ashāb) of Sulaymān. His claim to being the founder of philosophy was recognized as disputed by other theories concerning the history of philosophy (Picatrix, 245; Sūjīstānī, Īṣām Īsāmīn, according to Ms. Murad Molla 1948, 293, but following Picatrix (Plutarch ?), it was constantly repeated that he had coined the word “philosophy”, and, following the introductions to the Aristotelian Logic, that he had given his name to the philosophical school of the Pythagoreans. He was sometimes believed to have elaborated on the doctrines of Empedocles (Saʿīdī al-Anḍalūsī, trans. Blachère, 60; Kīfīfī, 258 f.), or to have been a forerunner of the Platonic theory of ideas (Picatrix, trans. Ritter and Plessner, 154). In addition to his role in the history of philosophy, his main achievements were the invention of the science of music and the propagation among the Greeks of arithmetic and geometry (Ya’qūbī, i, 134; or the introduction of geometry, physics, and metaphysics from the East: Abu l-Hasan al-Āmīrī, Āmīrī, Martībī, 789, 80b; Saʿīdī; Kīfī; Ibn Abī Usaybiʿīa). The Ḥarrānīn (or Harrānīn), or Harrānīn, are said to have been one of their prophets (Bīrūnī, Chronology, 205; Ikwānān al-Ṣafāfī, cf. P. Kraus, Jābirī, Cairo 1942-3, ii, 223 n. 1), and his mystico-religious character was noted (Māšīdry, Muradī, iii, 348; Ibn Abī Usaybiʿīa). In addition to his own contacts with the East, we hear about students of his who went east and influenced Zoroastrianism and Indian religious philosophy (from the doxographical work of Ammonius, Ms. Aya Sofya 2450, cited by Bīrūnī, Chronology [cf. H. S. Taqizadeh, in BSOS, vili (1935-7), 947 ff.], and Shahrastānī, 277 f. and 455 ff.).

Of the works ascribed to him, the Golden Words (Chrysdé epō) enjoyed extraordinary fame and a wide circulation in their Arab translation, which, in the course of transmission, underwent slight but at times meaningful variations. The text, referred to as al-Risāla (al-Raṣādī al-ṣaḥābīyya or Wāṣāya (Wajīya)), once they are also referred to as the “Golden Epistle and Exhortation for Diogenes” (Ras. Ikhwān al-Ṣafā, Cairo 1947-1958, iv, 100 to be connected with i, 92 f.). The appellation “golden” is said to go back to Galen who read the poem daily and copied it with gold letters, a statement for which the Greek authority remains to be found. Separate editions by J. Eichmann, Tabula Cebetis (1640, from Miskawabī); L. Cheikhb, Traités indéits, 2nd ed. (1911); M. Ullmann (Diss. Munich 1959, not yet published); cf. also F. Rosenthal, in Orientalia, N.S., x (1941), 104 ff., and M. Plessner, in Eshkolot, iv (1962), 68. The Muslims knew of various commentaries on the work. One is ascribed to Proclus (Picatrix, 252; Kīfīfī, 89) and listed as extant in a summary made by ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Tayyib (d. 435/1043) in Ms. Escurial 888 (8); its relationship, if any, to the commentary of Hierocles has not yet been investigated. A recension of Sūjīstānī, Īṣām Īsāmīn (Murad Molla 1408, 13a) introduces its (uncommented) quotation of the work as being “a summary of the book of Iamblichus in explanation of the ‘Golden’ Exhortations”. A manuscript of this commentary appears to be preserved in Prince K. Kritzeck, in MIDEO, iii (1956), 380. The existence of a commentary by Ahmad b. al-Tayyib al-Sarakhsī (p. 55, Rosenthal) is poorly attested (a confusion with the
The influence of Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism on Muslim civilization must be rated rather high. Greco-Arabic theories of music and numbers go back ultimately to them (Nicomachus of Gerasa, the author of the *Ariihmétikh Esagégê*, was even thought to have been identical with the father of Aristotle). The *Fitna* may not have been entirely unaware of the organizational precedent of Pythagoreanism, and — al-Ra'i, among others, is stated to have been inspired by the Pythagoreans and to have written in their defence (Mas’udi, *Tanbih*, 162; Safi’di, trans. Blanchère, 75). However, the name of Pythagoras must often be considered a mere label, as in his alleged appearance, together with Plato and Aristotle, in Isma’ili *mawṣûl* (*Mafrîz, Qahîî, Bûlûk* 1270, i, 394). Biblical allusions, however, are greatly out of place, and the manner of the article, supplementary to M. Steinmeisser, *Die arabischen Übersetzungen* (1889), repr. Graz 1960, 4–8. (F. Rothen sal) *Fitna*, the primary meaning is “putting to the proof, discriminatory test”, as gold, al-Djurjânî says in his *Tarîfî* (ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 171), is tested by fire. Hence the idea of a temptation permitted or sent by God to test the believer’s faith, which, for the man wedded to his desires, would have the appearance of an invitation to abandon the faith. “Your goods and children are *fitna*” (*Kûr*â’n, VIII, 28; LXIV, 15). The term *fitna* occurs many times in the *Kûr*â’n with the sense of temptation or trial of faith (“tention d’abjurer”, according to R. Blanchère’s translation); and most frequently as a test which is itself a punishment inflicted by God upon the sinners, the sinful, the unrighteous. “Taste your *fitna*” (LI, 14); this temptation is addressing “those who are *tried by the Fire*” (of Gehenna). It is not a matter of an inner, secret temptation, but of external circumstances in which faith succumbs or may succumb. “O Lord, do not place us in *fitna* before those who are unfaithful!” (*Kûr*â’n, LX, 5). The idea of scandal is associated with it (VII, 5), to such an extent that to take a part in this putting to the test is for man a very grave fault: “the *fitna* of believers is worse than murder” (ibid., II, 191; cf. II, 217). On the one hand, *fitna* will thus be employed in the sense of the “trial of the grace”, or even the torments of hell; but on the other hand *fitna* will be essentially a state of rebellion against the divine Law in which the weak always run the risk of being trapped. The idea which is to become dominant is that of “revolt”, “disturbances” “civil war”, but a civil war that breeds schism and in which the believers’ purity of faith is in grave danger. There are numerous *kadhîs* which proclaim the troubles to come, which will destroy the Community and from which the believer must flee. For example: “after me there shall break forth such troubles (*fitna*) that the believer of one morning shall, by evening, be an infidel, while the believer of the evening shall, by morning, be an infidel—save only for those whom God will strengthen through knowledge” (quoted in the “Profession of Faith” of Ibn Batîa,
in H. Laoust’s translation).—In view of the fusion of spiritual and temporal characteristic of Islam, the great struggles of the early period of Muslim history are fitna (pl. fitan), inasmuch as the questions contested regarding the legitimacy of the imams or caliphs and the armed conflicts that they aroused have a direct bearing on the values of faith.

The series of events which includes the murder of 'Uthmān, the designation of 'Ālī as 'Imām, the battle of Siffin and the development of both the ṛājūt 'Ālī [q.e.] and the ḥāshāridī [q.e.] schisms, and the seizing of power by Muawiya, is often called “the first fitna”, and also “the fitna” par excellence or “the great fitna”. On account of the struggles that marked Muawiya’s advent, the term fitna was later applied to any period of disturbances inspired by schools or sects that broke away from the majority of believers (al-dīwān). We read of the fitna of the Murādiya, which Ibn al-Nahkhāfi apparently described as “graver” than that of the Azarikā Khāridjī. And every “innovator”, every man guilty of bīdā’, is potentially an instigator of fitna. Reversing the terms, the al-Ḥasan al-บาṣrī gives this definition: “all those who foment disturbances (fitna) are innovators (mūkādhīn)”. The “men of Tradition and the Community”, ʿabī al-sunna wa l-dīwān have the strict duty to obey the legitimate sovereign so long as his orders do not run counter to the Kurgan, and to shun all fitna. It is in this spirit that the first Sunnī professions of faith (e.g., Ḥīb Ḥākar, i, 5) “rely upon God” in the dispute between ‘Uthmān and ʿĀlī, and regard the successive proclamation to Imām of both of them as equally valid.

Although the struggle between ‘Ālī and Mu’awiyah and its consequences instituted the era of fitna par excellence, during which schisms came into being which were never to be resolved, the term fitna was none the less applied, in the course of history, to other and more localized disturbances. It is in this way, for example, that some chronicles, denouncing the struggles and seditions which more than once pitted Ash’arīs and Ḥanbali against each other, are apt to speak of fitna, as is the case at Baghdād, shortly after the death of Al-ʿAshīrī, when his gravestone was overturned, or at Damascus in 835/1432, when the majority of the ‘ulāma’ anathematized Ibn Ṭaymiyya.—On the other hand, to denote the persecution of the “righteous Ancients”, which also affected Ibn Ḥanbal under al-Ma’mūn, at the time of the triumph of the Mu’tazilīs, the annalists are more inclined to speak of mihna [q.e.]. The chroniclers concerned are those who came after al-Muṭawakkil’s reaction and were opposed to mu’tazilī tendencies; according to this point of view, there was no element of “rebellion” under al-Ma’mūn, which was the central power which protected the bīdā’ī. The ʿabī al-dīwān thus underwent a “testing” (mihna) for the sake of their faith, there was no fitna (that is to say armed revolt led by “innovators” and “agitators”) whatsoever.

It is in the chapter on the imāma that the treatises of ʿilm al-kalām raise the question of fitna. It is taught that the nomination of an imām is “obligatory” (wadādīb) for the Community, an obligation justified “rationally” (ʿakhī) according to the Mu’tazilīs, “legally” (sharīʿī) or “traditionally” (ṣāhīʿī) according to the Ash’arīs. And one of the arguments most readily put forward is that only an imām can prevent the disturbances of fitna, or restore peace if they have already broken out. Indeed, certain schools with Khāridjī tendencies teach that it is obligatory to nominate an imām in the event of fitna, but not if peace is prevailing; others, on the contrary, hold that he should only be nominated in a period of peace, never in a time of unrest, for fear that the nomination should give rise to fresh revolts. The Ash’arīs, for their part, require the imām to lead the Community during fitna and in times of peace alike, and consider as the authority in favour of their opinion the history of the early years of Islam.

All these discussions relate implicitly to a notion of fitna defined as disturbances, or even civil war, involving a division of opinion which endanger the purity of the Muslim faith; and every mention of fitna evokes “the great fitna of Islam” which culminated at Siffin. We may say in fact that somewhat later summaries of the question—or more accurately, the nomenclatures of the schools in which they result—are closer or more distant echoes of the attitudes and opinions which the “great fitna” had caused to be accepted. At that time (early 2nd/7th cent.), certain traditionalists of Basra and the first Mu’tazilīs declared that “the era of the fitna” having opened, every muḍjī-ṭahid, every man capable of “making an effort”, was entitled to seek for the solution; the Karrāmīyya, for their part, upheld the concomitant legitimacy of the two imāms in dispute; the Shī’a maintained the sole legitimacy of ‘Ālī; while the majority of the Sunnīs maintained that it was better to obey the established power and refrain from taking sides, in order to have no part in civil war, and thereby to hasten the return to peace. It is on this last attitude that the Ash’arīs and Māturīdis were later to base their views. For the fitna in Muslim Spain, see Al-andalus, vi, 5.


FITNAT, pseudonym of Ḥuseyn (d. -1194/1780), a Turkish poetess. Little is known of her early life. She was the daughter of the Shaykh al-‘Īslām Mehmeh Efsadj Efendi (d. 1160/1753) the well known scholar of the reign of Mehmemed IV, whose father Abū Isḥāk Ismā’īl had also been a Shaykh al-‘Īslām. She was married to Derwīsh Mehmeh Efendi who became kādī-i asker of Rumeli under Selim III. Her short ʿafādīn contains all the usual conventional poems written for various occasions and ḥashāls which do not vary in style or content from those of her contemporary male poets. She tends on the whole to follow the Nābī—Kodja Râghib Pasha school of “wisdom-poetry”, full of aphorisms and fatalistic statements. But occasionally she is inspired by the carefree and joyful style of Nedin (see her musdās in Gibb, vi, 395). She writes with great ease in a polished and fluent style.

Bibliography: Fatḥn, Tebāhīr, s.v.; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iv, 150 ff.; A. C. Yöntem, in IA, s.v. (FAİR İZ)

FITRA [see ḤD-AL-FITR].

FITRA is a “noun of kind” (Wright, Grammar, i, 125) to the infinitive far and means (an Ethiopic loan-meaning, see Schwally, in ZDMG, liii, 199 ff.; Nöldke, Nussbaumen 94; and means “creating or of being created”. It occurs in Kurʾān, XXX, 29 (khlīsa, Baydāwī) and other forms of its verb in the same meaning occur 14 times. But though
Muḥammad uses derived forms freely, it was obscure to his hearers. Ibn 'Abbas did not understand it until he heard a Bedouin use it of digging a well, and then the Bedouin probably meant the genuinely Arab sense of ẓalḥ (Liṣān, vi, 362, l. 20). Its theologically important usage is in the saying of Muḥammad, "Every infant is born according to the fitra (‘ala ‘l-fitra; i.e., Allāh’s kind or way of creating; fitra (khabar) —a favourite subject for hair-splitting). Two attempts have been made to escape this. (i.) This statement of Muḥammad is to be regarded as a decision (ḥukm) and was abrogated by the later decision as to inheritance. But it is pointed out that it is not really a decision, but a narrative (ḥabar) and that narratives are not abrogated. (ii.) The being made a Jew, Christian or Magian is to be regarded as not only a significant, but a formative, and takes place in this figurative sense from the point of birth; the legal religion of the infant is automatically that of his parents, although he comes actually to embrace another or unbelief when the time should come. Another was that it referred to Allah’s creating man (khabar) and was abrogated by the later statement of Muhammad—it meant only "beginning" (bad'a). Still another was that it referred to Allah’s creating man with a capacity of either belief or unbelief and then laying on them the covenant of the "Day of Alastu" (Kur’ān, VII, 172). Finally that it was that to which Allah turns round the hearts of men.

**Bibliography:** Mālik b. Anas, Muwatta (ed. Cairo 1560; Bo with Zurkhān), ii, 35; Dict. of tech. terms, 1117 f.; Liṣān, vi, 362 f.; Rīḍā on ʿιdān by Abū Ṭāhir Muhammad al-Samarkandi prefixed to the Haydārābd ed. of the Fifī al-akbar of Abū Ḥanīfa, 25 f.; Misḥāb of al-Fayyūmī s.v.; Kreidl, Beitrag z. mūh. Dogm., 235; Hughes, Dict. of Islam under Infants; Rāzī, Mafṣāḥ al-ghayb, iv, 16; vi, 480 of ed. of Cairo 1308; Tabārī, Taṣfīr, xxii, 24.

**Fītrat** (Fītra), 'Abd al-ʿRahmān al-Misbīḥ, theorist of the reform movement in Turkestān. Very little is known of his life: born at the end of the 19th century into a family of small traders in Buhkārā, he was at first a teacher, and then devoted all his time to his activities as a writer, poet and journalist. Fītrat was active from 1908 in the reform movement of Buhkārā (the Diwādī, who were originally concerned with educational reform, but from 1917 were to form themselves into a political party, the ‘Young Buhkāris’), of which he soon became the ideological leader. From 1910 to 1914 he took part in the creation of a reformed system of teaching in Buhkārā and in Turkestān, and actively promoted the sending of students to Turkey. In 1920, after the inauguration of the People’s Republic, he held office in the government at first as Minister of Education, then as Minister of Foreign Affairs. After the suppression of the republic in 1924, he took no part in the government of the Uzbek Republic (unlike some of his comrades in arms, such as Fayd Allāh Hoʿlaev [see mūqayyār]), and taught at the University of Samarkand until his arrest in 1937. His fate after that is unknown.

Like Dīzmāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī, with whom he has much in common (though he himself does not claim it), ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Fītrat studies in all his works the causes of the spiritual and temporal decay of the Muslim world, examines the external signs of it, and seeks a means of salvation from it. Fītrat studied this crisis as seen in the example of Buhkārā, which, perhaps more than any other Muslim country, showed the full extent of it: one of the chief centres of Islam delivered over to the Russian conqueror, the madrasās deserted, the formerly powerful state sunk into anarchy, the Muslim faith reduced on the one hand to a fossilized religion, fettered by all the weight of an obsolete legalism, on the other, to the superstition and the fetishism of the masses (Mundāṣāra).

Fītrat saw for it only one possible salvation: the return to a dynamic religion freed from a rigorism which was completely foreign to the fundamental rules of Islam, and freed first of all from servile respect for taklīd.

But although criticism forms a considerable part of Fītrat’s work, it is not merely critical and destructive. He gave constant thought to the means by which his country and all the Islamic community could overcome this crisis. In this search for its salvation, Fītrat seems to represent the two fundamental aspects of Muslim renewal. He was a reformer, an educator and a politician whose thought was mainly revolutionary. He considered that all reform must start with assiduous work among the people. True to his first vocation as an educator, he held that no regeneration of the Muslim community was possible without the preparation and education of individuals, and a consequent rebirth in each of an understanding and grasp of the meaning of Islam. Fītrat stressed continually the importance of the individual and the part which he must play, maintaining that personal reform was an absolute condition of the whole of Islam. He gives a considerable place in his works to the problem of reformed methods of teaching (Munwāṣāra, 26, 35-6, 43, 48, 52; Bayānāt, 29). Traditional education having proved incapable of developing, even of recognizing the necessity for change, he regarded the reformation of the maktabs as the only road to salvation. An important feature of Fītrat’s thought is his pragmatic conception of knowledge. He considers that the only learning which is worth the name is one which is of value not only to man’s ultimate salvation but also to his earthly existence; it is also a learning...
which can be acquired within a reasonable period, leaving man time to put it to use for the good of humanity. Thus he opposed the preservation of scholasticism, which 'is of no help to man in the modern world' (Munāpara, 28), and insisted that all knowledge should be submitted to the criticism of the intellect and not accepted blindly.

In this field Fitrat, while recognizing that 'one must seek knowledge where it is to be found', denied that Islam needed to borrow anything from the West or to seek inspiration from it or to imitate it, for, he maintained, everything that has contributed to the temporal greatness of the West derives from Islam (Bayāndī, 32-3). But Fitrat did not consider that the salvation of the Muslim community would come only from below, through a regeneration of all Muslims; he held that there was another task to be accomplished, the transformation of Muslim society from above, and it is here that we see in him the political thinker. No institution is spared in Fitrat's political programme; he insists throughout his works on the importance of the individual and of individual initiative, and on man's ability to dominate everything around him, from Nature to his own destiny. Analysing the economic and social bases of power, he clearly distinguishes spiritual demands from physical, considering that men's conduct is related to the natural conditions. Without arriving at any definite separation of the spiritual and the temporal, Fitrat indicated that the solutions to the problems of the adoption of Islam to the modern world were to be sought along these lines. Similarly, he considered that a complete revision of social relations, leading to a more equitable distribution of wealth, was indispensable and in no way contrary to the teaching of Islam, and he declared that the introduction of a new kind of relationship within society, a 'family' (The Family) is devoted to a study of the reform necessary in family relations to the teaching of Islam, enunciated by Fitrat, was a consequence of the decadence of the Muslim community and that of Western society, but a radical choice, a break with the past, the complete re-making of family relationships, in which Fitrat gave a very important place to the raising of the status of women. For Fitrat, the internal renewal of the Muslim community could be brought about only by a double process: a spiritual renewal, involving the education of each individual, and a political and social revolution which would leave remaining nothing of the ideas, the institutions and the human relations of the period of stagnation, and which would give birth to a modern society and a modern state. This internal regeneration was indispensable in order to achieve external liberation. The salvation of Islam would imply the end of foreign domination, which was a consequence of the degradation of Islam: and the struggle for liberty does not come after the work of internal regeneration, but is one of the aspects of it. Fitrat constantly reminds his readers that 'the dhīḥād is an obligation for every Muslim'. For Fitrat, this internal regeneration and the resultant progress would contribute to the Holy War, and in a very direct fashion: 'Learn at the same time the traditional learning and the new learning, and thus you will be able to prepare the material means which are indispensable for the defence of Islam, which is obligatory for all' (Munāpara, 48). Thus Fitrat's thought develops into the ideas of the unity of Islam and of Pan-Islamism.

Like Djamāl al-Dīn al-Adhānī, Fitrat thought that the renascence of Islam had to come from the Muslims themselves. The incitement to action, the rejection of passivity, of quietism and of reluctance to accept responsibility, which are such noticeable features of the works of Djamāl al-Dīn, are similarly prominent in those of Fitrat. Fitrat followed Djamāl al-Dīn along the path which he had opened up by stressing the temporal history of Islam, and it is probably for this reason that he has become more concerned with defining the means of achieving a new vitality than with re-defining the content, or more simply the methods, of the Faith. The originality of Fitrat's work lies in the fact that to reformism and Pan-Islamism there is added a call to social justice and to a revolt against the rich and those in power.

His principal works are (1) Munāpara, first published in Istanbul in 1908, and re-published in Persian at Tashkent in 1913; Russian trans. by Col. Yagello, Tashkent 1911, under the title Spor Bukharskogo mudarissa s evropeytsem v Indii o novomotelnih ţolkolah. (Istinnly rezult obmena mслей) pervoye izdanie sochneniy Buğhara, Fitrat; (2) Bayāndī-i sayyih-i hindī, first publ. at Istanbul (n.d.), then republished in Russian at Tashkent in 1913 as: Abd ur Rauf, Rasshat indyiskogo putežestvennika (Buğhara kah ona 'est'); (3) Sāʻība, Istanbul 1910; (4) Rabbār-i nāḏiūr, n.p. 1915; (5) 'Afdle, n.p. n.d.

He published also various novels (notably Kiyâmat, Tashkent 1961) and poems in Millī Edebiyat, Berlin, i (1943).

Bibliography: Vele Kajum Khan, introductory article to the review Millī Edebiyat, i (1943), 4-5; A. Zavqī and I. Tolqun, Šair Colpan, in Millī Turkestān, lxvi (1952), 17-23; Erturk, Abdur Rauf Fitrat, in Millī Turkestān, lxxi-lxxii (1952), 9-16; F. Khojaev, O mlado Buşartas, in Istoriik Markissit, i (1926), 123-31; idem, K istoriy revolyutsii v Buğhara, Tashkent 1926; S. Ani, Buhowo ingilobi ta'rihi wcu materiialar, Moscow 1926. (H. Carrere d'Encausse)
and sacked the chief town”. They then infiltrated westwards, ascended the Rhône, and extended their influence as far as the Alps and Piedmont. About 1211/933 “light columns, very mobile, held—at least during the summer—all the country under a reign of terror, while the bulk of the Muslim forces was entrenched in the mountainous canton of Fraxinetum, in the immediate vicinity of the sea”. The States concerned reacted slowly, and only in 362 or 362/972 or 973, after several unsuccessful attempts, did they launch the vast raids of Otto the Great “arrive to free Provence and the transalpine regions from the Muslim peril and to drive away for ever these pirates from their lair in the gulf of Saint-Tropez”. Thus ended this “strange Islamic State encapsulated within a wholly Christian land” (J. Calmette, *L’effondrement d’un empire et la naissance d’une Europe*, 127).

**Bibliography:** No Arabic chronicle refers to these events, for which the *Annales de Liébroux*, ed. Becker, Hanover-Leipzig 1912, is the principal source; J. T. Reinaud, *Invasions des Sarrasins en France*, Paris 1836 (Eng. tr., Lahore 1951), gives the history of these corsairs in detail, for which see also: R. Pourlard, *Le royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens*, Paris 1901, 243-73; idem, *Le royaume de Bourgogne*, Paris 1887, 7-72; J. Levet, *De manière, Le royaume du Ier au XIIe siècle*, Paris 1908, 238 ff.; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Hist. Esp. Mus.*, ii, 154-60 (which has been taken as the basis of this entry) supplies a more detailed bibliography.

(Ed.)

**FREE WILL** [see **IYYITIVAR, KADAR**].

**FREEMASONRY** [see **MASOONIYYA**].

**FRONTERA** [see **AWASIM, GHAZI, MURABIT, RIBAT, TRAVEN].

**FRUNZE** [see **PIPEK**].

**FU’AD AL-AWWAL**, king of Egypt. Ahmad Fu’ad was born in the Gizeh palace on 26 March 1868, of a Circassian mother. In 1879 his father, the Khedive Ismail, who had been deposed by the Sublime Porte, took him with him into exile. He studied in Geneva and Turin, and in 1885 entered the Italian military academy. At Rome in 1887, as a second-lieutenant in the artillery, he frequently visited the Italian royal family. Having been Ottoman military attached at Vienna, he finally returned (1892) to Egypt after a stay at Istanbul. As prince he accepted the first Rectorship of the Free University of Cairo (1908-13). On the death of his brother Hussein (9 October 1917) he succeeded him as sultan of Egypt. The British considered him as not at all Anglophobe, though regretting that he enjoyed neither great popularity nor much influence among the Egyptians (Lord Lloyd). He assumed the title of king of Egypt from 15 March 1922, and d. 28 April 1936. He had a respect for decorum and tradition, and during his lifetime the queen and the princesses, excepting his own daughters, remained veiled.

The age in which he reigned is significant in the history of the Egyptian awakening. The nationalist movement was then embodied in the person of Sa’d Zaghlul and the Wafd, launched the open struggle against the British occupation immediately after the armistice of 11 November 1918. A campaign of signed petitions, demonstrations in Cairo, and strikes (1919, again in 1921) forced Great Britain to recognize Egypt as a “sovereign and independent state” (1922). While profiting by the action of the Wafd, which helped him to counteract British influence, king Fu’ad dreamed of an authority too absolute for him not to fear the nationalist leaders.

A constitution envisaging two chambers was promulgated on 19 April 1923. The 1924 elections were a triumph for the Wafd. But the assassination of the *Sirâd* (November 1924), the difficulties in the negotiations, several times broken off and then resumed, with the British with a view to drawing up a treaty, the intervention of the British in Egypt and their Sudanese policy, all added to the crises. Parliament was dissolved four times, and the elections always returned a Wafdist majority (1925, 1926, 1929), except that of 1931 which the Wafd boycotted. In spite of this, there were only three rather brief periods of Wafdist ministry (Sa’d Zaghlul in 1924, Mustafa al-Nabhâas in 1928 and 1930). That is to say, the king did as he pleased with the constitution, which was abrogated in 1930, immediately superseded, then re-established in 1935. He relied on minority parties or on unattached politicians; he appealed to, among others, Ahmad Ziaar (1924-6), Muhammed Mahmd (1928-9), and Ismaiil Shidid (1930-3). At the end of his reign the Italian menace ( Abyssinian war) demonstrated the urgency of an agreement with Britain. The treaty was signed in London on 26 August 1936, four months after his death.

From the economic point of view, the foundation of the Misr bank marked the first step in his reign towards economic independence. He took no share in it, nor did he deposit his private fortune there, which, however, he did not neglect. On the other hand, he took a lively interest in the intellectual development of the country. He founded schools, encouraged the new university at Gizeh (Fu’ad al-Awwal University, 1925) and the reform of al-Azhar (1924-6). At the end of his reign the personal prestige of mistrusting Egyptians and confiding in foreigners. He always patronized, without any fanaticism, all those who, outside politics, could contribute to the development of modern Egypt, especially in the cultural sphere. He was a kind of Mæcenas, visiting schools and institutions. The personal prestige which he enjoyed abroad and the historical studies which he patronized enlarged the world reputation of Egypt.


**FU’AD PASHA**, Keşeci-zade Mehmed, five times Ottoman Foreign Minister and twice Grand Vizier, was born in Istanbul in 1815, the son of the poet Izzet Molla [q.v.]. Upon his father’s exile to Tripoli in Africa; but since the Porte’s diplomatic business was rapidly increasing, his French gained Fu’ad appointment to the Translation Bureau in November 1837. Like his life-long colleague Mehemet Emin Ali [see **Ali Pasha Muhammad Amir**] he became a protégé of Mustafa Reşid Pasha [q.v.].

During the next decade Fu’ad advanced rapidly as interpreter and diplomat through the ranks of the Ottoman bureaucracy and gained firsthand expe-
rience of Europe. In 1839 he became dragoman of the Porte; in 1840 he was dragoman, and from 1841 to 1844 first secretary, of the Ottoman embassy in London; in 1844 he went on special mission to Spain when Isabella II was declared of age to rule. In March 1845 Fu’ad was appointed member of an ad hoc commission on education whose report of August 1846 recommended a new state school system. He became dragoman of the imperial Divan in June–July 1845, and on 18 February 1847 âmâddâr [q.v.]. Late in 1840 Fu’ad was sent to Bucharest to ensure smooth relations with the Russian forces which had entered the Principalities to suppress the revolution. When in 1849 Magyar and Polish refugees sought asylum in Ottoman territory Fu’ad was dispatched to St. Petersburg to uphold Reshld’s policy of no negotiations. Nicholas I received Fu’ad on 16 October. Fu’ad’s mission was successful. In reward he was advanced to şadâre’i ministêştir, in effect Minister of the Interior. After returning via Jassy and Bucharest to Istanbul on 11 April 1850 he sat on a special commission of the mejlîs-i waîdî to deal with Christian complaints from Vidin.

Fu’ad went to Bursa in mid-September 1850 to take baths for his rheumatism. There he wrote with Ahmed Djewdet [q.v.] the first modern Ottoman grammar published in the empire, Kavâid-i ‘Ogma ve ‘Ismâ’ilîn-în. In the autumn of 1850–1851 the Edjilâm-î Dânîsh [see ANDUMAN], Fu’ad was appointed a member. In Bursa Fu’ad and Djewdet also drafted a proposal for the Bosphorus ferry-boat company, which became the first joint-stock company in the empire. From April to July 1852 Fu’ad was in Egypt on a special mission to see to the application of Tanzimat [q.v.] decrees and solve questions of railway building, inheritance, and the Egyptian tribute. That year Fu’ad advocated a European loan to help the finances of the empire, but Sultan ‘Abd al-Mejjid refused.

On 9 August 1852 Fu’ad was appointed Foreign Minister, three days after ‘Ali succeeded Reshld as Grand Vizier. This marks the first time Reshld’s two disciples had worked together in the highest offices, and the beginning of their involuntary estrangement from each other due to their consistent differences of opinion. On arriving in Istanbul on 21 December. His first job was to deal vigorously with a financial crisis of panic proportions; he withdrew the hâkim [q.v.], drew up a budget, and negotiated the successful loan of 1862. A Montenegrin campaign was successfully concluded, but the Belgrade incident of 1862 forced Turkish evacuation of two Serbian fortresses. Fu’ad helped secure new millet constitutions for the Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. He resigned on 2 January 1863.

When in 1849 Magyar and Polish refugees sought asylum in Ottoman territory Fu’ad was dispatched to St. Petersburg to uphold Reshld’s policy of no negotiations. Nicholas I received Fu’ad on 16 October. Fu’ad’s mission was successful. In reward he was advanced to şadâre’i ministêştir, in effect Minister of the Interior. After returning via Jassy and Bucharest to Istanbul on 11 April 1850 he sat on a special commission of the mejlîs-i waîdî to deal with Christian complaints from Vidin.

Fu’ad’s three-year term was marked by the withdrawal law, prepared by Fu’ad and Midhat [q.v.] in 1864 for the new provincial administration experiment in Bulgaria; by the final authorization of the construction of the Suez Canal; by the necessity of recognizing Karl of Hohenzollern as the new prince of Roumania; by thefirman of 27 May 1866 granting Khedive Ismâ’îl’s heir direct succession from father to eldest son; and by Fu’ad’s growing feud with Mustafa Fâdîl Pasha [q.v.] over finances. Fu’ad was dismissed on 5 June 1866 because he opposed ‘Abd al-Aziz’s taking a daughter of Ismâ’îl as wife. When ‘Ali once more became Grand Vizier, on 11 February 1867, Fu’ad became Foreign Minister again. His masterly memorandum of 15 May for the Powers delineated Ottoman progress under the Tanzimat, but, with ‘Ali, Fu’ad was subject to increasing attacks from New Ottoman writers, especially over the Cretan rebellion and the final Turkish military evacuation of Serbia. From 21 June to 7 August 1867 Fu’ad accompanied ‘Abd al-Aziz on his trip to Paris, London, and Vienna; Fu’ad kept the sultan from blunders, and the trip succeeded in diminishing the likelihood of serious foreign intervention in Crete, as well as interesting the sultan in western material progress. Fu’ad returned exhausted. Nevertheless he also was acting Grand Vizier in the autumn of 1867 when ‘Ali went to Crete. He helped develop plans for the Council of State (Şârâr-î Davet [q.v.]) and the Galatasaray lycée, both inaugurated in 1868. On medical advice, for his heart condition, Fu’ad travelled via Italy to Nice for a rest in the winter of 1868/69; there he died on 12 February 1869. His body was brought to Istanbul by the French dispatch-boat Renard.
Fu'ad was a convinced westernizer. He worked on many of the reforms of the later Tanzimat period. He may have favoured representative government, though this was not achieved in his lifetime. His main objective was preservation of the Ottoman Empire through diplomacy and reform. He loved high office, but was not so jealous and grudging as 'Ali, and rather bolder in innovation. His honesty has been impugned, especially as regards gifts from Ismail, but his objectives remained constant. Fu'ad was a brilliant conversationalist. He was completely at home in French. His witticisms are famous; some imputed to him are apocryphal. He also wrote well, but his objectives remained constant. Fu'ad was a convinced westernizer. He worked on many of the reforms of the later Tanzimat period. He loved high office, but was not so jealous and grudging as 'Ali, and rather bolder in innovation. His honesty has been impugned, especially as regards gifts from Ismail, but his objectives remained constant.

Fu'ad was a convinced westernizer. He worked on many of the reforms of the later Tanzimat period. He loved high office, but was not so jealous and grudging as 'Ali, and rather bolder in innovation. His honesty has been impugned, especially as regards gifts from Ismail, but his objectives remained constant. Fu'ad was a

The tribe of Tamimi, an early Sufi, disciple of Suyfân al-Thawri, was born in Samarkand, grew up in Abiward, and in his youth was a highway robber. After his conversion, he betook himself to the study of Hadith at Kûfa. He was summoned to give ascetic addresses to Hârûn al-Rashîd, who called him "The chief of the Muslims". He settled in Mecca and died there 187/803.

Mentioned frequently as a transmitter of Traditions, he was also a noted ascetic and advocate of other-worldliness, known as one who lived with God. "The servant's fear of God", he said, "is in proportion to his knowledge of Him and his renunciation of this world is in proportion to his desire for the next", and again, "Satisfaction with God is the stage of those who are close to Him, who find in Him joy and happiness". Asked what he thought of the condition of mankind, Fu'ad replied, "Forgiven, but for my presence among them". It was said that when Fu'ad left the world, sadness disappeared.

Bibliography: Ibn Sa'd, v, 366; al-Sulami, Tabâbât al-Sâfiyya, Cairo 1953, 6-14; Abû Nu'aym, Hilyat al-awliyâ', vii, 84-139; al-Fudjwîrî, Kazîl al-mahdîyîn, (tr. Nicholson), 97 ff; 'Aṭṭâr, Tabâbât al-awliyâ', (ed. Nicholson), i, 74 ff; Ibn Khallîkîn, No. 542; Sha'îrâni, Tabâbât, i, 58, 59. This material is known as the "Al-Fudjâyra", (officially, al-Fujairah), one of the seven Trucial Shâkhdoms in Arabia and the only one lying in its entirety on the eastern side of the peninsula separating the Gulf of 'Umân from the Persian Gulf. The tiny state is wedged between the Sultan of Muscat's territory of Rûs al-Dîbâlî to the north, and the once independent territory of Kalbâ (Kalba in Yakût, T.4, and the Kûmâs of al-Fîrûzâbâdî) to the south. Kalbâ, since 1371/1952 a part of the Trucial Shâkhdom of al-Shârîka (Sharjah), lies between al-Fudjâyra and the central part of the Sultan of Muscat's domains. From Kalbâ north to Rûs al-Dîbâlî, the narrow littoral and steep eastern watershed of the mountains of al-Hadjar behind the coast constitute the region known as al-Shâmâlkûyûn.

The little town of al-Fudjâyra is at the mouth of Wâdî Hâm and about two miles from the sea. Most of the inhabitants of the town and wâdi are members of the tribe of al-Shârîkiyyûn. Strung along the coast to the north are other villages of the state: Sakamkâm, al-Kurayya, Murbih, Dádha and a part of Dâbâl. Between Murbih and Dádha is the enclavé of Khaw Fakkân (Fukkan in Yakût, T.4, and the Kûmâs of al-Fîrûzâbâdî) belonging to al-Shârîka.

Al-Fudjâyra has long been under the influence of al-Kawâsim of Ra's al-Khayma and al-Shârîka, who were occupying Khaw Fakkân as early as 1188/1775. Al-Fudjâyra, however, became virtually independent in 1321/1902 and was recognized as such by Great Britain in 1371/1952, when the Ruler, Shaykh Muhammad b. Hamad al-Shârîkî, subscribed to the agreements in force between Britain and the Trucial Shâkhdoms.
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AL-FUDJAYRA — FUDULI

FUDULI, MUHAMMAD B. SULAYMÂN (887-963/1480-1556), (in Turkish Fuzûlî) one of the most illustrious authors of Classical Turkish literature.

He was born in 'Irâk at the time of the Ak-Koyunlu (White Sheep Dynasty) domination, probably at Karbâlî, although Baghdad, 'Hilla, Nâjlî, Kirkûk, Manzik and Hîr are also mentioned as his birthplace. It is reported on uncertain authority that his father was muftî of Hîlla, that he was taught by one Râzmat Allâh, that he first took to poetry when he fell in love with this teacher's daughter and that his literary taste was formed by the Âdharî poet Hâbîlî. It can, however, be said with certainty that Fudûlî came from an educated family and was himself fully trained in all the learning of the age. His learning is also attested by the titles of Molla and, later, Mawlûnâ which are given to him. It appears that his education commenced at Karbâlî and continued at Hîilla and Baghdad.

Mehmed b. Sulaymân (v. Hâdîdî Kallâhî, 255, 645, 805, 914, 1075, 1721, 1729) invariably used the name makhlas (pen-name) Fudûlî in all his verse and prose works and, is, therefore, mentioned among poets known by their takhallus (pen-name) Fudulî in all his verse and prose. Fudulî met also two poets who participated in the campaign, Khayall (d. 964/1557) and Tadhkira, 772, 528; Hasan Celevî, Ashîk Celevî, part, 1st. Univ. T.Y. 5959, 38-41; 121a-222a). Fudulî met also two poets who participated in the campaign, Khayall (d. 964/1559) and Tadhkira, 950-952. While the Sultan was in Baghdad, Fudulî was promised a pension payable from waqf funds. Difficulties arose, however, when a later bârdî stipulated the payment of nine aspers a day from the waqf funds. These difficulties are the subject of the letter known as the Şîhâyet-nâme (Abdûl-kâdir Karahân, Fuzulî'nin mevlûpârî, Istanbul 1948, 37-8). Fudulî entered also into correspondence with Ahmed Bey, the Mir-i ise of Mâshî, 'Âyâs Pasha, the Kâdi 'Allâ al-Dîn (cf. Karahân, op. cit., 38-41, 42-4, 44-6) and the Sâhezde Bâyezîd (Hasîbî Çâhâs, Fuzulî'nin bir mektubu, in AUDTCFD, iv (1948), 139-40).

Fudulî composed kaşidas praising the Pâgdas Uways, 'Âyâs Karahân and Mehmed, when they were Wâdis of Baghdad and also the Kâdi of Baghdad, Fudulî, FK. He also wrote some of his most important works, including Hadîbat al-su'addâ' and Layîlî wa Ma'hûnâ, under the Ottomans. Although he spoke with longing of travel in his poems, and although in his youth he hoped to visit Tabriz and in his mature age to go to India and Asia Minor, Fudulî never left the confines of 'Irâk. He seems to have spent a large portion of his life in employment at the 'Abâdîre 'Aliya in Nâjdaf (cf. the Persian kaşidas in praise of the Imâm 'Allî in the Ma'hûnâs, in the author's possession, fols. 166 ff.).

He died and was buried at Karbâlî in 963/1556 during a plague (fûnûn) epidemic ('Abdul, Güshen-i gu'urarî; Alî Emîri Lib. No. 774, 1559; Riyâdî, Riyâd al-şu'urarî; Ist. Univ. T.Y. 3250, 46 etc.). The year 1970/1562 is stated in the Tartûsî, Târîh-i 'Irâk, Baghdad 1939, iii, 246) or a Bânjîn (A. Gölpinarî, Fuzulî'nin bânsîneği temsîlî; ..., in Azerbaycan Yurî Bilgisi Mecmuası, no. 8, 265 ff.; for objections cf. Sâdeddin Nûzhet Ergûn, Türk musikisi antolojisi, ii, 640). Nevertheless it is right to consider Fudulî as standing above sects and schools in his şûfi approach (cf. Karahân, Fuzulî-Muhûtî, kwâilt ve 500, 1948, 144 ff.).

Fudulî wrote some fifteen works in Arabic, Persian and Turkish, as follows: (a) Arabic: (1) Diwanî; (2) Mulla-î al-şikhâyî; (b) Persian: (3) Diwanî; (4) Hâfî-î ârâmî (or Sâhezde Bâyezîd); (5) Anîs-î bâchî; (6) Risâla-î mu-âmmayyât (he also wrote riddles in Turkish); (7) Rind-î sâhî; (8) Hûm-î-šîkh (or Şîkh-î-ramî); (9) Turkish: (10) Beng-û-bâde; (11) Leyîlî-î Mu'âmmân; (12) Kirh-î dâhidî târîf-î; (13) Şîh-û-şo'âla; (14) Hadîbat al-su'addâ'; (15) Letters.

Four other works are attributed to him on doubtful grounds. These are: Şu'bat al-âşrîyî, Divan-i-yemnî-nâme, a Turkish-Persian rhyming dictionary and the Konya Rûzâîlî (Müze Ktbî. 2617).

The known manuscript of Fudulî's Arabic poems is preserved in the Austrian Museum in Leningrad and also in the Yâsînî Mu'âlâmî, Konya 1948, 139-40). In the tract entitled Mulla-î al-şikhâyî is to be found in a Kûlliyât-i Fudulî, preserved in the Austrian Museum in Leningrad (see E. Bertels, Arabîskie stûkî Fuzulî, in Zapischi Kollegii Vostokovedov, v, Leningrad 1930; idem, Novaya rukopis 'Kûlliyatsa Fuzulî, in Izvestiya Ak. Nauk, iv, 1935). Mulla-î al-şikhâyî, together with the Arabic kaşidas, was published in Baku in 1958. Another edition is being printed in Turkey. There are many manuscripts in existence of the poet's works in Persian, many of which have also been printed (for details see Abdûl-kâdir Karahân, Fuzulî; Mügân Cunbur, Fuzulî hakkinda bir bibliografya denemesi, Istanbul 1956).
There is a Turkish translation of the Persian Dildan (which is also about to be published), with the exception of the kaşidas (Ali Nihat Tatar, Fuzulînin Farsça Divam, Istanbul 1948). Fuzûlî's collected works (a Turkish edition of the Persian Dildan) have been published several times under the title of Sâhih-nâma as part of Fuzûlî's collected works (a Turkish edition of the Persian Dildan). Other published works are as follows: Anis al-hâl, ed. Süleyman Cafer Erkiço, Istanbul 1944; Risâle-i mu’lumâyyatî, ed. Kemal Edib Kürkçuoğlu, Ankara 1945; Rind wa sâhih, same ed., Ankara 1956; Husain wa rûh as Safar-nâma-i Rûh, ed. Muh. 'Abbâs Nâsihi, in Armaghân (Tehrân), xi, 418-24, 505-17; the same work as Şikhat wa marâq, ed. Necati Hüsnü Lugal and O. Reşer, Istanbul 1943—for the latest Turkish translation and a summary in French, see Fuzulî, Şikhat ve maraz, Istanbul 1940.

Critical editions of most of Fuzûlî’s Turkish works have appeared recently. Of the Dildan 26 printed editions and more than a hundred MSS are known to exist (cf. op. cit., by Karahan and Cunbur, also İstanbul kitâbîhârisi Türkche yazma organizations, İstanbul 1947, 124-37; A MS copied during the poet’s lifetime is in the author’s possession). The latest edition of the Bengi u bade is that by K. E. Kürkçuoğlu, Istanbul 1956. An interleaved edition of Leyli ve Meşun, published by the Turkish National UNESCO Committee, Istanbul 1959. The author has edited the first published version of the Kîrkh hâdîth tertîjesî (A. Karahan, Fuzulî’nin têsîhî edımmi nîseri: Kîrkh hâdîth tertîjesi, in Seldâm Mecmuasî, Istanbul 1948, nos. 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 66). It was later published by Kürkçuoğlu, Istanbul 1951. Şihâb u gedâ is known only through a reference in Şâhî, op. cit. A critical edition of the Hâdîksat al-suwâ’dî is in preparation. MSS of this work are numerous (in addition to the works cited above, cf. catalogues by Rieu, Flügel, Pertsch, Blochet and Rossi). Five letters by Fuzûlî are known: the author of this article has published four (Fuzulînîn mektûbûlarîs, Istanbul 1948), while the fifth was published by Hasibe Çatbas (Fuzulînîn nîr mektûbû, Ankara 1948).

Both Fuzûlî’s artistry and his wide learning are reflected in almost every one of his works. The penetrating quality of his thought and his scholarlyship in many fields are made clear in many passages, chief amongst them being the taşıkra (praise of Divine unity) in the form of a kaşida at the beginning of his Turkish Dildan. Fuzûlî’s notions on medicine, material and spiritual welfare, love and beauty can be gathered from his tract Hûn wa rûh; his şîfi philosophy and the advice which he had to give are made clear in Rind wa sâhih; Haft-ı-dîsnî is full of the şîfi symbolism in which mystic love and wine are equated; mystic love and şîfi inspiration are also in Leyli ve Meşun and the ghazals; stories about the prophets and the poet’s feelings about the tragedy at Karbalâ can be found in the Hâdîksat al-suwâ’dî; the Divans (especially in the brief kitâfîs) and Anis al-hâl reflect the poet’s philosophy of life in general.

Fuzûlî was a brilliant linguist. No fault can be found with the language and technique of his Arabic poetry. Nevertheless in feeling they are overshadowed by his work in Persian and Turkish. It is true that in spite of their technical brilliance and richness of content his poems in Persian cannot compete with the great masterpieces of Persian literature, in which Fuzûlî is ranked as a better than average second class writer. In Turkish literature, however, he ranks with the greatest. Fuzûlî does not owe this reputation to the originality of his subject-matter, which he drew from earlier Persian writers. Thus, the subject of the Hâdîksat al-suwâ’dî, which can be classed as a mâyâlî (a description of the tragedy at Karbalâ) is drawn from the Rasûlîl-ṣâhādât (Hasûn) of Muhsin Wâîfî Kâşîfî; the desert story narrated in Leyli ve Meşun had been told many times before, particularly in the poems of the same name by Niâyîzî and Hâtîfî; the forty traditions of the Prophet in Kîrk hâdîth tertîjesi are drawn from Dîvânî’s Tarîjgâna-arba’în hâtîth (cf. A. Karahan, İslam-Türk edebiyâtında kîrk hâtîth, Istanbul 1954, 100-1, 167-72). Fuzûlî succeeded, however, in impressing the particular stamp of his personality on his treatment of this common subject-matter. His treatment of the themes of love, suffering, the impermanence of this world, the emptiness of worldly favours and riches and of the theme of death attain to a lyricism and directness which no other Turkish poet has reached. He is the Turkish poet who has expressed with the greatest effect a feeling of mystic love and wine, the face of adversity and of separation.

Fuzûlî’s Turkish has the characteristics of literary Âdîhârî. This is true both of his grammar and of his vocabulary. The works of his age of maturity reflect, however, some Ottoman influences which followed naturally the Ottoman conquest of Iran in 941/1534. Fuzûlî’s fame and influence, marked already in his lifetime, have not ceased to grow in the modern Turkish world. He has always been the most popular poet in all the countries inhabited by Turks. He has influenced many classical Turkish writers, such as Rühî, Newlî-zade ‘Âtâî, Nâ’ilî, Nâbî, Sheykh Qâlib and Nigarî. Such writers wrote imitations (nastras) of his poems, or lahîmîs and lasûls to his ghazals.

Traces of Fuzûlî’s influence occur also in post-Tanzimat modern Turkish literature, as well as in poems written specially for musical settings (sadî). Many of his own poems have also been set to music, starting from the 17th century. Even today, some of his ghazals are sung by bûhândan and are occasionally recorded.

Bibliography: In addition to the works cited in the article see: Lâtîfi, Tâdghira, Istanbul 1314, 265-6; Sâm Mirzâ, Tukhâ, Tehran 1314, 136; Beysiînî, Tâdghira (Ali Emirî Lib. no. 757), 148; Amin Ahmad Râzî, Haft ihsân, Calcutta 1358, 122-3; Fâzîî, Zobat al-ṣâhîrî (Ist. Lib. no. 1646), 84a-86a; Mirzâ Muḥ. Tâhir, Tâdghira-i Nasrîbâdî, Tehran 1327, 510; Khoshâbî, Sâhîna (Dastaftar-i şâmî) (Bodleian, Elliot 359), 316b-17a; Gibb, Ottoman poetry, iii, 70-107; Ibrahim ‘Aṣîhî, Fuzulî, Istanbul 1338; Muḥ. ‘Ali Tarbiyâtî, Danâgmandân-i Aghbâyarîyân, Tehran 1314, 300; Kervor Zeribaysanî, Nimûzî Arvazeînî mistîk panaşdehshûtan gam Fuzulî meynpanavand, i-i, Istanbul 1928-9; Tâhir Olgun, Fuzulîyle dîr, Istanbul 1936; Mehmed Mîhrî, Fuzulînîn sevîh ve tefsîrî divanî, Istanbul 1937; Muḥ. ‘All Tabrizî, Râyhnîân al-adab, Tehran 1328, ill., 222-3; Celse Özulu, Fuzulî, Niğde 1948; Ahmed Ateş, Fuzulînîn i-yanisî, in Türk Dili Bülteni (1948), 545-63; Hasibe Mazloğlu, Fuzulî-Hâtea, Ankara 1956;

(ABDULLAKID KARAHAN)

FULANI [see Fulbe].

FULBE, pl. of Ful, called Fula(s) in Gambia and Sierra Leone; usual French name: Peul; usual English name: Fulani; their language is variously called Fula, Fulani, Peul (French usage), Ful (German usage), their own name for it being variously called Ful, Fulbe, Fulfulde, in Mali and territories further east), a pastoral people—the only people of white (or red) stock in negro Africa—the ‘cattle-men' who for more than a thousand years have been moving in groups across Africa at its greatest width. Wearing their would-be white rags with unfailing pride, they look at you with a glance of aristocratic nonchalance. They are one of the few nomadic societies of negro Africa, and G. Vieillard, who professed a brotherly affection for them, spoke of the Fulani as “parasites on the bovine species”. Living amongst groups of stalwart negro farmers, the Fulani seem relatively frail, their frailty offset, according to Gautier (Afrique noire occidentale, 167) by a certain intellectual superiority.

According to Barth, Peul means “light-brown, red", in contrast to Olof (black), while according to Gaden the term Fulbe means “the scattered ones”. Peul being the Wolof name which was adopted by the French from the coast of Senegal, it is more correct to speak of Ful or Fulani, in the plural Fulbe, the name by which the Fulani call themselves.

Al-Makrizi (765-845/1364-1442) was probably the first to speak of the Füllanlyia, a term which was used again by al-Sa’di in the Ta’lih al-Saddan (1667). João de Barros speaks of them at length in his Asia, as do the various explorers who travelled through Africa from the 18th century onwards (Moore, Richet, Caillé, d’Avezac (1829), Clapperton (1825), the Lander brothers (1830), d’Eichtal (1842), Barth (1850-55). Substantial studies have been devoted to them by D. Crozals (1853), Gaden, Delafosse (1912), Mischlich (1931), and finally Tauxier (1932) who during his official career was for more than ten years in charge of districts containing many Fulani groups, and who produced an excellent comprehensive study. Vieillard (1938), Lhote (1951) and de Lavergne de Tressan must also be mentioned, as must Colonel Figaret, who settled at Bamako on his retirement, and died there in 1943.

Reference must also be made to the monographs by the British writers, East (on Adamawa), Stenting and Hopen, by the Germans Passarge and Strümpell, by the Frenchmen Lacroix, Richet and Froelich, and also the works of Wolf and Ahmadou Hampaté Ba on Macina and Senegambia.

Origin of the Fulani. The problem of the origin of the Fulani is one that is the subject of hot dispute among Africanists. In fact it seems vital to know whence came these pastoralists, often turned warriors, who have played such an important part in the establishment of various African kingdoms, from Senegal to central Cameroon. Racial resemblances, or reminders of some passage in the Bible or the Qur'an, have often led well-meaning authors along innumerable false trails which it is pointless to follow, now that considerable light has been shed on the existence in neolithic times of a humid Sahara, which for several millennia sheltered cattle-owning pastoralists who came from the east of Africa and are most probably the ancestors of the Fulani. Until quite recently, ignorance of the Sahara's climatic changes obliged authors to search, far or near, for peoples bearing a physical resemblance to the Fulani, and to conjure out of nothing a migration route which would have led them to Futa Toro in Senegal, the place where they are first mentioned in history. The various theories, many of which read like pure fiction, can be grouped under two headings: non-African origins, and African origins.

It has been maintained in all seriousness that the Fulani were descended from the Tartanes, from the Pelasgians, primitive inhabitants of Greece and Italy, or from Gauls or Romans who vanished in the sands of the desert. In support of the Judeo-Syrian theory, supported as early as the end of the 18th century by Winterbottom and Matthews, the explorers of Sierra Leone, M. Delafosse in his Haut-Sénégal-Niger put forward plausible arguments which for long were generally accepted. On this view the Fulani would have been the descendants of Jews from Tripolitania and Cyrenaica, a party of whom are known to have fled into the desert after the great Roman persecution of 115 A.D. Travelling by way of Fezzan, Air and Macina they would have reached the region between upper Senegal and the Niger, occupied by the ancient kingdom of Ghana. Tauxier, writing with merciless accuracy, has disproved this theory.

The supposed Indian origin of the Fulani has been upheld by many writers, including Faidherbe and Binger. It has been reinforced by the linguistic theories of which Mlle. Homburger has made herself the ardent propagandist, arguing as she does a relationship between the Dravidian languages and certain African languages such as “Serer-Peel", a relationship rejected by most writers. Finally Etienne Richet, in a lengthy study entitled Pensés de l'Adamawa, has adduced evidence of anthropological and sociological similarities between the Fulani and the ancient Iranians.

Two original African stocks have been invoked as representing the ancestors of the Fulani. The closest, geographically speaking, is the most difficult to defend. It seems clear that the Fulani are not Arabo-Berbers, as Cortambert, F. Dubois and C. Monteil have maintained—Monteil claiming that the Fulani are the descendants of the Honainen, mentioned by al-Bakr as the grandchilden of the soldiers sent in 734 by the Umayyads against the kingdom of Ghana. The Nubian-Ethiopian origin seems much more worthy of consideration. It has moreover been supported by the greatest number of authors. Mollien, the first of these, in his Voyage dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique aux sources du Sénégal et de la Gambie, 1818, sees a resemblance between the features, character and customs of the Fulani and those of the Barabra of Nubia; he makes them a race of red Ethiopians. Barth (1855) is inclined to admit that the Fulani occupied western Africa prior to the expansion of the Berber people; he likens the Fulani to the Pyrrhi Athiopis of Ptolemy, Ethiopians burnt to a copper-red colour. Coming from the east of Africa, the Fulani would have passed by southern Morocco (approximately 150 B.C.) and then, under pressure from the Arabs (from about 123/750), would have reached Senegal, occupying the region...
of Futa Toro. This theory was supported (1868) by F. Müller, who connects Fulfulde, the language of the Fulani, with Nuba in Kordofan, relates the Fulani to the Berbers, and supposes that the Fulani occupied North Africa, displacing the Berbers. Two years later Schweinfurth associated the Mangbutu (Mombutu) with the *Pyrrhi Aethiopes*, and found in them a resemblance to the Fulani, whose origin he too placed in eastern Africa. This theory was to be revived some years later (1881) by O. Lenz in his book on Timbuctoo; he makes the Fula and Nuba halfway between negroes and Mediterranean Hamites. About the same time E. H. Haeckel (1868-75), in his *Naturliche Schopfungsgeschichte*, takes the hair as a fundamental criterion, and this leads him to group together the Nubians and Fulani who are euplocomes (soft curly hair) like the Dravidians and Mediterranean peoples. He states: "the Nubians, properly so-called, inhabit the regions of the Upper Nile (Dongola, Changaalla, Barabara, Kordofan), from there the Fula or Fellata migrated towards the west and at present occupy a large zone in the western Sahara between the Sudan in the north and the negro peoples in the south". Haeckel, then, makes the Nubians and Fulani a race half-way between whites and negroes. He includes in these groups some Hamites or Cushites (Beja, Galla, Somali, Danakil), some elements of which have more negro features than the Fulani, who resemble rather the upper Hamites (Egyptians and Berbers) and Semites (Jews, Arabs, Indo-Europeans). Topinard (1879) says that the Fulani are a red people; he connects them with the Barabara and with the Ahmar described by Caillaud in the course of his explorations in Upper Egypt (1849).

Hartmann (1876) makes the Fulani some kind of sub-Ethiopians, a kind of cross between Berbers and Nigritians. Quatrefages and Hamy, in their *Crania Ethnica*, indicate a close connexion between Fulani and Egyptians, at the same time suggesting that there are fairly clear signs of admixture with negro peoples. Machat, in 1906, revives the theory of Dr. Tautin (1869) and of Dr. Verneau showing the relationship of the Fulani to the peoples of Upper Egypt and Nubia, which was supported by the Fulani traditions collected by Olivier de Sanderval and Heequard. Verneau's view was confirmed by Dr. Lasnet, who however connects the Fulani with the 240,000 soldiers of Psammetichus who in the 6th century B.C. left Egypt for Nubia; reaching the south of Morocco they would have become the leucho-Ethiopians and would then have moved down towards the Senegal. Deniker, in *Les races et les peuples de la terre*, after studying the Ethiopians or Cushito-Hamites, points to a Fula-Sande group derived from a mixture of Ethiopian and Nigritian stock. He makes the Fulani essentially Ethiopians with Berber or negro admixture. Montandon, in his *Ologniese humaine*, places the Fulani among the pan-Ethiopian races (which include also Barabra-Danakil-Somali, Abyssinians-Galla-Masaai, Badima), while Chantre, in his contribution to the study of the human races in western Sudan, connects the Fulani with the Beja in view of the following common features: colour of skin, which is not black but reddish; texture of hair, which is not woolly; the principal indices, which often differ only by a few millimetres; numerous common ethnographic features to the Nuba and Nubi-Fulani people between the 240,000 soldiers of Psammetichus (1.74 m./5 ft. 8½ ins.) and Deniker (1.75 m.) seem to suggest. Although they are taller than the average of negro peoples, they are shorter than the Wolofs. The height of the Fulani varies according to the region, and the samples taken give from 1.67 to 1.72 m. (5 ft. 5½ to 5¾ ft.) for men and 1.54 to 1.62 m. (5 ft. 1½ to 5¾ ft.) for women.

The Fulani are distinctly dolichocephalic (average horizontal cephalic index 74) and platyrhynine (average nasal index 96). These anthropological data enabled Dr. Verneau (1897-99), Deniker (1926) and Seligman to confirm the theory according to which the Fulani would be lower Hamites, Ethiopians. Tauxier, to whom we are indebted for the most complete study of the Fulani which has so far appeared, notes in this connection that they have always given the name *Phouta* or *Fouta* (Futa) to the countries where they have settled—Futa Toro, Futa Djallon, Futa Damga (west of Nioro Circle)—and he underlines the similarity of these names to the country of Phout (Fu) in Nubia. A. Berthelot accepts that the Fulani are Ethiopians, and red-skinned, and relates them to the Barabara and the Bakkāra, and makes their language a negro language. Recently Shelykh Anta Diop has supported this Nilotic origin by identifying the only two typical totemic proper names of the Fulani with two equally typical concepts in Egyptian metaphysical beliefs, *Ka* and *Ba*. On the other hand he supports the close connexion existing between the Fula language, Wolof and Serer.

The Fulani have no firm national tradition about their origin. They regard themselves sometimes as Arabs, sometimes as a cross between Jews and Arabs, sometimes as a cross between Arabs and negroes, or between Moors and negroes. In actual fact the legends most often date from the time of islammation, and on that account lack any kind of validity.

*Saharan route of the Fulani.* Although a number of authors have found little difficulty in demonstrating the relationship of the Fulani to the Nubians and the Masai, the difficulty of crossing the Sahara seems to have caused a diversion of the Fulani's supposed migration routes, so that almost all are made to pass by the northern fringe of the desert, in fact all over the Maghrib. It is only quite recently that the explorer H. Lhote has thrown light on a probable travel route across the present desert, a route possible in the climatological conditions of the 3rd millennium B.C. when the terrain of the Sahara resembled the present-day Sudan zone. More than a thousand rock engravings and paintings are found at intervals across the desert from Egypt to the Atlantic, depicting cattle and their herdsmen. The cattle portrayed belong to two types—longhorns, and the short-horned cattle, long ago domesticated in Egypt, which are indigenous to Africa. The style recalls that of Egypt—in the way the animal is depicted in profile and full face, and in the presence of a spherical object or appendage between the horns, suggestive of a cult identical with or related to the cults of Egypt; the human figures, with the hair fashioned into a crescent, are identical with those of present-day Fulani women.

The tools (polished axes, grinding stones) which
have been recovered near these engravings, particularly at Mertutek (Hoggar). It was probably around this period that these pastoralists left the Upper Nile and moved into a pastoral zone covering the present-day Sahara. They reached the Djebel Wenat, where some very beautiful paintings of cattle have been found, then reached the Pezzan, travelled along the high plateaus of Tassili, passed by way of the deep canyons of the Hoggar uplands, and then followed the valleys of the Hoggar and of Wadì Tamousak. They then passed to the north of Fezzan, and were unknown in Mauretanien until quite recently (their art, probably learnt in Egypt, had been lost). These movements are explained by the search for new pastures and the need for continual change of habitat that is typical of nomadic peoples, and also no doubt by the gradual encroachment of desert conditions through changes of climate; a contributory factor may also have been the importance which the Fulani attach to their cattle.

The vexed question of the origin of the Fulani is as hotly disputed by Africanists today as it has been in the past. Various branches of science—anthropology, ethnology, linguistics and prehistory—have made their contribution towards the solution of the problem. The type of ceramics (Chantre), cranial indices (Tautain, Verneau, Deniker, Chantre), linguistic relationships (Mlle. Homburger, F. Müller, Seligman), and the ethnographic context (Lhote, Tauxier) constitute a body of important presumptions concerning the common origin of these light-skinned peoples who set out from the vicinity of Ethiopia with their cattle, one group going west, the other south, peacefully driving their cattle before them. Often superior to the tribes they encountered, they became their advisers and their suppliers of meat—a luxury commodity—and then, when circumstances were favourable, they seized power, assisted by the fact that they were also skilled horsemen, and that in the open country of the savannah regions cavalry is always at an advantage, especially when the opposing infantry is equipped only with bows and featherless arrows, which make it impossible to shoot any distance.

Spread of the Fulani. Futa Toro plays an important role as the centre of the dispersal of the Fulani élite. It is nevertheless probable that where these élite have succeeded in establishing their authority, it is to a large extent due to the presence on the spot of other Fulani elements. It was probably in the 11th century that the Fulani established themselves at Futa Toro, and from there, at the time of the fall of the empire of Ghana, they spread towards the east by way of Dhombo and Kaarta, where several clans remained. Others mingled with the settled Mandinka population to produce the Fulanke. A fairly large group remained up to the end of the 14th century at Kanian (south of Bagana), whence Maga Djallo and his companions were set out at the beginning of the 15th century in the direction of Macina. Another section was to settle at Bakunu. Another contingent from Futa Toro was to reach the northern shore of Lake Debo and then, after crossing the Niger at Say, was to settle first in the Sokoto area and then in Adamawa. From Macina to come the Fulani of the Dogon country and of Liptako, as well as those of Futa Djallon. By intermarriage with the local negro population the Fulani were to produce six groups which were to be of considerable importance in the evolution of the African continent. The alliance of Fulani with Serer was to produce the Tukulors, the Fulanke and the Toronke, important groups in the valley of the Senegal crossed with the Mandinkas, they formed the groups of Fulanke who number more than 100,000 in the vicinity of Bafoulabe, Kita, Bougouni and Sikasso. The Kassonke and Wassulonke, who evolved during the 18th century at Wassulu, were to distinguish themselves during the struggle against the Fulani of Futa Djallon (1760).

The supremacy of the Fulani. The Fulani are normally regarded as fierce Muslims. Although this is true in general, nevertheless numerous pagan customs still persist, and their influence made itself felt at first in a pagan reaction against Islam.

The details of the spread of the Fulani have often been described. At first, as guardians of the cattle which farmers entrusted to them, they played an important economic role, and were fully conscious of their intellectual superiority. As a second step, the owner was reduced to slavery and his land and cattle appropriated. The extraordinary spate of Fulani conquests of the 18th and 19th centuries is then readily understandable.

From Futa Toro the Fulani, or at least their ruling classes, set out towards the east, establishing kingdoms as they went, first Macina, then Futa Djallon, and the Fulani empires of Nigeria and of Adamawa.

The Fulani empire of Macina was created by one Maga Djallo at the end of the 14th century. The Ardos resisted the assaults of the Songhai of the Sonni Ali Ber, and then came under the control of the Moroccans of Gao before finding themselves, at the end of the 18th century, caught between the Bambara invasions and the Tuareg expansion. It was left to Seku (Shuku) Hamadu (1840-52) to carry the Fulani empire of Macina to the peak of its power, thanks to the rise of Usman (Ughmân) dan Fodio. He established his capital at Hamdallahâ ("Praise to God") in 1815, and organized his states into provinces, with governors, judges, and fiscal and military systems. Seku Hamadu succeeded in converting to Islam almost all the Fulani and a considerable number of Bambara. After Hamadu Seku (1844-52), who established his suzerainty over Timbuctoo, his son Hamadu Hamadu (1852-62) saw his army of 50,000 warriors defeated at Sayewal at the hands of Al-Hâdîdâ. Umar's 30,000 Tukulors. Hamdallahâ was conquered and Hamadu Hamadu put to death. Two years later his brother Ba Lobbo was to succeed in defeating the Tukulor army while Al-Hâdîdâ Umar was to escape into the cave at Degemere with his reserves of ammunition. But Tidjani, nephew of Al-Hâdîdâ Umar, soon took his revenge. From that time on, the Tukulors were to be in control of Macina.
The Fulani (Fulas) of Futa Djallon came from Macina around 1694, led by a certain Sa'di. As soon as the Fulani felt themselves strong enough, they were to seize power and wage a succession of holy wars against the pagans. The position of Almamy was to be held alternately by the Sorya and Alfaya families; the most famous of the Almamys was Ibrahim Sori Maudd (1751-84).

The Fulani of Nigeria are among the best known of the Fulani groups, owing to the many written documents which have survived. Here, as elsewhere, a distinction is made between the Fulanin Gida, who took up a sedentary life and often intermarried with the local inhabitants, and the Bororo, who still faithfully tend their herds of cattle. In contrast to many of the Fulanin Gida, the Bororo are tall and slim, with a proud carriage, light skin, aquiline nose and thin lips. According to the Kano Chronicle, it was in the 18th century that the Fulani came from Futu Toro to establish themselves in the kingdom of Gobir, one of the Seven Hausa States.

Usman dan Fodio (born 1754) set himself up in opposition to the Emir of Gobir, declared a holy war, defeated the Emir's troops (21 June 1804), and had himself proclaimed Sarkin Musulmi ("Commander of the Faithful"). Thereafter he extended his authority over Kano, where he established his base while he collected the military and administrative documents of the Katsina, Kebebi, Nupe, Zaria and Liptako. Usman attacked Bornu (1808), although its people too were Muslims, but was repulsed by El-Kanemi (1810) and attacked Bornu (1811), while Muhammadu Bello, son of Usman, was given authority over Kano, where he established his base and had himself proclaimed Emir of Kano. Muhammadu Bello found time to write a History of the Eleven States of Northern Nigeria, and it was in the 18th century that the Fulani influence at Liptako had started with the establishment of British rule.

The Fulani of Adamawa entered the plateau areas during the 19th century in search of pasture. They settled peacefully among the Bata, Fali, Mundang, and Massa tribes in the neighbourhood of the Mandara mountains and the Benue, Mayo Kebebi and Logone rivers.

At the call of Usman dan Fodio the Fulani seized power. Summoning the influential malams (those learned in the Kur'an) to Kano, Usman dan Fodio appointed Adama of the Ba clan to carry his standard. Adama installed himself at Yola and conducted a campaign against the pagans of the north "for the faith, not to capture slaves and fill his harem". Meanwhile he attacked the chief of Mandara before carrying the war against the hill tribes of the Fulani, Mofu and Dawa. He overcame the Mundang of Mayo Kebebi, and to the south he fought the Vere, Chamba, Namchi and Doni. After the wars of liberation were to come the wars of domination. The captives made a plentiful labour force for tilling the soil. The Fulani themselves settled in the best-situated villages abandoned by the pagans.

On the death of Adama (1847) the conquest was practically complete. The country which had up to then been called Fombina ("the South") in the Fula language became Adamawa ("country of Adama"), subdivided into several chiefdoms (such as Banyo, Garu, Ngaundere, Rai and Tibati), whose incumbents received their appointments from Yola. After the death of Adama the chiefdoms of Ngoundere, Tibati and Bindere became independent, while the southern areas remained vassals of Yola.

The half-century between the death of Adama and the arrival of the Germans saw the gradual attrition of Yola's authority. The emirs were much more preoccupied with possible profitable raids and the sale of slaves to the Kanuri, the Arabs and the Hausas, than with converting the infidels.

Society and language. Fulani society is marked by a caste system consisting of nobles (rimbe, plural of dimo), serfs (rimast), traders and herdsmen (jaumalmb), singers and weavers (mababe), leatherworkers (sakhe or gargarabbe), woodworkers (ladhe or sakabbe) and smiths (sawabbe).

The language of the Fulani (Fula, Fulani, Pular, or Fulfulde) has been the subject of a great many studies. Once considered a Hamitic language related to the Berber dialects, Fula is generally grouped with the languages of Senegal and Guinea. It is a language with characteristic noun classes, marked by sets of suffixes and a pronominal system of an alliterative type. The roots are mainly monosyllabic roots consisting of closed syllables (consonant + vowel + consonant) like those of the other languages in the area. The verbal system is very rich, and includes three voices—active, middle and passive—and various moods and aspects.

FULBE — FUNDJ


FÖMAN (FÖMIN), the centre of a region (bâsaba) in Gìlan [q.v.], with (in 1914) about 70,000 inhabitants (mostly Shî'î Persians: Gîlak) whose main crops are rice and some cereals, and who also produce silk. The town of Fûman is 21 km. W.S.W. of Rašt [q.v.] on the right bank of the Gâzrâdbâd and it contains some four hundred houses. Before the advent of Islam in the 7th-8th century it was the seat of the Dâbhûa dynasty [q.v.] and for part of the middle ages it was considered the most important town in Gìlan. After the country's surrender to the Mongols in 1307, the prince of Ōfûman, said to be a descendant of the Sâhânids and the only Shî'î of the country, was, after the ruler of Lâhîdjan [q.v.], the Ilghân's confidant in Gìlan. Fûman was then the centre of a fertile agricultural area and an important market for trading, and was considered the focal point of the Daylam [q.v.] district. (The assertions of al-Umârî in Notes et traités des mes de la Bibliothèque du Roi, ed. M. E. Quatrembre, xiii, Paris 1838, 298, and Hand Allah Mustawfî, Nusha, i [text], 162 = ii [trans.], 159, contradict each other in many respects). Thereafter, until 980/1572-3, Fûman remained the capital of the Biya-pas ("beyond the river") region (see Gîlân) which was then transferred to Rašt. After that Fûman was the centre for two important clans, one of which was transferred to Rašt in the nineteenth century. Today Fûman is a small country town of little significance.


10. October, 1616.


17. Nul, d. 16 Shawwal 1136/8 July 1724.
18. Badi IV (Abu Shulub) b. Nul, deposed 2 Ramada- 
    dan 1175/27 March 1762.

* Date of accession of the last king.

The early monarchy: The northward expansion of the Fundj coincided with a southward Arab expansion under the hegemony of the ‘Abdallab dynasty, connected with the overthrow of the Christian Nubian metropolis of Sûbba. The two migrations clashed near Arbajji, the southernmost ‘Abdallabi town, on the Blue Nile, in the Gezira (Djajrat Sinnâr, Dj. al-Hûl, Dj. al-Fundi). The victory of the Gezira began the high-water mark of the ‘Abdallabi shaykh, whose own authority extended beyond the nomads and sedentaries northwards as far as the Third Cataract. The tradition that ‘Amâra Dûnîs and the ‘Abdallabi eponym, ‘Abd Allah Djamama, combined to overthrow Sûbba is probably a false-saving legend. The Fundj rulers were early converted to Islam. ‘Amâra had Muslims in his retinue, and his second successor, ‘Abd al-Kadir I, bore a Muslim name, and one which furthermore indicates the predominant role of the Kàdiriya tariqa in the Fundj territories. Our principal source of information on the islamization of the region, the Tabakdt of Wad Dayf Allah, says little about the true Fundj lands, but is almost wholly concerned with the ‘Abdallab districts further north. The dual hegemony was subjected to severe strain, when the Fundj chief, ‘Abd al-Majdîlak (i.e., “the Viceroy”), revolted against ‘Abdallan b. Onsa, and was killed in the battle of Karkoji (1067/1657-8). Peace was restored, and the ‘Abdallabî dynasty re-established, through the mediation of an influential Kàdiri shaykh, Idris b. Muhammad al-Abarb (d. 1060/1650).

The heyday of the monarchy: Fundj power expanded across the southern Gezira into Kordofan, west of the White Nile. The first stages were the conquest of the isolated hills of Sakadî and Muya, on the upper

Blue Nile, under a tributary chief, formed the southern limit of the Fundj dominions.

The monarchy in decline: On several occasions the purchase and freed sons of internal weak-

ness, as indicated by the deposition of monarchs. Bruce’s statement that there was a custom of regicide (Travels, vi, 372) seems, however, to be a gratuitous generalization. A development of great importance was the creation of a slave-army by Badii II, as a consequence of his successful raid in the west. These slaves, augmented by natural increase, produced further raiding, were settled in villages around Sinnâr. Their existence created tensions between the dynasty and the FundjJI warrior aristocracy. Badii III overcame a revolt of the Fundj of Sinnâr and al-Ays, who were supported by the ‘Abdallab, but his son, Onsa III, was deposed after the “troops of Lulu” had marched northwards on the capital. This marked the end of the direct male line. The next king, Nul, was connected through his mother with the former royal clan, the ‘Unsâb; there are other traces of matrilineal customs. Under Nul and his son, Badii IV, the monarchy temporarily regained strength. Badii was, however, overthrown by his victorious commander and viceroy in Kordo- 

fan, Muhammad Abi Likaylîk, who profited from the renewal of dissensions between the king and the Fundj aristocracy. Badi, the Fundj warrior chief became the high-king in a partnership with the ‘Abdallabi shaykh, whose own authority extended beyond the nomads and sedentaries northwards as far as the Third Cataract. The tradition that ‘Amâra Dûnîs and the ‘Abdallabi eponym, ‘Abd Allah Djamama, combined to overthrow Sûbba is probably a false-saving legend. The Fundj rulers were early converted to Islam. ‘Amâra had Muslims in his retinue, and his second successor, ‘Abd al-Kadir I, bore a Muslim name, and one which furthermore indicates the predominant role of the Kàdiriya tariqa in the Fundj territories. Our principal source of information on the islamization of the region, the Tabakdt of Wad Dayf Allah, says little about the true Fundj lands, but is almost wholly concerned with the ‘Abdallab districts further north. The dual hegemony was subjected to severe strain, when the Fundj chief, ‘Abd al-Majdîlak (i.e., “the Viceroy”), revolted against ‘Abdallan b. Onsa, and was killed in the battle of Karkoji (1067/1657-8). Peace was restored, and the ‘Abdallabî dynasty re-established, through the mediation of an influential Kàdiri shaykh, Idris b. Muhammad al-Abarb (d. 1060/1650).

The heyday of the monarchy: Fundj power expanded across the southern Gezira into Kordofan, west of the White Nile. The first stages were the conquest of the isolated hills of Sakadî and Muya, ascribed to ‘Abd al-Kâdir I, c. 1554, and the securing of the crossing of the White Nile, at this time dominated by the Shilluk, a pagan tribe, celebrated for their canoe raids. Badii II defeated the Shilluk, and raided the Muslim hill-state of Taqalî, south of Kordofan, which he laid under tribute. The command of al-Ays, the Fundj bridge-head on the White Nile, was always held by a member of the royal clan. The plains of Kordofan proper, ruled by the Musabbâ‘, kinsmen of the Kayra dynasty of Dar Fûr [q.v.], were not conquered until the reign of Badii IV. Fundj extension eastwards was barred by Abyssinia. Two Fundj-Abyssinian wars are recorded: the first (known only from Abyssinian sources) in 1618-9, and the second in the reign of Badii IV, culminating in a Fundj victory (Safar 1157/March-April 1744). The auriferous district of Fâzgufîl [q.v.] on the upper

(P. M. Holt)

FUNDUK, a term of Greek origin (πρόδυογελον) used, particularly in North Africa, to denote hostels at which animals and humans can lodge, on the lines of the caravanserais or ḥādūn of the Muslim East. These hostels consist of a court-yard surrounded by buildings on all four sides. The ground floors are generally used to house animals from caravans or owned by passing country-dwellers and also, when necessary, any merchandise stored there until such time as the consignee takes delivery of it. On the upper floor (usually there is only one), small rooms give onto a gallery which encircles the entire building; it is here that people are housed. The gate to the street is large enough to allow fully laden animals to pass through. In the Middle Ages it often happened that in towns open to international trade funduks were placed at the disposal of European traders on a "national" basis. Thus in Tunis there was a funduk for the French, in Cairo a funduk for the Venetians, etc. These hostels were patronized almost exclusively by the poor; others went out of their way to avoid the discomfort, the contiguity with the animals, and in many cases the presence of prostitutes who often occupied several rooms where they entertained travellers.

In Morocco the same type of building is often used by a group of merchants to store their goods. The court-yard is shared, and each participant hires one or more rooms; in this type of funduk there is no stabling for animals. It also happens that groups of artisans, often of the same trade, hire the various rooms in a funduk and use them as a collective workshop, each member remaining fully independent. In general, funduks belong to the administration of religious estates (babūs or awčāf) which let them out to the various occupants, in the case of traders or artisans, or to a concessionaire in the case of a hostelry.

Some of these buildings are of artistic merit, such as the funduk al-nadālīn and the funduk al-Tīfawīsīyīn in Piz. Funduks for storage or workshops are found along the infant or trading quay rs, while funduks in the sense of hostels are usually situated near the main gates of the town.

Biography: No work exists dealing specifically with funduks. Information relating to 1 2 will be found in R. Le Tournear, Pèse avant le Protectorat, Casablanca-Paris 1949, in particular 190-1 and 317-8. See also 3 4.

FUNKIRCHEN [see FES].

FUNG [see FUND].

FUR [see FAWR].

AL-FURAT is the Arabic name of the Euphrates, called in Sumerian BU-RA-NU-NU, Assyr. Puritu, Hebrew בּ֫רֻ, Syriac لب; in Old Persian it was called Φύρτα, whence Middle Persian Frat, modern Turkish Frat. On the name and the notices by authors in antiquity see Paulus-Wissowa, art. Euphrates (by Weissbach). The main stream of the Euphrates is formed by the junction of two principal arms, now called the Karasu (length 450 km./280 miles) and the Murad-suyu (650 km./400 miles). The former, though the shorter, long bore (and in its lower course still bears) the name Frat/Furat, and is regarded by all the sources as the true Euphrates. Its headwaters are the numerous rivers flowing down from the high mountains (Gavur-dagh [see GAWUR DAGHILA], Dumlu-dagh, Karga-Pazār-dagh) north of the plain of Erzurum. According to the Arab geographers, it rises in the district of Kalkalā [see ERZURUM] in a mountain called Ṿorne or some such name, in which we may probably recognise the Ḫūḏḏūḏy Ṿuṣq of Potlemy, and the Mons Parverdens of the Tabula Peutingeriana. For the upper course of the river we have the very important description by Ibn Serapion, whose text has been published with translation by G. Le Strange in JRAS, 1895; his statements were discussed by Tomasekh in a valuable paper in the Festschrift für H. Kiepert, 1898, 137-49. After leaving the marshy plain of Erzurum, the river flows westward through narrow gorges, accompanied by the line of the Erzurum-Sivas railway; the Erzurum-Tabzon road turns off north-west at Aşkale. Twisting south, between the ranges of the Cemal and Keşiş dağları, it is joined by the Tuzla yayin flowing from Tercan [see TERÇAN], and then turns west again to emerge into the plain of Erzincan [see ERZINCAN] (altitude 1200 m./4000 ft.). From there it proceeds through very steep and narrow gorges along the foot of the northern slopes of the Monzor range. Turning sharply south-east, it receives the Çalısuuyu (the Nahr Abrli of Ibn Serapion), which flows from Divriği [see DIVRİĞİ] to meet it, passes by Eğin [Eğen] a small town, and then enters the modern Erzurum province (which of a mountainous area), and finally reaches the plains of the Erzincan. The Murad-suyu rises in the volcanic Aldaş Mountains north of Lake Van, and flows westwards to traverse the Kara-köse plain. Alternately passing through steep gorges and across broad plains [see MALAZGERD, TUTAK], it enters from the north the extensive plain of Muş [see MUS], where it is joined by the Kara-su, flowing westward across the plain from the Nemrut-dağ. Now accompanied by the recently constructed railway to Elazığ, it again flows westward, receiving from the left the Harıcet-deresi, which drains the plain of Elazığ, and from the right the Peri-suyu, before uniting with the Kara-su.

The name of the Murad-su in antiquity was Arsanasia, whence the Nahr Arsunas of the Arab geographers, who describe it as rising in Tarın (Taranitis) and being joined near Shemahat (Arsamosa) by the Nahr al-Dhib, and the Nahr Salkıt (identified by Tomsekh with the Peri-suyu and the Sungut-suyu respectively). The origin of the name Murad is not clear; the hypotheses of Belck (Beiträge zu alter Geographie, i, 45), that it may be a popular etymology for Frat, and of Tomsekh (Sassn, 17), that it rises in a mountain region once called Murad, should be mentioned. Although some European maps and text-books refer to the Murad-su as the ‘Eastern’ and the Kara-su as the ‘Western’ Euphrates, such a distinction is not known in the
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region itself (and indeed the ‘Western’ Euphrates is in fact the northern arm).

The united stream flows, first south-west and then south-east of the village of al-Ma‘am (the modern Muslim, Khalil al-Zahrî, Zubda, 52: Mûshâr, receives on the west bank the Kuru-çay or Hekimhan suyu (probably the Nahr Djarjirîyya of the mediaeval geographers, reported as flowing from the neighbourhood of Kharšana) and the Tohma-çay. The latter (the mediaeval Nahr Kubûkîib, into which flow the Nahr Kurâkîs = Sultan-su and the Nahr al-Zarnûk, which irrigates by a branch Malatîyâ, is crossed by the celebrated Kanîtarat Kûbukîb, the modern Kûrgûz-köprü (see Yorke in the Geogr. Journ., viii (1896), 328 f.; Lehmann-Haupt, Armenien, i, 486). On the east bank the Euphrates receives the Nahr henzi (Bûyûk çay) which still preserves the name of the capital of the old district of Anzitene and then, breaking through the south-east Taurus, enters the cataract district, which it does not leave till it reaches Geze (see from Moltke, Briefe über Zustände der Türkei, 305-10; E. Huntingdon, in Zeitschr. für Ethnol., 1901, 183-204; idem, in Geog. Journ., xx (1902), 175-200).

Leaving the mountainous country the Euphrates divides the flat tableland into two, and forms the boundary between Syria and al-Djazira below Samasat (Sumaysât [q.v.]). At first the river continues as before to receive important tributaries from the west only. Of these the most important is the Nahr Sandja or Nahr al-Atrak crossed by the famous Kanîtarat Sandja, which, like the Singsas of the ancients (cf. R. Kiepert, Formara Orbis Asiatis, text to sheet 5, p. 3, *), is certainly to be identified with the Goksu. Below the rocky citadel of Kal‘at al-Rûm and the crossing of al-Dîra, of particular importance since the Crusading period [see BİREDJIK], there is still the Na̱r Sâgûr (modern Turkish Sacur) to be mentioned. Immediately after being crossed by the bridge of the Aleppo-Baghdâd railway, the river crosses the frontier into Syria.

In the early middle ages Düsr Manbîdî (the later Kal‘at al-Nadîm) and al-Rûkka [q.v.] were the main places where the Euphrates could be crossed. After Mesopotamia, which also swells eastwards, the river is navigable. It passes the battlefield of Şîfîn [q.v.], near which is the ruined citadel of Dîsbar [q.v.] with the reputed tomb of Sûleymân-shâh [q.v.]. Below al-Rûkka the al-Balikh, rising in the neighbourhood of Harrân, joins the mainstream at al-Rûkka [q.v.], the modern ruins of al-Samra (see Sarre and Herzfeld, Archäol. Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet, i, 160). The now very important crossing at Dayr al-Zôr has only become of any considerable importance in modern times. The place held by Dayr al-Zôr at the present day was held in ancient times by Circesium, the Kariksia of the Arabs, at the mouth of the Klîbîr; this river flowing from Ra‘î al-Ayîn formed, according to the repeated statements of the Arab authors, with its tributary the Hirmâs from Tûr ‘Abîdîn, a navigable connection between the Euphrates and the Tigris in the Nahr al-Tharthar, but, according to the investigations of Sarre and Herzfeld, op. cit., i, 193, this must be regarded as more than doubtful. The rôle of the ancient Circesium and of the modern Dayr al-Zôr was filled, particularly in the later middle ages, by the double village of Ra‘îba, or the Dîlîya of Mâlik b. Tâwîk, a little south of the former, the lands of which were watered by the Nahr Sa‘îd canal, which began before Kariksia, and was called after Sa‘îd b. ‘Abd al-Mâlik b. Marwân (see Peters, Nippur, i, 127, 129-30; A. Musil, In Nordostarabien und Südmesopotamien, p. 10 of the reprint from the Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Kl. der Wiener Akad., 1919, i, 166).

While modern geographers make Southern Mesopotamia begin at ‘Anâ [q.v.], already celebrated in the Middle Ages as a rule place the boundary between al-Djazira and al-Tîrât much farther south on the Euphrates. The Cerî Sa‘de, which was led out of the Euphrates downwards from Hit, the course of which can be traced almost as far as Nadjîf (see Peters, Nippur, i, 166 and 313; ii, 327; Meissner, Von Babylon nach den Ruinen von Uslra und Umrnawî, 15), has unfortunately not been sufficiently explored to establish its real importance and relation to Khandak Sâbûr (see Nûdeke, Sassamîden, 57; Le Strange, 65) and to the Wadî ‘Ayn al-Tamr (see Musil, op. cit., 11), which, according to Ibn Serapion, flowed into the Euphrates at Hit. According to Ibn Serapion a canal, called Nahr Dundjaiî, flowed from the Euphrates at al-Rabb (7 farsîh from al-Anbâr, 12 from Hit; possibly the Umm al-Rû‘ûs in Peters, Nippur, ii, 45) to the Tigris near ‘Ukbârî (see Streck, Die alte Landschaft Babylonien, 24), but it seems soon to have been silted up, as the later geographers give this name only to a Tigris-canal perhaps originally connected with the ancient Dundjaiî (see Streck, op. cit., 33 and 220 f.).

Only a little farther down, at al-Anbâr [q.v.] begins the great network of the Babylonian canal system, which dates back into remote antiquity, although only the remains survive today. The usual identification of the four main canals, Nahr ‘Ibâ, Nahr Şarî, Nahr al-Malik and Nahr Köghêr, led from the Euphrates, is given in the article DIJLAT (for details see Streck, op. cit., 25 f.), but in the present state of our knowledge of the country it can only be regarded as highly hypothetical. Shortly after they branch off, the Euphrates divides into two arms. The western arm, according to the Arabs the river proper, which flows past Rûfa and is finally lost in the Batiha, was also called al-Alqâm, which Musil (op. cit., 13) has found east-north-east of Karbalâ’ as the name of an ancient canal, perhaps forming the northern continuation of the modern Hindiyya arm. The eastern arm of the Euphrates, which even in Ibn Serapion’s time held a greater stream of water, for the first part of it corresponded to the bed of the modern Euphrates proper until, since about 1889, the river began to pour the greater part of its waters into the Hindiyya arm (see Peters, Nippur, ii, 335; Sachau, Am Euphrat und Tigris, 38 and 57), again divides near Bâbil. Its eastern arm, which flows to the Tigris under the names Nahr Šûrû al-A‘îb, Sarât al-Kabîra, Nahr al-Nil, or Nahr Sâbûs via the town of al-Nil (the modern Nîzîya), has been the roughly explored by Sarre and Herzfeld (Arch. Reise, i, 234-47) except for its eastern extremity. How far the western branch, the Nahr Šûrû al-Asfal, corresponds to the modern course of the Euphrates or the canals Shaṭṭ al-Nil, Shaṭṭ al-Kár, which flow to the southeast, cannot yet be exactly determined. This arm likewise ends in the great swampy area of the Batiha, the outflow from which, Nahr Abî ‘l-Asad, which runs into the Diţlat ‘Arîv, may in a way be described as the lower course of the Euphrates.

This is in its main outlines the picture drawn by the Arab geographers, particularly Ibn Serapion.
That the details which they give us are not always intelligible is not remarkable, considering the deficiencies in our knowledge of the country; that contradictions seem to be found in them need not cause surprise, when we consider how much the river has changed its course, of which the shifting to the south in quite recent times of its confluence with the Tigris is a striking example (see Geogr. Journ., xxxv, 11 with map). The Arabs themselves knew of considerable changes in the course of the Euphrates; for example, Mas'ud (Murādī, i, 216) says that in the period of Hira's prosperity sea-going ships came up as far as Nadjaf in the old riverbed (al-sūbīr). A detailed account has been given above (s.v.) of the Arabs' knowledge of the history of the Batba, which is at the same time the history of the Lower Euphrates. It is perhaps evidence of the gradual alteration in this area of swamps that, according to certain authors (see BGA, iii, 20, note 1; cf. also Yākūt, iii, 560 f.), an arm of the Euphrates—it can only be the Nahr Sūrā al-Asfal—entered the Tigris at Wāṣīt. Not only is the history of the Euphrates in antiquity and the middle ages still very obscure, but we have only very meagre information regarding the changes in its course in recent times.

**Bibliography:** The Arab geographers and the more important western works are given under the following head: (1) Karte von Kleinasien (1: 400,000). For further details see the separate articles. For the course, tributaries, etc. of the Euphrates in the modern Turkish Republic, see IA, s.v. Firat (by Besim Darkot) and Naval Intelligence Handbook, Turkey, 2 vols., 1942-3, index.

The Euphrates measures 2333 km./1480 miles from the confluence of the Karasu and the Murad-suyu to Basra. It drains an enormous basin, which is made up as follows: Karasu, 21,500 sq. km./83,800 sq. miles; Murad-suyu, 39,700 sq. km./15,500 sq. miles; the Euphrates as far as Diarabulus (where it enters Syria), 96,000 sq. km./37,500 sq. miles; as far as 'Āna (where it enters Irāq), 229,000 sq. km./89,300 sq. miles; to the point where it enters Iraq, 444,000 sq. km./173,000 sq. miles. It must however be realized that the greater part of this area is complete desert and contributes no water at all to the river.

The area from which the Euphrates is fed is virtually confined to the mountainous area to the north, which consists of 82,330 sq. km./32,110 sq. miles, only some 20% of the total area of the basin, 80% of which is made up of steppe and desert.

After it has left the mountains the Euphrates is nothing more than an artery for carrying away the rains and snows which have fallen in Eastern Turkey. Consequently, very soon—from Djarablus, on the Turco-Syrian frontier, 1980 km./1230 miles from the Persian Gulf—the river begins to dwindle. At Hit, its average annual flow is 838 cubic metres/29,595 cubic feet per second; at Hindiyya, 629 cu. m./22,213 cu. ft.; at Shinafiyya, 573 cu. m./20,730 cu. ft.; at Nasiriyya, 458 cu. m./16,174 cu. ft. (for comparison, the figure for the Rhine is 2200 cu. m./77,966 cu. ft. per sec.; for the Loire, 935 cu. m./33,020 cu. ft.; for the Oder, 510 cu. m./18,011 cu. ft.; for the Seine, 485 cu. m./17,127 cu. ft.). Between Hit and Nasiriyya (680 km./420 miles) the Euphrates loses 66% of its water by evaporation.

Similarly wide variations are found between different months of the year. During the hot season the flow decreases: (at Hit), August, 354 cu. m./12,501 cu. ft.; September, 293 cu. m./10,347 cu. ft. In the autumn it begins to rise again with the first rains: November, 433 cu. m./15,291 cu. ft.; December, 547 cu. m./19,317 cu. ft.; January, 587 cu. m./20,730 cu. ft., and rises still further during the winter: February, 668 cu. m./23,590 cu. ft.; March, 962 cu. m./33,973 cu. ft.; April, 1880 cu. m./66,394 cu. ft.; May, 2230 cu. m./78,755 cu. ft.; June, 1210 cu. m./42,732 cu. ft. Thus 63% of the water carried by the Euphrates flows during March, April, May and June only, and in May there flows 7 ½ times as much water (2230 cu. m./78,755 cu. ft.) as in September (293 cu. m./10,347 cu. ft.).

Especially striking is the rapidity with which the average flow declines in the space of two months—June and July—and also how late the annual maximum flow is reached (in May), whereas in the Tigris it appears a month earlier (in April). This is explained by the fact that the Euphrates is supplied to a large extent by snow which, on the high plateaus, does not melt until very late spring.

In addition to its extreme seasonal variations in rate of flow, the Euphrates is in flood for a shorter period than the Tigris, and this is due to the fact that the Euphrates flows during March, April, May and June only, whereas the Tigris flows during April, May and June and also in September. The Euphrates is fed by snow which, on the high plateaus of the Maritime Ala, does not melt until very late spring.

A very important feature of the geography of Mesopotamia is the fact that the Euphrates between Hit and Shinafiyya flows at a slightly higher level than the section of the Tigris between Bagdad and Küt. The northern part of Mesopotamia is thus irrigated by canals which lead off from the Euphrates to the east and the south-east, and this has been so since remotest antiquity (no canal can lead off to the west because of the edge of the Syrian plateau), while the southern part on the other hand is irrigated by canals leading off from the Tigris, the main one—practically the only one—being the Ultar, in whose bed the Tigris itself at one time flowed.

From Samawa to the Shat al-'Arab, the Euphrates clings to the desert plateau, the slope is very slight, and the area was formerly filled by the great marsh which, according to some sources, appeared in the 5th century A.D., while others say that it appeared at the time of the great flood of 629 A.D. The last traces of it are now represented by the 110 km./70 miles of lake Hammar.

At all periods embankments have been built to combat the floods. Since the building of the Ramaddl barrage in 1955-6, it has been possible when the water level is very high to divert 2800 cu. m./96,900 cu. ft. per sec. in the direction of Lake Habbaniiyya along a canal 8.5 km./5 miles long and 210 metres/230 yards wide. In the same year there
was completed on the Tigris at Samarra a similar barrage, which is capable of diverting 9000 cu. m./
315,000 cu. ft. per sec. towards the depression of the Wadi Tharthar along a canal 15 km./9 miles long.
Now, and for the first time in history, Mesopotamia
is protected from the catastrophe of floods.


(E. de Vaumas)

**AL-FURAT, BANU** [see IBN AL-FURAT].

**FURDA**, a term used interchangeably in Ottoman documents and Arabic texts with *firda*, in reference to personal taxes. Attested in Ottoman Egypt after about 1775 as one of the many illegal charges imposed on peasants by soldiers of the provincial governors, in 1792 this tax was legalized under the name *Firdat al-tahrir*, as a comprehensive levy to replace all the previous illegal charges. It was not a regular impost, nor was it applicable to the same tax, but only where and when local authorities needed money for special purposes. The total amount levied on each village and individual varied according to ability to pay and the amount of money needed. It was one of the *mukhridat* revenues of the Treasury, i.e., those collected and spent locally, without being sent to Cairo, although they were included in the accounts of revenues and expenditures of the central treasury. It was also considered to be one of the *kukhisiyye-i dejidat* taxes. In 1798, 7,066,194 paras were collected in this way, approximately five per cent of the total Treasury revenues. In March 1801 it was abolished by the French, along with most of the other taxes inherited from Ottoman times.

After the departure of the French, Muhammad 'Ali restored the *firda* and changed it into a general personal tax, theoretically an income tax (called *Firdat al-ra'ūš*). This was levied annually on Muslim and non-Muslim males alike, with only European employees and was a major cause of their discontent. In the villages and smaller towns, it was levied on individuals at a rate of about eight per cent of their incomes or salaries, but no one had to pay more than five hundred paras. The tax was deducted directly from the salaries of government employees and was a major cause of their discontent. In the villages and smaller towns, it was levied on households, which were divided into three classes according to ability to pay. It provided about one-sixth of the Treasury's revenues, and was used principally to pay for the expenses of the rapidly expanding armed forces. The *firda* was also collected in Syria during the period of Egyptian occupation.


**FURFIYYUS**, i.e., *Porphyroios*, Porphyry (A.D. 234-about 305) of Tyre, amanuensis, biographer and editor of Plotinus, and outstanding as the founder of Neoplatonism as a scholastic tradition. The philosophical syllabus common in Arabic philosophy is ultimately due to him: since his days it became customary to use the lecture courses of Aristotle as set-books in the Neoplatonic schools of late antiquity and to start with the *Categories*. He himself wrote commentaries on Aristotle and Plotinus, which seem to have reached the Arabs either in their original or in some diluted form. It is not impossible that his conviction that Plato's and Aristotle's views were basically real, and a part of the same system, but disputing where and when local authorities needed money for special purposes. The total amount levied on each village and individual varied according to ability to pay and the amount of money needed. It was one of the *mukhridat* revenues of the Treasury, i.e., those collected and spent locally, without being sent to Cairo, although they were included in the accounts of revenues and expenditures of the central treasury. It was also considered to be one of the *kukhisiyye-i dejidat* taxes. In 1798, 7,066,194 paras were collected in this way, approximately five per cent of the total Treasury revenues. In March 1801 it was abolished by the French, along with most of the other taxes inherited from Ottoman times.

A very sketchy Arabic account of Porphyry's works is to be found in Ibn Sinān, *Firdat al-ruus*). This was levied annually on Muslim and non-Muslim males alike, with only European employees and was a major cause of their discontent. In the villages and smaller towns, it was levied on individuals at a rate of about eight per cent of their incomes or salaries, but no one had to pay more than five hundred paras. The tax was deducted directly from the salaries of government employees and was a major cause of their discontent. In the villages and smaller towns, it was levied on households, which were divided into three classes according to ability to pay. It provided about one-sixth of the Treasury's revenues, and was used principally to pay for the expenses of the rapidly expanding armed forces. The *firda* was also collected in Syria during the period of Egyptian occupation.

Tayyib (343/1043) is preserved in the Bodleian MS Marsh 28. The 7th/13th century commentary by Al-Abhari (cf. Brockelmann, I, 669, S I, 841) becomes more frequent in later centuries, in turn frequently commented upon and eventually completely replaced the original work.

(2) Commentaries on Aristotle. (a) The Fīlīrīst, 252, 2 (= Cairo ed. 351, 21), refers to a lost commentary in the Nicomachean Ethics, in twelve books (translated by Ḥāšā Ḥūnaṇ), which is not mentioned in the Greek tradition but was obviously used by Arabic writers. Al-Fārābī [g.v.], for example, mentions it in the essay on the identity of Plato’s and Aristotle’s views, al-Ḍijmān baṣna raʿayy al-ḥakīmān Aflāṭūn wa-ʾĀristā (ed. Dieterici, 177; ed. Nader, 95, 17): “As Porphyry and many commentators after him say”. We are not in a position to decide whether he made much use of it in his other writings but it is obviously likely. Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Muhammad al-ʿĀmirī (d. 382/992) refers to Porphyry four times by name in his very interesting ethical work Fīlī-saʿda wal-ʾisʿād (ed. M. Minov, Wiesbaden 1957-9); once, p. 53, he mentions the commentary expressly while discussing Aristotle’s treatment of pleasure. The definition of felicity (p. 5) is given according to Porphyry; the other references occur on pp. 25 and 32. Another commentary, introduced in its Arabic text as ‘the interpretation ofPorphyry’ (which he seems to quote as the treatise Fīlī-saʿda wa-l-maʾṣūḥūl in the Iṯṣārāt) while voicing his dissatisfaction with Porphyry’s view of the unio mystica (cf. F. Rahman, Prophesy in Islam, London 1958, 75 ff.). As one ‘who is not among the most subtle of philosophers’ Porphyry is blamed by Ibn Rusḥād, Ṭahfūt al-Ṭahfūt, ed. Bouyges 250, 10 ff. (cf. van den Bergh, Incoherence ..., i, 154, ii, 100) for his explanation of the cause of plurality. Porphyry’s view on matter is rejected in the Epitome of Aristotle’s Physics (Amlin, 73), cf. S. van den Bergh, Die Epitome der Metaphysik des Averroes, Leiden 1924, 67 and 207.

(3) Porphyry’s History of Philosophy in four books (Greek remnants of it were edited by A. Nauck, Porphyrii Opuscula, Leipzig 1886, 3-52) was known in Syriac (Fīlīrīst, 245, 12 = Cairo ed., 355) and in Arabic (the Fīlīrīṣṭ, i, 245) mentions a translation of two books by Abu ‘l-Ḥāyyār al-Ḥasan Ibn Suwarā. The Arabic text of the Life of Pythagoras (Nauck, 11-12) is accessible in Ibn Abl Uṣayyība, ʿĪyūn al-anbāh, ed. A. Mueller, 38, 18-41, 4, and is discussed by F. Rosenthal, Arabische Nachrichten uber Zeno den Eleaten, in Orientalia, vi (1937), 43 ff.; F. Rosenthal edited from al-Mubashshir a section of Porphyry’s life of Solon (ibid., 40 ff.), and an unknown biography of Zeno of Elea (ibid., 30 ff.), which is most likely derived from Porphyry’s work. Al-Bīrūnī, Ḥind (Sachau, 21-43), seems to refer to this book. R. Beutler (op. cit., 287) does not mention the Arabic tradition at all.

(4) The so-called Theology of Aristotle [see ARISTOTELIS ET AL-BAYYAM AL-UYNANI], a running paraphrase of Plotinus, IV 3, IV 4, IV 7, IV 8, V 1, V 2, V 8, VI 7, arranged in a systematic order, is introduced in its Arabic text as the interpretation (tafsir) of Porphyry of Tyre. There is, in my view, every likelihood that it must ultimatley be connected with Porphyry’s explanations of the Enneads (ʿuṣūmiyya wa-khārījāt) which he mentions in § 26 (l. 29 ff.) of his biography of Plotinus. An English translation of the work by G. Lewis, arranged in the order of Plotinus’ Enneads, is to be found in the second volume of P. Henry and H.-R. Schwazer, The Enneads ofPlotinus, Paris-Bruxelles 1959, cf. particularly p. XXVI ff. Whether the Epistula de Sceneta Divina (cf. F. Kraus, Plotin chez les Arabes, in BIE, xxiii (1941), 263 ff.) which contains similar extracts from Enneads V 3, V 4, V 5, V 6 (also translated by G. Lewis in the same volume) goes back to the same source, is uncertain but it is quite probable.


The great corpus of Alchemy attributed to Ḥabīr ibn Ḥasyāḥ refers to a more probable spurious work of Porphyry entitled The book of Generation’, a book in which the creation of artificial human beings was discussed at some length. It is mentioned neither in Greek nor in Arabic lists of Porphyry’s works. It is described by F. Kraus, op. cit., 114 ff., 122 n. 3; cf. E. R. Dodds, The Greeks and the irrational, Los Angeles 1951, 295. (R. Walzer)
means “deliverance”, “redemption”, and (in the Christian sense) “salvation”. The Arabic root *furaṣa, which must be considered as another element in the meaning of the Arabic word seen in the context, means “to separate”, “to divide”, “to distinguish”.

*Sura VIII, 29 runs: “O believers, if you fear God, He will assign you a furkān and acquit you of your evil deeds, and forgive you”. In *Sura VIII, 47 “the day on which the two hosts met” (which must refer to the battle at Badr) is described as “the day of the furkān”. At the same time it is said that on that day something which must be believed in was “sent down” to the Prophet. On the five other occasions where the word is used it is always in connexion with the giving of divine revelation; twice Moses, or Moses and Aaron, are named as those who receive the revelation (II, 53; XXI, 48); on three occasions it is mentioned in connexion with Muhammad and the Kurān (II, 185; III, 4; XXV, 1).

The difficulty of interpreting these passages springs chiefly from the fact that the relationship between revelation-writings and *furkān is not always defined in the same way. In *Sura XXV, 1, the furkān seems to be identified with the Kurān (الْفُرْقَانُ [fa-‘frufr] بِالْعَبْدِ), whereas in *Sura VIII, 29 runs: “O believers, if you fear God, He will assign you a furkān and acquit you of your evil deeds, and forgive you”. In *Sura VIII, 47 “the day on which the two hosts met” (which must refer to the battle at Badr) is described as “the day of the furkān”. At the same time it is said that on that day something which must be believed in was “sent down” to the Prophet. On the five other occasions where the word is used it is always in connexion with the giving of divine revelation; twice Moses, or Moses and Aaron, are named as those who receive the revelation (II, 53; XXI, 48); on three occasions it is mentioned in connexion with Muhammad and the Kurān (II, 185; III, 4; XXV, 1).

The difficulty of interpreting these passages springs chiefly from the fact that the relationship between revelation-writings and *furkān is not always defined in the same way. In *Sura XXV, 1, the furkān seems to be identified with the Kurān (الْفُرْقَانُ [fa-‘frufr] بِالْعَبْدِ), whereas in *Sura VIII, 29 runs: “O believers, if you fear God, He will assign you a furkān and acquit you of your evil deeds, and forgive you”. In *Sura VIII, 47 “the day on which the two hosts met” (which must refer to the battle at Badr) is described as “the day of the furkān”. At the same time it is said that on that day something which must be believed in was “sent down” to the Prophet. On the five other occasions where the word is used it is always in connexion with the giving of divine revelation; twice Moses, or Moses and Aaron, are named as those who receive the revelation (II, 53; XXI, 48); on three occasions it is mentioned in connexion with Muhammad and the Kurān (II, 185; III, 4; XXV, 1).

The phrase wa-‘frufr la‘l-muttabit, which means “to separate”, “to distinguish”, is not always defined in the same way. In *Sura XXV, 1, the *furkān seems to be identified with the Kurān (الْفُرْقَانُ [fa-‘frufr] بِالْعَبْدِ). In *Sura VIII, 29 runs: “O believers, if you fear God, He will assign you a furkān and acquit you of your evil deeds, and forgive you”. In *Sura VIII, 47 “the day on which the two hosts met” (which must refer to the battle at Badr) is described as “the day of the furkān”. At the same time it is said that on that day something which must be believed in was “sent down” to the Prophet. On the five other occasions where the word is used it is always in connexion with the giving of divine revelation; twice Moses, or Moses and Aaron, are named as those who receive the revelation (II, 53; XXI, 48); on three occasions it is mentioned in connexion with Muhammad and the Kurān (II, 185; III, 4; XXV, 1).

Even the early commentators made some effort to interpret the term satisfactorily. Since the time of Abraham Geiger western orientalists have made renewed efforts at interpretation without ever reaching any certain conclusions. See the review of the whole question in A. Jeffer, *The foreign vocabulary of the Qurān*, Baroda 1938, 225-9. W. Montgomery Watt, *Muhammad at Medina*, 1956, 16, is in general agreement with the conclusion first reached by Richard Bell in *The origin of Islam in its Christian environment*, 1926, 118-25, and adds: “In VIII, 41 ‘the day of the furqān, the day the two parties met’ must be the day of Badr; and furqān, in virtue of its connexion with the Syriac word *purqān*, ‘salvation’, must mean something like ‘delivery from the judgement’. This being so the furqān which was given to Moses (II, 53; XXI, 48) is doubtless his deliverance when he led his people out of Egypt, and Pharaoh and his hosts were overwhelmed. Similarly, Muhammad’s *furqān* will be the delivery given at Badr when the Calamity came upon the Meccans. That was the ‘sign’ which confirmed his prophethood. Perhaps there is also a reference to the experience of his followers when they received the signs of revelation, which Muhammad apparently had during the heat of the battle, and as a result of which he became assured that the Muslims had invincible Divine assistance”.

In his *Introduction to the Qurān*, 1953, published posthumously by Richard Bell, again raised the question (136 ff., *Note on al-Furqān*), and put forward an interpretation of the whole subject which is both well-considered and complete in itself. According to Bell, “it was from Christian sources that the word was derived, but Muhammad must have associated it with the Arabic root *faraṣa* to separate, and taken it to imply the separation of an accepted religious community from the unbelievers”. To explain the places where the *furqān* is said to have been given to Moses (and Aaron) he adds *Sura V*, 25, in which Moses, referring to his people’s hesitation to enter the Holy Land, prays to God: “I control no one but myself and my brother: make a separation (fa-‘frufr) between us and the unbelieving people”. And he accounts for the passages referring to Muhammad’s own period by reference to the situation at (and before) the battle of Badr. “The victory at Badr was not only a ‘delivery’ of the small band of Moslems who had gone out with Muhammad expecting to intercept a caravan and had found themselves face to face with an army. It was a final separation between Muhammad’s followers and the unbelieving Meccans”. “Here (in the *furqān*) referred to then, we have the appearance of the Qurān as the distinctive Scripture of an independent Moslem religious community, linked with the *furqān*, the separation of believers from unbelievers, and the assurance of forgiveness and acceptance with God; and both linked with the *baddr*”.


**AL-FURS, one of the two terms used by the Arabs to denote the Persians, the other being al-`Adjam [q.v.]. In the following lines we shall attempt to show in precisely what way the Arabs were acquainted with the Persians and their civilization; for other aspects, see IRĀN.**

From remotest antiquity, the Arabian peninsula had maintained relations with Persia; shortly before Islam, these connexions were established, in the north-east, through the Lakhmids [q.v.] of al-Hira, and, in the south, through the medium of the Yemen, a vassal of Persia, and the Abād [q.v.] who were settled in the country. The word *Furs* does not appear in the *Kūrān*, which, however, contains a certain number of words of Persian origin, but among the Prophet’s entourage there was in particular one Salmān al-Fārisī [q.v.], whom legend has made a figure of outstanding importance. Already in the 1st/7th century, relations between Arabs and Persians were marked by the Islamic conquests, and some elements of Iranian civilization penetrated to Mecca and Medina through prisoners
who became mawāli ([q.v.]) and played an essential part in the history of the first centuries of Islam. However, it was only in the 2nd/8th century, and especially through the efforts of Ibn al-Mukaffa' ([q.v.]), that there first began to circulate Arabic translations of Pahlavi works such as the Khātā tāy-nāmāh (K. Siyar muláh al-'Ādīam or al-Furs), the ʿĀšīn-nāmāh, the Tādīn-nāmāh, etc., which helped to nourish the growing adūb ([q.v.]) and Arabic historiography, and later served as a source for Firdawsī (see F. Gabrielli, L’opera di Ibn al-Muqaffa’, in RSO, xii [1893], 197 ff.).

The dissemination of these translations and of the works they inspired coincided with the accession and rise of the ʿAbbāsid dynasty, which drew closer to Persia and, through its officials, increased Iranian influence to the point when it sometimes gives the impression of being heir to the Sasanids (cf. D. Sourdel, Vizīrat, passim). It is unnecessary to dwell here on the considerable importance of the khwād who, while attempting to acquire Arab culture, perceptibly followed the Iranian tradition, nor upon the rôle played by the Shūʿābīyya ([q.v.]) in the shaping of Islamic civilization.

What must be noted is the introduction into Arabic historiography, from the end of the 2nd/8th century or beginning of the 3rd/9th, of the history of Persia in the works of the Byzantines, the b.ʿAṣir (Al-Tabari, Persia, Abū ʿUbayda, etc.) which, together with the translated sources, were to serve as the basis for “universal” history. From then onwards historians writing in Arabic, among whom Iranians are not uncommon, were able to plan and write universal history, to include first the Biblical data and the legends transmitted by non-Muslims, representing a kind of scriptural history from Adam to Jesus Christ and then to Muḥammad; then a summary of the actual history or legendary events that had occurred since the earliest times in non-Arab countries now under Muslim rule; and finally the history of Islam up to the writer’s own period. Muslim Spain and the Maḡrib are somewhat neglected by the eastern historians, who on the other hand are better informed on the history of Egypt. The Persians, the b.ʿAṣir (Abū ʿUbayda, etc.) which, together with the translated sources, were to serve as the basis for “universal” history. From then onwards historians writing in Arabic, among whom Iranians are not uncommon, were able to plan and write universal history, to include first the Biblical data and the legends transmitted by non-Muslims, representing a kind of scriptural history from Adam to Jesus Christ and then to Muḥammad; then a summary of the actual history or legendary events that had occurred since the earliest times in non-Arab countries now under Muslim rule; and finally the history of Islam up to the writer’s own period. Muslim Spain and the Maḡrib are somewhat neglected by the eastern historians, who on the other hand are better informed on the history of Egypt. The Persians, the b.ʿAṣir (Abū ʿUbayda, etc.) which, together with the translated sources, were to serve as the basis for “universal” history. From then onwards historians writing in Arabic, among whom Iranians are not uncommon, were able to plan and write universal history, to include first the Biblical data and the legends transmitted by non-Muslims, representing a kind of scriptural history from Adam to Jesus Christ and then to Muḥammad; then a summary of the actual history or legendary events that had occurred since the earliest times in non-Arab countries now under Muslim rule; and finally the history of Islam up to the writer’s own period. Muslim Spain and the Maḡrib are somewhat neglected by the eastern historians, who on the other hand are better informed on the history of Egypt.

It must not be forgotten that the Arabic translation of Kalīla wa-Dīmma ([q.v.]) can be regarded as one of the first monuments—if not the first—of simple prose, and that adūb, which is the core of secular prose literature, is a product of Iranian influence. The early authors who sought to achieve a balance between the component elements of Arab culture took pains to restrict borrowings from Iranian civilization, but they were unable to prevent the Arabs from adopting and handing down with marked pleasure those traditions that had most impressed them. The names of emperors like Ardashīr or Anūširwān, even though obscure in the mists of legend, were well known to the authors who delighted in reproducing passages from the testaments (ahd) of Persian sovereigns, and, thanks to the adūb which popularized the figure of Buzurgmīhr ([q.v.]), gave the whole nation a reputation for wisdom and political adroitness, at least at a time when the Shūʿābī threat had been removed.

Bibliography: it is hardly feasible to give a restricted bibliography of the subject dealt with in the above article, since it would mean listing all the ancient works which mentioned the Persians. We confine ourselves therefore to referring to the articles ʿĀdīam, Iran and Shūʿābīyya, and also to the works of M. Inostranzev, Iranian influence on Moslem Literature, i, trans. G. K. Nariman, Bombay 1918 and R. N. Frye, The heritage of Persia, London 1962, 234 ff. (Ch. Pellat) FüRTENSPIEGEL [see SIVĀŠA]. FÜRCH [see FIKH, USUL].

FÜRCH, the pseudonym of two Persian poets: (1) Abu ʿl-Kāsim Khān, younger son of Fath All Khān Sabā, poet laureate at the court of Fath All Shāh Kājūr, was regarded as one of the scholars of
his time and had been well educated. He spent some
time in Mashhad in the civil service and, after
the crown prince ‘Abbās Mirzā had visited the region, he
entered his service, principally as a poet. Later he
returned to Tehran where he retired from public life
and lived until the end of the 19th century.

(2) Muhammad Mahdī ibn Muhammad Bāghīr
Iṣfahānī lived until the time of Muhammad Shāh
Kāḏār (1250-64/1834-49) and wrote a most interesting
work on the Siyād numerals, mathematics, calli-
graphy, weights and measures, contemporary cur-
rencies and accounts, entitled Furūġištān, dedi-
cated to the Grand Vizier Ḩāǧdī Miẓrā Ḥāṣūs.
The author of the Madīmā al-fusahd (ii, 396-9),
who included some of his poems, referred to him
incorrectly as Furūgh al-Dīn, and said that he was
born in Tabriz in 1223/1808, had a good education
from the age of seven, entered the service of the
crown prince ‘Abbās Mirzā and his eldest son
Farīdūn Miẓrā, travelled in Aḏharbāyjān and Fārs,
finally settled in Tehran where he entered the
finance department, and wrote various works in-
cluding the Šaḵāḵāl-āl-šām and the Taḏḏhirat
al-ḵābāb (“Recollections of youths”), a kind of au-
tobiography in which he included poems in Arabic and
Persian. He also had more than until the end of the
19th century.

Furūġištān: Rūḏ-Kūl Khān, Madīmā al-
fusahd, ii, 370-82 and 396-9; Furūğištān,
contemporary manuscript dating from the month of
Rabiʿ II 1259/May 1843, in the author's
possession. (Sāid Naṣīfī)

Furūḡ AL-DDIN [see FURUGH 2]
FURUGH, the pseudonym of three Persian
poets: 1) Miẓrā Miẓrāb Iṣfahānī, a scholar and
native of that town. During his travels in the middle
of his life he attached himself to Timūr Shāh, amir
of Afghanistan (1187-1209/1773-93) and became
his court poet. 2) Miẓrā ‘Abbās, son of Aḵa Muḥa.mmād
Bīstāmī, born in 1213/1798 in ʿĪrāk, where his
father was travelling. As a youth he travelled in Māzāndārān and Kārmān where he started
his career as a poet, at first using the pseudonym
“Miṣḵīn”. After taking the name “Furūḵī” he
came and settled in Tehran, where he held the pro-
tection of the paternal uncle Dūst “All Khān”, the
court treasurer. After joining the circle of the
Čīghī ʿṢīrā in ʿĪrāk, he led a retiring life of devotion and
died in 1274/1858. Furūḵī ranks among the best
modern lyric poets and his ghazals are very popular,
seven editions of them having been published in
Tehran. He is regarded as one of the best followers
of the school of Saʿdī. 3) Miẓrā Muḥammad Hūsūn,
son of Aḵa Muḥammad Ḥāḏī-Bīstāmī, born in
1255/1839 in Iṣfahān where he was educated. As
a youth he went with his father to India where he
was engaged in trade. Later he lived in ʿĪrāk, and
finally went to Tehran where he later served in the
Ministry of the Press, under the direction of the
celebrated publicist Muḥammad Ḥasan Khān ʿṢanī
Dawla, later ʿImām al-Šaltāna. He collaborated in the
publication of both official and official newspa-
ters of the time, as well as in some of his director's
publications. At the end of his life he received the
honorary title of Ḍḥāh-āl-Muluk, a title which was
granted to his eldest son Miẓrā Muḥammad “All
Khān who chose the family name Furūḵī. The
father was later appointed head of the translation
department at court and director of the School
of Political Science. He died in Tehran in 1906.
He was very active as poet, writer, translator,
publicist and journalist. On 11 Rādāb 1314/ 16 December 1896 he started publication in Tehran
of the weekly Tarbiyat which was influential in
introducing modern ideas into Iran and which
apparently appeared until his death. His chief activity was the
editing of works which his eldest son translated from
European languages, including La Chaumière
Indienne by Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Le Tour du
Monde en 80 Jours by Jules Verne, The Seventh
Great Oriental Monarchy by George Rawlinson,
etc. His eldest son started his career by teaching in
secondary schools in Tehran, was then elected
depot and Leader of the Chamber of Deputies
during the second legislature. He was nominated
several times as ambassador, president of the Court
of Cassation, Minister and Prime Minister. He died
in Tehran on 5 Adhar 1332/5 November 1943.
From the time of the founding of the Iranian
Academy (Farhangīštānī-ī ʿIrān) he was elected a
member, and ranked among the best writers and
translators of his day. He translated other works
into Persian without his father's collaboration, in
particular Plato's Dialogues, the Discours sur la
Méthode de Descartes and the Kitāb al-Ṣālah of
Ibn Sinā.

Bibliography: Rūḏ-Kūl Khān, Madīmā al-
fusahd, ii, 383, 394-6; Dīvān-ī Ḍḥāh-āl-Muluk
Miẓrā Muḥammad Hūsūn Khān mutaḥallī bi-
Furūḵī, 1234 Hijrī (Saʿdī Naṣīfī).
erudition. Very fortunately, they also added some pages on riding, in which they describe various methods of schooling or the principles to be inculcated in the young rider.

It would not be wrong to make a fundamental distinction between two types of riding which co-existed in the Muslim world, that practised by the Arabs in the desert, and, at a later stage, high school riding. With regard to the former, we possess few documents which allow us to build up a detailed picture of it. It occurred in two basic forms, for war and for racing. The tribal warriors, basing their riding on the tactics of al-barr wa l-farr (attack and flight), practised it in small bands of combatants (katiba) using the sabre and lance in preference to the bow, their handing of the latter being decidedly clumsy in the eyes of al-Dāhījī, according to whom "the Khārijī when fighting at close quarters relies solely on his lance. Neither the Khārijī nor the Bedouins are renowned for their skill as archers when mounted". The problem of harness is also difficult to solve for this period. The poems do not help us to decide what sort of saddle was used by the tribal horsemen.

The question of the bit also arises. From the accounts of 19th century travellers we know that the curb bit was very seldom used by Arab horsemen in the East, their preference being for the bozal (rasan). We may question whether the word ḥidām, in passages of ancient poetry, in fact represents the curb bit. Perhaps bits were used for horses only at the time of an action, to make it possible to perform sudden halts and swift half-turns. We possess fuller documentation on the subject of horse-racing (sabkī, sibākī). Though with certain discrepancies in points of detail, writers have described the conditions of training (taqdmīr, idāmīr). This lasted from 40 to 60 days and had the effect of bringing the horses into good condition by a suitable system of feeding, while excessive weight was sweated off under blankets. Horses thinned down in this way were called hinād, and the sweat they lost sirāk. In pre-Islamic Arabia, races covering very great distances and over varied terrain were organized between the horses of the different tribes and the rules were often the same as those of the long and bloody wars [see FARAS], although even at that time they were governed by rules. The field (kalba) consisted of 10 horses; seven tokens were placed on lances, in an enclosure into which the first eight horses of the field made their way; seven received a prize proportionate with their placing, and only the eighth received no prize, its admission being purely a matter of honour. Each horse was given a name, according to the order of finishing, but the list of these names varies in the different authors. According to al-Masʿūdī, they were: 1st - sābīk, 2nd - muṭu- bāris, 3rd - muqālīlī, 4th - musālī, 5th - muṣālī, 6th - tālī, 7th - muṭrāh; al-Ṭabālī, following al-Dāhījī, gives a slightly different list, in which the 3rd is called muḥāfīl and the 5th ṭallī; the 9th and 10th have the same names in the two traditions, ṭālīm (knocked out of the enclosure by a blow) and subkhayt (silenced by shame at finishing last).

The Prophet did not forbid racing, which fostered rivalry between breeders and encouraged the preservation and increase of the stock of horses so much reduced by the wars. During his lifetime he made regulations for them, and by his advice tried to establish what were for the most part open competitions by making the size of the field uniform and fixing the distance to be covered according to the age of the horses taking part. The traditionists relate that he organized races at Medina, from Ḥāfya to Ṭhanīyiyyat al-Wadāʾ (60 ḍalālu) for mature horses and from Ṭhanīyiyyat al-Wadāʾ to Banū Zurayk (10 ḍalālu) for young horses. He himself presented substantial prizes for these competitions and entered his own horse. A ruling on the subject of betting (rīkān) had been made earlier by the ḥabīma of the large tribes. As Islam forbade the maysīr, the ancient custom was slightly modified to include the entry, among the other runners, of a horse called muḥālīl or ḍabbīlī, whose owner made no wager and gained the whole amount staked by all the other entrants if his horse won.

The wars of conquest waged by the Arabs under the first caliphs brought them into contact with foreign equestrian traditions and led them to organize new tactics for warfare on horseback. Three foreign traditions contributed, Iranian, Turkish and Greek. The arabized names of the Iranian or Turkish riders referred to by the writers of treatises on riding are an indication of the part played by foreigners in the elaboration of the new equestrian art. This influence made itself felt at a very early period; even in the 1st/7th century the fātā ʿĀlūsan ī, a freedman of ʿAll, had, according to the traditionists, tamed an unridable horse belonging to that caliph (see T.A., iii, 507). To make a chronological study would be of little interest; indeed, in riding, two series of factors alone can determine any radical evolution—the type of horse used, and the use of new arms. The first of these factors cannot enter into it, even though the Arab stock was very largely interbred with the stock owned by the conquered peoples [see FARAS]; the resulting progeny was still of the eastern type. The second of these factors, which is closely concerned with the art of war, had a decisive influence on the Islamic equestrian art which sprang up in the 2nd/8th century, and whose apotheosis can be placed in the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries in Spain and Egypt.

Principles of schooling.—Treatises on the first steps of dressage for the young colt, started at about the age of three, might bear the signature of modern riders, but the principles of the more elaborate schooling are somewhat obscure. The terminology is often Turkish or Iranian: the term maysīn must represent καρτα (e.g. kalīf), the term kurūs the circular show-ring where the horse is made supple (istikhradī al-khāyī fī l-nawārīd). The expression tartīb al-mayṣūdān can no doubt be interpreted in the sense of organized movements of groups of horsemen; they doubtless served the same purpose as our show-routines. The riders also alluded to the balance between front-quarters and hind-quarters (la'dīl) and to the flexibility of the jaw (tākī al-līdījīm, lauk al-līdījīm). The advice given to aspiring riders is very simple: the secret of riding rests in the firmness of the seat (khādbī) and the evenness of the reins (taswiyat al-'indn). This firmness is acquired by riding bare-back ('ulā l-'dārī), the rider being held in position by the grip of his thighs. As soon as he has some measure of experience, the young rider uses a saddle and fork seat. It will be seen how different such methods of riding are from those practised today in North Africa and Andalusia under the name a la jinetе. This style is difficult to date and no doubt corresponds to the appearance of the cross-bow and gun. Writers have drawn up long lists of vices both natural and acquired, from which we can give a typical list: harūn, a horse that refuses to walk forward; rānī, a horse that sprints forward; ḍabīdī, that checks its head to escape from control by the hands; mūnsīnī, that takes the bit in its teeth and jerks the hands; ramāk, a horse that kicks; khābfānī, that...
stamps its fore-feet; ṣhabūb, that rears; ṣhamūs, difficult to mount; kalāb, a horse of uncertain temper; nafūr, that swerves and shies; finally, the fāmulāk is regarded as impossible to ride. In this list the writers have classed faults in carriage of the head and withers; the horse with bad head carriage is called munkhās. The remedies suggested for dealing with these defects are often brutal and sometimes fantastic.

Harness.—The treatises define with considerable precision the nomenclature of the harness (līṭāmān), which includes the reins (fīndīn), the cheek straps (īḍāb) and the browband (iṣāb). Three types of bits were used—the iṣām, a light bit, the fakk a snaffle bit (?), and the nāštikī, which must be the equivalent of the modern bit used by the Spahis. The bit is composed of branches (ṣhikhāma), mouth-piece and port (fa'a) and curb-chain (kabma); in other cases, this term also denotes the bozal or martingale. The saddle used, the so-called saddle of Khūzistān, was flat and wide, the pommel (barsūb) and cantle (muʃkškha) being only slightly raised. It rested on a pad (mīrgabā), held in position by one or two girths (ḥīṣām) and a breast-strap (labāb). The horse was provided with collars (ṣhikdā) and cloths (kabāb and skātī), the terms kābūhrī and ḡabābī ḡabūrī denote a stable-chain. The war-horse wore barsīm (carapaces) and barsīkī (helmets).

Throughout the whole of this period (6th-7th/12th-13th centuries) equestrian sports were regularly practised. Horsemens took part in gērdīd (q.v.) or burdī, a chivalrous duel with lances, in polo [see burdī] or diurrīd (q.v.), and in a chivalrous duel with the sabre and lance, giving detailed descriptions of lunges and parries (liṭāmānī). The bit is composed of branches (ṣhikhama), mouth-piece and port (faa) and curb-chain (kabma); in other cases, this term also denotes the bozal or martingale. The saddle used, the so-called saddle of Khuzistan, was flat and wide, the pommel (barsub) and cantle (mutshkha) being only slightly raised. It rested on a pad (mīrgabā), held in position by one or two girths (ḥīṣām) and a breast-strap (labab). The horse was provided with collars (ṣhikdā) and cloths (kabāb and skattī), the terms kābhūrī and ḡabūrī denote a stable-chain. The war-horse wore barsīm (carapaces) and barsīkī (helmets).

In any study of the furusiyya training, special attention must be paid to the condition of the hippodromes, which were the venue for these activities. No trace of cavalry training is possible for any length of time in dilapidated hippodromes. Their number and state of repair are, therefore, useful indications of the level of training reached. During the Bahri period (648/1250-784/1382) there was a considerable number of hippodromes in Cairo and its immediate vicinity, where furusiyya exercises were carried out systematically and intensively, especially under Sultan Baybars (658/1260-676/1277) and to a lesser degree under Sultan Kālāūn (678/1280-689/1290) and Nāṣir Muhammad (693/1295-741/1340, with interruptions). After al-Nāṣir Muḥammad's death the disintegration of the Kālāūnid dynasty set in; and it seems that the accompanying disturbances also had an adverse effect on Mamluk training. Sultan al-Ẓahraf Shāhīr (724/1323-765/1356) attempted to arrest the deterioration of furusiyya training, but in vain. The decline continued at an accelerated pace during the Circassian period (784/1382-923/1517), with a short interruption during the reign of Sultan Kansūh al-Ghawrī (905/1500-922/1516). The standard of the furusiyya training is clearly reflected in the state of the hippodromes. In the Bahri period there were the following hippodromes, most of which did not remain in use throughout that period: a) al-Maydān al-Salīḥī, built in 641/1243 by Sultan al-Salih Nāṣir al-Dīn Ayyūb, the founder of the Babriyya regiment; b) al-Maydān al-Zāhirī, built by Sultan Baybars; c) al-Maydān al-Kābāb, built by the same sultan in 665/1267; d) Maydān Birkat al-Fil built by Sultan al-Ẓahir Kitbughā (694/1294-696/1296); e) al-Maydān al-Nāṣirī or al-Maydān al-Kābir al-Nāṣirī, built by Sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad in 724/1323-2; f) Maydān Siryakūs, built by the same sultan in 724-5/1323-5; g) Maydān al-Mahārī, built by the same sultan in 720/1320.

From the end of the reign of al-Nāṣir Muḥammad and up to that of Kansūh al-Ghawrī no sultan is reported to have built a hippodrome. The remaining Bahri hippodromes were abandoned in the first years of Circassian rule. Towards the middle of the 9th/15th century, exercises were performed on a limited scale in the Royal Courtyard (al-Hawsh al-Sultānī) in the Citadel. The performance of such
exercises near Birkat al-Habash is also mentioned in the sources from time to time, but no source refers to the existence of a hippodrome there.

Kansūh al-Ghawrī was the only Circassian sultan who constructed (in 909/1503) a hippodrome in Egypt. But his attempt to revive furusiyya came too late, for the decline of traditional military training in the Mamlūk Sultanate coincided with the slow but steady rise of firearms, which revolutionized the whole art of war and, necessarily, of training for it (for a discussion of this aspect of furusiyya see my Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamlūk Kingdom, London 1956, 46-140, and art. BARŪD above).

Furusiyya included the following 'branches': a) the lance game (la'b al-rumūh, thāḥāf al-rumūh, thāḥāf or ṭhāḥāf); b) the polo game (la'b al-khurā, al-darb bi 'l-khurā, la'b al-yasa'idān); c) the kabākah (or 'gourd' game); d) archery (ral-ʿinā al-nasb>dāf al-nasb>dāf, al-rumūh bi 'l-nasb>dāf); e) fencing (al-darb bi 'l-sayf or darb al-sayf); f) the bird game (samw al-birdās); g) the mace game (fanun al-dabẤb); h) wrestling (ṣirāf); i) the games accompanying the maḥmil procession (samw al-maḥmil); j) hunting (ṣād); k) shooting with the crossbow (la^b al-kura, thaʃzd;). The information furnished by the sources on the first two branches is as meagre as, on the other hand, the games accompanying the maḥmil procession is considerably richer than that supplied on the other 'branches'. The mace game is mentioned rarely in the sources. Fencing is mentioned quite frequently in the enumeration of funūn al-furusiyya, but is rarely referred to independently. The bird game is often mentioned; but without any details. Though the sources frequently speak of the games of archery, they furnish no details regarding them. This is particularly disappointing, seeing that the bow was the main weapon of the Mamlūks and was far more important in battle than the game. The game of chess (qīṣrān) was very popular among the Mamlūks. Though it cannot be included among the furusiyya games in the strict sense of the word, the mastery of chess was considered as an accomplishment, deserving of mention side by side with the Mamlūk's accomplishments in the field of furusiyya.

The furusiyya master (or expert or instructor) was called muš'allim. If he was an expert in the handling of the lance, he was called muš'allim al-rumūh (or ramūh). If he was an expert in the handling of the bow and arrows he was called muš'allim al-nasb>dāf, and so on. The name waʃd in the same sense is also mentioned from time to time in the Mamlūk sources, but it is much more frequent in technical military literature. We know the names of a considerable number of such masters, especially from the Circassian period.


(D. AYALON)

FUSAYFISA mosaic. The fact that the Arabic word for the mosaic itself is ultimately derived from the Greek υψαύσια, perhaps through Aramaic דוד, and the word fass, used for the little coloured cubes which are arranged according to a pre-designed cartoon, derives from the Greek πασαύσια, leads us to consider the mosaic as a form of architectural decoration as a borrowing by Muslim art from Byzantine art. This borrowing is undeniable and we shall examine it later. All the same, apart from this importation from abroad, Muslim art of the early centuries seems to have included a form of mosaic which was rather different from any whose technique could have been learned from Constantinople and which the Islamic peoples must have found still flourishing in the countries which they conquered. The Byzantine mosaic is characterized by the use made in it of cubes of glass, called smalts, and by its use to cover walls, arches and domes. The pavement mosaic which derives from the Roman tradition is quite different, being composed almost exclusively of cubes of stone of various colours, mostly cut from pieces of marble. Being limited to these mineral components, the colouring of these pavements is usually confined to a few warm tones: creamy white, black, red and grey-green; the cartoons are often composed of large areas of geometrical motifs, chequered designs and polygonal figures, interlaced plant forms, and plaits, which, in state rooms, frame a central picture (emblema).

This type of decoration, appearing first in the Greek lands of the Near East, spread across the Mediterranean world with the Roman conquest. Not only in Italy, but in Syria and in North Africa and southern Gaul it enjoyed great popularity. The triumph of Christianity extended its domain and impeded its use, except when a Christian church was put. The mosaics which had covered the floors of villas and baths were, in a rougher style and with a less elaborate technique, adorned the apses and naves of churches. Pagan forms now represented Christian symbols. Nevertheless, these survivals from antiquity became suspect to the strict: fear of profanation caused these pictures to be banished from the chancels, while long inscriptions and geometrical patterns, often of an impoverished invention, covered vast areas. Paving mosaic underwent a great decadence, yet it did not disappear completely from Christian buildings: in the form of ornamented pavements it is still found in basilicas of the 8th and 9th centuries A.D.

Fairly recent discoveries allow us to state that at about the same period, and even later, Islam preserved the taste for mosaics and the technique for making them. North of Jericho, excavation has revealed the ruins of an Umayyad palace, called Khiรābat al-Muʃāfšār [q.v.]. To this princely residence is attached a magnificent bath. A vast columned hall, 30 metres long, with a central dome and with walls containing scooped-out apses, has a pavement consisting of thirty-eight mosaic panels, all different. The geometrical decoration consists of rectilinear and curvilinear interlacing patterns, chevrons and imbrications, splendidly executed and with a harmonious colouring produced solely by cubes of stone. In one corner of this monumental frigidarium is a small apsidal hall whose floor is adorned with a particularly elaborate decoration. A leafy tree rears itself along the axis, separating two groups of animals very realistically drawn: on one side two gazelles, on the other a third gazelle attacked by a lion. The very recent excavations of Khiรābat al-Miniya [q.v.], another Umayyad building, have revealed halls and courtyards paved with mosaic. The exclusively geometrical ornament consists of strapwork, lattice work, Greek key patterns and other related themes. Although less well represented in the West, the tradition inherited from pagan and Christian mosaic artists is attested by remains found in eastern Barbary. Five miles from al-Kayrawān there has been identified the site of al-Raکkāda which was,
at the end of the 3rd/4th and the beginning of the 4th/5th centuries, the seat of the Aghlabid amirs, was found there, either at ground level or buried in the masonry. Beside an enormous pool there had been erected palaces, of which very little remains. All the same, some rooms paved with mosaic are still to be found. The very simple decoration, of black on a white background, consisted of scattered geometrical figures, square, lozenge-shaped and hexagonal, and of compartments adorned with knots and of spirals arranged in crosses. These pavements of Ifrîkiya, executed in about 290/900 and so similar to Christian mosaics, betray themselves as being the work of local craftsmen who put at the disposal of Arab amirs a technique and a style of decoration which had been entirely inherited from their Romanized Berber ancestors.

Some forty years later was executed a mosaic revealed by the excavations of Mr. Sliman Zbiss at Mahdiyya (in Tunisia), among the ruins of the palace of the Fâtîmid caliph al-Kârim (322/934-334/946). This fine pavement covered the floor of a room of state 13 yards long and 4 yards wide. It consisted of a central panel adorned with quatrefoils interlaced like the rings of a coat of mail and a wide border containing horizontal rows of squares and circles. The colours represented are black and white, with ochre and bistre. Neither the colours nor the polygonal shapes are foreign to what is attested in Roman work. Yet the theme of interlacing patterns gives the decorative scheme an oriental character (for interlacing polygons are hardly ever found in Roman pavements); the compact plant themes enclosed by these polygons belong still more obviously to the flora of 'Abbasid 'Irâk or 'Ummân Egypt. The craftsmen working at Mahdiyya would seem to have been using cartoons imported from the East; just as the contemporary architecture of Ifrîkiya bears the stamp of the same foreign influences.

This pavement mosaic, whose survival in the first centuries of Islam is attested only by excavation, is to be distinguished from mural mosaic, of which Fatimid and Wegueline have preserved magnificent examples. In the East, they are to be found at the Kubbat al-Sâkhra [q.v.] in Jerusalem, built in 72/691 by 'Abd al-Malik, and at the Great Mosque of Damascus, built in 86/705 by al-Walid; in the West, at the Great Mosque of Cordova, in the superb kible of the caliph al-Hakam I [q.v.], of 930/941. As is evident, these are the three most important religious buildings of the Umayyads owing their adornment to mosaics. The interior of the Kubbat al-Sâkhra is largely covered with mosaic, which adorns the peripheral arcades, the drum surmounting them, and the dome. As for the Great Mosque of Damascus, only fragments survive of the pictures representing a great gilded vine and whole towns, the most striking of them adorning some surfaces of the arcade surrounding the courtyard. As for the Great Mosque of Cordova, in it are preserved, more or less worked over, the frame of the misbâr and of the doors flanking it, and also the dome in front of the misbâr. These three examples, from East and West, have many features in common, but are distinguished one from another by more than one characteristic. The materials used show clearly their interrelation. White and black cubes of marble and red and pink stones rigidly defined, as in the mosaic pavements; but much more numerous (85% at Damascus) are the cubes of glass paste coloured throughout, and particularly such cubes consisting of a brown base of glass paste upon which is applied gold leaf, which in turn is covered with a protecting layer of glass. It is the use of gold which creates the richness and the harmony of the Byzantine mosaics. The varied positions of the cubes, stuck in either vertically or slightly inclined towards the spectator, diversify the tones and, in particular, relieve the monotony of the areas of gold and bring life to these shining surfaces. The subjects of the decorations vary from one monument to another. That of the Kubbat al-Sâkhra is the richest, and in it floral designs predominate. The most frequent themes are those of acanthus leaves or vine leaves with grapes, the main stem emerging from a cluster of leaves, a bowl or a cornucopia. Narrow panels are provided with vertical supports reminiscent of the antique candelabras on which are placed trays, foliage or fruit. The plant themes, arranged in bands placed side by side, alternate with motifs of jewellery, ribbons, bandeaux, and pendants inspired by necklaces and diadems; plaques cut from mother-of-pearl add their lustre to these themes of adornment. This ornamentation derives almost entirely from Hellenistic tradition; the jewellery motifs seem to be inspired by the imperial decoration of Byzantium; some palm-branches in the form of wings and some flowers derived from the lotus are probable borrowings from the Sâsâni flora and were familiar also to Syrian sculpture of the same period.

Quite different are the very beautiful mosaics of the Great Mosque of Damascus, at any rate those which the removal of the layer of plaster has revealed in the courtyard. They contain large green trees rising up among groups of buildings: fortresses whose walls border on the terraces alternate with balconied houses with pitched roofs and wide balconies, vertical supports reminiscent of the antique candelabra and pendants inspired by necklaces and diadems; jewels cut from mother-of-pearl add their lustre to these themes of adornment. The Pompeian character of the architecture has been remarked. The waters which form the foreground of the decoration have been thought to be the Barada, the river which flows through the oasis of Damascus. This realistic interpretation, which associates a familiar and not very highly esteemed landscape with the adornment of a great mosque, does not seem compatible with Muslim aesthetic. Perhaps we should rather consider this decoration of the courtyard as the complement of the geographical pictures which spread across the walls of the prayer hall, and identify the tumultuous waters on the shore with those of the surrounding Ocean (al-bahr al-muhit) which, according to the Arab geographers, encircles all the inhabited lands of the world. According to the traditions which Ibn Idhârî has transmitted and which we shall examine, the Umayyad caliph al-Hakam II, following the example set by his ancestor al-Walid, the builder of the mosque of Damascus, obtained from the emperor of Constantinople the派遣 of a mosaicist and the necessary materials to decorate the Great Mosque of Cordova, which he was providing with a new kible. In fact the mosaics of the misbâr of Cordova and the parts which frame it or lead to it scarcely recall the picturesque decoration of Damascus. This is not surprising, for two and a half centuries separate the Syrian from the Andalusian work. The latter presents a simplified and schematic flora with its central axis, the stems slightly curving, regularly bent into foliated scroll-patterns or doubled and forming wide symmetrical interlacings. These stems bear palm leaves with two or three incurved fronds, flowers, or
bunches of grapes, each separate. The inscriptions play an important part here and their Kufic script is sober and elegant. One seeks in vain Christian mosaics of the same period analogous to these Muslim mosaics; on the contrary, analysis reveals the relation between this flat and coloured decoration and the sculptured decoration which surrounds it. We find the same floral themes portrayed by the two techniques, sculpture and mosaic, but both belong to the same Islamic art.

Nevertheless the historical conditions make it probable that mosaics were sent from Byzantium to Cordova. Relations between the two powers, interrupted for over a century, had been resumed since 346/958, and at the end of the reign of 'Abd al-Rahmān III they were active and cordial. The sending of gifts—notably of Byzantine mosaics—served for the embellishment of the Madinat al-Zahra'. The continuation of these relations between Al-Ḥašim II and Nicephorus Phocas is therefore not surprising and we have no difficulty in accepting the tradition, albeit three hundred years old, related by Ibn Ḥishām (Bayād, ii, 253, tr. ii, 392). At the request of al-Ḥašim, a mosaicist came from Constantinople with 320 quintals of mosaic cubes. The caliph assigned to him a certain number of slaves (some of whom had already begun to learn the craft at Madinat al-Zahra). The master worked under the direction of the Greek and were not long in surpassing their master in skill. When the latter left Cordova, where he had been lodged magnificently, he received from the caliph gifts and robes of honour; his pupils continued the work alone and completed it. The story seems to be historically possible.

However, we have seen that (according to Ibn Ḥishām) al-Ḥašim, in requesting the Byzantine emperor to send a mosaicist, was following the example of al-Walid, the founder of the Damascus mosque. Now it seems that this is a legend which was unknown to the earliest sources and which does not appear until the 6th/12th century. According to Ibn ʿAsakir (d. 571/1176) al-Walid accompanied his request with the threat to overrun the territory of Byzantium and destroy the churches on his own lands if the Basileus refused; and the Basileus complied. The attribution of such an attitude to the two rulers is doubtful. But although the story cannot be applied to the Damascus mosque it may be possible to associate it with the mosque of Medina. According to al-Yaʿqūbī, al-Walidid and al-Tabarī, for the re-building of this mosque, a request for a mosaicist was made to the emperor of Byzantium and was granted. This is nevertheless rather surprising. Al-Balāḍūrī (d. 279/992), speaking of the work on the mosque of Medina, gives a more likely report. Al-Walid, he says, wishing to embellish the Mosque of the Prophet, obtained the collaboration of mosaicists and other craftsmen of Rūm recruited in Syria and in Egypt. This supposes the existence in these countries of ateliers or individual artists, presumably of Greek origin, continuing in the 2nd/8th century the technique of Byzantine mosaic. The tradition of this fine craft, which had formed the glory of Antioch, could have survived in Syria from Christian times, which saw the building of the Church of the Ascension in Jerusalem, the Basilica of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the churches of Emessa and of Lydda. It seems very possible that for the first religious foundations of Islamic local mosaicists as well as builders were recruited, and probably they were still available during the following centuries to complete and restore the decorations of the sanctuaries of Syria. In Jerusalem there are the mosaics of the Fāṭimid al-Ẓāhir (411-729/1021-36), of the Ayyūbīd Sahlī al-Dīn (570-59/1174-93), and of the Mamlūk Taqlī (729/1330), and at Damascus those of Baybars. The date of the mosaics of the Kaʿba of Mecca described by Ibn Ḥiṣabī is not known.

In Egypt, which, as we have seen, had possessed, like Syria, artists from Rūm, who practised the art of Byzantine mosaic, only a few and late examples of this work remain. In Cairo, the tomb of Shaḥṣīr al-Durr (648/1250) retains a mosaic of Byzantine origin from which is decorated with cubes of blue, green, red and gilded glass with the addition of mother-of-pearl. Of the same type are the decoration of the mīhrāb which the sultan Lāḏīn gave to the mosque of Ibn Ṭūlūn in 966/1260, and the mīhrābs of the madrasas of ʿĀbd al-Mūmin (970/1369) and of Abū Ḥaḡā (740/1339), dependencies of the Al-Azhar mosque.

Philistion, camp, encampment, used by the bi-
lingual papyri to denote the town. The chroniclers
also use the expression Fustāt-Misr or even simply Misr.
The proximity of Babylon made it easy for
the Arabs to employ and control Coptic officials.
Later came the distribution of the land and the
building of the mosque (Dīmār 'Amr or al-Dīmār
al-Atlak). This mosque, the first to be built in Egypt,
originally measured 50 by 30 cubits. It is possible
that it had a minbar from the start; but the minābār,
in the form of a niche, seems to have been built only
in 92/711. Reconstructed and enlarged several times,
it attained its present dimensions in 212/827. It
served simultaneously as a place of prayer, council
chamber, court room, post (office) and as lodgings
for travellers. It was there that the main grants of
leases of land were made. Not far away was 'Amr's
house and the army stores. There was also a
mūsālah, an immense place of prayer in the open air, where,
in the 9th/15th January 604, prayers were
offered over the body of 'Amr b. al-Āṣ, who had
died the previous night. Each tribe was allotted a
certain fixed zone (khīṭa which, in Fustāt, is the
equivalent of the kāna in Cairo, that is to say quarter
or ward). Certain khīṭāt included inhabitants belonging
to different tribes, for example, the khīṭa al-rāyā
surrounding 'Amr's mosque, the khīṭa al-Luṭfī just
to the north of it, and the khīṭa al-dār al-Zahr, the
last-named being reserved for new arrivals who had
been unable to settle with their own respective
tribes (cf. Guest, in JARAS, 1907, 63 f.). Each khīṭa
had its own mosque. In 53/672, for the first time,
minarets were built for 'Amr's mosque and for those
in the khīṭa, with two exceptions. The Arab army of
conquest included a very large proportion of Yamanis.
Christians and Jews from Syria with political affili-
ations with the Muslims had accompanied the
invading armies; they were settled in three different
quarters near the river, named respectively, going
north from 'Amr's mosque, al-Hamrā al-dār al-
Îmāra, al-Hamrā al-Wastāt, and al-Hamrā al-ḥusnāt. Other
ghīmīs settled with them.

The original encampment was gradually trans-
formed. The different quarters were separated by
open spaces. Whole zones, particularly to the north
in the desert, were then abandoned, only to be
reoccupied later. Permanent structures multiplied.
The treasury, bāyāt al-māl, was built (Becker, Beitrag
zur Geschichte Ägypten, ii, 162). Al-Fustāt was not
fortified and, in 64-5/684, the Khāridjīs of Egypt
who had seized power had a ditch built on the east
side to defend the town against the caliph Marwān
and his forces. The governor 'Abd al-Ṣāhir b. Marwān,
who founded or developed Ḥulwān, where he
had taken refuge from the plague (70/689-90), also built
houses, covered markets and baths in Fustāt. The
Copts imperceptibly became intermingled with
the conquerors. Coptic was spoken in Fustāt in the
2nd/8th century. Some churches were also built, and
are occasionally mentioned by the chroniclers.
Warehouses were set up along the Nile for water-
proofing merchandise and for the storage of
Marwān II, in flight before the 'Abbāsidīs, went
through Fustāt (132/750) he caused the stores of

grain, cotton, chopped straw and barley, and indeed
the whole town, to be set on fire, according to
Severus of Asmūnayn (Pair. Orient., v, 168).
Further south, the suburb of Nāsirī was built,
created his own capital called al-Kātābī, the
north-eastern tip of the Dījāb al-Yaškur, as a refuge
from an epidemic, in 133/751. Later they settled at al-
'Askar where a dār al-Imāra was built and then in 169/785-6, just beside
it, a large mosque (dgīmīs al-'Askar, also called
dgīmīs Sāḥib al-Qaila). Around all there grew up a
real town, with shops, markets and fine houses.
Nothing now remains of it.

In the 3rd/9th century 'Abdād b. Ṭūlūn also
created his own capital called al-Kātābī, the
town which was divided into two districts—the "amāl fākh and
upper district with its western section (the high
ground in the south as far as the Nile) and eastern
section (the rest of the desert as far as al-'Askar), and the
"amāl asfāf or lower district, including the
remainder. The 'Abbāsidīs tried a new and short-lived
settlement on the Dījāb al-Yaškur, as a refuge from
an epidemic, in 133/751. Later they settled at al-
'Askar where a dār al-Imāra was built and then in 169/785-6, just beside
it, a large mosque (dgīmīs al-'Askar, also called
dgīmīs Sāḥib al-Qaila). Around all there grew up a
real town, with shops, markets and fine houses.

Nothing now remains of it.

In the 3rd/9th century 'Abdād b. Ṭūlūn also
created his own capital called al-Kātābī, the
north-eastern tip of the Dījāb al-Yaškur, as a refuge
from an epidemic, in 133/751. Later they settled at al-
'Askar where a dār al-Imāra was built and then in 169/785-6, just beside
it, a large mosque (dgīmīs al-'Askar, also called
dgīmīs Sāḥib al-Qaila). Around all there grew up a
real town, with shops, markets and fine houses.

Nothing now remains of it.

The founding of al-Kāhira (358/969) did not put
an end to the prosperity of Fustāt which, in the
Fatimid period, was one of the wealthiest towns of
the Muslim world, with its lotty houses of from five
to seven stories (Nāṣir-i Khusrūw, in the Safar
Nāma, trans. Schefer, 146, even speaks of fourteen
stories), the crowded souks round 'Abbāsi's mosque
and the network of narrow streets recently excavated
on the desert plateau. Al-Kāhira, where the houses
were lower and furnished with gardens, was then the city
of the caliphs and the military aristocracy; Fustāt,
more populous, remained the home of commerce and
industry, as is testified by very fine ceramics and
pieces of glassware discovered during excavations,
as well as texts on papyrus and paper. In the 7th/13th
century the town still manufactured steel, copper,
soap, glass and paper (Ibn Dukmāk, iv, 108), not
to mention its production of sugar and textiles. In
513/1119 the town was able to produce a massive
ring of polished copper, graduated, and measuring
more than ten cubits in diameter, weighing several
tons and intended to act as a support for an appa-
raus for astronomical observations. However, during
the anarchy that followed the death of the last
Fatimid, the town suffered a period of eighteen years (from 446/1054 to 454/1072)
the town suffered sixteen years of severe famine,
accompanied by epidemics. Al-'Askar, al-Kaṭāṭī‘ and whole zones of the desert quarters of Fustat were consequently abandoned. The vizier Badr al-Djamālī then caused the materials of the ruined buildings to be removed for re-use in Cairo. A second operation of this kind took place between 495/1101 and 524/1130; it was concerned with those buildings which the owners, despite a general warning, had failed to put into a state of repair. The year 564/1168-9 was catastrophic. The Frankish armies of Amr’s mosque were driven the just to the south of al-Ra‘ad, at Birkat al-Habashiyya; Shā‘war, their former ally, had sung them four years earlier, and he himself was now attacked by them. Fearing that they would occupy Fustat, which had no ramparts to defend it and which might be used by them as a base against Cairo, he had the town evacuated and his men systematically set it on fire. The conflagration lasted for fifty-four days. After all these catastrophes life began once again; the place was rebuilt. All the same, to prevent the recurrence of such incidents Ṣalāb al-Dīn built a city wall enclosing Cairo, the citadel and Fustat. The remains of this wall can be seen to the south of the citadel, and also 900 metres to the east as well as to the south-east of ‘Amr’s mosque. New quarters were built on the abandoned land by the Nile, while the notables erected pleasure pavilions alongside the water. The eastern districts were increasingly neglected, while ‘Amr’s mosque remained a flourishing centre of religious instruction until the great plague of 749/1348. Under the Mamluk sultans, however, Cairo attracted great commerce; it was the souks of Cairo, not of Misr, that the Christian traders visited. Fustat (which name disappears, being replaced by Misr) fell into obscurity. It remained merely the administrative capital of Upper Egypt whose produce was constantly brought by ship to its river banks. At the time of Napoleon’s expedition, Old Cairo contained 10,000 inhabitants, 600 of whom were Copts.

Bibliography: Makrizi, Kitāb al-Sina‘ al-Mas‘ūdī; Ibn Duknāk, Kitāb al-Imrā‘; All Mubarak, Al-Mar‘iyyat al-Fustatīyya. Besides, the works mentioned earlier, A. F. Mehrez, Daru‘ al-‘Imrā‘; C. Th. Clerget, Le Caire. Of the 750,000 inhabitants of the Fouta, two-thirds are Fulani and the others are former slaves who have adopted the Fulani language and who have been largely retained by them in their traditional way of life.

The administrative organization consists of the missidi (village mosque) at the bottom, then the 700 m./3,000 ft., with some peaks of over 1,000 m./3,300 ft. The Tinkissi, a tributary of the Niger, rises there. The central Fouta is an internal "Tassili" divided into three masses: in the north the massif of Mali (with its highest point at Mount Tennissa, 1,151 m./3,890 ft.), in the centre the plateau of Timbi, Labé and Popodara, with an average height of 1000 m./3,300 ft., which is divided by numerous canyons with impressive waterfalls (Ditinu, Kinkon, Kamabaga, the Sala, etc.), and finally in the south the massif of Dalaba (1,425 m./4,700 ft. at Mount Tinka). From these massifs with their cliffs (those of Massi reach 800 m./2,600 ft.) rise the Bafing, the principal feature of Senegal, the Upper Gambia, the Rio Grande of Portuguese Guinea and many mountain rivers, which together form the water tower of the western region of Africa. Because of its altitude the Fouta enjoys a favourable climate. It has a high rainfall in summer and its winter is a healthy dry season, the effect of which is further increased from December to February by the ‘harmattan’; the rainy season is from July to September. The scorching heat of the Sahara attracts the Atlantic clouds and each year Dalaba has a rainfall of 2035 mm./80 ins., Pita 1882 mm./73 ins., Labé 1764 mm./70 ins. and Mali 1933 mm./76 ins. Three types of vegetation are found in the Fouta: (a) bush, either brushwood or trees; (b) sparse grassland, sometimes on the shores of a small lake (dunkere) on the clay covering a plateau (hollandes), sometimes on sand which fills a depression (dantari); (c) the bowal, which covers three quarters of the surface of the Fouta and which is "in the dry season a vast and torrid surface of desert, marked at intervals by mushroom-shaped white-ant-heaps" (Richard Marcilard).

Population. The Fouta is a mountain district suitable for the rearing of livestock. As Vieillard says: "half-way between the Sahelian steppe and the dense forest: the former stretches over the endless barren plains of the high plateaus, the latter clothes the sides of the mountains in the form of tall riverside forests. This hybrid environment has favoured the formation of a composite society, a mixture of settled forest-dwellers and of shepherds and cowherds". The Baga and Landuman, probably autochthonous, were driven out in the 13th century by the Susu-Dialonke expelled by the Mandinkas of Sundjata. In 1534, the Fulakunda of Koli Tenguia came from the Fouta Toro to settle to the west of this group of mountains. Finally, in 1694, Fulani who had come from Macina formed an empire which was to last for two centuries. Apart from these great movements, there were small migrations from the plains of the north. The Fulani replaced the hump-backed cattle by the ndama which was more or less immunized against trypanosomiasis. They enslaved or drove out the former negro inhabitants of the forests, borrowing features of their material civilization. According to Vieillard they "brought with them their language, their faith which permitted the foundation of a Muslim fraternity, and a harsh exploitation mitigated by intermarriage. Of the 750,000 inhabitants of the Fouta, two-thirds are Fulani and the others are former slaves who have adopted the Fulani language and belonged to the feudal system of the Fouta. These vassals, rimaiz (slight three awadou), cultivated the ground for their Fulani masters. They live in rues near the country house of the master (marga).
tehu, a group of missidis with the lambode-tchu at the head. When the system of alternative government came into operation the chief of a djawel (province) was changed every second year, at the same time as the almamy.

The fiscal laws were very carefully worked out. The tax on inheritance consisted of the homidia (assigning to the marabout a quarter of the possessions of the deceased) and the kombabete, collected by the chief of the djawel or the lambode-tchu five months after the death. The assaka (or saka or farba) was due to the chief of the missidi for the poor. The ussuru was a tax on manufactured goods. In addition the ruler of the Fouta received a fifth of the booty of war and the tributes (sakkale) paid by the vassal peoples of the coast.

History. A large contingent of the Fulani of the Fouta came from Macina at the end of the 17th century, led by Seri or Sidi. After Muhammadu Sall, elected chief in 1700, they chose the pious Kikala, then his son Sambigh, whose two sons divided the succession (1720-26). So the Fulani called on Ibrahima Mussu, called also Karamoko Alfa, a man of immense piety, who was invited to wage war against the pagans. Karamoko Alfa inaugurated that permanent state of Holy War which was to become one of the characteristic political features of the Fouta. In the Fouta Djallon Islam served as a justification for the seizure of power. A committee of insurrection consisting of Karamoko Alfa and six other members was formed and the movement was supported by young Islamized Dialonkes and Malinkes. Thealist Dialonke were conquered and Timbo and Fukumba occupied. But some years later, Puli Garme, chief of the pagan Labe, subdued the Fulani chief of Labe, seized the council of the elders, and particularly its president, Puli Garme, chief of the pagan Labe, to fight Bokar Biro. The latter, put on to the throne by French authority, signed the treaty of the protectorate with Bissimilah (bism 'ilah) instead of his own name. Then Captain Müller marched on Timbo and Bokar Biro and his 1500 warriors were defeated at Poredaka. This was the end of the independence of the Fouta, which was divided by the French administration into districts.

The Fulani chieftains, which had been retained throughout the colonial period, were suppressed by the Council of Government set up during the summer of 1957. But by then they were already of very little significance. The Fouta Djallon had ceased to be an independent fortress and had become fully integrated into the political and economic life of Guinea.

Quite soon, however, in the complex society of the Arabo-Islamic Empire new fityan (now in the plural) made their appearance; it is however impossible to date their origin either exclusively to the ancient Arab tradition. Indeed, these new fityan themselves are presented to us in two categories of portraits which are at first sight incompatible.

A first group of texts, consisting for the most part of relatively late accounts of mystics, but also of earlier narrations of the lives of poets, presents the fityan as young adults living in small communities, coming from varied social, ethnic (and, to start with, religious?) circles and, free from any sort of attachment to family (they were frequently bachelors), profession (even if they had one) or tribe, associating together to lead in common the most comfortable possible life in an atmosphere of solidarity, mutual devotion and comradeship (with joint ownership of goods), without which such an aim could obviously not be achieved. The setting was more extensive than that of a single town, in the sense that a fraternity existed between the fityan of each town and others elsewhere by whom they were received when travelling, like the old "companions" in Europe. It seems that they wore a special costume. It was still largely under this aspect that Ibn Baṣṭūtā, the famous traveller of the 8th/14th century, was to see them when he encountered them among the common people of the Muslim East,

in the course of history, they have assumed very different forms, corresponding with which are two fundamental categories of documentation, the information from which often appears for that reason to be irreconcilable. Thus, from the time when, over a century ago, Hammer-Purgstall drew attention to them, many representations of them have been given and, despite the advance that has been made in our knowledge of them, it cannot be said that even now we really know exactly what they were. Hammer-Purgstall for his part regarded the futuwwa as a form of chivalry, and one finds this interpretation repeated up to our own time; but, for the past fifty years, particular attention has been given to the connexions maintained by the futuwwa at a late period on the one hand with Sufism, and on the other with the professional groupings; however, even in the latter case the nature of the treatises specifically devoted to it has resulted in its being approached from the doctrinal or psychological angle rather than being integrated within the social structure, of which nevertheless it constitutes an important element. It is to this last aspect that I wish to give especial emphasis.

In the pre-Islamic and early Islamic periods, the Arabic language does not use the term futuwwa, but only faṭā, itself used in the singular rather than in the plural, in that the word denoted individuals, not groups. At that time the faṭā was a man still young and vigorous, valiant in warfare, noble and chivalrous: an essentially personal attitude and, though obviously linked with tribal society and its combat, one not dependent on any collective activity or explicit religious belief; and indeed it so happens that a modern work will still extol this type of character under the name faṭā. In contrast, however, to these peaceful impressions the ancient chroniclers record many others which are far less so. In this connexion the name fityan is not in fact the one that occurs most frequently; since they were discussing elements of disorder, the writers, who belonged to the official classes, gave them names suggestive of the mob or rabble; the most general term, which the recipients adopted with just as much pride as did other men of the people in revolutionary France the term sans-culotte, is ṣaw‘yān ("va-grant, outlaw"); other quite common terms were abšāb ("rift-raft", shdtir, pl. shdtāt ("artful [ones]") and, from the time of the Salāqikids, rind (q.v.), pl. rūnāt ("scamp"). It is with their condition in Baghdād that we are through the documentation most familiar, but it must not be forgotten that the special character of that town may mean that they did not occur there in their widely-spread form, and it is important to study them also in any other place where it is possible to do so.

In Baghdād, we see the ṣaw‘yān emerging from obscurity in the periods when authority was relaxed. Well-known pages of al-Ṭabaršīr al-Mas‘ūdī evoke them for us, armed with stones and staves and with no protection other than helmets made of palm-leaves, standing together in defence of the caliph al-Adām against the attacks of the Khurāṣānīs who supported his brother al-Ma‘mūn, or, half a century later, in the cause of al-Muṣta’īn against the troops of al-Mu‘taazz. The three centuries from the 4th/10th to the 6th/12th are full of tales of disturbances fomented by them or in which they took part, their exploits only ceasing at exceptional times under strong rulers (the Būyid ʿAbūd al-Dawla, the three great Saḥālīkīs). During the civil wars of the last years of the independent caliphate, numerous leaders sought their help and enrolled them in their police forces. In 361/972, when arms had been distributed
to those who had declared themselves ready to set off for the Holy War against the Byzantine invaders, disorders ensued which were ended only by burning down the quarter of the town. In about 420-5/1028-33, two of their leaders, Ibn al-Mawsill and al-Burgdjam, were the real masters of the capital and forced the appointment as head of police of Muham mad al-Nasawi who was regarded as one of their friends and who in any case treated them with consideration and relied on them. If we are to believe later traditions, it is possible that the Buyid Abū Kālidār was an associate with them. In the following century the head of the futuwwā in Baghdad in about 530/1135 and the succeeding years included the governor and members of the vizier's and the sultan's families among his followers. These are only a few instances out of a multitude of other less striking ones. When they were strong, they succeeded in plundering, but the chief complaint of the merchants in the suks was in general less of their "thefts" than of the "protection" khifdrā, kumdya, ghnā, which, following the example of certain great men, they extended over the suks for the sake of the spoils that fell to them. They were particularly powerful in the outlying districts, but also in certain quarters of Karīkh, inhabited by artisans, on the left bank of the Tigris and, later, at Bāb al-Azāvj on the right bank, at the gates of the capital which provided their livelihood.

Who were they, what were their aims? In the first place they were clearly humble people, often without any established or definite profession; but more exalted persons readily mingled with them, either being attracted by them or, from ambition, desiring to have followers. They certainly had no 'programme' in the sense that a modern popular party would have, and often an inclination towards plunder and the rewards derived from it seem to have been their sole motivation; however, at the same time they had a more specific ambition, which may cause some surprise: they wanted to be enrolled in the police (shurta), partly of course for the sake of the regular pay, but also and primarily because to join the police was the surest way of avoiding trouble with them. This is also the reason why one sometimes comes across returns of persons who, acting as volunteers (mufāsārsūn), helped the government against their former companions. Among the masses, the true 'ayydrūn enjoyed the popularity of thieves who attack the rich, an elementary form of class resistance; sometimes they joined forces with the bourgeoisie in support of a native prince, as in the Sāmānīd territory; sometimes the bourgeoisie relied on them in resisting the authorities whom it resented as foreigners, particularly during the Turkish period. Their greatest success, in Sīstān, was the elevation to princely authority of a dynasty that had sprung up from themselves, that of the Saffārīds, which had started out by superseding the inadequate forces of the Caliph during the struggle against the bedouin Khāridjīs; and without going as far as that, there were many occasions when they made and undermined princes. More usually, in the majority of towns which had no shurta, they formed an indispensable local militia, whose quality was enhanced by their active traditions of sporting and military training and upon whom the rā's of the city relied, whether or not he was their actual leader (see the case of Bukhārā, where the K. al-Dhakhdhir clearly shows the official standing of their battalions alongside the army and the ghādir). It will naturally be asked what connexion there is between the fītyān whom we described at the beginning of this article and the 'ayydrūn of whom we are now speaking. The texts, however, make it clear beyond question that many of the fītyān of the first sort called themselves or were called 'ayydrūn or some equivalent name, while many of the 'ayydrūn on the other hand called themselves fītyān or followers of the futuwwā. An at least partial equivalence is therefore indisputable, and the only question is to know if this is or is not absolute and, insofar as it is confirmed, to understand its significance. To find the answer, we have to remember the existence of the urban 'asabiyyāt. In eastern towns certain kinds of factions existed almost everywhere under this name, feuding in the name of some particular doctrinal eponym; but they are more profoundly characteristic of a certain type of urban society. Now the texts also leave no doubt that the concepts of 'asabīyya and futuwwā were, at least in part, inter-related. In the moral sense, 'asabīyya is the principle of solidarity of a group, futuwwā the individual qualities by which it can be achieved. This being said, it is evidently as impossible to attribute any great numerical strength to the sodalities of fītyān of the mystico-literary texts as it is to deny it to the 'ayydrūn belonging to the 'asabīyyāt who inspired the accounts in the historical and related works; but we see very clearly that, in a sense that is materially elastic but morally no less strong, the members of the 'asabīyyāt could have regarded themselves as true adherents of the futuwwā and that, among the fītyān in the apparent idyllic sense, many individuals or groups may in fact have been steeped in the 'asabīyyāt and the disturbances that they engendered. Consequently the futuwwā must apparently be considered neither as an interesting but marginal socio-ideological institution, as most of the ancient descriptions imply, nor even solely or precisely as a form of reaction by the destitute classes, but as a general and fundamental
structural element of urban society in the mediaeval East.
Within which frontiers, in the East? Though attested throughout the whole Irano-Mesopotamian territory, the ʿṣydra-futuwwa is not recorded, at least under those names, in Syria or Egypt. There were militias there, it is true, the ʿabdāšt (q.v.), a name which, like ʿṣydn, evokes “youth”; they are found first in the 4th/10th century, ranged against the authorities while simultaneously entrusted with the functions of the ʿghurā; later, towards the end of the following century, they became an officially accepted institution, their ʿrāʾls then being ʿrāʾs for the town, sometimes almost by inheritance; however, they progressively declined in face of the organization of new powers relying on military garrisons. The resemblance to the ʿṣydn, both in the facts and the meaning of the name, is evident; and yet the analogy is not absolute. The status of the ʿabdāšt became more systematically official than that of the ʿṣydn, their recruitment was perhaps more bourgeois, and above all there is no indication that their organization was in any way concerned with the communal life, the rites of initiation and the ideological elaboration which, as we shall see, characterize the futuwwa; if we add to this that the latter’s domain was that of Sāsānid tradition, while the ʿabdāšt only existed in the ʿayydrun period, it becomes evident that Cārūn ʿayydrun, for the rest he is a phenomenon of wider occurrence, and even there generally coexisted with the other without confusion.

These remarks on the ʿayydrun apply particularly to the period up to the 5th/11th century; at that time there occurred an evolution, both among them and in the surrounding society, which in itself is of great historical importance, but which furthermore, as we shall see, is at the origin of the appearance of that form of literature on which, compared with the reality, is at first sight so misleading. The growing importance of the ʿṣydn-ʿayydrun, attracting persons of high social rank and an increasing number of men of erudition, provoked a tendency among them to clarify and scrutinize the values that the futuwwa in fact implied; in the second place, and simultaneously with this process, another movement came into being within ʿṣydnism which, for long restricted to individual forms of asceticism and mysticism, became organized into communities where, very naturally, the problems of collective life brought them into touch with the experience of futuwwa; it was perhaps the extra-legal aspect of the futuwwa which formed the attraction for some ʿṣydnīs like the Malamatiyya. It was in these circles, from the 7th/13th century onwards, that a specific literature on futuwwa made its appearance, which, for the first time, gave a characteristic feature of which it is that it provides us with a spiritual elaboration of the subject, with the addition of certain pseudo-historical traditions and a selective and idealized portrayal of the ancient ʿṣydn (such as we described earlier, partly from this source), without any other allusion being made to the real organizations of ʿṣydn and the use of violence, of which nevertheless the chroniclers continue to provide such irrefutable evidence—to such an extent that we might well wonder if we really are dealing with the same people, were it not that we know that at least from the 7th/13th century some of the writers of the treatises of this type were well-known as leaders of authentic groups of real ʿṣydn.

The attitude of the governments and aristocracy towards the futuwwa was consequently modified. It is true that they continued their struggle against those who fomented disturbances or who were suspected of heterodoxy, but, far from being opposed to the concept of the futuwwa, they were hostile only to what they called distortions, or deviations from what it should in fact be. Nīṣām āl-Mulk, the great Saljuqī vizier, in whose lifetime a vizier of the Caliph persecuted the group of ʿṣydn suspected of ʿṣydnīslic to whom we have already referred, was at the same time the man to whom one of the first treatises of murawwana and futuwwa was dedicated.
Again, during the following century, in the well-known pages where the Hanbali Ibn al-Diawzi attacked the fitiyān of his day and their conception of sexual honour, their acts of violence, etc., what he preaches is not so much the destruction of the futuwwa, as the taking over of the futuwwa, in its anarchic condition, by a superior authority capable of guiding it towards its true aims.

It was this reform that the caliph al-Nāṣir (577/1181-620/1223) was to accomplish. The dominating preoccupation of this remarkable man was his attempt to regroup under the aegis of the Caliphate all spiritual families and all organizations claiming to have kinship with Islam. At a very early date (578/1182 according to Ibn Abi '1-Damm and al-Sakhāwanī quoted in Muṣṭ. Diwād, see Bibl.) he had himself initiated into the Baghādādī futuwwa by its grand master, šaybān ʿAbd al-Diabbar. As we have seen, the futuwwa was to a greater or lesser degree diversified, and in the time of al-Nāṣir in Baghdad there were five branches of it, one of which, the Nabaweyya, whose existence is attested as early as the 4th/10th century and which was also known elsewhere in the 6th/12th century by Ibn Dūbayr, devoted itself to fighting against the heretic and the infidel, while another was the Rāhštisīyya, ʿAbd al-Diabbar's branch. Al-Nāṣir cannot have been a simple, ordinary man, he preaches is not so much their destruction as the transformation of the futuwwa, the troubadours, the ruffians, into an instrument of the state, the shārīʿa of which the Grand Master was the caliph assisted by a hierarchy of the simple adepts by the spoken word only (bashīl) and those who had girded on the sword (ṣayfī), but we do not know how far this corresponded to reality; at the end of the century an intermediate stage was still spoken of, that of those who had drunk the cup (ṣaybī). Solidarity between comrades had to be absolute. The general organization, in which the Grand Master was the caliph assisted by a nābūlī, was divided into a certain number of sub-groups (ahbāb, pl. of ḥāb) each of which consisted of several būyūṭ; and a kind of autonomous internal jurisdiction settled their disputes by a procedure in which the oath of honour of the futuwwa played a great part. The books on futuwwa do not mention any sporting privileges; but we know that these did apply to the rearing and flying of homing pigeons, an ancient occupation of the fitiyān but despised by the aristocracy, and the sport of the bundikh (see Kaws) (accompanied by the shooting of birds), the rules for which were then officially promulgated, and which seems to have been a favourite diversion of the Turkish military caste; we may suppose that this aspect of the fitiyān did not interest the writers who were considering the futuwwa in its moral and religious aspects.

There is no doubt, however, that from then onwards there was a certain convergence between the popular futuwwa and the futuwwa of the Sūfīs. One of the most ardent disseminators of the reformed institution was the same Suhrawardī, general theological adviser to al-Nāṣir and founder of an order of Sūfīs, and one who commanded extraordinary respect, especially in Asia Minor. A certain reciprocal penetration took place between the combative spirit of the fitiyān and the spiritual ideal of the Sūfīs. One manifestation of this was the adoption for the futuwwa of inīdāds inspired by Sūfī models, by means of which each group claimed attachment to ancestors, whether true or suppositional, whose patronage was morally significant: generally, in the end, to 'Āli, on account of the ambivalence of the word fašāl, and very often after him to Salāmīn, the patron of the Irano-Mesopotamian artisans. In more general terms, we thus see the futuwwa demonstrating in its own particular way the method of absorption of popular movements by Sūfī organizations which from the end of the Middle Ages to our own time has characterized such large sectors of social evolution in Muslim countries. It is merely necessary to repeat that the literature that resulted from this evolution cannot
be taken as a guarantee of what the classical futuwwa had been in earlier times.

Bibliography: It is impossible to enumerate here all the historical, literary, religious etc. works which provide occasional and exceptional valuable documentation on futuwwa; references will be found in the articles listed below, particularly those of Fr. Taeschner and Cl. Cahen; we shall confine ourselves to adding two works which have more recently become known, the K. al-Dhahabir wa 'l-tubah of al-Raghib b. al-Zubayr, ed. Hamidullah, Kuwait 1953, and the Ta'rikh of Ibn Abi 'l-Damm, unpublished, passage quoted by Muşaffa Dişâwîd in the work listed infra, 52. In the section following we shall consider only those treatises which, either wholly or in part, are devoted specifically and explicitly to the futuwwa, with the reservations noted in the article. The earliest is that of Sulamî (about 400/1010), ed. Fr. Taeschner, As-Sulami's Kitab al-Futuwwa, in Studia Orientalia Joannis Peter Der ... dicit, Copenhagen 1953, which is followed by some special sections on the futuwwa in the larger works of mysticism or muruswa of Thâ'alîbi (Brockelmann, I, 286), of ʿAbd Allâh al-Ansârî (Abdulbaki Gölpinar, op. cit., infra, 10), of Ibn Djadawîy (ed. Taeschner in Documenta Islamica Inedita [Festschrift für Th. Nöldeke, Leipzig 1951]; Risdâla, see R. Hartmann, al-Kuschairis Darstellung des Sufismus, Türk. Bibl. XVIII, Berlin 1914). In the following century appeared the critical chapter of Ibn al-Djâwî in his Taḥlîs Iblîs, ed. Cairo 1340, 421-2. But it was naturally around the caliph al-Nâṣîr that works on futuwwa especially developed. The most notable of these is the Bast modâd al-tawfiq of the Hanbali Ibn al-Mîmâr (and not ʿAmmar, as has been read until recently), which was studied by Thornîng (see infra) as early as 1913, though its attribution to al-Nâṣîr's circle was only established by P. Kahle in his article Die Futuwwa-Bündnisse des Kalifen al-Nasir, in Festschrift Georg Jacob, in Festschrift Georg Jacob (op. cit., infra, v, 1952), of Ibn al-Djawzi in his Al-Kuschairis Darstellung des Sufismus, das Futuwwarittertum des islamischen Mittelalters, in Beiträge zur Arabistik, Semitistik und Islamwissenschaft, Leipzig 1944 (not to mention his contributions on the later Turkish futuwwa and the âqîs, for which see below). More recently, critical views of varying validity have been expressed by G. Salinger, Was the Futuwwa an oriental form of Chivalry?, in Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, xxiv (1956). A valuable and illuminating study of social psychology has been made by L. Massignon, La futuwwa ou pacte d'honneur entre les travailleurs musulmans au Moyen Age, in La Nouvelle Clio, 1952. After bringing to light certain details concerning Les Débuts de la futuwwa d'al-Nasir, in Oriens, 1953, Cl. Cahen has attempted, by a more complete use of historical information, to further our knowledge of the futuwwa organizations as an organic part of oriental urban society, in his Mouvements populaires et autonomisme urbain dans l'Asie Musulmane du Moyen Age, in Arabica, 1958-9 (also printed separately, 1959); abridged German version: Zur Geschichte der städtischen Gesellschaft im islamischen Orient des Mittelalters, in Saeulium, ix (1958), 59-76, and quite recently the tiltîn of Khursân have attracted the attention of C. E. Bosworth in The Ghaznevids, Edinburgh 1963, chap. VI. Of the Arab scholars, besides the contributions of Muşaffa Dişâwîd reproduced in the introduction to his edition of Ibn al-Mîmâr, we should add S. ʿAffît, al-Maḥlî%C3%B9miyya wa ʿl-Sâfîyya wa ahl al-futuwwa, Cairo 1364/1945. For the Turkish scholars, who for the most part have concerned themselves with the Turkish period of the futuwwa, see below.

The fatâ, in its ancient Arab form, has been the subject of expositions, for example in Bishr Farrîs, L'honneur chez les Arabes avant l'Islam, Paris 1932, of Umar al-Dasûkî, al-Futuwwa wa al-ʿArab, Cairo 1953, and M. Bravmann, On the spiritual background of Early Islam, in Muséon, lxiv (1951). (CL. CAHEN)
POST-MONGOL PERIOD

(i) Survival of the courtly *futuwwa* after the Mongol Invasion.

When Hulegu, the grandson of Chingiz Khan, conquered Baghdad in 1258, putting a bloody end to the *Abbasid* Caliphate, he also dealt a blow to the *futuwwa* organization, which the Caliph al-Nasir II-Din Allâh had reformed and brought to new greatness by introducing it into courtly life. *Futuwwa* writings, which had come into being under al-Nasir, survived for a time to the extent of entries in the great encyclopaedias (here I would mention the Persian encyclopaedia *Nafâ'is al-funun fi masa'il al-uyûn* of Amuli, and the *Tuhfat al-ibnân* of *Abd al-Razzâk Kâghânî), which have a chapter on *futuwwa*, giving extracts from the writings, which had come into being under al-Nasir, c. Abu al-'uyûn al-'alî, *Nafd*is al-funun fi masâ'îl al-âdâb, c. Abd al-Razzâk Kashani), which have a chapter on *futuwwa* in its courtly form. For some time, however, the courtly *futuwwa* did in fact persist in Egypt. This was connected with the existence of this form of *futuwwa* under the Caliphate of the *Abbasid* Caliphate to that country under the Mamlûk sultan al-Zâhir Baybars (658-676/1260-1269), who had bequeathed to his successor 'Alâ' al-Din Kaykâbûd 1 (675-693/1276-1294), the great *Shaykh* Abû Hâfîm al-Suhrawardî—al-Nasir's theologian adviser—came to Baghdad as ambassador and performed the *futuwwa* rituals. One might be justified in assuming that this contributed to the spread of *futuwwa* in Anatolia, yet this impetus from courtly *futuwwa* does not seem to be solely responsible for the development of *Akhilik*. The existence of this form of *futuwwa* in Iran can be proved even before that in Anatolia, and everything tends to the fact that it must have reached *Abâbâd* from there. This theory is also supported by the cult of Abû Muslim (q.v.)—the propagator of the *Abbasid* revolt against the Umayyads—who (rather like Sayyid Ba'tsil [q.v.]) became a sort of national hero, first for the Persians and later also for the Turks. However, whilst Sayyid Ba'tsil was regarded as the model of fighter for the faith—the model for the artisans and the lesser people, who formed a corporate body under the name of *Akhili*, according to a widespread tale which was responsible for shaping the picture of Abû Muslim in the imagination of the people, the *Akhili* led by him—especially those of Marw and Khurâsân—were the ones chiefly concerned with the *Abasîd* rising. Even if one regards this as a mythical elaboration of the figure of Abû Muslim, one may still assume that the institution as a popular element in the social structure of Iran dates quite a long way back.

Although there is clearly a connexion between the *futuwwa* and the *Akhili*, there is some question about the earlier Islamic and Iranian antecedents of the *futuwwa* (see above). *Akhili* Farâdî, *Zindânî* (died 1257/1265), one of the most famous saints in Iran, is, the earliest personality on Iranian soil who is mentioned as an *Akhili*, and he is also revered by the Anatolian *Akhâs* (whose adherence to the *futuwwa* is beyond doubt) as one of their own *shaykhs*, appearing in their rolls of honour (*sililsa*). *Akhili* Farâdî *Zindânî* is held to be the master of the great Persian poet *Nizâmî*, but as the latter was born only in 535/1141 (that is to say 80 years after *Zindânî's* death), one can only regard *Nizâmî* as a spiritual disciple of the great master.

In the 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, when *Akhili* flourished in Anatolia (as is borne out by
numerous documents) it also flourished in Iran. There were a number of Akhīs in the time of Shaykh Ṣaḥīf al-Dīn Ardabīlī (1252-1334), the ancestor of the Ṣafawī Shāhs, and some of them must be numbered among his own companions and followers. Notable amongst these is Akhī Sulaymān al-Gīlānī, the father-in-law of the Ṣafavī. In connexion with these, one should probably also mention a certain Akhī Ahmad al-Muhībī al-ʿArbābīlī, by whom we have a Kitāb al-Futūwāt (in Arabic (which contains, however, only quotations from the Kurān and hadith, and saying concerning generality). The Ṣafawī Akhī tradition may also be the basis of the fact that we find the word Akhī (with reduced significance) several times in the Dīwān of Khaṭībī (i.e., Shīʿī Ṣamīʿī), as a name for followers of the Ṣafawīyya.

Further evidence for the existence of the Iranian institution is to be found in the work of the great Persian Sūfī Shāykh and saint Amīr Sayyīd ʿAlī b. Shīḥāb al-Dīn Ḥamādānī, called Ṣālīh 11 (714-786/1313-1384), entitled Risāla-i Futūwawīyya, in which he not only equates futuwwa and āsawāwī (and where the possessor of the futuwwa, the futuwwatdar, is referred to by the name of Akhī), but where there is also clear reference to the institution as such.

Like the Anatolian Akhīs, the Iranian ones occasionally intervened in politics. This can be seen from the example of Akhīdīdīk [i.e.] who gained power in Tābrīz and Ādharbaydān for three years (758-760/1357-59), until the Dījālīkī Shāykh Uwāyṣ al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Radāwī, dated 931/1524, the full title of which is Miṣḥāb al-dādāšt, is the most important of these documents. It describes the futuwwat customs of the guilds in full detail, and from this it appears that the futuwwat of the guilds had nine grades (whereas that of the Akhīs had three). The first three of these, nāṣī, sim-jarāk, and meydān-beste, may be taken to correspond to the first three grades of a trade: apprentice (terbiye, or ērā), journeyman (kafās), and master (usta), which do not, however, appear under these names in the futuwwatnāme. The next three grades (that is to say, 4 to 6), are those of the master of ceremonies, the nakīb: bishrewīsh (i.e., the assistant of the nakib), nakib, and head nakib (nakib al-mubābī); the three top grades (7 to 9), are those of the Shāykh: the representative (khalīf) of the shaykh, also known as Akhī, the Shāykh, and the Supreme Shāykh (shāykh al-shaykh). The Akhī, therefore, is the seventh grade in the hierarchy of this particular guild futuwwat. There is a further difference: whereas the Akhīs show a division into two classes, the futuwwatnāmes of the guilds give evidence of a division into three: Kōwī, Shīrīh and Seyfī. Thus there is an intermediate class between the lowest members—those who are committed by their word only—and the full members—those who have received the accolade; this is the class of those who have partaken of the ritual cup.

A further interesting custom of the guild futuwwat is the one by which the novice, or apprentice—the nāṣī—chooses not only a master as “Patron of the Journey” (yol atası), but at the same time he has to choose two “Brothers of the Journey” (yol kardesleri)—apparently from among the older apprentices—who are to assist him along the path of the futuwwat.

A further thing which emerges clearly from almost every page of the “Great futuwwatnāme” of Sayyīd Ṣeyyīd b. Sayyīd ʿAlī al-Dīn, is its decidedly Shīʿī (and more specifically “Twelver” Shīʿī). Imāmī chronology is clearly reflected in this text when it was written, at the beginning of the 10th/16th century, the “Twelver” Shīʿa enjoyed a
time of expansion because of the Safawiyya, and this led to the foundation of the new Persian Empire. It threatened to spread also to Ottoman territory, until Sultan Selim I put an end to the threat of the new Shi'i Persians by his campaign against Shah Isma'il, over whom he won the victory of Çıldırán [q.v.] in 1514. This was also the time when the Shi'i order of the Bektashiyya [q.v.] was organized by Bâlim Sultan. There are, in fact, some points of contact between the "Great futuwwetname" of Sayyid Mehmed, and the Bektashiyya: a number of the lendemâns—short verses—mentioned there which were recited or sung at the celebrations of the guilds—can also be found in the book Mirât al-mabâsîd fi dâ'i al-mâjâsîd of Sayyid Ahmad Rifat, which describes the Bektashi ceremonies.

There appear to be only a few complete manuscripts of the "Great futuwwetname" of Sayyid Mehmed. There are, however, shorter guild extracts in all libraries, and these are usually also called "futiwwetname". They are generally excerpts from the "Great futuwwetname". One may therefore assume that every guild compiled its own little futuwwetname from that source. It is worth noting that the Shi'i character of the original no longer emerges in these. This fact reflects a trend in the history of religion of the Ottoman Empire where—after earlier indecision between Sunni and Shi'i—the Sunni creed progressively took ground from the days of Selim I onwards. Arabic futuwa writings (discussed by Thorning in a study which has become an indispensable basis for all work on futuwa) also seem to be based on the Turkish "Great futuwwetname" of Sayyid Mehmed, and to represent Arabic translations of excerpts from this work.

Whilst there were other futuwa traditions besides Aâkhilik in most of the guilds whose rule was Sayyid Mehmed's "Great futuwwetname", there was also a group of guilds which must be regarded as the direct continuation of Aâkhilik, namely the tanners and all trades concerned with the treatment of leather, such as saddlers and cobblers. All these paid homage to their pir Aâkhî Eivân [q.v., properly Eivân, an Aâkhî saint of Kârshâhî in Central Anatolia (south-east of Ankara), who is himself said to have been a tanner. They did not use Sayyid Mehmed's "Great futuwwetname" as their rule, but the original futuwwetname of the Aâkhîs, which is that of Yahyâ b. Khalîl al-Burghâzî. There is, however, in most of these manuscripts which come from tanner circles, an appendix informing the reader of the more modern terms, and these are the terms familiar to us from Sayyid Mehmed's "Great futuwwetname". Thus there is evidence that influence was exerted by the futuwwet tradition represented by the latter over the Aâkhî tradition kept up by the tanners.

For their part, the tanners, thanks to their Aâkhî tradition, could exert their own influence over the other guilds, particularly as they had a firm and centralized organisation which had its centre at the grave of their patron saint Aâkhî Eivân in Kârshâhî. At this place there was a tekâye whose guardian, called Aâkhî Baba [q.v.], was taken to be a descendant of Aâkhî Eivân, and regarded (admittedly only in the Turkish provinces of the Ottoman Empire, Anatolia, Rumelia, Bosnia and even the Crimia, but not in the Arab provinces) as the head of all the tanners in the Ottoman Empire. This Aâkhî Baba, or his representative, travelled through the provinces every year, receiving the apprentices into the guild. The main part of this ceremony was their girding with the belt (bukkan) of Aâkhî Baba. Naturally, such ceremonies brought a certain income, and this formed the financial basis of the organisation. The Aâkhî Babas succeeded in gaining the privilege of girding the apprentices to other guilds as well, and thus they gained a position of considerable power among the craftsmen of the ancient Ottoman Empire. Aâkhî Eivân thus became pir not only of the tanners but of the whole of the Turkish guilds. This position of the Aâkhî Babas of Kârshâhî was repeatedly confirmed by edict, and, on the whole, the Ottoman sultans protected the guilds and their organisations. These writings were useful to them on ecclesiastical counts: firstly, they supplied not only the general populace, but in particular the armies on their campaigns, and secondly they were a reserve of men—some of the guilds were bound to do military service; in the earliest days, the guilds were also the only means of reaching the whole population of the Empire. This was the purpose of the occasional processions of the guilds. Ewliya Celebi describes one which took place under Murâd IV in 1048/1638. Such gatherings gave the ruler a picture of the military and economic strength of his country.

There were, however, some protests from 'ulema' circles, both against the Shi'i leanings of the "Great futuwwetname" by Sayyid Mehmed, and against the Aâkhî Eivân cult of the tanners. A learned man by the name of (Mustafa b. Fakhr al-Din) Belghrâdî wrote a book entitled Nisâb al-ittisâb, sa-âdâb al-iktiisâb, attacking these things and presenting the crafts from the strictly Sunni point of view. The book was of no avail; probably it never even reached the hands of those for whom it was intended.

There is a great amount of important documentation concerning the guilds (including their rules and regulations) in Turkish archives, the major part of which has not been studied.

The European provinces, including those inhabited by other races, like Bosnia, took part in the general development of the Turkish guilds; they also relied on the same writings.

As has already been mentioned, the "Great futuwwetname" of Sayyid Mehmed b. Sayyid Aâkhî al-Din was also the accepted authority in the Arabic provinces of the Persian Empire. There, the guilds used extracts, written in Arabic, and adapted them to their special needs. This is the material on which H. Thorning based his epoch-making work. There is a description of the guilds in Damascus in 1683 by Elia Qoudsi, from which it becomes clear that the organization at that time was still essentially the same as that with which we know to have existed among the Turkish guilds.

A valuable document concerning the futuwwet as an organization of the guilds comes from Persia. This is the Futuwwetname-i sultânî of the well-known writer Kamâl al-Din Huseyn Wâ'iz Kâshîfî (died 920/1515), a nephew of the famous poet Şâni. Unfortunately only one manuscript has so far come to light; it is in the British Museum, but is incomplete and still awaits an editor. One may hope, though, that further manuscripts of this important work, and of others concerning the futuwa and the guild organizations, will emerge from the still largely unexplored libraries of Iran.

In Turkestan also it can be shown that futuwa is at the basis of the guild organizations. The eastern Turkish guild treatises (of which there was quite a number in the collection of the Berlin orientalist Martin Hartmann), are generally called risâla. It has not been shown that there is even a reference to the Anatolian saint of the guild,
Akhl Evren. Thus the effects of his cult stretched as far as Turkestan.

In the course of the 19th century, with the influx of European goods and the expansion of the European type of commerce, the guild-organizations fell into decay in all states of the Islamic Orient. For this reason it has been gradually abolished in all countries of the Islamic world. In Turkey, it was discontinued in Young Turk times, and replaced by chambers of commerce (by a law of 13 February 1325 (1906-07), and later by another law of 14 April 1325 (1907-08)). A few surviving features were abolished in the time of the Turkish Republic. With this, therefore, the organization of the futuwwa also came to an end.

In the Arabic dialect of Egypt, futuwwa means "ruffian"; cf. the Mudhakkirat futuwwa, 2nd ed., Cairo 1927, written in colloquial Arabic.

Bibliography: On Turkish guilds in general: Oğhman Nürtî [Ergun], Mejdî-î-i sâmî-i beldeîî, Istanbul 1338/1922, ch. VI: Esnâd teşkilâtî ve tıfîdjet uşâlî; Fr. Taeschner, Das Zunftwesen in der Türkei, in Leipzig's Vierteljahreschrift für Südosteuropa, v (1941), 172-182. Concerning the "Great futuwwetînâmê" of Seyyid Meşmed b. Seyyid 'Allâ, in a letter from the Egyptian capital to Ascalon, Palestine, took twelve days, while those carried between Tunisia and Egypt required from one to two weeks. A letter from the Egyptian capital to Ascalon, Palestine, took twelve days, while those carried between Tunisia and Egypt required from one to two weeks. Concerning the guilds in Turkestan: M. Hartmann, Die osttürkischen HANDSCHRIFTEN der Sammlung Hartmann, in MSOS, vii (1904), 16, no. 9 (artisan Russîles); M. Gavrilov, Les corps de métiers en Asie Centrale et leur statuts (Rissala), tr. from the Russian by J. Castagné in REI, 1928, 202-220; A. K. Borovok, K istorii bratstva "Achi" v Sredney Azii ("Concerning the history of the Achi union in Central Asia"), in Akademika VI, A. Gordesskomu ...., Moscow 1953, 83 ff.; Pearson, 251-2.

AL-FUWATI (see IBN AL-FUWATI).

FUYYDĐ, pl. of fuyyq, (from Persian payq), is the name only not of the couriers of the government Barîd [q.v.], but also of the commercial mail serving the population at large. This term was common all over North Africa and Egypt during the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries, while on the Egypt-Syria route the word Barîd, letter-bearer, was used. Occasionally, rasal appears in the same sense, although the latter is more regularly applied to special messengers (see below).

Since only a few letters written in Arabic script on paper have been published, for the time being our information about the fuuydi is derived exclusively from the letters of the Geniza [q.v.], which are written in the Arabic language but in Hebrew script.

In addition to carrying letters between the cities of a country, the fuuydi provided the international mail services during the winter, when the sea was closed, and in midsummer, since the ships used to sail in convoys in spring time and in the autumn. As with the Barîd, one and the same man would carry the dispatches entrusted to him from the starting point to the final destination, e.g., from al-Kayrawân to Cairo, or even from Almeria, Spain, to Alexandria.

For the task of the fuuydi was of a confidential nature. The names of the fuuydi (mostly Muslim, some Jewish) are often referred to in a way which indicates that they must have been personally known to the addressee, albeit coming from a distant country.

No traces of any guild organization of the fuuydi have been found thus far, but the times for their departures and arrivals must have been more or less fixed. The Geniza letters suppose that there was a weekly service between Cairo and Tyre, and presumably also other Syro-Lebanese-Palestinian cities, see below), while that between Cairo and al-Kayrawân also was regular, but dependent on the caravans, which, in normal years, seem to have made the double journey three times during one winter.

As to the speed of this service, the time between Cairo and Alexandria required four days approximately. A letter from the Egyptian capital to Ascalon, Palestine, took twelve days, while those carried between Tunisia and Egypt required from one to
two and a half months, depending on the length of the stay of the caravans in each of the localities visited by them (which stay was used by the *fuyūdī* for collecting additional mail).

The cost of the forwarding of a letter from Jerusalem to Ramle was half a *dirham*, that from Alexandria to Cairo one *dirham* exactly, that from Almeria to Alexandria, referred to above, one and a half *dirhams*, four letters being sent to the same address. These prices are indicated in the letters preserved because payment was to be made after delivery. The prices were certainly not fixed, but probably customary.

The payments to special messengers, called *rasūl*, of which three cases have been traced thus far, were up to fifty times as high as those made to *fuyūdī*. A service midway between the latter, who moved too slowly, and the special messengers, who were too expensive, was provided by the *fayyūdī* or express courier. The request *tuṣṣayr il kīlāb*, "fly your letter to me", most probably refers not to carrier pigeons, but to this express service. Carrier pigeons might have been intended in another letter, in which the addressee is asked to send a *barz*, or release, *mālāl līfayr*, "with the birds", possibly a technical term, parallel to the usual request to send a letter either bi *l-ma'rūsh", "by boat" or *mālā* *l-fayūdī*, "with the mail couriers".


(S. D. Goitein)

GABON [see GABON].

GABAN, properly *GABANPERT* (cf. Abu l-'Faradj, *Chron. Syr.*, ed. Bruns, 329 and *Kaplan* *pp* *o* *ou* *lav* *ov*, Cinnamus, i, 8), an Armenian mountain stronghold on the Tekir-Su, a tributary of the Djayhān, now called Geben and belonging to the *ilçe of Enderin in the il of Maraş*. Here the kings of Armenia kept their treasures and retired in case of need; the last king Leon VI de Lusignan of Maras. Here the kings of Almeria to Alexandria, referred to above, one and a half *dirhams*, four letters being sent to the same address. These prices are indicated in the letters preserved because payment was to be made after delivery. The prices were certainly not fixed, but probably customary.

The payments to special messengers, called *rasūl*, of which three cases have been traced thus far, were up to fifty times as high as those made to *fuyūdī*. A service midway between the latter, who moved too slowly, and the special messengers, who were too expensive, was provided by the *fayyūdī* or express courier. The request *tuṣṣayr il kīlāb*, "fly your letter to me", most probably refers not to carrier pigeons, but to this express service. Carrier pigeons might have been intended in another letter, in which the addressee is asked to send a *barz*, or release, *mālāl līfayr*, "with the birds", possibly a technical term, parallel to the usual request to send a letter either bi *l-ma'rūsh", "by boat" or *mālā* *l-fayūdī*, "with the mail couriers".


(S. D. Goitein)

FUZULI [see FUDULI].

FYZABAD [see FAYDABAD].

Ogoué Ivindo, 32 in the Ngounié, 22 in the Ogoué-Lolo, 10 in the Nyanga and 4 in Upper Ogoué).

The paucity of Muslims is matched by the small number of mosques, one at Port Gentil, one at Lambaréné, two at Libreville, the biggest of which was built at the expense of the French Government. The Muslims in Gabon, representing 0.4% of the population, were of importance only during the colonial period in the capacity of subordinates in the administration. They still play a certain part as a commercial bourgeoisie.

**Bibliography:** Some lines in the various works relating to Gabon. The Abbé Raponda-Walker has very kindly furnished the essential features of the information contained in the above article.

(R. Cornevin)

GABAR, term generally used in Persian literature—with rather depreciative implications—to indicate *Zoroastrians*. Philologists have not yet reached agreement on its etymology. Several suggestions have been made, e.g., (a) from Hebrew *ḥabber* ("companion") in the sense of *Kidādān* 72a; (b) from Aramaeo-Pahlavi *gabrā* (read *mart*), especially in the compounds *mālā-martān* ("the Magi") (written *māg-gabrā-dn*); (c) from a Persian corruption of Arabic *kafir* ("unbeliever"). The first two etymologies are very improbable, so that the derivation from *A. kafir* seems the most acceptable. In Persian literature the word takes often the depreciative suffix -*ak* (*gabrāk*, pl. *gabrākān*). Persian knows also the form *gawrlvār*, Kurdish the forms *gebr* (applied to Armenians), *gawr* (*Zoroastrians*), *gāʾer* (applied to Europeans, especially Russians), Turkish the well-known word *gawur* (unbeliever). In Persian literature the word is applied only secondarily to "unbelievers" in general, the oldest texts using it especially and technically for *Zoroastrians*. This, together with the iranization of the Arabic word which probably lies behind it, points to a very old origin—purely "oral"—of the loan, certainly at a period preceding that when Arabic words were introduced in abundance into new-Persian, at the birth of new-Persian written literature.

**Bibliography:** Gr. I. Ph., ii, 697; *Burhān-i kafīr*, ed. M. Muinī, Tehran 1342/4, iii, 1773-4, 1850; M. Muinī, *Masdāyān wa taḥfîr-i ān dar adab-yādī Pārī*, Tehran 1326, 395-6 (and new

G
The Gagauz are a small Turkic tribe speaking a Turkic language but Orthodox Christian in religion. At the present time they are settled in the south of the Moldavian S.S.R. (Bessarabia) in the district of Komrat, Cărlig-Lungă, Kangaz, Tarakliya, Vîlkanesti; in the south of the Ukrainian S.S.R. in the district of Zaporozhe and Odessa (Izmail) and in the district of Rostov in the Russian S.S.R. There are also small Gagauz settlements in Central Asia—in the districts of Kokpekî, Zarma, Carșikî, Aksuat and Urdzar in the region of Semipalatinsk and in the eastern Kazakh and Pavlodar region of the Kazakh S.S.R. The Gagauz also live in the region of Frunze in the Kirghiz S.S.R. and in the district of Tashkent in the Uzbek S.S.R. The total number of Gagauz in the U.S.S.R. is 124,000 (1959). In Bulgaria the Gagauz occupy the villages in the district of Varna, near Provdyâ, in the Dobrudja near Kavarna and in the south of Bulgaria in the district of Vambol and Topolovgrad. In Rumania there are only a few Gagauz villages left—and those in the Dobrudja.

The name Gagauz is derived from a small Turkic tribe speaking a Gagauz language. The etymology of the name is not clear. According to one hypothesis the Gagauz originate from the Kumans or Polovtsians who played an active role in the history of the south Russian steppe and the Kievan Rus. The name Karvuna-land was changed to Dobrotic-land. The form 'Dobrudja' became current at a later date. Dobrotic was followed by Yanko (1356)—according to other sources Yanko—the last Ottoman ruler. In 1398 he was obliged to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Ottoman Turks. After the fall of the Gagauz state some of the population accepted Islam but the rest remained true to Christianity. With the conquest of Constantinople the Ottoman Sultan recognized the Gagauz tribe as an independent state and the Gagauz of the Bessarabian peninsula—in connexion with a similar movement by the Bulgars—over the Danube to Russia (until 1769 into the province of New Russia; between 1787 and 1791 and most strongly between 1801 and 1812 into Bessarabia).

Initially this went on without any apparent interference from the Russian government, which only later introduced order into the management of the land and the administration. This migration was apparently caused by the oppression of the robber bands (the Daghi and Kirdjali) of Pasvand-oglu 'Othman [q.v.], the notorious Pasha of Vidin, and of Kara Feydi).

Since 1949 the territory of the Bessarabian Gagauz has belonged to the U.S.S.R. In 1949 all the Gagauz villages in the Moldavian and Ukrainian S.S.R. were collectivized together with those in Bulgaria and Rumania. The Gagauz work mainly in agriculture, cattle-raising, wine growing and, on the coast, fishing. As a result of being the long-standing neighbours of the Bulgarians, the Gagauz have borrowed much from their way of life, their customs and their domestic activity. The most salient characteristics of the Gagauz are diligence, hospitality, cheerfulness and contentment.

The language of the Gagauz belongs to the southern group of Turkic languages, i.e., it is closest to the Turkish of Turkey, of Adharbaydjan and of Turkmenistan. Several phonetic features, almost the whole syntax and phraseology as well as most of the morphology and vocabulary of the Gagauz are not Turkish. The following points may be enumerated here:

1. the softening of consonants before front vowels;
2. the appearance of the gender suffixes -ka, -yka;
3. syntactically the Gagauz language is completely Slavicized and un-Turkish;
4. the strong foreign element in the vocabulary (Greek, Rumanian and Slavonic).

For a long time the Gagauz possessed no literature of their own. For ecclesiastical purposes the Greek Church used 'Karamanî' books written in the Turkish language. But these books contain lives of the saints and prayers. By contrast a rich folk poetry has developed, together


(A. BAUSANI)
with riddles (bilmeydā), proverbs (soleiś), folk-songs (tiirkii, mani), stories (masal), etc. The Gagauz alphabet, based on the Russian with additional letters, was created in the Moldavian S.S.R. in 1957. Since 1958 elementary education in the Gagauz language has been introduced. For this purpose text books are being compiled. Work is gradually going on towards the development of a Gagauz literary language. In Kishinev a Gagauz newspaper is published twice a month as a supplement to the Moldova Socialista.


(Wlodzimierz Zajączkowski)

GAKKHAR, a war-like Muslim tribe, inhabiting mostly the Hazara district and parts of the districts of Rawalpindi, Attock and Djehlam (Jhelum) of West Pakistan and that part of the Indian-held territory of Djammi which lies to the west of the Cīnāb; it is of indigenous origin. Agriculturists by profession, the Gakharaks are considered socially high and stand apart from the local tribes of Rādpūt descent who resent their arrogance and racial pride. Many of the religious and social ceremonies observed by the latter tribes, were not permitted to the Gakharaks who had not only ravaged their territory and inflicted a crushing defeat on them but were also instrumental in their conversion to Islam. It is also possible that some disgruntled members of the tribe, who had unwillingly abandoned the faith of their forefathers, might have nurtured a grudge against the Gakharaks and, finding a suitable opportunity, wreaked their vengeance. Here again we are confronted with a difficulty in that history does not record any large-scale defections on the part of the Gakharaks. The Tābahā-i Nāsīrī (Raverty, i, 485) also says that the Sultan "attained martyrdom at the hand of a disciple of the Mulahidh (sic)", who was apparently a Muslim, and not a Hindu as stated by Hamd Allah Mustawfi (Tārīh-i Ḡūz̄a, i, 472), and al-D̄uwaynī (tr. Boyle, i, 326), where "Hindu" has been wrongly translated as 'Indian', as he was
found on capture to have been circumcised. He could not, therefore, have been a Khokhar as there is no evidence to prove that the Khokhars had ever been so circumcised. The chief among the Khokhars captured in the present expedition was Mu'izz al-Din Muhammad Ghūrī. Piecing all the recorded evidence together one is led to believe that the assassination was a Gakkhār, smarting under the insult and humility suffered by his tribe. It was the result of a personal vendetta and had no political or religious implications as has been suggested by Raghib al-Dīn (Zan'ī al-tasvīri, ed. Shaimmīnov, i, 56) and Ibn al-Athīr (sub anno 602 A.H.) involving even Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (q.v.) in the conspiracy.

The Gakkhārs continued to harry the Delhi Sultans and in 645/1247 even a peace-loving prince like Naṣir al-Dīn Māḥmūd had to take measures against them. He appointed Balbān, who reduced their country, took revenge on them for their continued incursions, chastised them for having allowed passage to the Mongols through their territory and made thousands of them captives. Malik Aṭīrūnī, who had forcibly married Rādiyya Sultānī, most probably had pressed these very Gakkhārs, along with the Dīās and other tribes, into an army with which he opposed the forces of the slave king Mu'izz al-Dīn Bahram Shāh but was defeated. Almost a century later they invaded the Pandjāb in 743/1342, during the reign of Muhammad b. Tughluk, killed Tāhir Khan, the viceroy of Lahore and "completed the ruin of the province". Taking advantage of the disturbed conditions in the wake of Timūr's invasion of India (802/1399), they tried to harrass the great conqueror but had to pay dearly for their audacity. They again gave trouble to Bābur (q.v.) during his victorious march 932/1525 against the Delhi Sultans. Ibrāhīm Lahorī captured their fort of Phafwala (now called Phafwala, but mostly in ruins, about 12 miles east of Rawalpindi), ruled by Hātī Khan, their chief, who had to flee before the onslaught of the Mughals. At the end of 933/1526 Hātī Khan waited on the emperor during his return to the Pandjāb and assisted greatly in procuring supplies for the Mughal army. Bābur fully recognized his services, made him a handsome present and conferred on him the title of Sultan but refused to recognize his chieftainship. However, as the result of Timūr's invasion of India (802/1399) following a family scandal, Sultan Adam Shāh was blinded, Adam receiving robes of honour, a diāhr or title of Nawwab. (This seems to have been a personal title as no later Gakkhār chief ever used it.) He was defeated by the Sikhs at Gudjrat (q.v.) in 1152/1739, which showed up the cracks in the crumbling fabric of the Mughal empire. As a reward for his services he was confirmed in his possession of the fort of Phafwala and on return to Kabul, Nadir Shah conferred upon him, as a mark of further favour, the title of Nawwab. (This seems to have been a personal title as no later Gakkhār chief ever used it.) He was defeated by the Sikhs at Gudjrat (q.v.) in 1179/1765 and had to surrender the whole of his possessions up to the Djehlam to the Sikhs. They seem, however, to have reluctantly accepted the Timūrids as their overlords, inasmuch as a celebrated Gakkhār warrior-chief, Mukarrab Khan, sided with Nadir Shāh Afshār (q.v.) and took part in the battle of Karnāl (1152/1739), which showed up the cracks in the crumbling fabric of the Mughal empire. As a reward for his services he was confirmed in his possession of the fort of Phafwala and on return to Kabul, Nadir Shāh conferred upon him, as a mark of further favour, the title of Nawwab. (This seems to have been a personal title as no later Gakkhār chief ever used it.) He was defeated by the Sikhs at Gudjrat (q.v.) in 1179/1765 and had to surrender the whole of his possessions up to the Djehlam to the victors. Four years later he was treacherously captured and put to death by a rival chief, Himmāt Khan. The Sikhs, finding it a suitable opportunity, annexed the entire Gakkhār territory to the Sikh kingdom of the Pandjāb. Mukarrab Khan's two elder sons were, however, allowed to retain the Phafwala fort as a diāhr; this too was confiscated in 1234/1818 by the Sikh governor of the area. Chafing under successive insults and acts of expropriation, the Gakkhārs revolted in 1835 but were crushed by the Sikhs who put their chieftains—Shād-mān Khan and Muddū Khan—along with their families in confinement, where both of them died. On the annexation of the Pandjāb in 1849, the British conferred a pension of Rs. 1200 per annum on Hayāt Allāh Khan, a son of Shād-mān Khan, he and the other members of his family having been released from captivity by the British two years earlier. In 1853 Nādir Khan, the Gakkhār chief of Mandāla, joined a Sikh conspiracy against the British. The rising, which might have been serious, was promptly quelled and Nādir Khan was captured and hanged. Apart from this incident
the Gakkhar remained loyal and peaceful; they joined the army and served the British well, who honoured one of their chiefs, Râjîa Dîjahândâd Khân (Khânpur), by conferring upon him the order of C.I.E. The present chief of the tribe is Sultân Irâdî Zamân Khân, an 18-year old youth, who succeeded to the title in October 1963 after the accidental death of his father, a grandson of Dîjahândâd Khân.

The Gakkhar is divided into several clans, the leading being: the Bûgüylâ, Iskandâral, Fûrûzâl, Sârângâl and Adâmâl. Of these the last two are more influential and powerful; they are the descendants of Sârângâl and Adâmâl respectively, the two chiefs who gained prominence during the reign of Humâyûn and Akkar. While the Sârângâls are found in Hazâra and Aytoc, the Adâmâls inhabit the districts of Rawalpindi and Dîjahm. As compared with the Gakkhar of Hazâra and Dîjahm those of the Rawalpindi district are generally considered the senior and most important branch of the tribe (for details see Rawalpindi District Gazetteer, 63 ff.).


Galata [see İstanbul].

Galata-Saray [see Galata-Saray].

Galen [see Galina].

Galicia [see Diliçgayê].

Galla [own name Oromo, 'the people']. A people widespread in the modern state of Ethiopia, speaking a language belonging to the Eastern (or Low) Kushitic group which includes 'Afar-Sahô and Somâli). They irrupted from the region south of the Webi during the first half of the 16th century, most contemporaneously with the campaigns of Ahmad Grâh [q.v.] and spread fanwise, penetrating deeply into the Abyssinian highlands. For long they were a menace to the existence of the Ethiopian state but were finally subdued by Menelik II between 1872 and 1888.

When their expansion began they were all nomadic herdsmen with an elaborate political system based on a cycle of generation-sets (qada), but in consequence of their tribal movements and settlement in different environments many of the groups underwent profound changes. When they first expanded they came into contact first with Islam and then with Ethiopian Christianity. Their gradual and qualified adoption of the one or the other religion was slow, piecemeal, and tribal or regional. Although all the other Hamitic nomads of north-east Africa (Bedjâ, Sahô, 'Afar and Somâli) had long been Muslim, and although the important Muslim city of Harar [q.v.] and the southern Muslim states of Bali and Dawaro lay in their path, the Galla remained impervious to religious change so long as they remained nomads and their qada system intact. But when they settled in contact with Amhârâ and Sidâmâ they became either Christian or Muslim.

The vast number of tribes forbids any formal classification here, whilst the syncretistic character of their religion, whatever they call themselves, also prevents any clear-cut religious classification. The southernmost Galla, small groups of Warday or Orma of Tanaland in Kenya, detached from the rest by Somali expansion, have adopted Islam in this century. So have many Borâns of northern Kenya. But the nomadic Borân of southern Ethiopia, occupying a vast territory between the Lake Stefânie region and the River Djûba, and those Arsi (Arsî in Amharic), living to the north of the Borân between the Somali of Ogaden and the Sidâmâ, who continue to maintain a pastoral nomadic life, remain pagan. Some Arsi are Muslim and in their territory lies the famous Muslim-pagan pilgrimage sanctuary of Shaykh Husayn. Muslims are the northernmost Galla of the highlands (Yêdju and Raya or Azebo), who inhabit a region once occupied by a Muslim population known as Doû'a, and the Wallo, covering a wide area of the eastern highlands north of the Tulamâ, who played an important part in the history of the empire in the 19th and 19th centuries, during which many embraced Christianity. Among the Shanâ Galla (collectively known as Tulamâ) Christianity prevails. The Galla who penetrated the Gîbê region of south-west Ethiopia, where they mingled with Sidâmâ, were transformed in form of government, forming a group of five monarchical-type states (Dîmmâ, Limmû, Gera, GommA and Guma), which many embraced Christianity. Among the Shanâ the Galla who penetrated the Gibe region of the Galla of Southern Abyssinia, Harvard African Studies, iii (1922), 9-228; idem, Ethnographic Study of Ethiopia (Report for 1883-84), see "Robtas—the fortress of"; Abu 'l-Fadl, A'in-i Akbhari, tr. Blochmann, Calcutta 1873, i, 486. On the confusion between Gakkhar and Kohkhar, see Rose, Kohkars and Gakkharas in Panjab history, in Ind. Antiquary, 1907. (A. S. Bazmee Ansari)


Gallipoli [see Gelibolu].

Gambia, British Colony and Protectorate, West Africa, 13° 25' N., 16° W.; 4,000 square miles in extent with a population of about 260,000. It forms a narrow enclave in the surrounding territory of Senegal, occupying both banks of the Gambia river to a distance of 200 miles from the coast and being nowhere more than 39 miles broad. The principal tribal groups are Mandingo, Fula and Wolof.
The country is entirely agricultural, millet and rice providing the staple food of the people. The main economic crop is groundnuts, which accounts for nine-tenths of the revenue in an average year. There is no mining and apparently no mineral wealth. The only town is the capital Bathurst (population, 20,000). Under the constitution introduced in May 1962, the country has attained full internal self-government, the prime minister being Mr. D. Jawara the leader of the People's Progressive Party. A measure of union with Senegal is under active consideration (1964).

The British trading interest in the Gambia dates from early in the seventeenth century, and from 1662, when the fort on James Island was seized from the Duke of Courland, the succession of British African Companies maintained permanent occupation of one or more trading posts. The eighteenth century was a period of intense commercial rivalry with the French, who had established a factory at Alberda on the north bank and were not finally excluded from the river until 1857. Bathurst was founded in 1816 to provide an additional base for the campaign against the slave trade. At least four-fifths of the indigenous population are Muslim. Islam was first introduced in the pre-Muslim capital of Adharbaydjan (now the ruins of Tiflis). Later (1235) the town was captured and burned by the Georgians; but the retreat afterwards was not shared by Adharbaydjan and Gandja under the rule of the Ildegizids. The town of Gandja came to Tiflis; according to him 9 farsabh, according to Yākūṭ (i, 132) 16 farsabh. After the decline of Barđha's Gandja became the capital of Arrān; the Shaddādīd dynasty ruled here from c. 340/951-2; after it had been overthrown by Sultan Malik Shāh, the latter's son Muhammad was granted Gandja in fief. In 533/1140-9 the town was destroyed by an earthquake in which, according to Imam al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, there perished some 300,000 persons (130,000 according to Ibn al-Athīr), including the wife and children of Kara-Sonkur, amīr of Adharbaydjan and Arrān, who was absent at the time; Demetrius, king of Georgia, sacked the ruined town and carried off one of its gates. 'Imād al-Dīn says that the Georgians built a new town in their country, gave it the name Djanza and set up the lower river. In some areas literacy in Arabic is not uncommon. Protestant and Catholic missions have been at work for more than a century, but there are very few Christians outside Bathurst.


GAMES [see Lār].

GANĀFA [see DIJANABA].

GANDĀPUR, the name of a Pathan tribe which lives in the Dāmān area of the Dera Ismā'il Khān district of Pakistan. The tribe is now, for the most part, absorbed in the population of the area.

The tribe descended from the Afghan highlands to the plains of Dāmān during the 17th century. The centre of their winter quarters developed into a town in the 19th century, probably because of the trading activities of the tribesmen between Khurāsān and India. This town is at present called Kulāči.

The Gandāpur tribe took part in Pathan tribal wars during the 18th century but under British rule the tribe became settled and peaceful, mixing with other Pashto-speaking settlers. The origin of the name is unknown, as is the history of the people.


GANDJA, Arab. DIJANZA, the former ELIZAVETPOL, now KIROVABAD, the second largest town in the Azerbaian S.S.R.

The town was first founded under Arab rule, in 1245/659 according to the Ta'rikh Bāb al-umāra (V. Minorsky, eds. A History of Skandarbeg, Cambridge 1958, 25 and 57). It is not mentioned by the oldest Arabic geographers like Ibn Khurraḍah-bih and Yākūṭ; it seems to have taken its name from the pre-Muslim capital of Adharbaydjan (now the ruins of Tiflis-i-Sulaymān). Isṭakhrī, 159 and 193, mentions Gandja only as a small town on the road from Bār’dhā (q.v.) to Tiflis; according to him the distance between Bār’dhā and Gandja was 9 farsabh, according to Yākūṭ (i, 132) 16 farsabh. After the decline of Bar’dhā Gandja became the capital of Arrān; the Shaddādīd dynasty ruled here from c. 340/951-2; after it had been overthrown by Sultan Malik Shāh, the latter's son Muhammad was granted Gandja in fief. In 533/1140-9 the town was destroyed by an earthquake in which, according to 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, there perished some 300,000 persons (130,000 according to Ibn al-Athīr), including the wife and children of Kara-Sonkur, amīr of Adharbaydjan and Arrān, who was absent at the time; Demetrius, king of Georgia, sacked the ruined town and carried off one of its gates. 'Imād al-Dīn says that the Georgians built a new town in their country, gave it the name Djanza and set up the lower river. In some areas literacy in Arabic is not uncommon. Protestant and Catholic missions have been at work for more than a century, but there are very few Christians outside Bathurst.

the Turks, who in 966/1558 captured the town itself; invested in Shawwal 104/February-March 1606 by Nâdir Shâh in 1148/1735 it remained after his death under the rule of Khâns who were practically independent, passed at the end of the 19th century into the power of the Kâdîjars and was stormed on the 2nd (i5th) January 1864 by the Russians under Prince Tsitsianov to be definitely ceded to Russia by the treaty of Gulistân [q.v.]. On the 13th (25th) September 1828 Paskevî of the Persian army under 'Abbas Mirzâ in the immediate neighbourhood of the town. Called Elizavetpol by the Russians, it was resumed its old name in 1924, to change it again in 1935 to Kirovabad in honour of the Soviet statesman S. M. Kirov.

The modern town with a population (1959) of 116,000 inhabitants, lies on both banks of the Gandja Çay, a tributary of the Kura. In the older western half of the town, fortifications and the so-called "Tatar" mosque have survived from the time of Shâh 'Abbas; the "Persian" mosque belongs to a later period. The climate is unhealthy and malarial but favourable to the growth of vegetation. Vines, fruit trees, vegetables and tobacco are cultivated in the surrounding countryside; it is also a centre of sericulture.


**GANDJA** [see FULBE].

**GANZA** [see GANDJA].

**GANDO** [see FULBE].

**GANGA**, the Ganges (also Gang [gaŋg] in the Muslim historians of India), the principal river of Upper India [see HIND] which rises in the snows of the Himalaya in the district of Garhâwal in an altitude of some 3100 m., flows through the present provinces of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Bengal, and falls in the Bay of Bengal after a course of about 2500 km., the last 500 km. through the Bengal delta. Above the delta it receives successively the waters of the Râmgângâ, Yamunâ [Dîjamnâ, [q.v.]], Gomâth, Gôgrâ, Sôn, Gandak and Kôsî; above the Dîjamnâ confluence at Prayâg (Allâhâbâd, [q.v.]) it is faster. At the six months commences south of the ruins of Ganges [see LAKÂNIWATI], the westernmost channel which passes close to Murshidâbâd [q.v.] being known in its upper reaches as the Bâghrâthi and in its lower as the Hûglî [q.v.]. The main (eastern) channel, known also as the Padmâ, runs south-east to Gôlândâ where it joins the Bengali Dîjamnâ, i.e., the lower reaches of the Brahma-putra. The confluence forms a broad estuary, narrowing at its mouth into the Ganges, which enters the Bay of Bengal near Noâkkhâli as the most easterly of a number of channels. The delta is fertile in the north, and the swampy Sundarbans (salt, timber for boat-building) form its southern base; the Hûglî is its main commercial channel. Until the construction of the railways the Ganges formed, with its tributaries, a most important traffic artery (J. Renell, *Memoir of a map of Hindostan ...*, London 1793, 335 ff.), its major towns (e.g., Kanawâdi, Allâhâbâd, Faydâbâd, Banârâs, Patnâ, Munger, Râjdînâhâll [q.v.]) having in many cases stone or brick landing stages. Its irrigation waters are extended by the Upper and Lower Ganges canals, with headworks at Hardwâr.

In its lower reaches the fall is no more than from 1 to 3 cm. per kilometre, and hence its course is very liable to change under the weight of monsoon rain-fall; for example, before the Muslim conquest of Bengal the main stream instead of turning south at its present point ran eastwards to Mûldâ and then turned south along the present course of the Mûhâmmâd, running east of Gâwî (cf. E. V. Westmacott in *JASB*, 1875, 7 ff.); the transfer of the Bengal capital from Gâwî to Pândûa in 739/1338-9 was evidently occasioned by such a change, as was a subsequent removal of the court from Gâwî to Tândâ about 850/1446. The differences between the present courses of the Ganges and its deltaic tributaries and those shown on Renell's map (op. cit., facing p. 364; cf. *IA*, facing p. 345 ff.) are striking. For further details of change of course see Hûglî.

To the Hindus the Ganges is a sacred river, having its source in paradise whence it is precipitated on to the earth as the centre of seven streams; this legend, represented in Sanskrit sources in the *Matsyapîrûpa, Vâyuapûra, Râmâyana*, etc., is recounted in al-Bakrî's *K. a.l.-Hind*, Eng. tr. W. Crooke, London 1888, i, 261. Its water has a special ritual purity, either for bathing at the confluences, especially at Allâhâbâd when the sun is in Aquarius, or for drinking (for the express courier which took Ganges water to Muâammad b. Tughulk's court in Dawlatâbâd see Ibn Ba'tûtâ, ii, 96, tr. Gibb, 184; for Akbar's use of Ganges water see Abu 'l-Fâdîl, *Al-în a Akbar*, i, 55; and cf. Tavernier's *Observations sur les voyages*, Eng. tr. ed. W. Crooke, London 1925, i, 95 that the emperor (Shâhdjahan) and his court drink no other. For the Hindu practice of self-immolation in its waters, and casting the ashes of the dead therein, see Ibn Ba'tûtâ, i, 79, iii, 141 f., tr. v. Mîlk, 57; tr. Gibb, 193; V. Minorsky, *Gandzîl on India*, in *BSOAS*, xii (1947-8), 639 f.

**Bibliography:** In addition to the references in the text, see *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, ed. 1908, s.v. Ganges. (J. Burton-Page)

**GANO**, a town in the republic of Mali, situated on the left bank of the Niger (10,000 inhabitants), is one of the oldest commercial centres in West Africa, standing at the point where the caravan route from Timîni reaches the Niger. In older writers, Gâo is referred to under the names Kaukau, Kawkaw, Koomou, Kâwakou and Kounkou. Two etymologies are suggested: according to al-Bakrî (*Description de l'Afrique*, 399), the name Kaukau derives from the sound of tom-toms; Houdas (Ta'rîkh al-Salâdîn, 6, n. 3) suggests that it is an abbreviation of kokoy Korya (the king's town).

Probably founded in about 690 A.D. by the Sôrko Faran fishermen expelled from Kûkia by the Songhai Gâo became an important commercial centre. It is probably the town referred to by al-Khârîzmî (before 218/833) and, in about 258/872, by Ya'qûbî as "Kawkaw, the greatest and most power-
ful of the kingdoms of the Sudan", which would anticipate by some twenty years the date 890 given by Earth as marking the extension of the authority of the Songhai rulers of Kukia over Gao.

Gao was then very much frequented by traders from the Maghrib. Hence it happened that, according to Ibn Khaldûn (Berbères, trans. de Slane, iii, 201), it was at Gao, during one of his father's business journeys, in about 271/885, that ʿAbd ʿAzīz (q.v.), the man known as "the monkey", was born. Al-Muhallabi tells us: "The king of this people sets his subjects the example of the faith of Islam, and the majority of them follow his example. It has a town on the east bank of the Nile (Niger) named Sarna; this town contains markets and merchandise and is regularly frequented by people from all countries. The king also has a town on the west of the Nile where he lives with his nobles and intimates. He has a mosque where he prays, while the people have their own musalli bi between the two madrasas. In his town the king has a palace which no-one lives in except himself and which now harbours only a single eunuch. They are all Muslims. The king and his principal companions wear tunics and turbans and ride horses bareback". These lines, quoted by Y. Kamal (Monumenta Cartographica Africae Occidentalis, trans, de Slane 1859, Algiers 1913, iii, 201), were written in about 385/996, that is to say 15 years before the date given for the conversion to Islam and the settling at Gao of Dia Kossoi (1009-10).

Al-Bakrī (459/1067) describes the division of the town into two quarters: "(Kawkaw) consists of two towns, one is the residence of the king and the other is inhabited by the Muslims. Their king bears the title of Kanda. Like other negroes, they wear a loin-cloth and a jacket of skins or other material, the quality of which varies according to the wealth of the individual. Like the negroes, they worship idols... When a new king mounts the throne, he is given a seal, a sword and a Qurʾān... Their king professes the faith of Islam, they never entrust the supreme authority to anyone other than a Muslim" (Descr. de l'Afr. sept., trans. de Slane 1859, Algiers 1913, 342-3).

In 1393, royal steles of the 12th century were discovered at Sane (9 km. east of Gao). Al-Zuhri (before 545/1150) noted a greater volume of trade came from Egypt and Wargha than through the Tafilelt. Gao was captured by Sagamandia, one of the generals of ʿAbd al-Maʾzūn (Mansa Musa), at the time of the return from pilgrimage of the emperor of Mali (724/1324) who had a mosque with mihrāb built, perhaps on the plans of the poet al-Sāhilī. Dia Assibahl, a vassal of Mali, had to surrender his two sons as hostages. One of them, ʿAll Kolen (the cricket), managed to escape and restored the Songhai empire by depposing the dia Bada who was governing Gao on behalf of the Mali. He was called Sonni (the liberator) and founded the second dynasty which ruled from 739/1339 until 898/1493.

Gao, however, remained a highly prosperous capital and, after his visit in 753/1352, Ibn Battūța stated that it was one of the most beautiful and extensive cities in the Negroes' country, and most abundantly supplied with foodstuffs. But during the 8th/14th century the Songhai were driven back to the former capital of Kukia. It was only in 802/1400 that the Songhai Sultan ʿAbd al-Day Ṣaḥhā (that is, the Giant) passed to the attack and sacked the town of Mali. The last ruler Sonni ʿAll (868/1464-898/1493) or ʿAll Ber (the Great) brought the Songhai empire to its apogee when he captured Timbuctoo (872/1468) and Djenne (877/1472). But it was a period of pagan resurgence and of persecution of the Muslims.

When nominated chief of the Songhai on 21 January 1493, the Sonni Barou refused to adopt Islam; he was compelled to fight against ʿAli Ber's best commander, the Sarakole (Soninke) Muhammad Toure who won a victory (12 April 1493) and took the name Askia (signifying usurper or it is not he). Muhammad Askia (898/1493-934/1528) made the pilgrimage to Mecca (1497-8), and then extended and organized his conquests. He received a visit (907/1502-909/1504) from the reformer al-Maggīlī who had just had the Jewish colonies at Touat (Tuat) massacred.

The 16th century represents the great period of the empire of Gao. The Taʾrīḫ al-Fattālī enumerates 7626 houses, which represents a large town. Leo Africanus, who probably visited Gao at the beginning of the 16th century, related: "Gao is a very large city without walls... the greater part of the houses are ugly in appearance; however, there are some quite handsome and commodious buildings in which the king lives with his court". In 999/1591, the army of the pasha Diawīdhār captured Gao. But, accustomed to the splendours of Morocco, Diawīdhār was disappointed: "the head donkey-driver's house in Marrākūḫ is better than the Askia's palace" (Taʾrīḫ al-Fattālī, 1583, 182).

But dependence on Morocco was soon no more than nominal. In any case, it merely took the form of plundering the educated and bourgeois classes, which explains the utter collapse of Islamic culture. After 1021/1612, the pashas commanding the Moroccan army no longer came from Morocco, but were appointed on the spot by the soldiers. The Arma, half-breed descendants of Moroccans, had difficulty in fighting against the Tuareg who occupied Gao for the first time in 1093/1680, but were driven from it in 1099/1688 by the pasha Mansūr Senebe, who however left no further garrisons there.

Thereafter, decline set in, and in 1184/1770 Gao, following Timbuctoo, was under Tuareg control. At the time of Barth's visit in 1854, Gao was no more than a wretched village with from three to four hundred huts, where only a single partly ruined monument was to be seen, the tomb of the great Askia Muhammad. Although they reached Timbuctoo in 1893, the French military authorities established a base there only in 1899 (Lt.-Col. Klobb). On their arrival, the French found merely a small group of sharīfs called Sherifīla in the neighbour-hood of the Askia tomb.

The peace brought by French rule permitted the intermingling of the various races which nevertheless retained some degree of specialization, with Songhai farmers, Arma artisans, Moorish shopkeepers, Hausa traders and Bambara fishermen and tailors.

Bibliography: R. Basset, Essai sur l'histoire et la langue de Tombouctou et des royaumes de Songhay et Melli, Louvain 1889; Béraud-Villars, L'Empire de Gao, Paris 1943; Boulnois and Bououb Hama, L'Empire de Gao, Paris 1954; Delafosse, Haut-Sénégal-Niger, Paris 1912; Dubois, Tombouctou la mystérieuse, Paris 1897; idem, La Région de Gao, berceau de l'Empire Songhay, in BCAF, 1909, 47 ff.; Dutel, Comparaison entre une généalogie Sonrai de tradition arabe et la généalogie des Askia de Gao donnée par les sources historiques, in Notes africaines, xxv (January 1945), 22-3; R. Mauny, Notes d'archéologie au sujet de Gao, in BIFAN, 1951, 837-52; idem, La tour et la Mosquée de l'Askia Mohammed à Gao, in Notes Africaines, xlvi (July 1950); Capt. Péfontan, Les Armes, in Encyclopaedia of Islam, II 62

GARDIZI, Abû-Sâ‘îd Abû al-Hâvy b. al-Dâhîr b. Mâhmûd, Persian historian who flourished in the middle of the 5th/6th century. Nothing is known of his life. His niṣba shows that he came from Gardiz [q.v.]; since he says that he received information about Indian festivals from al-Birûnî [q.v.], he may have been his pupil. His work, entitled Zayn al-akhbâr, was written in the reign of the Ghaznavid Sultan ‘Abd al-Râshid (440-449/1049-1052). It contains a history of the pre-Islamic kings of Persia, of Muhammad and the Caliphs to the year 423/1032, and a detailed history of Khurâsân from the Arab conquest to 432/1041: no sources are named, but for the history of Khurasan Gardizi must have had access to Khwâjuzâdâ’s romantic history of the Khwâjahs. Khwâjuzâdâ’s history has been mainly following al-Sallâmî [q.v.]; the work includes also a valuable chapter on the Turks, based on the works of Ibn Khurâdâghîbî, al-Diâyânî and Ibn al-Muqaffî [q.v.] (ed. with Russian tr. by W. Barthold, in Oevet o poedvetke v Srednyi Aziiy (Zap. Imp. Akad. Nauk po Ist.-Fil. Otd., i, no. 4), St Petersburg 1897, 78 ff., and with Hungarian tr. by G. Kunn in Kolekt Kudfok, 1898, 5 f. and KS, 1903, 17 ff.), a chapter on India (see E. Sachau, Alberun’s India, London 1888, ii, 360, 397 and V. Minorsky, Gardizi on India, in BSOAS, xii (1948), 625-40), and essays on Greek sciences, chronology, the religious festivals of various peoples, and genealogy.

Only two incomplete manuscripts are known: Bodleian, Ouseley 240, dated 1196/1782, which is a transcript of the Toofan Valley now in the possession of the Peshawar Museum dated 248-857 contains the words fi barr* ‘Uman in the land of ‘Uman’, which appears to refer to the well-known Khwârîjî conceptions beyond the Persian Gulf. The ruler’s name has not been read, but the early date suggests that he must have been one of the princes of Gardiz. The historian Gardizi [q.v.] (Zayn al-akhbâr, ed. Nazim, 11), reports an attack by the Saffâris Yâ’âbî b. al-Layvî on the amir of Gardz, Abû Mansûr Afllab b. Muhammed b. Khâkân in 256/869. In 364/974 Bilgetegn, one of the predecessors of Mahmûd of Ghazni, died whilst he was undertaking a siege of Gardiz. However, the town soon fell into the hands of the Ghaznavids, for during the reign of Sebicukin, in 385/995 according to Barthold, the former was housing political prisoners in the fortress of Gardiz. With the loss of its independence, the historical importance of the town began to diminish. During the Mongol invasion it was the scene of a counter-attack by the Sultan Djâlal al-Dîn upon the Mongol vanguard. The Emperor Bâbur, in his Memoirs, mentions it as a strong fortress, and the scene of a skirmish with the “Abd al-Rahmân Afghans”. Modern research has devoted little attention to Gardiz, and it is remarkable that its earlier rulers are apparently unknown to numismatics.

Guercif was founded towards the middle of the 3rd/9th century by the Banū Abī 'l-‘Āfiya, one of the tribes of the Miknāsa, a Berber people who led a nomadic life in the Moulouya valley. It became the centre of the lands of Māsā b. Abī 'l-‘Āfiya (d. 327/938) and then of his sons who were renowned for their wars with the Idrīsids and Fāṭimid s.

Its commercial and strategic importance was due to its situation at the intersection of two important routes, one from Fez to Tlemcen, the other from Sījdīlmāsā to Melilla. In the middle of the 5th/11th century al-Bakrī described it as an important village with a considerable population (kāra ‘āmira). But after being captured and destroyed by the Almoravid Yūsūf b. Tāḥfīnīn in 473/1080 it lost its former importance; and al-Idrīsī (middle of the 5th/11th century) did not know it.

At the beginning of the 7th/13th century, the site of Guercif was frequented by the Banū Marin, nomadic Berber tribes belonging to the Ẓanātā group. In summer they came down from the high plateaus of the pre-Saharan zone and spent the summer in the lower Moulouya valley. It was at Guercif that they stored their stocks of grain; it was also there that, at the approach of autumn, their tribes met before retreating to their grazing-lands in the Sahara. In 670/1271, taking advantage of the enfeebled state into which the Almohad empire had fallen as a result of the disaster at al-'Ukāb, the Banū Marin settled down along the lower Moulouya and occupied Guercif. It was there that, in 646/1248, they lay in wait for the Almohad army in its retreat from Tlemcen to Fez, and then defeated and routed it. In about 1211/1212, the Banū Marīn became masters of the whole of Morocco. However, on the eastern borders of their empire the Zayyānīd kings of Tlemcen constituted a dangerous enemy. Along with the neighbouring localities of Tawrīrt and Dūbūt (qv.) Guercif formed a march (ṭahlīr), barring access to the interior of Morocco. In 721/1321 the Marinid Abu Sa‘īd had the fortified castle of Murada (15 km. to the north of Guercif) destroyed by Abu ‘l-‘Inān.

After his death (759/1358) Guercif, together with the fortified castle of Murāda (15 km. to the northeast, on the Moulouya) became a fief of the cele- brated Wanzammār b. ‘Arif, chief of the Sūwayd Arabs, who was in command of all the Bedouin tribes supporting the Marinids, and the mentor of the kings of that dynasty. Numerous attacks were made against it by Abū Ḥammū, king of Tlemcen, and the two fortified places were on several occasions captured and sacked.

Later, Guercif lost its military importance when the boundary between Morocco and Turkish Algeria was moved east of Oujda; the Sa‘īdīs and ‘Alawīds preferred Tawrīrt.

From 1912 Guercif was occupied by France and acquired a measure of importance through being at the head of the railway from Oujda. After the line had been extended, first to Taza, then to Fez, the village declined rapidly. With Musouin, it is one of the two centres of the Hawwāra, an important tribe who move with their flocks to summer pasturages and who devote themselves to sheep- rearing.

**Bibliography:** Bakrī, index; Ibn Khaldūn, *Histoire des Berberes*, index; Leo Africanus, ed. Schefer, ii, 229, tr. Epaulard, 259. (G. S. Colin)

**GASPRALI (GASPRINSKI), İSMÂİL**, promi- nent ideological writer of the Turks, more particularly of the Russian Turks, was born in 1851 in the village of Avūł, near Bagḥesārā. His father, Muṣṭafā Agha, was one of the notables of the village of Gaspra, between Yalta and Alupka (whence their family name Gasprali, later Gasprinski), and a graduate of the Military Lycée in Odessa. At the time of the Battle of Sevastopol in 1854 Muṣṭafā Agha settled in Bagḥesārā and sent his son İsmâ’il first to the Zindjīrī Medrese in Bagḥesārāy and later, at the age of ten, to the Simferopol Gymnasion. Two years later İsmâ’il went to the Voronēz Military Lycée and was then transferred to the Moscow Military Lycée. Together with Muṣṭafā Mīrzā Davidović, a Lithuanian Tatar in origin, he attracted the attention of their principal teacher, Ivan Katkov, the famous Pan-Slavist and editor of the newspaper *Moskovskiy Vedomosti*, who invited them every week to his house. At the time of the rebellion in Crete in 1867 the hostility which Katkov showed toward Turkey produced a reaction in these two youths, and they went to Odessa with the intention of serving in Crete as volunteers on the Turkish side. As they had no passports, however, they were arrested and sent back to their homes in the Crimea. İsmâ’il Bey was appointed a teacher in Russian, the study of which was compulsory, in the Zindjīrī Medrese in Bagḥesārāy. He constantly thought of going to Turkey to become an officer; and when he discovered that it was necessary to learn French to do this, he learned French during his four-year appointment at Bagḥesārā. He had, in fact, acquired some knowledge of this language while at the Military Lycée in Moscow. In 1871 he resolved to go to Istanbul; but, seeking to perfect his French, went by way of Vienna to Paris. The results of his observations in Paris were reflected in works which he later published in Russia—especially in his work named *Rüśvā IslāmîLt* ('The Muslim Community in Russia')—and also in a work named *Avrâpa medeniyetine bir nasar-t müsävâne* ('A balanced view of European civilization') which he wrote while still in Paris.

While in Paris he earned his living by working as an translator of advertising and Second empire was to go to Turkey, he did not mix much with the Young Ottoman circles in Paris. Finally in 1874 he went to Istanbul and stayed with his paternal uncle, Süleymān Efendi, who had settled there earlier. He made great efforts to enter the Turkish War College, but when the Russian Ambassador Ignatiev learned of this he brought influence to bear on the Grand Vizier Mâhmd Nedîm Paşa and pre- vented it. After vainly waiting a year, Ismâ’il returned to the Crimea. While in Istanbul he pub- lished non-political articles describing Eastern life for some Russian newspapers appearing in St. Petersburg and Moscow.

Between the years 1874 and 1878 he became familiar with the village life of the Crimean Turks, and described this period of his life in his story * Gün Dogğdu*, published in 1906. In this he refers to him- self under the name "Dâniyâl Bey’. While becoming familiar with the needs of his nation, with education and village life, this Dâniyâl Bey sees the vital need of bringing out a newspaper and making his nation aware of the world. In 1878 İsmâ’il Bey was elected mayor of Bagḥesārāy, and in 1879 he applied to the Czar’s government for permission to bring out a newspaper, but was refused. He thereupon wrote in the Russian-language newspaper *Tavrida*, published in Simferopol, serious political articles pertaining to the Muslims of the Russia Empire. He also published...
occasional collections of articles: Tungud (lithograph, Simferopol); Shefefy and Latfy (Unıszádéler Press, Tıffis); and, later, Ay, Yıldız and Guney. These writings were mostly in the Crimean dialect. In the new law for Russian subject, every expanded a little the articles he had published in Russian in the newspaper Taşvida and published them in the form of a fifty-four page work with the title Russoyoe Muslumanstvo (Russian Islam). This work was a pioneer work relative to the political and cultural problems of the Muslim subject-peoples of the Russian Empire. Although Ismà’îl Bey presented himself in this work as a loyal Russian subject, even speaking approvingly of the salvation of the Russians from Tatar domination, Russian circles believed this to be a device and regarded this work with suspicion. In it he considered the “Turco-Tatars” under Russian rule as a single Russian Muslim community and showed the road by which they might join Western civilization. In the pamphlets which he published in Turkish he pointed out that if the Turco-Tatar group were to remain dispersed the result would be calamitous: he tried to explain that the sole road of salvation for them was to work together to join the new Western civilization by means of their own languages. In the year 1883 he received permission to publish a newspaper named Terdişmân. The Russian title of the newspaper was Pervovolück; and in the first issues the Russian-language section was more important. It explained that it was to perform the role of translator in the matter of spreading Western civilization among the Russian Muslim community. The Turkish-language section gradually expanded and became more serious and later, in 1890, Terdişmân became “the national newspaper concerning politics, education, and literature”. After 1905, it took the name Terdişmân-ı Aşiwi-i Zamân, and at the head of the newspaper was the slogan: “Unity in language, work, and thought”. Finally the part in Russian was abandoned altogether, and the newspaper became the interpreter of the thoughts and aims of the Muslim community in the Russian Empire. All the Turks living in the regions of Kazan, the Caucasus, Turkistan, and Siberia recognized this newspaper as being the disseminator of their national ideas. The deep influence of this newspaper on Turkish intellectual may be judged from the first novel in the Tatar language, entitled Molla Hüsâm al-Din by Mûsâ Akeýgtızâde, published in 1886, from the speeches and gifts of the delegates who came from every part of the Russian Empire on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the appearance of Terdişmân in 1908, and from the increased numbers of newspapers that year.

Ismà’îl Bey married Zehra Khanım, a member of the Akcura (Akcurin) manufacturing family, one of the noble Kazan families. Through this marriage his ties with the Kazan Tatars became close. He was in constant touch with Azerbaijan Turkish writers, Hasan bek Melikov, Unıszáde, Topçabash and others. Muşţáfa Davıdoviç, the Lithuanian Muslim who had studied with him at the Moscow Military Lycée, settled in Bâghçeşaray, where he was mayor for twenty years, helping Ismà’îl Bey in all his enterprises. The work with which Ismà’îl Bey was most occupied was to create modern primary schools for Russian Muslims and to publish textbooks for these. He also wanted to ensure modern methods of instruction by opening teachers’ courses in Bâghçeşaray and other places, and to assure the opening of this type of school throughout the Muslim community of Russia. He himself visited every part of that community, including Tashkent, Bûhkârâ, and Siberia. He set up and printed personally on his own press Kâgâde-i iþbân, Mu’âlimât-ı iþb(130,949),(552,978)

word and other works which he brought out for the primary schools. Together with his wife, Zehra Khanım, and the mayor, Muşţáfa Davıdoviç, he opened a handcraft institute for girls on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the appearance of Terdişmân, an idea which spread to other provinces as well. He brought out the first magazine for women, entitled Àlem-i nisâan, and placed his daughter Shefîka at the head of it. He also published a word concerning women’s rights, entitled Kûhûr-ı Rûhî. Inspired by Shams al-Dîn Sâmî’s Kimâm al-àlîm, he began to publish an encyclopedia for Russian Muslims, but was unable to complete it. He became occupied with problems of language and literature. After the 1905 Revolution he planned a programme especially designed to deal with the problems of instruction and “literary language”. It envisaged that in the first three years of primary school instruction would be carried out in the local Turkish dialects; afterwards, the “common literary language” would become the general language of instruction. His original idea of the “common literary language” was some addition of Ottoman to a language which was mainly Tatar; but the Ottoman influence increased under the influence of those who were working with him, and the result was a simple Ottoman which could be understood by the Muslims of Russia. National Turkish literature, according to Ismà’îl Bey, would consist of novels which would reflect the life of the regions in which the Turks lived and which would incite in them new thoughts and ideals. The supplements named Damîmâ-ı Terdişmân, which he published as additions to Terdişmân in the years 1892-4, and his newspaper Damîmâ-i Târkât Muslûmanları were important in this respect. In language, Ismà’îl Bey earnestly opposed the domination of Arabic and Persian in Ottoman and also the tendency among the Kazan Tatars to take words from Russian, and he put forward the idea of drawing on popular literature for the literary language. His stories Arslan Köşk and Gâdişmâl Biket telling of the 18th century Chinese occupation of Kashgâr, and his writings entitled Bâghçeşarâyân Tâshkende, which included the memoirs of his travels, were serialized in many issues of the Damîmâ. In 1893 he published stories about Bâghdâd Khâhn (q.v.), who played an important role in the history of the Hîghânids. He also published an expanded version of the treatise Târkîlerde úrum ve junân of Bursâl Tābih, publishing some of it—the discussions of Sa’d al-Dîn Taftâzânî, for example—in the Damîmâ.

At first Ismà’îl Bey valued Islam as being useful in preserving for the Turks their national identities but, aside from the “pocket Kur’an”, he did not devote much space to religious publications. After the 1905 Revolution he saw the adverse results of Socialism and Communism, which were beginning to appear in those years in Kazan and Baku, and became frightened of those movements, especially in the face of publications which, opposing the separate political institutions of the Russian Muslims, claimed allegiance solely to the Russian socialist parties, and which made haphazard efforts to impose Russian as the literary language. In the series of articles which he published in Terdişmân under the title “Ikhrîsîkhîyân”, he moved noticeably to the right and began to think of bringing about a cultural unity among Islamic nations. With this aim in mind he wanted to convene a general Muslim
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congress in Egypt in 1907, and, having gone there himself, even began to further this endeavour; but when these efforts did not give the results he had hoped for, he resumed his old activities in Baghche-
saray.

Among the other publications of Isma'il Bey are the Mebad'-i tamedân-i İslâmîyyan-i Rûs, published in 1901, and the twenty-page work Rûs ve Şark anlihamisi, published in Russian (Russko-vostoknoyje soglâšenye) in 1896. Isma'il Bey, having seen the positive results of his efforts, fought in the last years of his life against the excessive bias which viewed Westernization as a form of spiritual suicide for Turks and other Muslims in Russia. Isma'il Bey, carried away with new hopes at the time of the beginning of the First World War, died on 11 September 1914, in his house in Baghche-
saray and was buried there. His son and daughters carried on for a period after his death the publication of the newspa-
per Tergümân which had continued for thirty-one

Bibliography: The biography of Isma'il Bey has been written by Yusuf Akcûra in Türk Yıllı, 1928, 338-46. Cafer Seydahmet also published a fairly large work entitled Gasprals Ismail Bey in 1924. A complete set of Tergümân is preserved in the Leningrad Public Library; outside Russia, some copies of this newspaper may be found in the Helsinki University Library, the Inkilap Library in Istanbul, the British Museum, the Ankara National Library, and in various private libraries. The Centre Russe de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études in the Sorbonne is now collecting micro-
films of all the years of publication of this newspa-
per.

GATE, GATEWAY [see Bâr].
GAUR [see LAKHNAWTI].
GAUR [see KÁFÎR].
GAWILGARH, in the histories also GAWIL, GAWILGHAR, a fortress "of almost matchless strength" (Abu ‘1-Fadl, A’ín-i Akbari, Eng. tr. Jarrett, ii, 237) in Berar, Central India, lat. 21° 20’ N., long. 77° 18’ E., seven kos (about 25 km.) north-west of Elüçpur (Elüçpûr [q.v.]). According to Firishta the fortress was built by Ahmad Shah Writers [see BAH-
MANIS] in 829/1425-6; but from its name it appears to have been a former stronghold of the Gawai chiefs, and it is more likely that Ahmad Shah merely strengthened the fortifications during the year he spent at Elüçpur in the consolidation of his northern frontiers before proceeding to his attacks on the Vidjayanagar kingdom on his south. A Brahman captured in an earlier Vidjayanagar campaign who was received into Islam under the name Faith Allah was sent for service under the governor of Berâr; later, under the Bahmani minister Mahmûd Gâwân, this Faith Allah, with the title ‘Imâd al-Mulk, was himself made governor in 876/1472. The increasing loss of power by the Bahmani sultans to their Baridi ministers in the capital, Bídâr, had led Faith Allah to prepare against possible opposition by strength-
ing the defences of Gâwilghar in 893/1488 (inscription on Faith Darwaza), from which time also dates the rebuilding of the Dâmî Masjid "with the old stones" and Faith Allah’s use of the Vidjayanagar emblems on the gates (see below, Monuments). Two years later Faith Allah assumed independence (see ‘IMâD SHÁH) with headquarters at Elüçpur and the fortresses of Gâwilghar and Narnâl as his strong-
holds, and these remained ‘Imâd Sháh possessions until the extinction of the dynasty in 983/1574 when Berâr became a province of the Nizâm Sháh (q.v.) dynasty of Ahmadnagar. After the cession of Berâr to the Mughals in 1004/1596 Gâwilghar was still held by amîrs of Ahmadnagar, and Akbar’s son Prince Murâd, reluctant to besiege it, made Bálâpur his principal stronghold; two years later, however, it fell to Abu ’l-Faḍl. The description of the sâba of Berâr was added to the A’ín-i Akbari immediately after the cession of Berâr, obviously before the Mughals had had time to reorganize the province, and thus the place given to Gâwil as the largest and richest of the thirteen sârkarâs must reflect the pre-
Mughal administrative division. This division was substantially unchanged in the great scheme of reorganization of the Deccan provinces under Awrangzib as viceroy in 1640/1636. In the Marâthâ troubles in the Deccan in the early 17th/18th century the province was held together by Àsàf Dîhâr-Nâzîm al-Mulk, but on his absence in Dîhî in 1751-78 Berâr with its great fortresses of Gâwilghar and Narnâl was taken by the Bhonsâla Marâthâs. In 1803 Gâwilghar fell to Wellington, but was retained by the Bhonsâla in the treaty which followed; in 1822, however, it was restored to the Nizâm. In 1853 it was assigned to the East India Company, and the fortification and administration of the place was entrusted to the Commissaries.

Monuments. Much of the walling of the fort still remains, with gates and bastions. One fine tall bastion on the west wall, the Burdji-e Bahram, gives its date of repair (1855) by chronogram by Bahârân Khân, governor of Gâwilghar under the Nizâm Shâhs at a time when it was expected that Akbar’s forces would advance. The Dîhî Darwâza is most interesting for its sculptured symbols: the lions with elephants beneath their paws, level with the top of the arch, are devices of the Gond kings, but the two-headed eagles holding elephants in each beak, which lie over the lions, are the ganda-
berurunda symbols of the Vidjayanagar empire; this is the northern gate, which leads to the outer fort built in the 17th/18th century by the Marâthâ Bhonsâlas of Nâgpur. The Dâmî Masjid stands on the highest point within the fort, and in its present form doubt-
less represents the rebuilding by Faith Allah recorded in the inscription on the Fath (south-west) Darwâza; the liwân was three bays deep behind the seven-arched façade, on which was some blue tile decoration in addition to fine stonework, and bore a rich bâddîq on carved brackets; the mihrâb wall has fallen. The most interesting feature, character-
istic of the local style, is the pylon standing at each end of the liwân façade, which bears not a minâr as in the other Deccan styles but a square châtrî with projecting eaves, rich brackets, and djâlî screens in each side. A large walled sahn stands in front of the liwân, with a great eastern gateway. To the north-
east of the great mosque stands a smaller unnamed mosque, similar but supported on octagonal columns.

Few other buildings remain.

Bibliography: Almost the sole source for the history of Berâr is Muhammad Kâsim b. Hindi Shâh Firishta, Gûljân-i Ibrâhîmî, passim. See also T. W. Haig, Inscriptions of Berar, in E.I.M, 1907-8, 10-21; Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report 1920-1, Plate VIIIa; ibid., Report 1922-3, 56-8 and Plate XXl; ibid., Report 1926-7, 36-8; Dispatches of the Duke of Wellington, ... , London 1838, ii, 560 ff. (J. Burton-Page)

GAWR [see LAKHNAWTI].
GAWUR [see KÁFÎR].
extremity of the eastern Taurus. It consists of a vast anticline rising to 7,411 ft./2,262 metres, orientated north-east/south-west in its southern section after the col of Belen, with a structure of palaeozoic sands, with peaty soils. The population consists of Turks and Alawis. Apart from the permanent villages (which are found up to a height of about 3,000 ft./900 metres) there are yaylas (Belen, Sorkun) which in summer are occupied especially by the inhabitants of the coastal towns and villages. The official Turkish name is now Amanos. For the other names, which are very varied, see Streck, art. ALMA DAGH, in El. The most important is the Arabic: Djabal al-Ūkkiām = Turkish Kara dağ, "the black mountain", very probably the origin of the name Akma dağlı used by several European travellers, owing to a confusion with Alma (or Elma) dağlı.

Bibliography: see in general IA, s.v. Gavur dağları (D. B. K) and (on 2) for structure: E. de Vaumas, Structure et morphologie du Fracile-Orient, in Revue de Géographie Alpine, 1951, 469-72; idem, L'Amanas du Dji, Ansarist, étude morphométrique, in Revue de Géographie Alpine, 1954, 633-64; for vegetation: H. Louis, Das natürliche Pflanzenkleid Anatoliens, Stuttgart 1939, 98; among the travel accounts see also Th. Kotschy, Reise in den Amanus, in Petermanns Mitteilungen, 1863, 340 ff. (X. de Planhol)

GAYHAT, Ilkhān [q.v.] from 1291 until 1295, the younger son of Abaka, was raised to power by the leaders of his country after the death of his brother Arghun [q.v.]. He ascended the throne on 23 Rajab 692/12 July 1291, when he also adopted the Buddhist (Tibetan) names Rin-chen rDo-rje "precious jewel"; he was, however, in no way hostile to the Muslims, and he was the only Ilkhān who did not carry out any executions. Earlier, as an official in Asia Minor, he had been renowned for his unbounded liberality; now he squandered the State Treasury within a short space of time, devoted himself to drunkenness and pederasty and—apart from an attack against Asia Minor in 1292—paid no attention to State affairs. In order to prevent financial disaster, Ṣadār al-Dīn Ahmad b. 'Abī al-Razzāk Khālidī (also called Zangjālī), his Finance Minister (Ṣāhib ṭawāf) since 1292, advised him to introduce paper money on the Chinese pattern; the name tāw (from Chinese ts'āu) was retained in Persia [see ČAO]. Since the population was not familiar with this type of currency and since it was not covered by treasury resources, the State finances collapsed in the autumn of 1294 (under circumstances described most dramatically by Rashīd al-Dīn). Gaykhātu was consequently deserted by his armies and troops which he was powerless to advance against him. Three days after his defeat at Hamadān (3 Dijumād 1 694/21 March 1295) he was taken prisoner and executed. The paper money was again withdrawn.—After six months of civil war, his nephew Ghārān [q.v.] succeeded him.

Bibliography: Rashīd al-Dīn, Geschichte der Ilkhān Abīgīh hūsain Gāvārī, ed. K. Jahn, Prague 1941 (The Hague 1957), 81-90; Wajīh, lith. Bombay 1852, iii, 259-84; K. Jahn, Das iranische Papiergeld, in ArO, x (1938), 380-40; B. Spuler, Mongolen, 86-9, 541 (with further data on sources and bibliography). (B. Spuler)
La Turquie d'Asie, iv, 687; C. Frh. v. d. Goltz, Anatolische Ausflüge, Berlin 1896, 74 ff.

(FR. TAEESCHNER)

GEDI or GEDE, a late mediaeval Arab-African town, built on a coral ridge four miles from the sea and ten miles south of Malindi on the Kenya Coast of East Africa. It is shown on sixteenth century Portuguese maps as Quelam, a rendering for the Swahili Kilimani, meaning "on the hill". Gedi is a Gala word meaning "precious", the name which the site acquired in the seventeenth century.

The ruins, excavated during the years 1948-58 and maintained as a National Park, cover an area of forty-five acres, and are surrounded by a town wall. They include a dâmi, seven other mosques, a palace, a number of private houses and three pillar tombs. The excavations have produced large quantities of Chinese porcelain and Islamic faience, and also glass beads.

The single dated monument is a tomb with date 802/1399-1400. The original settlement may go back to the 7th/13th century, but the majority of the structures remaining are unlikely to be older than the 9th/15th century. It may have been destroyed in the early 10th/16th century, but was re-occupied at the end of the century. In the early 17th century it was abandoned as a result of the southern advance of the Galla from Somalia.


GEDIZ CAYI, a river in west Anatolia, the former Hermos; it takes its modern name from Gediz, a place (39°3' N., 29°29' E.) near its source. It rises on Murat Dagi (3212 m.) and in its upper reaches flows through the Lydian mountains.

In its central section the Gediz Çayı traverses the broad plain which is bounded on the south by Mount Sipylos (Manisa Daği), at the foot of which there are the ruins (see p. 459) of Magnesia (the ancient Magnesia). Further along on the southern extremity of this plain lie the towns of Turgutlu (Kasaba) and Salihli which have been connected with Izmir by a railway since 1863. In this plain are also to be found the remains of the ancient Sardes, near Sartköy.

After forcing its way through a ridge of mountains the Gediz Çayı flows past Menemen in the plain near to its mouth in the Gulf of Smyrnia (Izmir). And indeed in ancient times and in the Middle Ages the river-mouth was dangerously near to the old port of Smyrna. Since the land round the river-mouth was continually being enlarged by deposits from the sea and Izmir was in danger of being cut off from the sea, in 1886 the mouth was removed above Menemen, so that it now flows into the more open part of the Gulf. (FR. TAEESCHNER)

GEG [see ARNAWULTU].

GELIBOLU, in English Gallipoli, town on the European coast and at the Marmara end of the Dardanelles (Turkish: Çanak-kale Bogaz [q.v.], in the Ottoman period a naval base and the seat of the kapudan-pasha [q.v.], now an île belonging to the île of Çanakkale; the name derives from the Greek Kallipolis, Kallionpolis, also Kallipolis (for the various forms see E. Oberhumer, in Pauly-Wissowa, x, 1659-60).

When, towards 700/1300, the Turks of Anatolia first concerned themselves with the town, it was one of the greatest and strongest Byzantine fortresses in Thrace and the Peloponnese. L’Émir des Omeyyades et l’Occident, Paris 1957, 69-70, the base, towards 720/ 1320, for all the crews of the Byzantine fleet. In the winter of 704/1304-5, the Catalans in the service of Byzantium were stationed there, and when their leader Roger de Flor was killed in the following year they seized and fortified this strategic position (L. Nicolau d’Olwer, L’expansion de Catalunya en la Mediterrania oriental, Barcelona 1926, passim). Some 500 Turks, led by Edje Khâli, came from Karasli [q.v.] to join them. When these Turks, returning from the raids they had made with the Catalans in Thrace, wished to cross back from the Gallipoli peninsula into Anatolia, they were attacked by the Byzantines (709/ 1309) and obliged to stay there two years longer (P. Wittek, Yassifoglu ‘Ali on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja, in BSOAS, xiv (1952), 639-68, at 662-67). In 731/1331 or 732/1332 Umur Beg [q.v.] of Aydin made an unsuccessful attack on Gelibolu with his fleet, but was able to seize and sack the fortress of ‘Lazgol’ (Lazu?) (Lemerle, op. cit., 70). Enweri (Düstürnâme, ed. M. Khâli [Yînanc], Istanbul 1928, 256-61, and tr. I. Melikoff-Sayar, Le Destan d’Umur Pacha, Paris 1954, 62) states explicitly that this fortress was on the Gallipoli peninsula. If, however, one thinks it might be a small fort in the neighbourhood.

The Ottomans, under the command of Süleyman Pasha [q.v.] and as allies of John Cantacuzenus, in 753/1352 occupied the fortress of Tzyyme in the Ottoman registers and in the wakfîye of Süleyman Pasha, ‘Dînbîl’, north of Gelibolu, and, occupying the whole of the hinterland, cut Gelibolu off from Thrace. In order to maintain pressure on the strong fortress, the Ottomans made an ‘idjê’ here, under the command of Yâkob Edje and Hâzî Fâdîl (‘Aşkipaşâzâde, ed. Giese, 45; tr. R. Kreutel, 77).

While the Byzantines were trying to buy them off (Cantacuzenus, Bonn ed., iii, 278-81; Fr. tr. Cousin, Hist. de Constantinople, viii, Paris 1774, 230-1), a violent earthquake, on 7 Safar 755/2 March 1354, destroyed the walls of Gelibolu (Düstûrname, 82; P. Wittek, in Byzantion, xiii (1938), 220; P. Charanis, in Byzantinosavlica, xvi (1955), 113-7). The Ottomans immediately occupied Gelibolu, and other neighbouring fortresses whose walls had been thrown down. Süleyman Paşa crossed from Anatolia, repaired the citadel, and settled there Turks brought over from Anatolia (Cantacuzenus, loc. cit.). This occupation of Gelibolu made it possible for the Ottomans to install themselves in Europe: Süleyman Paşa made Gelibolu the base for the conquests in Thrace (‘Aşkipaşâzâde, ed. Giese, 47; tr. Kreutel, 80), and Gelibolu became the first centre of the Paşa sandığâli in Rumeli. After Süleyman’s death (758/ 1357), he was succeeded at Gelibolu by Prince Murad (later Murad I); the wakfî-registers mention his palace at Gelibolu (Tapu def. no. 67 [see Ibhit], 426). On 15 Dhu ’l-Hiddâja 767/23 August 1366, the Duke of Savoy, Amaddeo VI, attacked Gelibolu with a Crusader fleet and captured it. The Crusaders handed it over to the Byzantines on 15 Şawwal 768/14 June 1367 (N. Jorga, GÖR, i, 226; idem, Philippe de Mésières, Paris 1896, 334-5). In a speech made in the summer of 773/1371, N. Cydones was urging that Gelibolu must not be returned to the Turks (Ortelius, Invent. Generale, iv, 497, cliv, 1009; R. J. Loemertz, Les recueils de lettres de Demetrius Cydones, Vatican 1947, 112), but finally
Andronicus IV yielded to the Sultan's insistence and returned the fortress to the Ottomans on 14 Rabl' II 778/3 September 1376 (G. Ostrogorsky, History of the Byzantine State, tr. J. N. D. Kelly, Oxford, 1936, 483).

During the reign of Murad I Gelibolu was the regular crossing-point for Ottoman armies, and became also the principal base for the Ottoman fleet. In 791/1389 Murad I transported the army to Rumeli under the protection of the fleet stationed here, and left Yanâli Beg at Gelibolu to protect his line of communications with Anatolia (Nesghi, ed. Taeschner, i, 68). In 796/1392 Venice had sent her fleet to make a threatening demonstration off Gelibolu (N. Jorga, La politique vénitienne dans les eaux de la Mer Noire, in Bull. de la sec. d'histoire de l'Acad. Roumaine, no. 2-4 (1914), 14-5). Indeed, during the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries, to blockade the Strait and destroy the Ottoman fleet at Gelibolu were always two main objectives in the plans of the Crusaders (such a plan had been mooted even before 767/1366: O. Halecki, Un empeure de Byzance à Rome, Warsaw 1930, 63-144; for the plan of 798/1396 see M. Silberschmidt, Das orientalische Problem zur Zeit der Entstehung des türkischen Reiches, Berlin 1923, 145; for the plan of 848/1444 see H. Inalcik, Fatih deersi, . . ., i, Ankara 1954, 12, 30); G. de Lannoy wrote in 825/1422: "Et qui auroit dit chastel et port les Turcs n'aurroit nul seuur passage plus de l'un à l'autre pont; tandis que nos tiles, en Gelibolu, comme perdu et defect!" (Voyages et ambassades de Messire G. de Lannoy 1399-1450, Mons 1840, 117-8).

Bâyezîd I well understood the vital importance of Gelibolu for his imperial policy. He rebuilt completely the ruined citadel and fortified with a strong tower the harbour, which was capable of accommodating large galleys. His aim was to control the Strait (Ducas, ed. Grecu, 43 = Turkish tr. by V. Mirmiroglu, Istanbul 1956, 9; Silberschmidt, 115). In 806/1403, Clavijo saw a great arsenal and docks at Gelibolu and reported that the fortress was full of troops and that there were about 40 ships in the harbour; between the inner and the outer basins there was a bridge with a three-storey tower (presumably that which Ducas mentions) at one end of it to protect the inner harbour. G. de Lannoy, who visited Gelibolu in 825/1422, speaks of a "ville très grande" outside the wall; there was a citadel with eight towers, and a fine large square tower to protect the inner basin. The upper part of this tower was destroyed in 1920 (Kurtoğlu, op. cit., pl. 32). In 1069/1659 Eyhîâî Celebi described Gelibolu as a strong fortress, hexagonal in shape, with 90 (?) towers of hewn stone (Seydihatname, v, 315).

By thus making Gelibolu into a powerful fortress and naval base and by strengthening the fleet (Silberschmidt, 139), Bâyezîd I hoped to establish complete control over the Strait, and compel foreign ships to halt off Gelibolu, undergo inspection and pay a due for the right of passage. But Venice decided to fight for the right of free passage through the Strait. In alliance with Hungary she planned to destroy both the naval base and the Ottoman fleet (Silberschmidt, op. cit., 111-2, 145; F. Thiriet, Règtes des déliberations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie, i, Paris 1896, 852, 868). The Ottoman fleet was not in fact very powerful (Bâyezîd had 17 galleys); it would emerge from the shelter of the strong base at Gelibolu and attack Venetian territory and merchant ships in the Aegean, but only when the Venetian fleet was not at sea; and it could not prevent Marshal Boucicaut from sailing past Gelibolu in 1399, although it seriously hindered Venetian attempts to bring relief to Constantinepol, then under investment by Bâyezîd (see Thiriet, op. cit., ii, Paris 1959, doc. 1023). After the Ottoman defeat at Anchâr (804/1402), the Venetian fleet was ordered to seize Gelibolu (Thiriet, op. cit., ii, docs. 1070, 1078), but the plan was not carried out, and the Ottoman threat continued in the reign of Emir Suleyman, so that Venice was obliged to send warships to protect her merchant ships in their passage through the Strait (Thiriet, op. cit., ii, docs. 1289, 1431). In 812/1409 Emir Suleymân built another fortress (the so-called 'Emir Süleyman Burkozl') at Lapseki on the Anatolian coast, primarily as a protection against his rivals in Anatolia. While the struggle among the Ottoman princes continued, Venice encouraged the Byzantines in their hopes of recovering Gelibolu (Thiriet, op. cit., ii, doc. 1415) and came to an agreement with Moçul Moçul Celebi under the protection of the fleet stationed here, by which he granted her free passage through the Strait. In 817/1414 she was unable to renew this agreement with Mehemmed I (Thiriet, op. cit., ii, doc. 1538), so that Gelibolu became the main object of dispute in Venetian-Ottoman relations. When, in 818/1415, an Ottoman fleet based on Gelibolu attacked Venetian territory in the Aegean, the Venetian fleet, under Pietro Loredano, appeared off Gelibolu and, when the Ottoman fleet rashly emerged from the well-protected harbour, destroyed it (1 Rabî' II 819/29 May 1416; see Jorga, GOR, i, 372). Makrîzî (al-Sulûk il-mârîsîfat dusul al-mulâk, MS. Istanbul, Fatih 4380, fol. 66a) mentions that the Venetians captured 12 ships (Venetian sources say 14, Ducas says 27) and killed 4000 Muslims. In spite of this victory, Venice was unable to achieve control of the Strait and remained obliged to convoy her merchant ships (see Thiriet, op. cit., ii, docs. 1667, 1708, 1749, 1853, 1866). During the peace negotiations of 822/1420 Venice endeavoured above all to obtain freedom of passage past Gelibolu and exemption from tolls (Thiriet, ii, doc. 1750). In the Venetian-Ottoman war of 826/1425-834/1430 (for possession of Salonica/Selanik [q.v.]), Venetian attacks were mainly aimed at Gelibolu (see Thiriet, ii, docs. 1931, 1949; Jorga, GOR, i, 403; idem, Notes et extraits . . ., 2nd series, i, Paris 1899, 374). When her merchant ships were seized, the Venetian fleet under Silvestro Mocenigo launched an attack on the inner harbour: Mocenigo broke through the 'palisade' of the bridge and penetrated the inner harbour, but was obliged to retire (Jorga, Notes et extraits . . ., i, 505-6; Tarihi takvimler, tr. J. Hussey, Oxford 1956, 483); the aim of the Venetians was to destroy once and for all the Ottoman fleet (see Thiriet, op. cit., ii, docs. 1789, 2212; Jorga, GOR, i, 409). At about this time the Emir Süleyman Burkozl at Lapseki was destroyed on the orders of Murad II, for fear that it should be occupied by the enemy (Tarihi takvimler, 26; according to Ducas, 149 = Turkish tr., 67, this occurred in 1447). In 824/1422 the authorities at Constantinople hoped that the struggle for the throne between Murad II and his uncle Mustafâ would enable them
to recover Gelibolu by negotiation, but neither of the rivals was willing to relinquish control of this important base (see IA, art. Murad II, 599-601). In the whatever war with Venice broke out (winter of 868/1463-4), two strong fortresses, named Kılıl al-bahr and Kal-ei sultaş-
niye, were built on opposite sides of the Strait towards the Aegean end, and an arsenal and harbour were constructed in Istanbul at Kapidîrga Lümalân (see IA, art. Mehmed II, 523); nevertheless Gelibolu remained the principal naval base of the Empire (Iorga, Notes et extraits, iv, Bucharest 1925, 330) until superseded by the great arsenal and base constructed on the Golden Horn in 922/1515 (F. Kurtoglu, op. cit., 57-8). When the Venetian fleet attempted to gain control of the Strait during the war for Crete, two more fortresses were built at the Aegean entrance to the Strait, Seddüb-i-bahr (Sadd al-bahr) and Kum-kales, also called Khaşâniyye and Sultaşâniye (Naftmâ, iv, 420; Silâhâdar, i, 118). By this time, according to Ewliya (v, 317), Gelibolu had lost its former military importance and counted as 'iç-el'.

When the Ottomans first occupied Gelibolu, the upper class of the Greek population fled by ship to Constantinople (Diştürnâme, 83). Those that remained settled in the area known as Eski Gelibolu and the nearby village of Kozlû Dere. The tabir-register of 879/1474 (Cevdet O 79, see Bibli.) shows the Greeks of Gelibolu organized into two principal djemä'at, the kürbükâyân (rowers) and the senbekeryân (arbalettes); of the latter, a group of 35 served in the citadel and a group of 22 in the 'tower'. A further 95 Greeks were organized into various djemä'at for ship-building and repair, and for the maintenance of the galleys. Some of these were paid a daily wage, others were recompensed by exemption from the kharâj, ispendje and 'awârid-i divânîye. The register of 925/1515, however, shows that all the members of these djemä'at were by then Muslims. It shows the Greeks living in six mahâalles, and records also 80 Greeks as 'bâyâmine', organized in five djemä'at: these are presumably migrants who had been able to settle at Gelibolu.

After the occupation, Gelibolu developed as a typical Ottoman city. The population at various dates, as revealed by the tabir-registers, was:

879/1474 39 mahâalles comprising 1055 households (khiine)
924/1518 55 mahâalles comprising 1303 households
1009/1600 58 mahâalles (four of them Christian and one Jewish).

Each mahâalle was usually named after the founder of the mosque which served it: most of these founders belonged to the military or to the theological class (e.g., Hasan Paşa, Şarûdu Paşa, Ahmed Beg, Kapudan, Hâddîdî Dîzdar, Shâycîh Mehemd, 'Ali Fakih, Mûtewwilli Khoshadî, etc.); some were merchants (Keçêçî Hâddîdî, Weled-i Xllaladînî, Khâdîja Hamza); the founder of the Hâddîdî Khîdr mosque (Tapu def. 67, 509) was presumably the Hâddîdî Khîdr who had accompanied Süleyman Paşa into Rumeli. According to Ewliya Celebi there were in his day some 300 two-storied houses in the fortress; outside the walls the city, with most of the principal buildings to the west, contained seven or eight hundred fine two-storied houses. The population in the middle years of the 19th century was 12-17,000 (N. V. Michoff, La population de la Turquie et de la Bulgarie, iv, Sofia 1935, 58, 94, 112, 128).

According to a register (Tapu def. 12), at the end of the reign of Mehmed II the principal buildings were: (1) the mosque of Hâddîdî Khudâwendârî (Murad I), also known as Eski Kehf; (2) with a bath (hammâm) and a shop (dükânîm) among its wakf properties; (2) the zâîüye and mosque of Karâdja Beg, built by the close associate of Emir Süleyman, who was killed with him (Hammer-Purgstall, i, 349; on his grave-stone at Gelibolu he is called Hâddîdî Karâdja b. 'Abd Alâh and the date of his death is given as the first decade of Shâwâl 924/1518); (3) the 'îmârât (with inscription dated 840/1436) and medrese of Şarûdu Paşa, who was beglerbegi of Rumeli until 840/1436, when he was dismissed and banished to Gelibolu (see H. Inalcik, Fatih davri ..., i, 86; Sa'd al-Dîn, i, 374): he appears as saqâjâbeg of Gelibolu until the winter of 847/1443; the wakf properties of his foundations were, at Gelibolu, a bezâsiyât, a hârûnsâray, 96 shops, a bath and two abattoirs (see M. T. Gökbelgin, Edirne ve Paşa Livâdâs, Istanbul 1942, 248); (4) the zâîüye and mosque of Khâûs Ahmed Beg (b. 'Abd Alâh), an officer of Murad II; his wakfâyî (reproduced in M. T. Gökbelgin, op. cit., 257-61) is dated Shâwâl 863/August 1459; among the endowments he made were several shops and fields and a hârûnsîray beside the quay at Gelibolu; for the property-guants (temîlîk) made by Murad II there are deeds of con-
firmation (mukarrer-nâme) issued by Mehmed II in 886/1482 and by Bâyezid II in 886/1481; (5) the medresse of Balaban Paşa; the wakfâyî (Gökbelgin, op. cit., 223), dated 846/1442, endows the medresse with a bath and some shops; (6) the zâîüye and türbe of Gûveyî (Gûvey = Dâmdâ) Sinân Paşa, the husband of Bâyezid II's daughter 'Ayyahe ('Ayyahe) Khatun; as beglerbegi of Anatolia he played a part in bringing Bâyezid II to the throne; in 907/ 1501 he was beglerbegi of Rumeli, and from then until his death in 909/1503 was governor of Gelibolu and Kapudan (Sa'd al-Dîn, ii, 220-1); the zâîüye, of which the ruins survive, was built in 896/1491; the türbe was, in Ewliya's day, a place of pilgrimage.

These and several other similar religious foundations, and the gates, bazaar, markets, and shops, whose revenues supported them, promoted the development of Gelibolu as one of the chief cities of the Ottoman Empire. This development was most pronounced during the reign of Murad II, but important buildings were added in later years, such as the mosques of Meslih Paşa [q.v.] and of Ahmed Paşa (941/1534). Ewliya Celebi credits Gelibolu with 164 mosques, zâîüyes and tekkes, 14 'îmârâts, 900 shops and 8 baths. The tekkes of Yazidiyzade Mehemd [q.v.] and of the Mewlewl order (detailed description in Ewliya, v, 318) were especially famous. Gelibolu, known as 'Dar al-mudâjdîhindî', remained the principal naval base and arsenal of the Empire until the 10th/16th century, so that a high proportion of its population consisted of fighting men. The register of 897/1494 shows the sailors organized in 4 djemä'ats: captains (re'isî) and 'azebîs of (1) the galleys (kaptîrga), (2) the galleots (galyata), the 'bâyîks' (at this period a bâyik was a transport big enough to take 14 horses), and (4) the horse-transports (at gemilerî). Each djemä'at was divided (like the djemä'at of the Janissaries [see YENİ CEHR]) into a number of bôlûks [q.v.]. The djemä'at of the galleys comprised 24 bôlûks: the first, that of the kohâr (of which contained also, in two separate djemâ'at, 7 'inâ'îsî [see MIHTER] and 5 non-Muslim 'kumîs' [from Latin comes, Greek kôpîs, officer in charge of the galley-slaves, see Tietze and Kahane, The Lingua Franca in the
Levant, Urbana 1958, no. 789; these were mostly non-Muslims, Greeks or Genoese); it was headed by the kapudan and a ser-oda, the rest being ‘azbes, i.e., seamen. Each of the other bôliûks was similarly composed of a râfs (captain), a ser-oda, a kümi, and a number of ‘azbes. The captains and ‘azbes were all Muslims (a captain named ‘Frenk Ilyas’ is presumably a convert). The dîjmed’at of the galleys comprised 1112 men, and the division into 92 bôliûks shows that the strength of the fleet at that time was 92 galleys. There were 5 bôliûks in the dîjmed’at of the galleys (hence 5 in number) and 11 in that of the hayûks. In the register of 925/1519 we find 93 bôliûks in the dîjmed’at of the galleys, and very little change in the organization. At the time of the Malta campaign of 973/1565, the construction of a new arsenal was begun (Mükûmmîm register no. 5, p. 183; I. H. Uzunçarsîh, Osmanlı devletinin merkez ve bahriye teşkilâtı, Ankara 1948, 395, n. 3).

Besides these naval crews, there were the garrisons of the citadel (bâlîl), consisting in 879/1474 of 56 men (27 with timârs, 29 with ‘ülûfe), and of the ‘tower’, consisting of 42 men (9 with timârs, 33 with ‘ülûfe). The dîjmed’ats of Christians who rendered service as arbalers or in the upkeep of these fortresses numbered 60-65 men.

The first oğlab of ‘âdami oğhlans [q.v.] was established at Gelibolu. In the roth/16th century they numbered between four and five hundred, and served on the transports plying between Gelibolu and Cardak.

Particularly in the 9th/15th century, Gelibolu was the most important point on the great trade-route between Crimia (via Mîkhâli-C—Bigha—Lapseki or Cardak) and Rumeli (see H. Inalcîk, in Belleten, xxiv/93 (1960), 55). From Gelibolu the Florentines carried the silk which they had bought in Bursa (‘Barbàrossa’) to their markets and to the Venetians. In 940/1533 Khayr al-Dîn Pasha (an Ottoman vassal of the Serbs) was made kapudan pasha at Gelibolu, that of 925/1519, eight. At about this time 15 Jewish families had come from Istanbul to settle here as merchants. In the reign of Mehemmed II there were also Venetian trading-houses (Hedîy, op. cit., ii, 328).

Before the capture of Constantinople, Gelibolu was one of the principal customs-houses of the Ottoman Empire. Under Mehemmed II theîdîvâtsa [q.v.] of the Gelibolu customs was included in that of the customs of Istanbul. The customs levied at all harbours from Edîv-oevasi to Tekfur-daghî (Rodosto) were farmed out as a separate mêkhîba; in about 880/1475 the ‘Gelibolu customs’ brought in some 9000 gold ducats (about 400,000 akbas) a year (F. Babinger, Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Tacopo de Promontorio-de Campis ..., Munich 1957 [SBBAyr.Ak., 1950/8], 63); in 1009/1600 it brought in 766,663 akbas (Muafaqât register 141 [see Bibli.]; Ewliya Çelebi (v, 316) gives a similar figure—700,000 akbas—for 1069/1658-9. But by this time the port was declining, and the French consulate there was closed in 1100/1689. Customs dues (for the rates see M. T. Gökbildîn, in Belleten, xxv/78 (1956), 252). Every foreign ship, after being inspected at Istanbul, was inspected again at Gelibolu before passing out into the Mediterranean and issued with an âdijem tetherkresi (‘clearance’); in about 1091/1680 the charge for this ‘âdijem-i sêfîne’ was about 100 kurush; the revenue from these charges amounted in 1009/1600 to 610,000 akbas. By article 29 of the French capitulation of 1153/1740, ships inspected at Istanbul were relieved from the obligation to be inspected again at Gelibolu.

Gelibolu served also as the principal control-point for traffic between Rumeli and Anatolia. A traveller going in either direction was obliged to obtain from the kapudan of his starting-point a ‘chit’ (tâdefhir) attesting the purpose of his journey and produce it to the authorities at Gelibolu. The ‘peedjiik resmi’ [see Pendik], levied on enslaved prisoners-of-war being transported from Rumeli to Anatolia, was collected at Gelibolu by the ‘peedjiik emini’. Gelibolu was also a centre for the slave-trade. Here too a tax of four akbas a head was levied on sheep and goats being taken from Rumeli to Anatolia; this tax brought in 66,499 akbas in 1009/1600. There was an additional levy of 80 akbas per thousand sheep, which was assigned to the hâss of the sandjak-begi.

The chief exports from Gelibolu were wheat (see A. Refik, Onalınce asrîda İstanbul hayâtı, İstanbul 1935, 82), cotton, fish, wine and arack (îdâm, Hicri onêmesî asrîda İstanbul hayâtı, İstanbul 1930, 119), bows and arrows, and naval stores such as cables and sails. In 1009/1600 the ‘municipal’ taxes, which were assigned to the hâss of the sandjak-begi, amounted to 15,000 akbas from îsîntâb (see Bâsra) dues, 12,000 akbas from niyaçet [q.v.] dues, and 3,500 akbas from the îmân (see Bibli.).

Until 940/1533 Gelibolu was the chef-lieu of a sandjak belonging to the beglerbegi of Rumeli (see M. T. Gökbildîn, in Belleten, xxv/78 (1956), 252). As commander of the fleet, the sandjak-begi of Gelibolu held a position of especial eminence among the other sandjak-begis: his hâss approached in value the hâss of a beglerbegi (500,000 akbas early in the reign of Sûleyman I, 605,000 later in that reign). The post of sandjak-begi was often given to prominent statesmen—dismissed viziers or beglerbegis, or pasha with the rank of beglerbegi. When in 940/1533 Khayr al-Dîn Pasha [q.v.] (‘Barbàrossa’) was appointed both beglerbegi of Algiers and Kapudan Pasha [q.v.], Gelibolu was incorporated in this beglerbegili; later it became the chef-lieu of the eyâlet of Diyarbaşî-î Bahri-i Safîd [q.v.], i.e., the ‘Pasha-sandjak-begi’ of the Kapudan Pasha (see Eyâlet, Sandjak). According to the register of 1009/1600, the nâzîyes of the sandjak were: Gelibolu and Erevshe (together), Lemnos, Taşhoz (Thasos), Mîglakara (Malkara) and Harala (together), Abri, Keshan, Ipsala, Gümülûjine. In the time of ‘Ayn-i ‘Ali (Kâwûnîn, İstanbul 1280, 20 = German tr. by P. A. von Tischendorf, Das Lehrwesen ..., Leipzig 1872, 70 f.) it contained 14 ze’âmets and 85 timârs, in the time of Ewliya Çelebi (v, 316), 6 ze’âmets and 122 timârs.
During the confinement there of the pseudo-Messiah Shabbetay Sebi [q.v.] in 1666, Gelibolu briefly became a place of pilgrimage for his Jewish disciples.

By the new provincial law of 1281/1864, Gelibolu became a sandjak (liwa?) of the vilayet of Edirne, containing in 1287/1870 six kadás: Gelibolu, Sharköy, Ferejik, Keshan, Malkara and Enoz (Edirne sânamesi, 1271). The sandjak was later reduced in size, to comprise only the three kadás of Keshan, Mürtefe and Sharköy (Edirne sânamesi, 1309). The town is now the centre of an ilçe, population (1960) 12,945.

Bibliography: (1) Defter-i esâmi-i sandjak-i Gelibolu (awâ'il Shawwâl 879/[February 1475], Istanbul, Belediye Library, Ceved collection no. 79 (a muhâfâz register, lacking at the end the section on Malkara); (2) Gelibolu sandîgî muselûman ve piyâdegân defterleri (the tahrir of 879/1475), Istanbul, Bâşvekâlet Arşivi, Tapu defteri no. 12; (3) Gelibolu sandîgî muselûman ve piyâdegân defterleri (Dhu 'l-Kâda 925/[November 1519]), Istanbul, Bâşvekâlet Arşivi, Tapu defteri no. 67 (the hâmân-nâme at the beginning of this register has been published by O. L. Barkan, Kanûnlar, Istanbul 1963, 240-2); (4) Gelibolu sandîgî muhâfâz tahrir defterleri (Dhu 'l-Kâda 932, fols. 11-12) is more detailed); Samuel Yemshel, Tahrir defteri, published by Barkan, op. cit., 235-6; (5) Gelibolu sandîgî muhâfâz tahrir defterleri, Ankara, Tapu ve Kadastros Umûm Mûdürülüğü, Eski Kayıtlar dairesi, muhâfâz def. no. 141 (with a hâmân-nâme at the beginning); (6) Defter-i işmâlî-i Gelibolu, as (5), no. 293 (defective at the end).


GEMÎLK, the ancient Kios, a small port in north-west Anatolia, 40° 25' N., 29° 9' E., on the Gulf of Gelibolu, an inlet on the Sea of Marmara, at one time situated on the road leading from Bursa to the port of Yahova; a kadâ in the vilayet of Bursa, at one time in the liwa of Kudâlûndwânkâr (Bursa) of the eyâlet of Anadolu. Population in 1960: the town, 12,640, the iîçe 30,073, before the first world war mostly Greeks (the modern Greek name of the town is Kio). By the time of Oğhûmân, probably towards the end of his life, Gemlik had apparently already come under his sway, being the last of his conquests.

Bibliography: Kâbit Celebi, Dîhihnâmûn, Istanbul 1145, 658; V. Cuinet, La Turquie d'Asie, iv, 141; Ch. Samy Fraschery, Kâmin al-âalam, v, Istanbul 1314, 388 ff. [Fr. Taeschner]

GENEALOGY [see KARAM]

GENEROSITY [see KARAN]

GENIE [see DÎNN]

GENIL [see SHANLI]

GENIZA, a Hebrew word of the same Persian origin as Arabic djanâza, designates a place where Hebrew writings were deposited in order to prevent the desecration of the name of God which might be found in them. As a term of scholarship, Geniza, or Cairo Geniza, refers to writings coming from the store-room of the "Synagogue of the Palestinians" in Fustât [g.] and, to a small extent, from the cemetery al-Basâtîn near that ancient city. When the synagogue was pulled down and rebuilt in 1889-90, a good deal of the manuscripts preserved in its Geniza were dispersed and acquired by various libraries in Europe and the United States, until, in 1960, Solomon Schechter brought the bulk of what remained to the University Library, Cambridge, England, where it forms the famous Taylor-Schechter Collection.

Naturally, it was mostly Hebrew literature which gained from these treasures. Paul E. Kahle's book with the somewhat misleading title The Cairo Geniza (second edition, New York 1960) deals exclusively with this aspect. For Islamic studies, it is mainly the documentary material, such as letters, accounts, court records, contracts etc., which is of immediate interest. Most of these documents come from Fâtimid and Ayyûbid times; there is little from the Mamlûk period; but from the 10th/16th century onwards, the Geniza was again used somewhat more frequently, albeit in a sporadic way. This article is concerned with the "classical Geniza", the three hundred years between 354/965 and 663/1265 approximately.

The major part of the documentary material of the Cairo Geniza is written in Arabic language, though in Hebrew characters. Business letters were invariably and family letters generally written in Arabic, and the same applies to court records and other legal documents with the exception of writs of divorce, deeds of manumission and the formal—parts of marriage contracts. Only subjects related to religion or the life of the Jewish community were largely, but by no means exclusively, transacted in Hebrew. As to the number of the Geniza documents preserved, if we disregard mere scraps and confine ourselves to complete pieces and fragments which are self—contained, meaningful units, we arrive at a total of about ten thousand items.

In addition to Egypt itself, Tunisia and Sicily are conspicuously represented in the Geniza. This has its reason in their prominence in Mediterranean trade during the first half of the 9th/11th century and the migration of many Maghrûbûs to Egypt in the second half (see S. D. Goitein, La Tunisie du XI siècle à la lumière de l'Édiction de la Geniza du Caire, in Études d'Orientalisme . . . Lévi Provençal, 1962, 559-79). Most of the Geniza letters dealing with the India trade come from the 6th/12th century, but here
again we find that the majority of the Mediterranean merchants active in South Arabia and India were Maghrībis (see idem, Letters and documents on the India trade in medieval times, in IC, xxxvii (1963), 188-205). Spain is only sparsely represented during the 5th/11th century (see E. Ashtor, Documentos españoles de la Genizah, in Sefarad, xxiv (1964), 41-80), and somewhat more generously during the 6th/12th, but Spanish products loom large in the Geniza papers and so do persons called ‘Andalusī’, although many of these seem to have originated in countries other than Spain. There is some correspondence from Palestine and the cities on the coast of Lebanon and Syria, but very little from Damascus and other Syrian and Mesopotamian cities and next to nothing from Baghdad. On the other hand, thousands of responsa (fatwās) and a number of letters of the heads of the two Jewish academies of Baghdad have been found in the Geniza. Most of them were addressed to places in Tunisia and Morocco, but were preserved in Fustat, partly because they were copied there before being sent on to the West and partly because they were brought back by immigrants from the Magrib. Still, the discrepancy between the abundance of official correspondence with Baghdad and the almost complete absence of business and private letters is not easily explained. A few Persian items (see D. S. Margoliouth, A Jewish Persian lan-
report, in JQR, xii (198-92), 67 (there are more)), and one or two beautifully written Arabic letters from Iran have also been found.

Material in Arabic characters also made its way into the Geniza, either because blank reverse sides of Arabic documents were used for Hebrew writings, or because the persons concerned were Jewish, or for no apparent reason. Much of this material is dispersed all over the various Geniza collections. In the Cambridge University Library some of it was put aside in boxes labelled ‘Mohammedan’, which is, however, somewhat inaccurate, since most of the documents contained in them concerned Jews. There are a number of pieces from the Fatimid chanceries (see Bibl.) as well as a variety of material on widely different topics: two Christians lease from a Muslim two-thirds of his vegetable garden (19-20, vegetables to be grown are specified) on the outskirts of Alexandria; an archer (ahab al-rumāl) in prison requests his commander to work for his release; a funduk, or proprietor of a caravanserai, undertakes to transport to the sīna‘a, the customs station on the Nile at Fustat, all consignments for which no customs had been paid, whether brought to his own funduk or to any other in the city; a tax-farmer makes a contract with a representative of the caliph al-Mustansir; the al-sīda al-fubāda are requested to give a fatwā in a disputed case of inheritance, etc. Jews also corresponded sometimes with each other in Arabic characters. When a schoolmaster writes a complaint to a father about his son in this way, he certainly did so because he did not want the boy, who thus far had learned only the Hebrew letters, to read it. When a scholar boasting of his Jewish learning asks a notable for financial help in a letter written in Arabic characters, he followed that course because he knew that the addressee was more fluent in Arabic than in Hebrew (there is an express statement to this effect). However, even a letter addressed to the Gaon, or head of the Jewish academy of Jerusalem, and dealing exclusively with communal affairs, is written in Arabic characters.

Research on the Geniza documents began imme-

diately after their discovery in the eighteen-nineties. A survey of the widely scattered publications is contained in S. Shaked (see Bibl.). Jacob Mann’s work, although intended to serve Jewish history, is important for Islamic studies as well, and so are the publications of S. Assaf and D. H. Baneth, which are, however, all in Hebrew. The importance of the Geniza documents for the economic, social and cultural history of mediaeval Islam, as well as for the history of the Arabic language, is being more and more recognized. Joshua Blau, A Grammar of mediaeval Judoæo-Arabic, Jerusalem 1961, is a mine of linguistic information, and, albeit in Hebrew, can be used with profit also by scholars not familiar with that language, since each paragraph has also a name in English and consists mainly of examples culled from the Geniza and similar sources. E. Ashtor is completing a book on prices in mediaeval Islam, based largely on the Geniza. N. Golb has prepared an edition of the magnificent series 18 J of the Taylor-Schechter Collection with an English translation and commentary. S. D. Goitein has written two volumes containing a general survey of the Geniza material under the title A Mediterranean society: The Jewish communities of the Arab world as portrayed in the Cairo Genizah, accompanied by a volume of selected translations in English, called Readings in Mediterranean social history. His col-
lection of Geniza papers dealing with the India trade amounts now to 315 items. M. Michael is preparing an edition of letters emanating from or addressed to Nahray ben Nissim, a prominent Kayrawānī merchant scholar and public figure who was active in Egypt in the second half of the 5th/11th century. Muhammad El-Garbi of Cairo University is preparing a selection in Arabic characters of Geniza documents written in Hebrew script.

The Geniza contains also a consider-able number of fragments of Judoæo-Arabic literature (see, e.g., the series of articles The Arabic portion of the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge, in JQR, xv-xvi (1902-4), by H. Hirschfeld), and some items from Islamic Arabic literature, which might not have been preserved otherwise, e.g., a manual of correspondence prepared for Muhammad al-Dawla ʿAll b. Naṣr (cf. D. S. Margoliouth, Eclipse, Index g3), publ. by Richard Gotthiel in BIFAO, xxxiv (1933), 103-28, under the title Fragments from an Arab Commonplace book, or A Muhammedan book of augury in Hebrew characters, publ. I. Friedlaender, in JQR, xix (1907-8), 84-102. Cf. also H. Hirschfeld, A Hebrew-Sufic poem, in JASO, xlix (1929), 168-73, and the literature on the subject noted by S. M. Sterin, in JQR, 1 (1960), 356, n. 21.

Bibliography: S. Shaked, A tentative bibliog-
graphy of Geniza documents, Paris-The Hague 1964; S. D. Goitein, The Documents of the Cairo Geniza as a source for Mediterranean social history, in JASO, lxxx (1960), 91-100; idem, Studies in Islamic history and institutions, Leiden 1965, chapters XII- XVIII; Jacob Mann, Tests and studies, Philadelphia 1935; R. Gotthiel and W. H. Worrell, Fragments from the Cairo Genizah in the Freer Collection, New York 1927; A. Merx, Documents de paléographie hebraïque et arabe, Leiden 1894; David Kaufmann, Beiträge zur Geschichte Aegyptens aus jüdischen Quellen, in ZDMG, li (1897), 436-52; idem, Letter sent to Constantinople by Alfaḍhā’s ex-minister of finance, in JQR, x (1897-8), 430-44; J. H. Green-
tone, The Turkoman defeat at Cairo, by Solomon ben Joseph ha-Kohen, in ASJSL, xxii (1905-6), 144-75; E. J. Worman, Forms of address in
Genizah letters, in JQR, xix (1907-8); I. Goldziher, Formules dans les lettres de "Guenata", in REJ, iv (1908), 54-7; E. Ashkenazi, Le coût de la vie dans l'Asie centrale, in JESHO, iv (1961), 56-77; idem, Matériaux pour l'histoire des prix dans l'Égypte médiévale, in JESHO, vi (1963), 158-89; idem, Le coût de la vie en Palestine au moyen âge, in Eretz Israel, vii (1964), 154-64; S. M. Stern, An original document from the Fatimid chancery concerning Italian merchants, in Studi ... Levi Della Vida, ii, Rome 1956, 529-38; idem, Three petitions of the Fatimid period, in Oriens, xv (1962), 172-209; idem, Studies in Ibn Qusam IV, in Andalus, xvi (1951), 411-21; Sophie Walzer, An illustrated leaf from a lost Mamluk Kitāb wa-Dinmah, in Ars Orientalis, ii (1957), 503-5; Abdul-Jalil Badria Abdul-Kader, A new Epistolarium Arabicum in bisheyen, in M. A. I. (Ithaca, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1962). (S. D. GOETEIN)

GEOMETRY [see DJUGHRĀFYA]

GEOGRAPHY [see Raml]

GEOMANCY [see Mandasa]

GEORGIA [see Kurd]

GERDEK RESMI [see 'Arūs resmi]

GERMİYAN-OGHULLARI. Germiyan, at first the name of a Turkoman tribe, was afterwards applied to a family, then to an amirate. Mentioned from the 6th/12th century in the history of the Anatolian Turks, the Germiyan appeared for the first time in 636-7/1239 in the reign of the Saltukid Ghiyath al-Dīn Kaykhusraw II; at this time the Germiyan Muẓaffar al-Dīn b. 'All Shīr, installed in the region of Malatya, was sent at the head of a troop of Kurds and Germiyan against the Turkoman rebel Baha b. Kutb al-Dīn. After the execution of Ghiyath al-Dīn Kaykhusraw III by the Mongols in 682/1283, and the accession of Mas'ud II, it seems that the Germiyan sought to break their bonds of vassalage towards the Saltukids and to proclaim their independence. The downfall of Mas'ud, however, put an end to the hostilities between the Germiyan and the Saltukids, as is revealed by an inscription in the mosque of Kızıl Báb at Ankara, dated 699/1299, according to which Yaṣūk b. 'All Shīr, whose possessions at that time extended up to this town, declared himself a vassal of 'Alla' al-Dīn KaykobĀd III. This Yaṣūk b. 'All Shīr was the founder of the amirate of Germiyan, under the nominal suzerainty of the Saltuk Sultan and the Mongol Ilḫān; the breakdown of the central power was progressively to give him complete independence. According to al-'Umari he was the most powerful of the Turkish amirs; he led a princely life and surrounded his amirate with ostentation over the neighbouring amirs, many of whom, such as his former subhāgh Mehmed Beg Aydınlı-oğlu, had at first waged war in his name before becoming independent; the Byzantine emperor paid him an annual tribute of 100,000 pieces of gold. The amir of Germiyan, whose capital was Kütahya, occupied the greater part of the ancient Phrygia, according to Gregorios (i, 214); his sovereignty extended to the region of Toğruflu-Lâdik, which was governed by a member of his family, and to that of Karabsahr, where his son-in-law was amir; Pachymeres (ii, 426, 433, 435) attributes to him possession of Tripoli on the Menderes, and al-'Umari that of Gümüşhâne (not to be confused with the town of the same name in northern Capadocia) where there were important silver and alum mines, and of Sivri-Köy, a rice-producing region; the conquest of the regions of Smav and Kula, regained by the Catalans and then reconquered by his son Mehmed, is attested by the inscription of the madrasa of Yaṣūk b. Kütahya; Yaṣūk b. 'All Shīr also coveted Philadelphia (Alashehir), to which he laid siege but which was liberated by the Catalans in the spring of 703/1304 (cf. Pachymeres, ii, 421, 427-8); we learn, however, from an inscription in the Wāqidiyya madrasa in Kütahya that in 714/1314 the town of Alashehir, the only Byzantine possession in Turkish territory, had been forced by him to pay the diwān. In the reign of Yaṣūk b. I the amirate of Germiyan was extended up to the greater part of the ancient Phrygia, according to Gregorios (i, 214); his sovereignty extended to the region of Tofmızlu-Ladik, which was governed by a subhāgh, the best in all Anatolia, and for its cloths and brocades; thanks to the Menderes it maintained an active commerce, transporting goods by this waterway as far as the Aegean Sea ports. The date of the death of Yaṣūk b. I is not known; it took place after 720/1320. His successor was his son Mehmed Beg, on whom there is little information; a court romance composed for his elder son, Suleymān Shāh, relates that Mehmed Beg was named Câşık-bâddān (cf. Kâḥrîhâname, B.M. ms. Or. 11408, fol. 14 v°). We also know, from the inscription of his grandson mentioned above, that he reconquered the regions of Smav and Kula which the Catalans had retaken from his father. The date of his death is not known; but, from the inscriptions of his son Suleymān Shāh, it is known that the latter was reigning in 764/1363. In Sulaymān’s time the Germiyan amirate was no longer the prosperous state described by al-‘Umari: separated from the sea by the coastal principalities founded by his former vassals, Aydınlı-oğlu, Sarukhan, Karesi, the Germiyan amirate was reduced to the situation of an inland state confined by the states of two rival powers, the Karaman-öğli and the ‘Oğhambâlî. Before the increasing threats towards him by the amirs of Karaman, Suleymān Shāh decided, forgetting the hostilities which had opposed his family to that of the ‘Oğhambâlî, to align himself with the latter and to consolidate their friendly relations by matrimonial ties: in 783/1381 he gave his daughter Dewlet Kâthtîn in marriage to the prince Yıldırım Bâyazîd, with the towns of Kütâhâya, Smav, Egrîzîz (Emed) and Tâwganîl as dowry, and himself withdrew to Kula (cf. Aşkîpâhasâzâde in Osmanlı tarihiileri, i, 129-31; Neshirî, Türk Tarih Kurumu ed., i, 203-9). Suleymân Shāh was a generous and benevolent prince and a patron of men of letters; many works were written for him: at his request Bâbî ‘All b. Sâlih b. Kûth al-Dīn translated the Kâbüsh-nâme and the Mârâshân-nâme from Persian; Şâhîgül Mustafâ, who filled the offices of nîşâhâq, defterdar and treasurer at his court, composed for him a work in prose entitled Kâns al-kubârâ and, in particular, the Kâhrihâname, a verse romance
manuscripts of which exist in Istanbul, London and Paris, and which is a valuable source of information; from this work we learn that Sülêyman died in 790/1387. In 824/1421, he bequeathed his principality to Murad II; on the death of Mehemmed I, he upheld, with the amir of Karaman, the claim to the throne of the Othmanlis. In 854/1449, the amir of Germiyan, Ya'qûb II, died in 789/1387. His son Ya'qûb, together with the towns which had been given to his sister as dowry (804/1402). In the dynastic struggle which involved the sons of Bâyazîd I, Ya'qûb aligned himself with his sister's son Mehemmed Celebi. Robbed once more of his principality in 831/1428 the amir of Germiyan, Ya'qûb II, was thereafter able to reign under the protection of the Othmanîs. In 824/1421, however, the amir of Karaman, who took the opportunity in this troubled period to enlarge his territories, he had his amirate restored to him, after two and a half years of exile, by Mehemmed I, who had triumphed first over his young brother of Murad II, Kucûk Mustafa (cf. Ashikpashazade, 139-40; Neshrl, i, 343, 353). After his victory Timîr rested the Germiyan amirate to Ya'qûb, together with the towns which had been given to his sister as dowry (804/1402). In the dynastic struggle which involved the sons of Bâyazîd I, Ya'qûb aligned himself with his sister's son Mehemmed Celebi. Robbed once more of his principality in 831/1428 the amir of Germiyan, Ya'qûb II, was thereafter able to reign under the protection of the Othmanîs. In 824/1421, however, the amir of Karaman, who took the opportunity in this troubled period to enlarge his territories, he had his amirate restored to him, after two and a half years of exile, by Mehemmed I, who had triumphed first over his brothers and then over the amir of Karaman. Ya'qûb II was better educated than most folk-poets. This made him a better imitator of the classical form and style, but at the same time adversely influenced the language of his more spontaneous folk-poems, where the use of the vocabulary and mannerisms of "upper class literature" is sometimes overcome. In his poems in the diwn tradition he is repetitive and achieves nothing but an awkward and uninspired imitation of classical poets, particularly of Fûdûlî. In his poems in the folk tradition, which revolve on themes of love, separation, nostalgia and epic exploits, he proves to be a most original and spontaneous poet, one of the strongest representatives of the Ashîk [q.v.] literature. Some of his poems have been set to music and are still sung.

Gevheri seems to have died after 1150/1737 (see H. Dizdarolu in Fikirler, no. 262 and 263, İzmir 1944).
period a north-south traffic was carried on, as is borne out by the ruins of Ottoman caravanserais, one of them that of Ka‘f®at al-Mud®b, near the site of the ancient Apamea/Al-Mî‘ámîya. The gradual spread of reed-covered lagoons and the ravages of malaria explain the increasing abandonment of this area, where there soon remained no more than some few poor villages, almost surrounded by lakes, living by buffalo-breeding and chiefly by fishing for catfish, carried on every winter on a very big scale. However, important modern land improvement works have already been started; besides the control of the course of the Orontes by damming, they provide for the drainage of the swamps and the installation of a new system of irrigation.


GHABA. Forest. The terrace of Mount Al-Ghab lying for the most part within the arid and semi-arid districts of the Old World, includes comparatively few areas of dense and continuous forest. The monsoon forests of parts of East Pakistan, Malaysia and Indonesia are of course exceptional. The hazel woods of the coastal mountains of north-east Turkey and the adjacent parts of the Caucasus, the forests of plane and alder which overlook the Caspian shores of Iran, and the stands of deodar and pine in the high valleys in Cyprus led to the desiccation of wells downstream.


GHADAMES (Ghadams), a little oasis in the Libyan Sahara, situated approximately on the 30th parallel and the 10th meridian east of Greenwich (at almost the same longitude as Ghat, Gabès and Tunis). It lies at an altitude of 350 m. between the great oriental erg and the arid plateaus of al-Hamâda al-Hâmirâ® almost at the meeting-place of the Libyan, Algerian and Tunisian frontiers. It owes its very ancient existence and its continuity to the artistic spring called Aya al-Fres (faras) (temperature 30°C, 2-3 grammes per litre of sodium and magnesium chloride), and also to its situation, almost equidistant from Gabès, Tripoli, Ouargla, the heart of the Fezzân and Ghât. Far more than its very limited agriculture, it was trans-Saharan trade which made its fortune over the course of the centuries and it is the disappearance of this trade which explains its decline. Paleolithic and Neolithic implements have been discovered in the neighbourhood. In 19 B.C. Cornelius Balbus camped in this Libyan centre, which was to become Cydamus, and, under Septimius Severus,
an advance post with a garrison of the 3rd Augusta legion, 200 km. to the south-west of the limes. By Byzantine times, it had a church and a bishop; the "idols" (al-`asndm) which stand nearby are ancient remains. The Arab conqueror, `Ubay b. Nafi', occupied it with a detachment of cavalry between his conquest of Fezzan and his march on Gafsa in 47/667. It was Ibadî between the 2nd/8th and the 4th/10th centuries. Ibn Khaldûn (Barberès, iii, 303), far more than al-Bakri (340), dwells on the prosperity and importance of this "portent" of the desert, both for traders and pilgrims. In the 10th/16th century again, Ghadames seems to have consisted of several kd'immâkdm, and the no less compulsory good relations with Tunis and Tripoli. It suffered several attacks by Ḥafṣîd and Turkish troops but always managed to free itself rapidly from the taxes imposed by Tunis. It was nevertheless obliged to recognize the authority of the Turks of Tripoli in 1860. It then became a seat of a šuyūkhd, and after 1874 was given a little garrison; it continued none the less to administer itself with a šuyūkhd and a dîjamâ'a formed from the heads of noble families.

The Italians, who disband at Tripoli in 1911, did not at first occupy Ghadames, but did so later from April 1913 to November 1914, then from February to July 1915, and finally and more permanently from 15 February 1924 on. They left it before the arrival of General Leclerc's troops on 27 January 1943. First of all attached to the Territory of Fezzan (q.v.), it was provisionally administered by the Tunisian Protectorate from January 1948 until 1 July 1951; but following the proclamation of independence of the United Kingdom of Libya on 24 December 1951, and then of the Franco-Libyan treaty of 20 August 1955, Ghadames was evacuated by the French authorities. It was attached to the province of Tripoli in the spring of 1957.

All the texts are in agreement to show that trans-Sahara trade was the essential activity of Ghadames. They dwell on the comings and goings of the caravans, on the remarkable aptitude of its traders who were to be encountered in the Sudan as far away as Timbuktu, as well as at Tunis and Tripoli, and who made large profits under the protection, for which they paid tribute, assured to their caravans by the Touareg Ajjer, at the extreme limit of whose territory Ghadames was situated. Caravans coming from the south brought above all slaves, as well as gold, leather and hides, ostrich feathers, ivory and incense. On the return journey, they carried cotton goods and cloth, sugar, and various products manufactured in Europe. The extreme points of their journeys were Tunis and Tripoli in the north, Agiades, Kano and, more rarely, Timbuktu (for which Ghât was the first halt) in the south.

Trade profited above all the nobles (aḫrâr), who also possessed gardens and sometimes herds; they had many black slaves (agnaw) whom they sometimes allowed to become free men (addra); the humrân formed a small and not very numerous middle class of artisans and shopkeepers; mostly, no doubt, of foreign origin, they formed the retainers of the principal noble families.

In the middle of the 10th century, Duveyrier notes the beginning of the decline in trade, following the abolition of the slave trade, for the most part still little enough resorted to. In 1810, for instance, the geologist, described the stagnation of a much diminished cross-Sahara trade which had turned away from Ghadames. To-day it is practically dead, the towns of the Mediterranean coast no longer needing the produce of the Sudan region, which in its turn is provisioned by sea. At the same time, the artisans, once extremely prosperous, many-sided, and since the beginning of the 19th century, the industries which brought about the ruin of most of the nobles, have almost ceased to exist, lacking raw materials.

The people of modern Ghadames are almost all reduced to cultivating their little oasis, and the Touareg to the raising of camels, sheep and goats. The palm-grove has barely 20,000 palms and the whole area of the gardens is only 75 hectares. It seems that the flow of Ayn al-Fres has become less since 1872-7. The Italians opened an artisanal well in 1952 and another was sunk by the French but their flow also tends to diminish. The departure of a great number of addra and former slaves, now become free men, provoked a man-power crisis which brought about the ruin of most of the nobles, only a few of whom were willing to apply themselves to agriculture.

The population of Ghadames, estimated at 7,000 by Duveyrier round about 1850, had fallen to 1,900 by 1952. Most of the people have emigrated to Tripolitania or Tunisia; nearly 2,000 live in Tunis, the town to which the young people used to go in former times to get their initiation into the business world, which led to a local proverb saying: 'Ghadames gives birth and Tunis brings up'.

Ghadames is a pretty little oasis which attracted some tourists in Italian times. The palm-grove and gardens are surrounded by crumbling mud walls, and the village, all of unfired brick, is in the interior, a little to the south-east, beside the attractive pool of Ayn al-Fres. Most of the houses are very unusual with their urban appearance, rooms placed in uneven storeys or spanning the streets, often transforming them into dark tunnels. The inhabitants, Berbers of the Beni Waxit and Beni Ulid, are Awdâl Beîlî who consider themselves of Arab origin, used to live as enemies, one group against another, shut up in seven districts isolated from one another by walls whose gates were shut at night. Despite these divisions, hard to understand for people travelling between the Mediterranean and the Sudan, the little urban centre of Ghadames has been able to maintain across the centuries its personality as a city of caravaners, its own Berber dialect (a little different from that of the Touareg), its social castes, its original houses and, for a long time, its independence.

Three kms. west of Ghadames, Tounin is no more than a hamlet with a few palm-trees. The poor oases of Derдж and Sinawan are situated on the trail which goes via Nalout to Tripoli. Oil research has been going on in this area since 1956.

Ghadir Khumm


**Al-Ghadanfar** [see Hamdâns].

**Ghadanfer Aqha** [see Aqha Aqahl].

**Ghadâr** [see Kafaff].

**Ghadir Khumm**, name of a pool (or a marsh) situated in a large area called Khumm, between Mecca and Medina, about 3 miles from al-Dhufra. The waters from which it was formed came from a spring which rises in a wadi, and from it they flowed to the sea about six miles away, along a valley which was also called Khumm; the name is no longer in use. As the place was frequently watered by rain, there were there bushes and thorn trees which provided large shady areas around the pool and the mosque built in honour of the Prophet between the pond and the spring. The climate there was very hot and unhealthy, and the inhabitants, belonging to the Khuzâ'a and Kinânâ tribes, who in any case were not numerous, finally abandoned the region because of the lepers which afflicted them and the lack of pasturage.

Ghadir Khumm is famous in the history of Islam because of a discourse (or some sentences) in favour of 'Ali which the Prophet uttered there during a discourse, the circumstances of which, according to the most detailed accounts which are preserved in some hadîths, were as follows. On his return from the Farewell Pilgrimage, Muhammad stopped at Ghadir Khumm on 18 Dhu 'l-Hijja 10/16 March 632. As he wanted to make an announcement to the pilgrims who accompanied him before they dispersed, and as it was very hot, they constructed for him a dais shaded with branches. Taking 'Ali by the hand, he asked of his faithful followers whether he, Muhammad, was not closer (awlî) to the Believers than they were to themselves; the crowd cried out: "It is so, O Apostle of God!"; he then declared: "He of whom I am the mawlî (the patron?), of him Ali received, affirmed that revelation on the night of the mawlid (man kuntu mawlî huwa 'alî)". Nothing which can explain the inner meaning of the main sentence is added either by the additions supplied by several hadîths, e.g., "O God, be the friend of him who is his friend, and be the enemy of him who is his enemy (Allâhumma wâli man wâlihu wa-qâdi man qi'dahu)", or by the variants (the most interesting of which is the substitution of the word wâli for mawlî, which proves that the meaning of the latter word, at least in its metaphysical sense, was not very precise). Most of those sources which form the basis of our knowledge of the life of the Prophet (Ibn Hîshâm, al-Tabârî, Ibn Sa'd, etc.) pass in silence over Muhammad's stop at Ghadir Khumm, or, if they mention it, say nothing of his discourse (the writers evidently feared to attract the hostility of the Sunnis, who were in power, by providing material for the polemic of the Shi'is who used these words to support their thesis of 'Ali's right to the caliphate). Consequently, the western biographers of Muhammad, whose work is based on these sources, equally make no reference to what happened at Ghadir Khumm. It is, however, certain that Muhammad did speak in this place and utter the famous sentence, for the account of this event has been cited elsewhere, either in detail, not only by Al-Ya'qûbî, whose sympathy for the 'Alid cause is well known, but also in the collections of traditions which are considered as canonical, especially in the Musnad of Ibn Hânbal; and the hadîths are so numerous and so well attested by the difference of interpretation, as the Shi'is and the Sunnis, that it is hard to reject them. Several of these hadîths are cited in the bibliography, but it does not include the hadîths which, although reporting the sentence, omit to name Ghadir Khumm, or those which state that the sentence was pronounced at al-Hudaybiya. The complete documentation will be facilitated when the Concordances of Wensinck have been completely published. In order to have an idea of how numerous these hadîths are, it is enough to glance at the pages in which Ibn Kathîr has collected a great number of them with their isndds. This author informs us that al-Tabârî, in a two-volume work (probably the unfinished work mentioned by Yâkût, Irshâd, vi, 432, the title of which was K. al-Fadâ'il) in which he reported the Prophet's discourse at Ghadir Khumm, had collected, he says, "the fat and the thin, the strong and the weak". Abu 'l-Kâsim Ibn 'Aqîshî (d. 57I/1176) also reproduces many hadîths on the same subject and it is from his collection that Ibn Kathîr has chosen the principal traditions, which however, he adds, supply no basis for the Shi'is claims.

The beliefs of the latter concerning the affair of Ghadir Khumm are as follows: Muhammad had already known through divine inspiration (or by revelation on the night of the mawlid) that 'Ali was to become his successor as leader of the Muslim community, but he had kept this divine decision secret, waiting for the moment when there should be no more opposition to 'Ali among the Muslims. At Ghadir Khumm he received the revelation: "O Apostle, communicate that which was revealed to you by your Lord" (Kur'ân, V, 76/69). Then, in the presence of the Companions, taking 'Ali's hand in his own, he pronounced the sentence man kuntu mawlîhu etc., which is thus a nass [q.v.] nominating 'Ali as imâm of the Muslims after the death of their Prophet. On the same occasion, Muhammad announced his impending death and charged the Believers to remain attached to the Book of God and to his family. After this communal prayer he went into his tent and, on his orders, 'Ali received, in his tent, the congratulations of the Muslim men and women, who greeted him with the title of amîr al-mu'mînîn. Among them was Umar b. al-Khattâb. Hasan b. Thâbit recited, with Muhammad's approbation, some verses in honour of 'Ali (some verses by him, affirming that 'Ali was named as the successor of the Prophet on the day of Ghadir Khumm, are quoted by Ibn Shahârahû (ii, 230) and, if they are authentic, they are, apart from the hadîths, the earliest attestation of the event at Ghadir Khumm, and not, as Goldziher has suggested, the verse of al-Kumayt). It is said that the same day Muhammad received at Ghadir Khumm the revelation of Kur'ân, V, 53 ("Today I have perfected your religion for you, and I have completed my blessing upon you, and I have approved Islam for your religion"), which is generally accepted to have been revealed at 'Arafât a few days earlier.

The Sunnis do not deny that Muhammad may have expressed himself in the above manner concerning 'Ali, but they consider that in the sentence in question he was simply exhorting his hearers to hold his cousin and son-in-law in high esteem and affection. On this point, Ibn Kathîr shows himself formerly to be a percipient historian: he connects the affair of Ghadir Khumm with episodes which took place
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1552 and dedicated to the Safawid Shah Tahmasb; Nusakh-i džahān-ārā, a history of the dynasties from the beginning up to 972/1564, dedicated to the same sovereign.

**Bibliography:** Sâm Mîrâş Şafavi, Tuğha-yi sâmi, Tehran 1314/1936, 72-4 (six members of the family, with printing errors in the names); The Muntâhâb al-tauwârikh of Abû al-qâdir bini-Malâkât shâh al-Bada‘wi, iii, Calcutta 1870, 185-6; Amin Abâmad Kâzî, Haft iltım, Tehran, iii, 178; Lutf ‘All Beyk Azar, Ateskhâdeh, Bombay 1296, 238; Râhmân ʿAll, Tâdqîka-yi ʿulamâ-yi Hind, Lucknow 1914, 18; Sayyid Muhammad Şiddîk Khân, Shamʿi andûjan, Delhi 1921, 93; ‘All Shâr Kânî Tâtawî, Mahâtâl al-ʿawârîdâ, Karachi 1937, 17-18; Storey, section II, 114-6; Saïd Naficy, Taʿrikh-i nazm o nafir dar Iran va dar zabân-i Fârs, Tehran 1342/1963, 354-506. (S. Naficy)

**GHAFFARI, MUHAMMAD B. KASSMÎ B. ASLAM.** Spanish-Arab scholar and oculist, probably of the 6th/12th century. The Arabic chroniclers are silent with regard to his biography and we know almost nothing of his life. It has been more than supposed that he was born in Cordova and that he practised for a long time in this city. According to Wustenfeld, he was the father of Abû Ḥâfar Abâmad b. Muḥâammad b. ‘Ali Sâdîq. (In the modern Supplement, the famous doctor and pharmacologist, author of the Kitâb al-ʿAduways a al-muwfrada.) Of Muhammad al-Ghâfiqî, there remains only the Kitâb al-Murshid fi l-ʿulûm, “The Oculist’s Guide”, of which a single copy exists in the Esorcal (N. 835). This book is regarded as a summary of all the knowledge of ophthalmology possessed by the Arabs of both the Islamic east and west, in its author’s time. It is divided into six sections of which, in fact, only the fifth (partially) and the sixth (entirely) treat of the medicine and the hygiene of the eyes.

Although the K. al-Murshid is considered to be the most remarkable ophthalmological text of the Islamic east, it has been said of it that it is no more than a vast compilation without original contributions, that the part which concerns the oculist in reality only occupies a limited space in relation to that dedicated to general medicine, and that it lacks a sense of proportion (Hirschberg). But in judging it from the point of view of present-day knowledge, it is precisely in the plan of the work and the arrangement of its material that it is possible to catch a glimpse of a kind of anticipation of the modern conception of the pathology of the eye, necessarily linked to and following as a corollary on that of the entire organism.

**GHAFFARI, MEDJID,** one of the best-known national poets of the Bashkurts and Tatars. He was born in 1881 in the village of Dîllîm Karan, a village inhabited by both Tatars and Bashkurts belonging to the Isterlitamak administrative district of Bashkurdstan. He died in 1934, a Soviet poet. His father, Nurgâni, was the village teacher, and Medjîd (ʿAbd al-Madjîd) received his primary education from him. For his intermediate schooling he went to the medrese in the neighbouring village of ʿOteş, and from 1898 to 1904 he studied in the Resûlîye Medresesi in the city of Tôrûsk. Through teaching among the Kazaks he became attracted to their style of literature. He published his first poetry in Törgümân in 1902, and later, in 1904, in the form of a collection with the title Sîbir Temiriyolû yahi Awdâl-i millet. He subsequently published small collections of poems with titles like Yâsh ʾomrîm (1906), Mîllet Mahâbât (1907), Zamâne shîrîrî in and Mâjîd Ghorfâri shîrîrî (1909), Tehârhusârîm (1910), Muṣ̂ûr zar (1911), Mîllet âsâr ve emtâhî (1913), and Yanqan Yûrel (1915). As he knew little Russian, he did not derive much inspiration from Russian literature, being influenced only by Krylov’s Fables and some of the works of Gorky. His first poems, written under the influence of Kazakh literature and especially of the Kazakh poet Akmolla, were beautiful, and bring a fresh style to Bashkurt and Tatar literature. After 1907 he wrote his poems wholly in Tatar, in the classical metres (ṣarâd). Because of lack of variety in his thoughts and carelessness in metre and style, however, he was considered to be in the second rank of poets, compared with men like Shams al-Dîn ʿÎzek and ʿAbd al-Lâh Tôkây among the Bashkurts, and ʿAbd Allâh Tôkây among the Tatars. In Zamâne shîrîrî, in which he imitated Sufi Allahyâr, he made it clear that he had read Caghatâî literature first by way of poetry. In his collected works, which appeared in 1904, he complained of the backwardness of the Bashkurts and Tatars, of the ignorance of the Mollas and so on. He manifested his belief that the Siberian railway, which was completed in 1902, “the longest railway in the world”, would bring about some changes in the life of the Bashkurt. In his works generally he reflected the early twentieth-century life of the Tatars and Bashkurts and also their complaints and desires. Before the 1917 Revolution, the works which he had written under the influence of the popular literature of the Kazaks and the Bashkurts, not attempting to rival the Tatar poets, had made him very popular in his own land. One of his finest works is the bayâda Ab-Edil, published at Ufa in 1917. After 1923 he was drawn into propaganda work by the Soviets, and he was much used for this purpose. In the Soviet period his collected works were published in five volumes, which included the greater part of his early writings, as well as later works of an entirely different character and outlook.

**GHAFTIB, absent,** usually means in law the person who at a given moment is not present at the place where he should be. But, in certain special cases (see below), the term is applied also to the person who is at a distance from the court before which he was to bring an action or who does not appear at the court after being summoned.

If to this first notion is added that of uncertainty concerning the person’s existence, the term used is not ghâftib but maʃâfd, although sometimes the state of the maʃâfd is called also ghâftib, to which is added the epithet munkâbûs (absence not interrupted by information on the person’s existence). This state of affairs may give rise to juridical consequences of greater or less importance according to circumstances. If such an absence extends to a period when persons of the same generation as the missing person are dead, the judge declares him dead; his estate goes to his heirs, and his marriage or marriages are dissolved. Up to this time, the estate of the maʃâfd continues to be administered by his agent, if he had appointed one, or, failing such an appointment, by
a trustee nominated by the judge; inheritances which are due to him remain in suspense; his marriage or marriage continues to subsist.

Ghalata-sarayi, in its normal and general sense, gives rise to various juridical consequences, particularly the following:

As regards marriage, the absence of a husband which extends beyond a certain term—four years, four months and ten days, according to the majority opinion—permits the wife to apply for judicial divorce if she is not regularly receivingimony. Thus, in the absence of a litigant at a hearing does not permit the judge to decide the case by default, a procedure which, in principle, is not recognized, although various means may be employed to compel the litigant to appear, provided that he is not too far away. Nevertheless in the most recent stage of Muslim law, as it is represented by the Ottoman codification of the second half of the 19th century, judgement by default is admitted.

In public law, in certain states (for example the Mamluk Empire) the Sultan, when himself absent from the capital, often appointed a locum tenens, who was called naib al-ghalaya (literally, 'substitute of absence').

In public worship, salat al-ghulafa ('prayer of the absent') is the name given to the prayer said for a dead person whose body cannot be produced.

Bibliography: Madjallata (Ottoman Civil Code), arts. 1608 ff., 1835 ff.; E. Tyan, Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire en pays d'Islam, Paris, i, 177; Leiden, 369 ff.; idem, Institutionen des St. Isl., i, 221; Enderun. After completing their education, which lasted from seven to fourteen years, the most able were chosen for the imperial palace, the Topkapi sarayi. Other joined the permanent cavalry regiments (sipahi).

Ghalata-sarayi was changed many times into a madresset and was restored in 1127/1715 under Ahmed III it remained a palace school, up to its closing in 1251/1835-6. During this period Mahmud II had added a library to the school in 1167/1753. Burnt in the first years of Mahmud II's reign, the school was rebuilt in 1235/1819-20. Ghalata-sarayi became a medical school under the name of Tibbiyye-i 'adliyye-i şahane [q.v.] in 1254/1838. European and Turkish doctors taught there modern medicine for ten years: a fire in August 1848 obliged the students to move into the Kâlidjoglu on the Golden Horn.

The site was changed many times into a madresset but from its restoration in 1127/1715 under Ahmed III it remained a palace school, up to its closing in 1251/1835-6. During this period Mahmud II had added a library to the school in 1167/1753. Burnt in the first years of Mahmud II's reign, the school was rebuilt in 1235/1819-20. Ghalata-sarayi became a medical school under the name of Tibbiyye-i 'adliyye-i şahane [q.v.] in 1254/1838. European and Turkish doctors taught there modern medicine for ten years: a fire in August 1848 obliged the students to move into the Kâlidjoglu on the Golden Horn.
were nominated to the administration of the school. Except for two short intervals, the Imperial lycée remained on the same site. In September 1873 it moved into GÜlhane, to provide accommodation for the Faculty of Medicine. But three years later, in 1876, it returned to its old premises. On 6 March 1907 a fire burnt the school, and courses continued in a pavilion in the courtyard. The construction of the new building ended the next year, offering more space to the school.

The programmes were revised after the proclamation of the Turkish republic in 1923. Meanwhile the main courses continued to be given in French, mostly by French teachers. Able directors and distinguished professors, many of them famous Turkish poets, scholars and scientists, served in the lycée of GHALATA-sarayl (now Galatasaray). Graduates of the school contributed much in all fields of activities in Turkey, the Balkans and the Arab countries. The share of the lycée of GHALATA-sarayl in the modernization of Turkey is important. It still continues to educate Western-minded young men.


**GHALATAT-I MESHHURE,** Ottoman term meaning literally ‘well-known errors’ and hence ‘solecisms sanctioned by usage’. Arabic and Persian loan-words in Ottoman Turkish generally retained their original spelling and pronunciation only so far as was essential to accommodate them to the Turkish alphabet. The programmes were revised after the proclamation of the Turkish republic in 1923. Meanwhile the main courses continued to be given in French, mostly by French teachers. Able directors and distinguished professors, many of them famous Turkish poets, scholars and scientists, served in the lycée of GHALATAT-I MESHHURE, among them Kemal Pashaözde (’Al-tanbih ’ulal ghalat al-‘ishqiizdr wa ’l-nabih, see Brockelmann, II 452, S II 671 (no. 106); tr. and printed, Istanbul 1289, as Terdjume-i Ghalatdt al-‘awweem), Abu ’l-Sufi‘id al-Mehmed; many of these ‘solecisms’ were written in the period of the Tanzimat (q.v.) and after, when there was increased controversy over the rules of correct usage. A number of these `solecisms’ have been accepted in modern Arabic usage.

**Bibliography:** ‘All Seydi, Defter-i Ghalatdt, Istanbul 1324; Muṣṭaфа ‘Izzet, Taṣbiḥ al-ghalatdt see ʿl-muḥarrarât fi ʿl-buğd, Istanbul 1303; ‘Ali Himmet, Fâdišt al-ghalatdt defteri, Samsun 1338; Sîri, Ghalatdt, Istanbul 1301. For a discussion of the phonetic phenomena involved (dissimilation, assimilation, labialization, etc.) see J. Deny, Principes de grammaire turque, Paris 1955; T. Banguoglu, Türk grameri, i: sesbilgisi, Ankara 1959. (G. ALPAY)

**GHALCA,** an imprecise designator for those mountain peoples of the Pamirs who speak Iranian languages. The term has been used in English scholarly literature for the Iranian Pamir languages. In New Persian the word means ‘peasant’ or ‘ruffian’, while in Tajik it means ‘squat, stupid’. In old Yaghnibä ghalca meant ‘slave’. The origin of the word is uncertain, for one might compare Sogdian yé ‘to steal’, (Pashto yé ‘thief’) or Sogdian yé ‘mountain’, hence ‘mountaineer’. Usually the term ghalca has been used in modern literature to cover the speakers of the following languages and dialects (from north to south): Wangji, Yazaqulami, Orokor, Bartangi, Sarikoll, Rosani, Shughni, Wakhi, Ishkshami, Munjii, Sangchel, Yidgha. A wider use of the term would include such tongues as Yaghnibä in the north and Parak 4 in the south.

The earliest attested use of the word by an European is found in the travel account of Benedict de Gös circa 1603 (Lentz 12). The term Ghalca was brought into prominence by Shaw, who early investigated some of the languages.

Little is known of the history of the Pamir region. Although much of the area paid tribute to Muslim rulers in Balkh in the first three centuries A.H., it is probable that the majority of the population of Islam remained non-Muslim until the Ismaʿīlī missionary activity of the fifth/sixth century. The most famous missionary in neighbouring Badkhšan was the author Nāṣīr-i Khusrav. Various forms of the Shi'a creed remained among the populace down to the present. Today the area is divided between Afghanistan, the USSR and China.


**GHALIB** [see WARBABITYA].

**GHALIB b. ‘ABD AL-RAHMAN,** freedman (mawud) of ‘Abd al-Rahman III, in whose time and those of his son al-Hakam and grandson
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Hisham he was one of the great generals. He led
tradition that he visited the Prophet and asked him
expeditions against the Christians of the Peninsula about the reward of the deeds of his father in the
and also against the Idrlsids and Fatimids in Morocco time of the Djahiliyya (Aghdni, xix, 4) seems however
and Ifrikiya. In 335/946 he was appointed chief of
to be spurious. Ghalib belonged to the generation
the Upper Frontier and rebuilt Medinaceli, which
after the Prophet; his name is connected with the
he made the base for operations against the Christian
names of Talba b. Kays b. cAsim and cUmayr b. alpositions of the middle and upper Duero valley. His
Sulayl al-Shaybanl, tribal leaders in the time of
expeditions against Castile in 342/953 were very
Mucawiya, in the story of the men of Kalb who tried
successful as concerns prisoners and booty but
to find the most generous man (Aghdni, xix, 5; in
achieved no territorial gains. In 344/955 his fleet
Ibn Abi THadld's Shark, iii, 426, ed. 1329 A.H.,
attacked the coast of Ifrikiya in order to avenge the
Ghalib is mentioned with Aktham b. Sayfl and
c
c
sack of Almeria by the Sicilian fleet of al-Mu izz the
Utayba b. al-Harith, which is an obvious anachroFatimid. This first attack failed but in the foUowing nism). The most generous man among the three
year, 345/956, he returned with another squadron of
sayyids was indeed Ghalib. (Ghalib was a neighbour
70 ships, took and set fire to Marsa al-Kharaz (La of Talba in al-Sldan, in the vicinity of Kazima). He
Calle) and laid waste the districts of Susa and is said to have visited CA1I b. Abi Talib and introduced
Tabarka. In 357/968 he attacked Calahorra and was
to him his son al-Farazdak; CA1I recommended him
sent in 361/972 to Morocco to subdue the Idrlsids.
to teach his son the Kur'an. (According to the
After a long and victorious campaign he brought
tradition of Aghdni, xix, 6 he visited him in Basra
them back in subjection to Cordova. In 364/974 he after the battle of the Camel. According to the story
undertook a carefully prepared expedition against
quoted in Baghdadl's Khizdna, i, 108, Ghalib was
the Castile-Navarre-Leon coalition in which he beat
then an old man; al-Farazdak was in his early youth).
firstly the Christian allies under the walls of Gormaz,
Ghalib earned his fame by his generosity. Muh. b.
then count Garcia Fernandez at Langa, south of the
Irlablb counts him in his list of the generous men of
Duero, on 25 Shawwal 364/8 July 975. At this time the Djahiliyya (al-Muhabbar, 142); al-Djahiz stresses
he took the title of Dhu '1-Sayfayn and established
that he was one of the generous men of the Islamic
himself at Medinaceli where he had Ibn Abi cAmir,
period, not inferior to the generous men of the
Djahiliyya, although public opinion prefers the
the famous Almanzor, as his intendant general. When
Hisham succeeded to the throne Ibn Abi cAmir
latter (al-Hayawdn, ii, 108, ed. cAbd al-Salam
joined with Ghalib in his campaigns as commander
Harun). Ghalib is said to have granted bounteous
gifts to people, not asking them even about their
of the forces of the capital and married his daughter
in 367/978. But discord soon broke out between names. The story of his contest with Suhaym b.
father-in-law and son-in-law when the old general, Wathll al-Riyahl in slaughtering camels in the time
devoted to the Umayyads, saw the affront suffered of c Uthman is quoted in many versions. Al-Farazdak
by the dynasty at the hands of the parvenu Ibn Abi mentions this deed of his father boastfully in his
c
Amir, who restricted the activities of the young poems; Djarlr refers to it disdainfully; the competition was censured in Islam as a custom of the
caliph to pious exercises. The conflict now open, Ibn
Djahiliyya (Goldziher, Muh.St., i, 60). A peculiar
Abi cAmir seized Medinaceli, Ghalib's fief, at the
head of big Berber contingents. Ghalib, to spite him, story in Nakd^id 417 tells how he threw to the
populace in Mecca (anhaba) 40,000 dirhams.
allied himself with his old enemies the count of
Ghalib was assaulted by Dhakwan b. cAmr alCastile and the king of Navarre. The first encounters
Fukaymi in consequence of a quarrel between
went in his favour, but Almanzor decided to wager
Fukaymi men and a servant of Ghalib, who tried to
all and provoked a decisive engagement on 4 Muharram 371/10 July 981. The battle took place near the prevent them from drinking water from a reservoir
castle of San Vicente, probably the modern Torre belonging to Ghalib in al-Kubaybat. Mudiashicl
tradition denies the Fukaymi claim that Ghalib died
Vicente about half way between Atienza and
Gormaz. In spite of his 80 years Ghalib gave, as in consequence of this assault. He died in the early
years of the reign of Mucawiya and was buried at
always, proof of his courage and boldness, but in a
furious attack his horse stumbled and, pierced in the Kazima.
Al-Farazdak mourned his father in a number of
breast by his saddle-bow, he fell dead. The field was
elegies (cf. Dlwdn al-Farazdafy, 163, 210, 611, 676, ed.
thus left free to the unbridled ambition of his lucky
al-SawI). His tomb became a refuge for the needy
rival.
and the oppressed who asked help, which had indeed
Bibliography: Levi- Provencal, Histoire de
always been granted to them by al-Farazdak (cf.
VEspagne musulmane, ii, 64, 68, 108, 116-234; iii,
58, 80, 122, 318, 500; on Medinaceli, Makkari, Dlwdn al-Farazdak, 94, 191, 757, 893 and Nakd^id
380). Al-Farazdak often mentions him in his poems
Analectes, i, 252-6; on Calahorra, Ibn Khaldun.
as "Dhu '1-Kabr" or "Sahib al-Djadath" (Goldziher,
'Ibar, iv, 145; Makkari, i, 248; on Gormaz, Codera,
Muh. St., i, 237).
in Bol. Acad. Hist., xiv (1889); Ibn Hayyan, MukBibliography: In addition to the sources
tabis, iii, 49, 233, 239, 240, 242; idem, 91, 116-8;
quoted in the article: Baladhuri, Ansdb, Ms.
on Asma3 daughter of Ghalib, Ibn Bassam,
97ia-b, 972a, 9743, 978b, 992a, io43b; al-MarzuDhakhlra, iv, 47; Makkari, ii, 62; Ibn cldharl,
banl, Mu^diam, 486; al-Mubairad, al-Kdmil, 129,
al-Baydn al-mughrib, ii, text 285, tr. 443; Ibn
c
280; Ibn Kutayba, K. al-^Arab (Rasd'il alal-Khatib, A'mdl al-a ldm, n~4'> Ibn Hazm,
Bulaghd', 350; idem, Shi'r, ed. de Goeje,
Nakt al-carus, 21 (ed. Seybold, 239); Ibn cAbd
index; Ibn Durayd, Ishtikdk, ed. Harun, 239-40;
al-Malik al-Marrakushl, al-Dhayl wa 'l-takmila,
Al-Diahiz, al-Baydn, ed. al-Sandubl, ii, 187, 225,
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iii, 139, 195; Aghdni2, index; Nakd^id, ed. Bevan,
fiHALIB B. §AC$ACA B. NADJIYA B. C!KAL B.
index; al-Djumahl, Tabakdt, ed. vShakir, 261;
MUHAMMAD B. SUFYAN B. MUDJASHI C B. DARIM, an
al-Kall, Amdll, ii, 120; idem, Dhayl al-Amdll,
eminent Tamlmi, famous for his generosity, the
52, 77; Yakut s.v. Saw3ar, Mikarr; Ibn Hadjar,
father of the poet al-Farazdak.
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The tradition that Ghalib was a contemporary of
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the Prophet (lahu idrdk) seems to be valid; the


GHALIB B. SHAJA'A — GHALIB DEDE

GHALIB DEDE, MEHMET ES'AD, also SHAYKH GHALIB (1171/1757-1213/1799), Turkish poet, the last of the five great representatives of the Divan literature (the others being Bâkil, Fu'âdî, Nefti and Nedîm [q.v.]). He was born in Istanbul at the Yenikapı Mewlewîkhâne, in 1171/1757, as is recorded in two famous chronograms: iether-i 4lk and diweret-âllih. His father Muṣṭâfa Rešhid, poet and scholar, belonged to a Mewlewî family and exercised a decisive influence on Ghalib's life and his choice of career. Of his mother we only know, from a chronogram by Ghalib himself, that her name was Emîne and that she died in 1209/1794. Ghalib does not seem to have had a regular madrasa training, but to have been thoroughly educated in Islamic classics in the family circle and in the Mewlewî convent. After his father, his main teacher and guide seems to have been Aṣhdî-bashî Hüsûn Dede who became the Shaykh of the Ghalata convent in 1194/1790. Ghalib began to write poetry at a very early age and was able to arrange a diwerîn at the age of twenty-four, while at the same time serving as an official at the Beylikdî Odaî of the Diwanî Hûmâyîn. At the suggestion of the poet Nesh'et he adopted as pen-name (makhlaṣ) Es'ad, which he later changed to Ghalib. Ghalib became increasingly interested in the works of Diwel al-Dûnîmî and the Mewlewîs. He suddenly decided in 1198/1783 to join the order and went to Konya accompanied by his young friend İbrâhîm Kâhân-zade 3ûnuss Bîey to perform the necessary rites in the headquarters of the order, under the guidance of the head of the Mewlewîs, Seyyîlîb Ebdî Bekir Celebî. On his return he completed his cîle at the famous Ghalata convent of the order and then retired to his house in Sütülgüe on the Golden Horn where he wrote a commentary to Yusûf Sînetek's Diweret-i Methnewî.

His appointment by the Celebî of Konya as the shaykh of the Ghalata convent is a turning point in Ghalib's life. He soon attracted the attention of the Sultan Süleyman III, himself a poet and musician, an admirer of Diwel and Din Rûmî and a friend of the Mewlewî order. The Sultan became a great personal friend of Ghalib and used to pay him frequent visits in the convent, and the poet was always welcome in the Imperial Palace. With the Sultan's help Ghalib succeeded in restoring the convent and its annexes completely and then in making it the most important literary centre of the capital; he himself moved to the living quarters of the convent. Princess Beyehan, the sister of Süleyman III, a cultured and intelligent woman, had great sympathy for the poet, which seems later to have developed into an attachment. She helped and protected him in many ways until his death. Ghalib reveals his great respect and admiration for her in many of his poems. It is not impossible that he was in love with her; judging from the many passages where feeling and affection are couched in expressions of reverence.

In the circle of the Mewlewîs Ghalib's best friend was Esâr Dede, poet and biographer, on whose death he wrote his famous elegy. Ghalib himself died in 1209/1799, at the age of forty-two. The sources are not in agreement as to the causes of his early death. It seems likely that he fell victim to tuberculosis. He was buried at the Ghalata convent cemetery by the orders of Sultan Selim III, himself a poet and musician, an adherent of the Ghalata convent and in 1209/1799, at the age of forty-two. The sources are not in agreement as to the causes of his early death. Ghalib reveals his great respect and admiration for her in many of his poems. It is not impossible that he was in love with her; judging from the many passages where feeling and affection are couched in expressions of reverence.
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of poetry began to influence 12th/18th century Ottoman poets like Nefci and more particularly Nāīl and a host of other minor writers. The appearance of a poet of genius like Nefdi in the early 12th/18th century seemed to announce a radical change in the Persian-inspired tradition of Ottoman poetry. Nedim, although not daring to do away with traditional themes, forms and clichés, made great efforts to “depersianize” Ottoman poetry, introducing many themes and motives from his time and surroundings and using unconventional and even unconventional forms. With his poetic genius, unusual power of imagination and mastery of form, might have achieved what Nefdi had started: to create a thoroughly Turkish diwan in the classical tradition, had he chosen to follow his example. Instead, although he admired Nefdi and owed much to him in some of his poems, he decided to turn the clock back and picked up again the “Indian School” tradition where Nāīl had left off. But as he was a greater poet with more vision and imagination, and imbued with mysticism, he created, at the close of the classical period, his original blend of both sources.


**FAHİR 12**

GHALİB, ISMĀ‘IL [see ISMĀ‘IL, GHALİB].

GHALİB, MIRZĀ `ALI KHAN, one of the greatest Muslim poets of the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent. He was born in 1797 at Āgra in an aristocratic Muslim family; his childhood and early boyhood were passed at Āgra where he received the classical Mughal education (Persian being one of its chief subjects). He moved to Delhi when he was about 15 years of age and lived in the Mughal capital till his death on 15 February 1869, except for a brief sojourn in Lucknow and Benares on his way to Calcutta where he remained two years (1830-32) in connexion with an unsuccessful attempt to have his pension increased. Returning to Delhi, he lived on pensions granted him in recognition of his talents first by the nawāb of Oudh, then by the court of Delhi. Thus Ghalib lived a major part of his life near the degenerate Mughal court of his times and witnessed the hard days of the famous “Mutiny” of 1857. Only with great difficulty and after painful humiliations did he succeed in freeing himself of suspicion of having taken part in the Mutiny and get his pension restored to him by the British Government. Apart from domestic unhappiness (he lost his father at the age of five years, all his seven sons died in infancy, etc.) Ghalib’s life was rather quiet and colourless. Hardly any hints at the grave political events of his times can be found in his poetry. He was not even passionately concerned with the Muslim religion, and his broad and tolerant attitude in this respect is shown in a letter to Munṣīr, Margonī, Tātkhīm, to whom he writes: “I hold all human beings, Muslim, Hindu or Christian, dear to me, and regard them as my brothers”; the mystical imagery present in his lyrics is due rather to his following the traditional style than to genuine Şı‘ī feeling. The real protagonist of all his poetry is his own mind, which creates extremely refined intellectual images; his poetry, chiefly of a very melancholic trend, is therefore extremely fragmentary, but those “fragments” in the Limon described as his Diwan as a “selection” are amongst the most perfect specimens of Urdu literature.

Ghalib’s more important works are: (1) His Urdu Diwan first published in 1841 and then, with additions, four times again during his life (last edition in Ghalib’s life in 1863 with 1975 bayts), and numerous times after his death (Diwan-i Ghalib, ed. Dḥākīr Husayn, Berlin 1925 is an attractive pocket edition without notes; the last good edition is: Diwan-i Urdu, ed. and annotated by Intīyāz ‘Ali Arghī, ‘Allīgarh 1958); (2) His Persian Kulliyāt, consisting of kasidas, ghazals, short matnawīs, khīfas etc., first published in 1845 and then repeatedly, especially by Nawalkishore in Lucknow (1862, 1924 etc.); (3) Various works in Persian prose included in his Kulliyāt and some other important minor writers. His most mature part of his Persian work has been superseded in the Indian administration by Urdu and had practically no future in India. There is the second part of which never came out), and Dastanbā (an account of the Indian Mutiny as seen by Ghalib); (4) Kāfīr-i Burhdan, a critical work on the famous Persian Dictionary Burhdan-i bāqa‘ī, first published in Lucknow in 1861-62, and then, with additions, in 1865-66 as Dirāfī-khā Kārsyān; (5) The two famous collections of letters in Urdu, the Qād-i Hindī first published in 1868 (162 letters) in Meerut, and Urdu-e Mu‘allā‘ (472 letters) published only 19 days after his death, in March 1869 in Delhi; further letters, fragments in Persian and Urdu etc. were repeatedly published afterwards. Ghalib expressly stated that he entrusted his fame and renown not to his Urdu, but to his Persian works, and his letters reveal his keen interest in Persian grammar, lexicography and stylistics. He declares that at first he was fascinated by Bīdīl [p.v.] and his difficult style, but afterwards he preferred a sounder and simpler, more classical Persian. Actually the most mature part of his Persian work is far superior to that of many Indo-Persian writers, but historically speaking its value is rather reduced by the fact that Persian had, already in Ghalib’s time, been superseded in the Indian administration by Urdu and had practically no future in India. Therefore a more durable trace was left by Ghalib’s Urdu productions. In spite of the difficulty, the wealth of conceits and the extreme over-persianization of its style, his small Urdu Diwan shows what has been called by some of his commentators a “passionate intensity of thought”, partly at least derived from his former master Bīdīl. In some of his fragments he tries even the supremely refined experiment of simplicity. Simplicity—in contrast to his rather complicated Persian prose—is the chief and revolutionary aspect of his Urdu letters, an unsurpassed model of direct, unaffected expression. Ghalib can therefore be considered the father of modern Urdu prose; for what concerns poetry, he is the father of only one aspect of modern Urdu
poetry, the intellectual and psychological deepening of the old imagery; his complete aloofness from outward reality (no more than 15-20 lines out of the


In North Africa, the Ghalzays aided Shah Shudja to take Kabul in 1218/1803, and ties of marriage joined the Ghalzay chiefs to the ruling Durrani tribe. In more recent times a Ghalzay force was defeated at Ahmad Khel in 1887, and the Ghalzays revolted against the ruler of Afghanistan, 'Abd al-Rahman in 1886, and have participated in many local uprisings and raids since that time.

At present the Ghalzays are mainly found east and south-east of Ghana, although groups of them are also scat tered in the north and west of Afghanistan near Mayamana and in Badakhshan. They are divided into two main groups, the Turan (Tolkhi and HotakI sub-tribes) and the Burhan (Sulayman-khel, 'All-khel, Tarakki and Ishkazzay). There may be almost two million Ghalzays, of whom three-quarters live in Afghanistan, and the rest in Pakistan.


GHAMID, tribe and district in western Saudi Arabia. The tribe is said to descend from Ghamid b. 'Abd Allah of al-Azid of Khafs, who moved northward from the W. of the Jeddah area and settled in the area now called Bilad Ghamid in the highlands of southern al-Hijaz, centred around approximately 20° N. and 41° 45' E. The tribe is now subdivided into a large number of sections, most of which are sedentary. The few nomadic sections, called Al Sayyah, roam along the northern and western edges of the desert. It owns a few gardens in al-'Ashik and along Wadi Ranyah. The district of Ghamid is relatively thickly settled, fertile, and prosperous. Rainfall allows dry farming, and fruits, wheat, barley, beans, and tobacco are grown. The villages consist for the most part of stone houses, made from locally quarried granite blocks. The fertility of the area, the extreme fragmentation of tribal splinter groups, and the raids by the Beduin, formerly always at odds with the farming population, led to the construction of innumerable defensive towers, also made of granite blocks, which are characteristic of the area. Many of these towers have been allowed to decay.

Before the First World War Ghamid owed allegiance to either the Turks or the Sharif of Mecca, and its administrative centre was in the village of al-Zafr (from Al al-Zafr section of Ghamid). The construction of the Saudi government, the district of Ghamid and that of Zahrn [q.v.] to the north have been administered as a unit. The seat of local government is now some 15 miles south of al-Zafr at BaldujGhur (or BaldujGhur), a name designating twenty-four small settlements scattered over a wide plain (altitude 1,960 meters). Four of these settlements: al-'Awasha, al-Silmiya, al-Rukba, and al-Ghazl, collectively referred to as Dér al-Sök, are close together and form the administrative and marketing centre.

Middle Ages, now vanished, the site of which should apparently be identified with Kumbi Salih (15° 40' N., 8° 27' W.), some 70 km./45 miles north of Nara and 70 km./44 miles south-south-east of Timbedra. Kumbi Salih belongs to the administrative district of Aioun el Atrous ("Uyun al-satrás") (subdivision of Timbedra) in the Islamic republic of Mauritania.

The term Ghana signified sovereign in the Awkar. By extension, it denoted the capital city of the first negro kingdom of Nigerian Sudan. Al-Fazārī (before 848/800) is the first to speak of "Ghana, the land of gold", which is mentioned also by al-Yaʿqūbī (256/870) and, in particular, by Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadhānī who died probably in 290/930 and who, in his Kitab al-Buldān (BGA, vi, 57), provides some amusing details (ed. and trans. M. Hadj-Sadok, Algiers 1949, 31): "from Tarkala to Ghana it is three months on foot through the desert; in the country of Ghana, gold grows in the sand like carrots (dżaras); it is dug up at sunrise; the natives live on millet (dhura) and beans (labrān); their name for millet is dżūn; they clothe themselves in Panther skins since these animals are abundant in their country".

The first eyewitness account by a traveller is that of Ibn Hawkal, who in 366/977 wrote the Kitab al-Suddn (1065/1655), in the Tarih al-Suddn (ed.-tr. O. Houdas, Paris 1900, 2nd ed. Paris 1906) mentions 44 princes of white stock of unknown origin, 22 of whom are said to have ruled before the hidīrga and 22 afterwards, but Delafosse thinks it is dug up at sunrise; the natives live on millet (dhura) and beans (labrān); their name for millet is dżūn; they clothe themselves in Panther skins since these animals are abundant in their country".

by the king of Ghana, who is, however, his deputy, despite his title when it attained independence in 1957-

The largest concentrations are found in the capital, Accra, which probably has about 75,000 Muslims (total population of Ghana). The largest concentrations of Muslims are likely to be less than 10%, and may be significantly higher. The largest concentrations are found in the capital, Accra, which probably has about 75,000 Muslims (total population of Ghana).
laitian: 388,000), and in Kumasi with probably about 60,000 (total population: 221,000). Estimates of the extent of Islamization in northern Ghana vary widely from 15% to 50%; much depends upon the view taken of the many marginally Muslim groups there.

No detailed study of Muslim organization in Ghana has yet been made. The Kâdiri and Tijani orders are both established. The history of the former in Ghana, as already suggested, may date back to c. 600/1200, though its main growth took place in the early 19th century, largely through Hausa intermediaries. The Tijâniyya spread widely, often at the expense of the Kâdiriyah, in the second half of the 19th century and is still ascendent. The Tijání wird in Ghana is probably partly of Umari origin (al-Ḥâḍirī Umâr of Segu, d. 1864), but it has certainly also been received immediately from the Senegambia, and, through pilgrims, from Meccan contacts. There are no reliable estimates of the numerical strength of either order. In addition, since 1921 Aḥmâdi missionaries have been active especially in Saltpond in the extreme south, in Kumasi, and in Wa. In 1963 they claimed a following of between thirty and forty thousand. In the political life of Ghana Muslims are represented by the Moslem Council, a wing of the ruling Convention Peoples Party. The Moslem Association, founded in 1932 as an auxiliary to the political organization of the Moslem Association Party joined the opposition to the C.P.P. in 1956, but was disbanded in late 1957.

The development of Islamic learning in Ghana was one result of the spread of the faith. A tradition of local authorship was certainly well established by the early 18th century; it is exemplified in the extant Kûdâ Ḡundâdî, an important historical work of Goniya authorship compiled in the middle of that century. The tradition is still a thriving one, and is excellently represented in the works of al-Ḥâḍirī Ḫumâyî b. Abî Bakr of Salaga and Kete Krachi (b. Kano, c. 1590; d. Kete Krachi, 1643), of which over a hundred are known. They are characterized by their lively treatment of topical events,—the coming of the Christians; the Salaga civil war; the influenza epidemic of 1619; the claims of a false Mahâdi; etc. Al-Ḥâḍirî Ḫumâyî's pupils are now widely dispersed throughout Ghana and the surrounding territories. The Institute of African Studies in the University of Ghana has a growing collection of works in Arabic script from Ghana; these are mainly in the Arabic language but also include items in Hausa, Dagbane, Mamprule and Guan.

The ancient Western Sudanese tradition of mosque architecture, best known from the Niger Bend, is represented in about thirty surviving buildings in northern Ghana, of which the Friday mosques at Larabanga and Bole (Gonja) are particularly worthy of note. In general, however, the old mosques are rapidly being replaced by undistinguished (though more commodious) structures of concrete and corrugated iron. Much of the domestic architecture of north-western Ghana is also heavily Šudano-Islamic in style. (I. Wilks)

GHANAM [see Bawd (ii.a), Yûruk, Zârât.]
GHAN, tabâkhus, the Persian poet Mullâ Muhammad Tâhir Aşha'î of Kâšmir, who flourished during the reign of the Moghal emperors, Shâh Shâhjâhân and Awaŋrzîb [q.v.]. Nothing is known with certainty either about the date of his birth or the origins of the clan; the Aşha'îs, which he belonged to, is, however, certain that he was the son of an obscure poor shâbîf (a weaver of woollen shawls). A pupil of Muḥsin Fâni, assumed by some scholars to be the author of Dâbâšt-i mâdâşhâh, Ghânî began writing poetry at the early age of twenty. The etymological value of his pen-name Ghânî (i.e., 1060/1650) supplies the date. True to the literal meaning of his poetical name, he hated and detested meeting and attending on princes, potentates or men of power and riches. When his fame as a great poet reached the emperor Awaŋrzîb, he wanted to see him and offered the governor of Kâšmir, Sayîl Kâshân, to send Ghânî to Delhi. Learning of the governor's intention, the poet refused to comply with his wish, and asked Sayîl Kâshân if he could not be properly understood on the first hearing or reading was absurd and meaningless. Ghânî lies buried in the Gurgan Mahalla (formerly known as Kutb al-Dîn pur), Zayna Kadal, Srinagar where his grave is still extant. His cottage in Radjwer Kadal, near the city, is also pointed out to visitors although the simple brick-built structure (with walls covered with mud) was arranged and edited posthumously by Muhammad 'Ali Maḥir, a Hindu convert to Islam and an adopted son of Mir Qâfar Muḥammâdî. It contains over 2,000 select verses and was printed in Lucknow in 1261/1845. Given to composing verses which exceeded in length of more than one interpretation, Ghânî has few rivals in this field of sanâ'at-i ikâm-gûâ'. Piqued and offended, he gave up attending on 'Inâyât Kâshân, son of Governor Awaŋrzîb. A pupil of the Moslem Association founded in 1932 as an auxiliary to the political organization of Kashmir and a great patron of art and culture, as the former had once remarked that a couplet which could not be properly understood on the first hearing or reading was absurd and meaningless. Ghânî lies buried in the Gurgan Mahalla (formerly known as Kutb al-Dîn pur), Zayna Kadal, Srinagar where his grave is still extant. His cottage in Radjwer Kadal, a quarter of the same city, is also pointed out to visitors although the simple brick-built structure does not show any signs of age. (A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)


GHAN b. AŞ'UR b. Sa'd b. Kâys (b.) AYålân, an Arab tribe. They were, according to the genealogists, the brothers of Bâhîla (q.v.). Their grazing-grounds lay between Bîsha (q.v.) and the later hîmâl Darîyà (q.v.). Being small in number they were never prominent. In pre-Islamic times one of them, Kâshân Aşbâl, killed Al-Rây towards the middle of the 6th century A.D. Shâb, the son of Zuhâyir b.
Djadhlma, the powerful chieftain of the Banū 'Amr b. Sa'ā'a. Since then the Ghanī were in subordinate alliance with them, though not considered their equals (Nakādīd, 533, 17; cf. also Mufaddalidāyyīt, no. 105, 19). The Ghanī fought about 580 A.D. on the side of the Banū 'Amr b. Sa'ā'a at Shib'in (Agdhun, x, 37, 20; Mufaddal, 353, 1, and 710, 17; Mubarrad, Kūml, 482, 16), the ancestor of the leading "house" of the Banū 'Amr b. Sa'ā'a. The Ghanī took part in the fight on the Day of al-Rajām (Mufaddalidāyyīt, 31, 18) towards the end of the 6th century and on other occasions (Nakādīd, 227, 1; 1060, 12; 1061, 9; 1063, 6). Some time afterwards they suffered heavily on the Day of Muḥaddidār, when Zayd al-Khayl al-Tām (d. 10/632) fell upon the Banū Kilāb and Banū Ka'b; but they soon took revenge on him (Agdhun, xvi, 52 and vii, 147; Tufayl b. 'Awf, nos. I and III).

It seems that the Ghanī were indifferent towards the rising power of Muḥammad; there was, to be sure, amongst his earlier companions Abū Marḥṣāb al-Ghanawi, but he was a confederate (halif) of Ḥanuma b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib (Ibn Hīshām, 332, 3 etc.). After the battle of Hunayn (8/630) the Ghanī accepted Islam without resistance, nor did they take part in the revolt (ridda) after Muḥammad's death (11/632). During the conquests many of them went to Syria. In the wars that ensued after the battle of Ṣard al-Rakam (12/633) towards the end of the year 2/624 the Ghanī met the enemy—no doubt because of the political insight of the Prophet, according to one tradition, hesitated to comply with this custom in one case (al-Bayḍawī, Tafsīr, on VIII, 1). Nevertheless he was forced on several occasions as a matter of policy to make considerable adaptations, lest, in view of the vital interest taken in this question by his followers, discontent should become serious.

Most later theorists regard it as a settled rule that the spoils (salah), comprising the clothes, weapons and occasionally the mount of an adversary killed in battle, are the property of the victor and are not to be included in the rest of the booty. But after Ṣa'd the Prophet, according to one tradition, declared that the Prophet was free to dispose of his personal share of four per cent of the booty (ḳhums al-ḳhums) as he wished could scarcely have given rise to discontent. There is some authority for the view that salah should be promised before the battle as a fixed share of the expected booty (Ikhṭildf, 251 ff.), but this view was not generally regarded as valid. Criticism was especially severe after Ṣa'd, when the political insight of the Prophet led him to reconcile former opponents with Islam (taʿalluf al-ṣubḥ al-ḥilāl l-islām) by bestowing upon them large shares of the booty to the detriment of his old supporters (cf. Sūra IX, 60). There is hardly any reason for posteriority to attempt to exculpate the Prophet for this manoeuvre on the ground that the booty in fact went to persons who had already embraced Islam. Since the obvious political aim of Muḥammad was to secure a stable centre among the wavering Bedouin tribes it was essential for him to establish his position in Mecca. The ridda after Muḥammad's death demonstrated, in its extreme form, a situation which he had successfully kept in check during his lifetime—rival prophetic movements in certain tribes which detested
a centralized government and aversion to the poor-tax. Subsequent opponents of the Umayyads, using in their invectives against the dynasty the term al-mu'allafa/atu kalâlum (al-Dinawari, 175, 3), failed to appreciate that the Prophet had won over the ablest politicians of the day, who were destined to provide an effective government at a time of crisis. Once triumphant, however, Islam could afford to abandon this line of approach and was not loth to do so. But, of course, even in later Islam the way to political influence was occasionally paved by economic means, although other names were used. When al-Mâwardî (239) calls transferred property (amâwâl mânâka, cf. Má'dîkâh, 64, 11) by the term ghâzwâ'im mânâ'â, it shows he was not unaware of the fact that such property was taken from the shares of the militia [see further TA'LIF AL-KULûB].

A highly interesting example of the vast amount of booty and the unpreparedness of the government for sweeping successes in the field appears in the tradition of Diyarîr and his tribe Badjîla. After the latter's exploits in Irâk the laxity of the rules for the division of the militia is underlined. Of course such rules could never be realized in practice, since situations falls outside normal conditions. See also BARANTA, GHANIMA, YATHLUM. The traditions are undoubtedly right in maintaining that it was 'Umar I who first settled fixed annual pensions or incomes on the most influential and deserving of the inner circle of conquerors and on the Prophet's widows. The transfer of the militia to a diwân of fixed stipends also took place under his leadership, a process which undoubtedly continued to develop under 'Uthmân. A Muslim could choose the state of hîdrîa, or military service, and so become entitled under the law governing the dâr al-hîdra to fâyî contributions (Abû Yusûf, 85; al-Dinawarî, 131, 141; al-Baladhuri, 275). In the systematized rules enunciated by the jurists for the division of the booty it is possible to trace the growth of Islam from its small beginnings and the development of skirmishes into large scale operations. The booty was divided on the basis of military potential. As with regular pay a distinction was drawn between foot soldiers and mounted troopers. The precedent may have been set by the Prophet but the aim behind it was well suited to the conditions of the times. Every man was given one share, but the mounted soldier got one or two extra shares for his mount. Some jurists would go even further and give to the horseman one share for each of his horses. This tradition marks the trend of development. An illustration is provided by a case in the 4th/10th century of an increase in pay in the ratio 10 : 1 (al-Sûhî, A'khâr al-Râdi wa l-Mutâkabbî, ed. J. Heyworth Dunne, 1935, 226).

Where large armies were engaged it was naturally not only upon those in the front ranks or those who actually came in grips with the enemy that the victory depended. Tradition in fact represents 'Umar I as faced with the situation of the appearance of certain troops after the battle had been won (al-Baladhuri, 256). He is said to have decided that they were entitled to booty if they had arrived before the dead had been buried. Some jurists claim that even if the army is returning to the dâr al-isldm and is then met by other troops of auxiliaries, these latter can claim part of the booty. Furthermore the next of kin of fallen soldiers may inherit their shares. On the other hand, since only free Muslims are entitled to booty, bondmen, women and dhimmis who may in some way have contributed to victory may take only a bonus share, ra'dâ, to be given at the discretion of the Imam. Such shares may even be given to those who are temporarily absent. It is not clear whether this also applies to those who are represented by a hired substitute (badîl). Such shares are usually small, and ought not in any case to exceed the normal share of one person.

As regards ransom money there was a precedent from Badî, where the captor received it for his own captive ('Ubayd Allah ibn Abî Jâbar, ed. J. Schacht, 1933, 20 ff, 68-196; Yahyâ ibn Abî 'Abdallah, 1896, 3-51 passim; A. J. Wensinck, Handboek, references s.v. booty; F. F. Schmidt, Die occupatio im islamischen Recht, in Iisl., i, 303-5; W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, 1956, 255 ff., 348 ff.; Sabîh 'Abd Allâh, al-Tanquim al-idâmî'â'wa l-thiqâdî-â'wa l-Baṣrâ, Baghdad 1953, 125 ff., and references above.

GHANIMA, MUHAMMAD AKRAM, Indian poet who wrote in Persian, a descendant of a family of muṣlis who originated from the village of Kandîdah five miles from Gudrât (Pandjûb). Nothing is known about his life and it is not proved that he was governor of Lahore from 1106 to 1108/1695-7, as is asserted by Étêh (Gr. Ir. Ph., ii, 257). He was in the service of Makkârâm Khân at Gudrât and we do not even know the exact date of his death, which occurred, it is said, at the end of the 9th century A.H. (about 1690). He is best known for a mathnawî, highly esteemed in India, entitled Neyrang-i 'sâhî, which tells of the love of the young prince 'Azîz (who seems to have been the son of his patron) for a gipsy dancer named Shâhâ. 'Étêh gives the date 1685 for the composition of this poem. He left also a small collection of ghazals which have recently been published (Lahore, 1337).
Bibliography: Mir Husayn Dust Sanbhli, Tadhkira-i Husayni, Lucknow 1875, 230-2; Muhammad Afdal ibn al-Nasir on his return but was overwhelmingly defeated on the Chelif plain. Passing along the edge of the desert

Meanwhile, the Almohads had just landed in Spain (541/1149). Yahyā b. Ghaniya was one of the last defenders of the peninsula of the Almoravid domains. He died at Granada in 543/1148.

Muhammad, Yahyā's brother, had been nominated governor of the Balearic islands by 'Ali b. Yusuf in 520/1126. At the time of the Almoravid collapse many members of the fallen clan came to join him there. The governor was declared an independent sovereign and this was the beginning of a new dynasty. Following a palace revolution authority passed to Isḥāq b. Muḥammad (560/1156). Under his rule the small Almoravid kingdom enriched itself by piracy at the expense of the Christians; the islands were peopled by refugees and prisoners. Isḥāq himself died in 579/1183 during a piratical expedition. The eldest of his many children, Muḥammad, succeeded him, but he was compelled to submit to kingship of the Almoravid family. In the midst of all this 'Ali b. Ghaniya retired to the Djadrī. Six thousand Almohad horsemen followed him there, and he inflicted a bloody defeat on them on the plain of al-ʿUmrā (583/1187). Al-Mansūr then went at the head of his troops and gained a victory at al-Ḥamma near Gabes, and reoccupied Tozeur and Gafsa, whose remains were razed. "All 'Ali b. Ghaniya and Karakūsh fled to the desert. Scarcely had Al-Mansūr retaken the road to the Maghrib than the two allies reformed, rallied their followers, and began their campaign afresh. In the midst of all this 'Ali b. Ghaniya died (584/1188). Power passed to his brother Yahyā, who for nearly fifty years was to deal the heaviest blows against the Almohad might. His action began with two fruitless attempts against Constantine. He retired to the desert, the traditional refuge of the vanquished, and rejoined Karakūsh there. Not that his relations with the Armenian condottiere were unclouded. They had broken off their alliance many times. The dubious attitude of Karakūsh with respect to the Almohads and his severity towards the Arabs caused opposition, and conflict broke out in 591/1195. Yahyā b. Ghaniya, helped by the Sulaym Arabs, seized Tripoli and Gabes and then proceeded north, where he took Mahdiyya from Ibn 'Abd al-Karim al-Rasgrādī, a curious character who had declared himself independent sovereign. Two years' campaigning had made him master of Bējā, Biskra, Tēbessa, Kairouan, and Bōn; then, on 7 Rabī‘ II 600/14 December 1203, the Almohad governor of Tunis, the Sīd Abū Zayd, surrendered to him. Learning that the Khāridjīs of Dījābl Nafūsā were profiting by his absence to stage an uprising, he mounted a rapid expedition against them, defeated them, and extorted a crushing indemnity from them. Yahyā b. Ghaniya, master of eastern Barbary, was then at the height of his power. He was at Tunis when he learnt that the Almohad caliph al-Nāṣir was on the way to attack him. He did not wait for him but withdrew towards the Djadrī. He was overtaken on the Tājūra plain, where he suffered a heavy defeat. Al-Nāṣir re-took possession of Mahdiyya and Tunis, where he appointed Abū Muḥammad ibn Abī Hāfīẓ governor, with orders to continue the reconquest of the country. Knowing the danger which hung over him in Ifrikiyya, the Almoravid chief transferred his efforts to the central Maghrib. With his Arab allies he wished to halt al-Nāṣir on his return but was overwhelmingly defeated on the Chellī plain. Passing along the edge of the desert
he rallied fresh nomad allies, met Abu Muhammad ibn Abi Hafs on the river Shabrur near Tebessa, and suffered a fresh defeat. He returned westwards as far as Tafilalt and took Sigilmassa, which he gave up to pillage. Loaded with booty, he encountered the Almohad governor of Tlemcen and beat him, and passed through Tiaret, which he devastated along with many small towns of the central Maghrib of which Ibn Khaldun, in the 8th/14th century, was to say “there no more will you find a lighted hearth, nor hear any more the crowing of the cock.” On his return from this campaign of destruction a meeting with Abu Muhammad proved disastrous for him; a second battle fought in the Djibal Nafusa was still more catastrophic (606/1209).

Thus decisively driven out of Ifrikiya, Yahyā ibn Ghāniya sought refuge in Waddan in the south of Tripolitania. Karakūsh the Armenian was installed there but capitulated, unable to resist his old rival. Yahyā had him executed and took his place.

Abū Muhammad ibn Hāfs had been replaced in the governorship by the Mu’āminid prince Abu ‘l-‘Ālā, who resumed the struggle against the Almoravids. The latter, taking the field again, took possession of Biskra; he even conceived a bold plan of marching anew on Tunis. At Majdūlī, not far from Tunis, a bloody battle decimated the Almoravid force and put Yahyā to flight (620/1223).

Having instigated by his action in Ifrikiya the indefatigable rebel, having got himself new allies in the south, again took the road to the central Maghrib and once more sowed ruin there. He went on to Bougie, laid siege to Delys, Mitidja, and Algiers, and stirred up a revolt at Tlemcen which came almost to the point of recognizing Almoravid sovereignty. He fled before an army from Tunis which was marching on his heels and took refuge at Sigilmassa (624/1226). The eleven years of life left to him saw a hopeless prolongation of his activity. He gave up hope of returning to a too well defended Ifrikiya but he pursued to the end of his career the harrying and pillaging along the border of the central Maghrib and perished on the banks of the Chelif, not far from Miliana, in 633/1237. He left three daughters whom he entrusted to the generosity of the Ḥāfiz Abū Zakariyya who was governor of Tunis. They were treated considerately and housed in a palace called Kašr al-Banāt (Palace of the Daughters) which a Tunis boulevard (Bāb Banāt) still commemorates.

As a conclusion to this account of a turbulent enterprise which lasted more than 50 years some observations may be made to fix its place in history and underline its importance.

The attempt to restore the Almoravids failed completely and could scarcely have succeeded. But although apparently a mere episode in the past of the period of the Almohads, this was more evident than the rise of Tlemcen in central Barbary that of Tunis in Ifrikiya, where a strong rule was established which delivered the province from the danger of the Almoravids. The handing over of the government by the Almohads to the Hafsids, who soon assumed autonomy, seems to be one of the only happy consequences of the epic of the Banū Ghāniya.


The Ghārīb, part of the Moroccan coast situated approximately between the Wādi Lukkius, the Wādi Subī and the mountains which border the coastal plain to the east. This territory has never been precisely defined, but its limits have varied according to the tribes which occupied it and were or were not considered as tribes of the Ghārīb. It is an alluvial plain, humid and marshy, along the coast and bordered to the east by rolling hills. The Ghārīb, thus roughly defined, was at first inhabited by Berbers and probably formed part of the territory of the Barghawata [s.v.]. There were these exterminated by the Almoravids and the Almohads, leaving an uninhabited area so that the Almohad Ya’qūb al-Manṣūr could establish there at the end of the 6th/12th century levies of the Hilāl Arabs which he intended to use in his battles against the Christians of Spain. The Marinid rulers Abū Yusuf and Abū Ḥābih similarly used the Maṣ’il Arabs in the 7th and 8th/13th and 14th centuries. Hence the population of the Ghārīb is almost entirely of Arab origin (Banū Mālik, Sufyān, Khluṭ and Tīlīk) and, until the 19th century, the tribes inhabiting this territory were fighting tribes and nomadic rather than settled, pastoral rather than agricultural, which have been of some importance, particularly during the period of Sa’did anarchy (first half of the 17th century).

With the French colonization, heavy in this region, the Ghārīb became a prosperous agricultural district, where the growing of rice particularly has flourished. With the possible exception of al-Kašr al-Kabīr and the large market of Sūk al-Arba’, no thriving urban centre has so far flourished in this area. Bibliography: Leo Africanus, Description de l’Afrique, tr. Epaulard, i, 250 ff. (in his time, the usual place-name was Azghār and not Gharb); L. Massinon, Le Maroc dans les premières années

**GHARB AL-ANDALUS**

**Algarve, the West of Andalusia.** This name, now that of the southernmost province of Portugal, was applied by the Muslim historians and geographers to the territory lying to the south-east of Lisbon, reaching as far as both banks of the Guadiana estuary. Mússá b. Nuṣayr[8] took Mérida in 847/1253 and his son 'Abbād al-'Azīz made himself master of Niebla, Beja, and Ocsówoba, but the Gharb soon began to itself a focus of rebellion with the revolt of the Berbers, who were beaten in the Mérida region by the governor Tha‘laba in 1247/743. The Syrian king of Hīna settled in Niebla and a part of that of Egypt in Beja and Ocsówoba. Niebla was the scene of a revolt of Yemenites against 'Abbād al-Raḥmān I, whose son Sulaymān also revolted against his nephew al-Hakam I. In 213/828, Mérida was the centre of a prolonged Berber rebellion under Muḥammād b. al-Djabbār. Hemmed in by the forces of the Córdoban caliph, little by little the Taifa of Niebla was forced to retreat on a fortified position on Monte-Sacro, not far from the present-day town of Faro in the Ocsówoba district, but soon emigrated to Galicia, where he was killed by Alfonso II in 225/840. During the reign of the amīr Muḥammād I one 'Abbād al-Raḥmān b. Marwān b. Yūnūs, known as Ibn al-Djillīki (son of the Galician) as being a member of a muwallad family originally from the north of Portugal but long settled in Mérida, proclaimed himself champion of independence in the west of Andalusia and in alliance with Alfonso III kept up a struggle in Badajoz, Esparraguera (between the Guadiana and Almāddn), and Antaniya (I典kana a Velha, about 140 km. from Mérida and 30 km. north-west of Castelo-Branco). His dynasty, the b. Marwān, survived till 318/930, in which year 'Abbād al-Raḥmān III recovered Badajoz. Soon afterwards he also recovered the petty principalities of their vassals in Beja, Santa María del Algarve, and Silves. On the fall of the caliphate of Córdoba, during the first period of 'party kings', the petty kingdom of the B. Muzayyin was formed at Silves and lasted from 420/1028 to 445/1053. In 433/1041 Muḥammād b. Sa‘d b. Hārūn made himself independent at Santa Maria del Algarve but had to submit to al-Mu‘taṣid the emir of Seville. At Huelva and Saltes there reigned 'Abbād al-Sakīr, the father of the famous geographer Abū ‘Ubayd al-Bakrī, the father of the famous geographer Abū ‘Ubayd al-Bakrī, from 403/1012 to 445/1051 when he surrendered to al-Mu‘taṣid. Niebla suffered the same fate. Tāǧj al-Dawla came to power there in 414/1023 and was recognized by Huelva and Gibraleón. On his death in 433/1041 he was succeeded by his brother Muḥammād al-Yāsibī, who retired to Córdova in 443/1051 leaving the power to his nephew Nāṣir al-Dawla who handed it over to al-Mu‘taṣid and took refuge in Córdova in 450/1058. When the Almoravids power declined a party kingdom re-formed in Algarve under Ibn Ḥaṣīn at Mertola, which has an old tradition of spinning and textile manufacture in Egypt. Tanta, now the capital of the province, has the tomb of Sayyid Ahmad al-Badawi[8], where the annual feasts attract thou-
sand of devotees. The population of the province in 1960 was 1,815,000 persons.


---

**Ghārdāyā** (current spelling: Ghardaia), the chief town of the Mzab, situated 635 km. by road south of Algiers on the parallel 32° 30'. Between 500 and 560 metres in altitude, it is built over a rounded hillock on the right bank of the Wādī Mzab, which cuts a hundred metres into the completely desert-like and deeply channelled limestone plateau of the bēlkā ("net") of the Mzab.

Ghardaia was founded in 1450/1053, after al-'Atif (al-Atif, 407/1011), Bou Noura (Bou Nura), Beni Isguen (Isgen) and Mellika, its lower neighbours, by the Ibāḍīs who, little by little, abandoned Sedrāta (south of the oasis of Ouargla), their first refuge in the Sahara, after the ruin of their capital, Tiaret (Tahart), in 296/909 by the Fātimids. It was families from Ghardaia who later founded Guerara (Grara) in 1631 and Timūn in 1679, 100 km. to the north-east and 50 km. to the north respectively. Ghardaia, like all the other towns of the Mzab, gives the impression that it has always lived by trading across the Sahara, and, above all since the 10th/16th century, by its dealings with Algerians, far more than by an agriculture seriously limited by shortage of water.

The Mzabis have remained fiercely Ibāḍī and attached to their Berber speech. Ghardaia has grown over the centuries owing to Ibāḍī immigration. To the Awlād ʻAmrī, ʻIṣa and Awlād Bā Silmān, the groups which founded the city, have later been added Ibāḍī groups from Tafilalet, from the Wādī Rīgh, Djerba and Djiābal Nafsū. It has grown equally through the Mdabih, Mālikīt from the ḥājīr of al-Māya, on the foot-hills of the Djiābal ʻAmūr, and Mdabih by little, through some Benī Merzūg families from the old ḥājīr of the Shaʻanba of Metlili; Mdabih and Beni Merzūg are Arabic speaking and belong to the Mālikī school. Ghardaia also shelters a community of Jews, of whom the earliest are supposed to have come from Djerba from the 14th century on, and others from Morocco, Tripoli and Algeria.

Ghardaia surrendered to France with the rest of the Mzab in 1853 and was peacefully occupied in 1882. To-day it has a population of 16,000 (1957), of whom about 1,000 are Arabs and about 1,500 Jews, and there is a small number of Europeans. Both in its appearance and in the way it functions, even more than from the size of its population, Ghardaia is a true city and not a simple Sahara ḥājīr.

Originally, its shape was oval and its plan concentric and radiating. Its single mosque, focal point of the city, placed by the Almighty, refuge and storehouse in the troubled times of the past, dominates the whole town with its annexes (schools, takhdibust for the ablutions of the scholars) and its great truncated cone of a minaret (ʻassāda), twenty metres high, which overlooks the whole surrounding country-side. The circular streets, with others radiating from them, narrow but rarely covered, and lined with houses side by side, are the main thoroughfares of the district which surrounds the mosque. To the south-west there is a way down to the edge of the town through a place where the ancient ramparts have been demolished to form a rectangular market place, 55 by 44 metres in extent, bedded with porticos of irregular arches and shops—the souk. Eight streets coming from three directions of the compass, lead into this and here are to be found the shopkeepers and artisans. This is the economic centre of the town as well as the political and administrative one, where the baʿid has his office and the āḏādīn meets. To the south-east, the little Jewish quarter leads into the new business district; the Mādhīb live together to the north-west. Several vast cemeteries enclosed by walls cover the land immediately surrounding the town.

Ghardaia is primarily a town of merchants and business men. Little by little, the trade across the Sahara has disappeared, but its population lives mainly on the profits of its approximately 2,000 shopkeepers, grocers and textile merchants in the towns of the Tell. Ghardaia is also the principal market of the Mzab and a transit post for food supplies for the stations further south. Arabs and Jews share the transport business with the Ibāḍīs. Since 1920, lorry traffic has little by little replaced the traditional caravan. Tourists visiting the Mzab usually stay in Ghardaia. It is also the chief town of the administrative district (circlaire) of the Mzab. Some of the traditional artisans (the men make carpets and woollen textiles, the men are coppersmiths) are encouraged by the schools and workshops of the White Sisters and find some exterior outlets. Blacksmiths, carpenters, tailors, shoemakers, work for the local population as do the Jewish jewellers; the building industry has always been active.

Agriculture, on the contrary, shows a debit balance. The 60,000 palm trees and the gardens in the lower part of the valley, watered with difficulty by deep wells, which are worked by animal traction, or flooded by the rare spates of the Wādī Mzab, are used more as pleasure gardens where, for the last three-quarters of a century, the people of Ghardaia have built houses of an urban type in which they live during the summer. The profits of trade pay for the upkeep of the houses.

In many features of its activities, in its type of housing, in its particular form of administration, and even more in its social and religious life, Ghardaia is inseparable from the other cities of the Mzab. (J. DESPOIS)

**Ghardjistan, Gharghistan, a territory in the mountains of Afghanistan east of Harat on the upper valley of the Murghab River and north of the upper Har i Rūd. Al-Muqaddasi (309) was probably right in explaining the word as "mountain", hence "country of the mountainiers".**

Little is known of this land before the time of the Ṣāmānids (q.v.), but we may assume that it was ruled by petty Hepthalite princes. Ghardjistan was raided by Asad b. Ṣubayl b. Asfari, governor of Ḳūrān in 107/725-6. The local ruler Namrun (?) made peace and accepted Islam (al-Tabarī, ii, 1489-9). The title of the ruler of Ghardjistan was ṣār, derived from an Old Iranian word for "king" (Marquart). The Muslim geographers knew that ṣār meant "king" (al-Muqaddasi, 309; Ḳudūd al-ṣārim, 105), but Ibn Ḳurrādaḍībīb (39) says that the king of Ghardjistan was called Barāz bandah, which is probably a confusion with the ruler of neighbouring Māğhān.

The geographers (al-Muqaddasi, 30; Ibn Hawkāl, 443; Yāḳūṭ, s.v. Ghardjistan) speak briefly of two
principal towns in the country, Baghlan and Shahrin, which cannot be located.

Muhammad b. Karam (d. 255/869) converted many people in Ghardjistan to his heretical doctrines (al-Baghdaḏ, 202), and centres of this heresy remained in the mountains (al-Mukaddath 323). The rulers of Ghardjistan acknowledged the suzerainty of the Samanids but Mahmud of Ghazna had taken to Ghazna where he died in 406/1015 (Uṭbī, 146). The kingdom of Ghardjistan was placed under the governor of Marv al-Rūḏ, but apparently local princes resumed control of the country for we hear of several Ṣāḥr again in the time of the Gharīḍs (Dīḏzḏānī, 49). The founder of the dynasty of Khārīzmiyān, Nush Teg̲n, was a Turkish slave from Ghardjistan (Djwvwj豪门, ii, i).

The name of Ghardjistan appears in many annals of the Ghurids and Mongol periods, while the "kings" of Ghardjistan are mentioned as late as 715/1315 (Ta’ilk-ānā-i Ḩarīḍ, ed. M. Z. Siddiqi, 626). Thereafter the name does not appear in relevant sources.


(A. N. FRYE)

GHARĪB, literally: "strange," "uncommon," a technical term in philology and in the science of tradition. As a term in philology it means: "rare, unfamiliar (and consequently obscure) expressions" (in which sense the terms wāḥīš and ḥāšī are also used), and frequently occurs in the titles of books, mostly such as deal with unfamiliar expressions in the Kūrān and in the Tradition (books carrying the titles Gharīb al-Kūrān and Gharīb al-ʿIqāl seem to have existed as early as the second century). The term also occurs in works on literary theory (where it may also have the non-technical, laudatory sense of "uncommon," "original"). More or less anecdotal reports purport to show that some Umayyad and early ʿAbbāsid critics rejected the use of unfamiliar language by certain contemporary poets such as Ṭirimmā, Kumayt, and Ibn Munāḏhir, because this unfamiliar language was not part of the native vocabulary of these poets, but resulted from an archaizing tendency. Most classical scholars of literary theory follow the same line with regard to the poet's vocabulary, allowing only expressions that are known in the poet's own time, and likewise condemn the use of the gharīb in prose and oratory. Ibn al-ʿAǧīr, however, who deals with the subject at great length, holds that unfamiliar expressions may be used in poetry as long as they are not unpleasant to the ear.

For the technical meaning of the term gharīb in the science of tradition see ḤADRĪTH.


GHARIM (gharim, according to the lexicographers, is a synonym): debtor or creditor. By analogy with other legal terms this semantic distinction was
favoured by the jurists. In Islam the ghadr was entitled to a share of the zakat (Sura IX, 60) to pay his debt, provided he was destitute and the debt did not arise from any disreputable cause or, if it had so arisen, the debtor had duly repented. Other debtors had this claim although they were not destitute, if the debt had been incurred “for God’s sake”, i.e., for Islam or for an unselfish purpose. The zakat of relatives might be employed to this end as an exception. This latter case reflects pre-Islamic standards, where it was praiseworthy for a man of standing to take upon himself the burden (hamdla) of blood money (diya) in order to prevent or stop a blood feud (Hatim al-Ta’I, ed. Schulthess, 1897, lxi, 40 (ar. ft; Hamdla, Cairo 1335, i, 145; The Naghamia of Djair and al-Farasaab, ed. Bevan, i, 345, 8; 382, 14; li, 789, 17; 1046). The Prophet also paid diya on several occasions (al-Bukhari, 87, 22; 93, 38).

**Bibliography:** Abu Dawaids, Saheb Sunan, Cairo 1280, i, 165; Al-Mawardi, Kitab al-Ash’am al-sultaniyya, ed. Enger 1853, 212; Al-Shirazi, Al-Tamhid, ed. Juybobi 1897, 62, 113, 288.

(F. Løkkegaard)

**GHARNATA, GRANADA, the capital of the province and ancient kingdom of that name, does not come into prominence in Spanish history until the early 5th/11th century when a collateral branch of the Banu Hammad (the ruling clan of the lands of the Banu Hamdil and late in Bougie) realigned its power and offered its services to the first caliph of Kairwan II, Abd al-Malik al-Muzaffar, son and successor of al-Manṣur Ibn Abi ʿAmir. The reply was satisfactory, so they embarked with a considerable band of fellow-tribesmen and retainers, with Zawi b. Zaki at its head, soon to become one of the most important and turbulent sections of the Berber army recruited by the ʿAmirids. On the death of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Sanchol they espoused the cause of the leader of the Berber party in Spain, Sulaymān al-Mustāʿin, and contributed largely to his succession to the Caliphate. When Sulaymān rewarded his chief followers by the grant of fiefs, to these he allotted the district of Elvira-Granada (al-Hamds, al-Sultaniyya, ed. Enger 1853, 212; Al-Shirazi, Al-Tamhid, ed. Juybobi 1897, 62, 113, 288).

Historians and geographers of Muslim Spain are at one in stressing the beauty of Granada and the fertility of its plains. The admiration inspired in the Muslims, a people hitherto inhabited mainly by Jews.

In the story of the Zirid dynasty (treated at length in the article ZIRI (BANU)) the principal events directly affecting the city of Granada are: the siege by the caliph al-Murtada, who incited and betrayed by the ʿAmirid fadis al-Mundhir, and Khayrān sought to drive out the Zirids, only to flee and perish in Guadix, after a shameful defeat. After this unexpected victory and the consolidation of the dynasty during the amirs of ʿAbd al-Murtaḍ, and with the effective support of the Jewish viziers Samuel and his son Yusuf b. Nagralla (Negrello), Granada was the scene of a notorious pogrom, whose victims included the vizier Yusuf as well as a large number of his co-religionists. Just after this the amir Bādis, old and conscious of the threat to his rule, spent large sums on making the old alcazaba of Granada strategically impregnable, judging that if the neighboring states, or his enemies, or his own rebellious subjects should drive him to a last resort, he might shut himself up in it with the possibility of embarking at need for Ifrīkiya, as his grandfather Zawi had done before him. Of the last
Zirid amir, 'Abd Allah, Badis's grandson, who began his reign when little more than a child, we have only to mention that after a chequered career of revolts and resistance to the Castilians and Christian neighbours, he finally incurred the enmity of the Almoravids, and prepared for armed resistance against them by provisioning and fortifying his castles, and building walls adjoining the alcazaba. However, when Yusuf b. Tashfin appeared before Granada, his innate cowardice and the advice of his ministers and his mother decided him to go out to welcome the Almoravid amir, to open the gates of Granada to him, and give him all the treasures of his palace.

After this, Granada was administered by Almoravid governors from 483/1090 to 551/1166, when it passed into the hands of the Almohads. Its first Almoravid governor was Abu Muhammad 'Abd al-'Aziz, himself followed by the amir Yahyá b. Wasíná, related to Yusuf. The latter returned to the Peninsula for the last time in 496/1102 to safeguard the position of his son 'Ali as heir apparent (he had been proclaimed the year before in Marrákkush), proceeded via Granada, whose governor at the time was Abu 'l-Hasan b. al-Hadjdj, and went first to Levante. Attacked by Alfonso VI at Medinaceli, he counter-attacked through Toledo and Talavera, but was defeated and died on the field of battle. The next governor was Abu 'l-Hasan's brother Muham- mad b. al-Hadjdj; he, with the Granada forces, came to the help of the amir Súr, governor of Seville, whose territory was threatened by Alfonso VI, but at Mu'tá, close to Seville, he was forced to retire with heavy losses. The following year (499/1105) we find as governor Abu Bakr b. Ibráhím al-Lantuní who, on the death of Yusuf b. Tashfin (500/1106), attempted some opposition to the proclamation of 'Ali b. Yusuf; the citizens of Granada, however, gave him no support, and he was captured and sent to Marrákkush. 'Ali, accompanied by his faithful but incompetent elder brother Abu 'l-'Táhir Tamlím, went straight to Andalusia to stifle this attempt at revolt and another which had broken out in Cordova, and appointed Tamlím governor of Granada. The latter organized the defence of Granada against Ulus, during which Alfonso VI's son the Infante Sancho met his death. However, he was dismissed in that same year, and after a brief period under the governor of Valencia, 'Abd Alláh b. Fátima, the governorship of Granada was taken over by 'Ali b. Yusuf's cousin the amir Mázdallá b. Sulánkán. Though his attack at Guadalajara (506/1112-3) had no success, in the year following (507/1113) he took Ocreja, and in July 1114 attacked the Sagra of Toledo, pillaged Pégina, Cábanas and Magán, and defeated the alcaide Rodrigo Aznárez. His success was short-lived, for during Shawwál 508/March 1115 this great ally of Yusuf b. Tashfin and his successor 'Ali was defeated and killed. His son 'Abd Alláh b. Mázdallá, who succeeded him as governor of Granada, went with his forces to the assistance of Abu Bakr b. Yahyá b. Tashfin, amir of Cordova; he was engaged by the Castilians around Baeza, and was defeated with heavy losses. In 510/1117, while Tamlím was once again in Granada, Alfonso I (the Battler) undertook his great expedition across Andalusia, in the course of which he twice camped before Granada but did not manage to lay siege to it; he defeated Tamílm at Aranuel. Dismissed at last for his inefficiency, Tamílm was succeeded by Abu 'Umar Inalú, grandson of Tashfin and a former governor of Fez, who had engaged Alfonso during the retreat before Guadix. When Ibn Ruqád told 'Ali b. Yusuf what had been happening in Andalusia and advised him to complete the fortifications of Marrákkush, a few men sent by the same advice about Andalusia. Orders were therefore sent to the governors of Sevilla, Granada, Cordova and Almería to mend and reinforce the walls and defences of their cities. In Granada the new governor Inalú made great efforts to get this done even though while the work was in progress the Geníl rose and swept away his building materials around Báb al-Ramla and Bab Fannú, and many lives were lost. 'Ali dismissed Inalú on Diumád 512/May 1118 and ordered him to Marrákkush to face serious charges preferred by the Mozarabs of Granada. These were proved at a court of inquiry, and he was imprisoned and sentenced to make good the wrongs he had committed. This unpublished episode from the Almoravid Bayán shows clearly that by no means all the Mozarabs were deported to Morocco, no more were they all accomplices and collaborators of Alphonso the Battler, for the majority of them suffered no punishment or reprisals, and even after the great damage caused by him, their rights were respected and justice was done to them. The new governor Abu '1-Hasf 'Umar, a son of 'Ali b. Yusuf, campaigned in Levante and seized an unnamed castle, only to be disposed after (May 516/1121-2) and replaced by another of 'Ali's sons, the famous and unfortunate Tashfin, who for ten years struggled with vigour but without success against the Castilians. In 526/1132 he had to take on as well the governorship of Cordova, and therefore delegated that of Granada to Abu Muhammad al-Zubary b. 'Umar, the Azoel of the Christian chronicles, whose valorous exploits came to a tragic end in 538/1143, when he was beaten and slain by the heroic Toledan alcaide Muño Alfonso.

The last of the governors answerable to Marrákkush was 'Ali b. Abu Bakr, son of 'Ali b. Yusuf's sister Fannú; he died during the revolt of Ibn Adhäuser who gave up Granada to Sayf al-Dawla (Zafadola) the last descendant of the Banu Hud of Saragossa, who had made his submission to Alfonso VII. The Azoel of Cordova, who had just resisted the assaults of Sayf al-Dawla and forced him to retire after killing his son Imam al-Dawla during a sortie. After the Granadan populace had expelled 'Ali b. Adhäuser who retired to Almuñecer, they acknowledged the sovereignty of the Almoravids of the alcazaba. Commanded by Ibn Gháníya's lieutenant Maymún b. Yiddar, they stood their ground until 551/1156, but the achievements of the Almo had governors of Cordova and Seville, added to their sense of isolation and dwindling numbers, moved them to write to Marrákkush and sue for peace. Their offer to surrender the city was preferred by the Mozarabs of Granada. These were proved at a court of inquiry, and he was imprisoned and sentenced to make good the wrongs he had committed. This unpublished episode from the Almoravid Bayán shows clearly that by no means all the Mozarabs were deported to Morocco, no more were they all accomplices and collaborators of Alphonso the Battler, for the majority of them suffered no punishment or reprisals, and even after the great damage caused by him, their rights were respected and justice was done to them. The new governor Abu '1-Hasf 'Umar, a son of 'Ali b. Yusuf, campaigned in Levante and seized an unnamed castle, only to be disposed after (May 516/1121-2) and replaced by another of 'Ali's sons, the famous and unfortunate Tashfin, who for ten years struggled with vigour but without success against the Castilians. In 526/1132 he had to take on as well the governorship of Cordova, and therefore delegated that of Granada to Abu Muhammad al-Zubary b. 'Umar, the Azoel of the Christian chronicles, whose valorous exploits came to a tragic end in 538/1143, when he was beaten and slain by the heroic Toledan alcaide Muño Alfonso.
whose garrison was absent in Almería, but the vizier Abū Dī’ār Ahmad b. ʿĀtiyya and the sayyid Yūsuf b. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, having expeditated the surrender of Almería, set out of the place, and the vizier the Almohad garrison entrenched itself in the old alcazaba, which Ibn Hamushuk attacked with battering-rams from the Alhambra in the Sabika. He appealed for reinforcements to Ibn Mardanšī, who arrived with his soldiers and the Christian mercenaries commanded by Alvar Rodríguez the Bald, grandson of Alvar Fáez. The governor of Granada, the sayyid Abū Saʿīd ʿUghmān, was absent in Marrākush, so he set off and crossed the Straits to bring up to the beleaguered city, and from Málaga he reached the plain of Granada, picking up reinforcements from Seville; but at a place called Mārdī al-rukād (“sleepy meadow”) some four miles from the city he suffered defeat and fled to Málaga. ʿAbd al-Muʿmin, in Rabat at the time, sent picked forces over the Straits, commanded by himself, who, by his lieutenants, Yūsuf b. Sulaymān, but in reality by the veteran Yūsuf b. Sulaymān, who scaled by night the rocky cliffs above the Genil, near to the Sabika and the Alhambra, surprised the enemy encampment at dawn, and achieved total victory. Hefreed the beleaguered garrison and received the submission of all the dwellers of the plain (who had already submitted to Ibn Hamushuk), and provisioned and restored the liberated Alcazaba.

In 563/1168, at the very moment when Granada had recognized Yūsuf I as amīr al-muʿminīn, its governor defeated between Granada and Guadix a detachment of Christian mercenaries in the service of Ibn Mardanšī which had got as far as Ronda. Returning from his abortive expedition against Huete (autumn 566/1172), Yūsuf I came by Granada where he left as governor his brother Abu Saʿīd ʿUghmān, who had been with him on this campaign. Nothing of importance occurred in Granada during the reign of the subsequent Almohad caliphs until al-Maʿmūn, who, proclaimed in Seville, before he left for Morocco had to tackle Muhammad b. Yūsuf b. Hūd al-Dīwadhamī, the personification of general insurrection of the Spanish Muslims. During al-Maʿmūn’s absence, Ibn Hūd quickly mastered the whole of Andalusia. He had recognized the sovereignty of the ʿAbbāsīd caliph al-Mustanṣir, and in 630/1232 the caliph’s ambassador was received with due solemnity when he came to invest Ibn Hūd with the title of amīr of all Andalusia. But Ibn Hūd was assassinated in Almería in 550/1157, and his enemy Ibn al-Ahmar rose in Aχrjona and took possession of Granada in 556/1258 and founded the Naṣrīd dynasty.

One of his first tasks was to make a thorough inspection of the Alhambra. He traced the foundations of the Alcázar, appointed the excavators, and before the year was out many defensive works had been built. He brought water from the river, set up an asād and dug a dike to feed it. When this work was just beginning he put to death in the Alhambra itself the tax-gatherer of Almería, Abū Muḥammad b. ʿArūs, and later other collectors of revenue, determined to clear the building programme. When the Almohad caliph al-Rashīd died in 640/1242 he transferred his allegiance to the Ḥāṣfīd amīr of Tunis, Abū Zakariyā, from whom he received considerable sums intended to be used by the Spanish Muslims in the holy war; but Ibn al-Ahmar spent them on the works he had undertaken and on the extension of the mosques of the city, and made the hādi Muhammad b. ʿAyyāb swear that this money from the Tunisian sovereign was not intended for any definite purpose, but could be spent at will. For the rest of the long and eventful story of the Naṣrīd dynasty up to the capture of Granada by the Catholic Kings, see the article MARRAKESH.

Bibliography: E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. Mus., i, 342; ii, 330; R. Dozy, Hist. des Musulmans d’Espagne, iii, 70, 143; idem, Recherches, ii, 228-31; E. Lévi-Provençal, Les «Mémòries» de ʿAbd Allāh, dernier roi ziride de Grenade, in al-Andalus, iii, 223-344; iv, 29-145; vi, 1-62; L. Torres Balbás, La Alhambra antes del siglo XIII, in al-Andalus, v, 155 ff.; Ibn Ḫālid, ed. Lévi-Provençal, iii, 113, 125, 126; Abū al-Munīm, al-Raṣūl al-mūṭár, ed. Lévi-Provençal, 29-30; Ibn al-Khaṭīb, Aḥmad al-aṭ-īm, 139, 260-70; idem, Ḥāja, Cairo edition, i, 334-7; Codera, Decadencia y desaparición de los Almávrides, 136; A. Huici, Las grandes batallas de la Reconquista, 19-134; idem, Historia política del Imperio almohade, i, 756, 202, 205; ii, 468; idem, El Bayan almohade, in Colección de Crónicas árabes de la Reconquista, iii, 309, 355; iv, 103, 109-10, 125-6; idem, La salida de los Almávrides del desierto y el gobierno de Yūsuf b. ʿAsk al-Mans d’Espagne, in Hesperis, 1959, 179; idem, ʿAli b. Yūsuf y sus empreses en el Andalus, in Tumud, 1959, 17-114. (A. Huici MIRANDA)

Monuments

A. — The town

The Roman and Visigothic town.—Granada originated in a small Roman town, Illiberis, built on the site where, in the 5th/6th century, the palace of the Zirids, al-Kasaba al-kadima, arose, and on the hillside sloping down towards the Darro. Ancient tombs have been discovered on the other side of the river, and before the year was out many defensive works had been built. For the rest of the long and eventful story of the Naṣrīd dynasty, see the article MARRAKESH.

The remains found in the ground at Granada are inadequate for a reconstruction of the topography of the town, or for assessing the value of its monuments. A Visigothic inscription preserved at Granada, but which may have come from somewhere else, mentions the founding of three churches in an unspecified place. Hence the history of the monuments of Granada can only be written from the Muslim period onwards.

Granada in the 4th/10th century.—Up till the 5th/11th century Granada was not the most important town in the region. The chief town in the district was Madina Elvira, at the foot of the ridge of mountains of that name, where excavations have unearthed remains of the period of the caliphs with painted or carved decorations. However, from the 4th/10th century onwards Granada had monuments of a certain importance, built according to the techniques current in Spain under the caliphe. The minaret which served as the base for the bell-tower of the church of San José is similar in its plan and arrangement of stretchers and bondstones to all the minarets of that date. As early as that period the town had a fortified wall, some remains of which are still in existence: the wall was of concrete: the towers and the remains of a gateway are chained with free-stone. Old drawings show that the façades of the gates of Elvira and of Hernán Román had
kept their 4th/10th century work up to modern times. The bridge over the Genii, several times altered ... on the first floor. The hospital—the Mdristdn—has been destroyed;

but its plan has been preserved. Its central court seems to have been a spice tray. There are two gates in this part of the wall: the Puerta Monaita and the Puerta Nueva or Arco de los Pesos. They have arches made of stone or brick, surmounted by brick lintels and relieving arches. They are the oldest known examples in Spain of towers with crooked entry made of vaulted halls, interrupted, at the Puerta Monaita, by an open bay. The gates of Barambla and of the Maouror, now vanished, belonged to this enclosing wall.

This rampart was prolonged on the left bank of the Darro by a stone archway between two towers, allowing the curtain to cross the river without interrupting the route of the patrol. What remains of this beautiful work is commonly known as the Bridge of the Kâdi. The wall reached right up to the summit of the Alhambra plateau, where it was supported by two small fortresses. It enclosed a fairly extensive suburb in the quarter of the Maouror, where wealthy houses were erected. What is left of this Zîrid enclosure remains one of the finest fortifications in the Archangelus 9th/15th century.

The palace of the Zîrids occupied the upper part of al-Kasaba al-badima. Nothing of it remains beyond a cistern with four cradle-vaulted bays, and several pieces of wall utilized in later buildings.

Of the buildings of the town itself only a hammam called the Bânu elo remains. After a room for undressing and resting—with a basin in its centre and which the hose courtyards had galleries on the first floor—come three parallel vaulted rooms: the tepidarium had columns along three sides; the frigidarium and the caldarium were prolonged by little loggias reached through twin arches. The columns, with neither base nor astragal, are surmounted by re-used antique capitals. The walls are made of a very hard concrete; the arches and vaults of brick. The Banuelo with its row of three parallel rooms is the perfect example of a Hispano-Moorish bath, which persisted in Spain during the following centuries and is often found in Morocco.

Few remains of decoration have been found in Granada, apart from a few capitals. A curious piece of sculptured marble, divided into several sections and decorated with a Kufic inscription, preserved at Madrid in the Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan, seems to have been a spice tray.

Granada under the Almoravids and the Almohads.— Under the African dynasties Granada apparently did not undergo great changes. It is possible that the fortification to the west of the Alhambra, now known as Torres Bermejas, goes back in the main to the 6th/11th century.

Some carved woodwork and fragments of moulded plasterwork of the Maouror, all of which have been collected in the Maouror Regional Museum, seem to be of the Almoravid period. They are of excellent quality. This continuity of the Granada workshops played its part in assuring the rise of Nasrid art. Nasrid Granada.— With the dynasty of the Nasrids, the founder of which, Muhammad Ibn al-Ahmâr, settled in Granada in 635/1238, Granada became, and remained till its conquest by the Catholic monarchs in 897/1492, the capital of the last Muslim state in Spain (see NASRIDS).

Nasrid Granada, while maintaining profitable economic relations with Castile and Aragon, was closed to all spiritual and artistic influence from the Christian world. It shut itself up within its Muslim traditions, which it preserved, without renewing them, with pious faithfulness. Nasrid art was thus the final outcome and the supreme flowering of Muslim art in Spain.

The end of the 7th/13th century and the 8th/14th century were the periods of active construction: architecture and decoration, within formulas now become classical, continued to evolve slowly. But in the 9th/15th century in this increasingly threatened kingdom, often shaken by internal strife, buildings of importance seem to have been very rare, while the decoration of monuments lost its spontaneity and fine quality.

The surrounding wall. — From the moment that it became the capital of Muhammad Ibn Ahamar, Granada was transformed, especially by the influx of refugees. The wall was extended to the north in order to take in the Albaycin quarter; a concrete rampart with oblong quadrilateral towers, a part of which still exists, enclosed this extension. The rest of the city wall was underpinned and reinforced. In engravings made shortly after the reconquest, the wall appears with albarranas towers in many places. But all this fine array of fortifications was demolished when the modern enlargement of the city took place.

Religious buildings. — Granada has kept hardly any of its religious buildings. The church of the Salvador remains some remains of the ahn of the great mosque of the Albaycin, the site of which it occupies. From an old description we know that this Nasrid sanctuary was a beautiful building with nine naves, the arcade of which rested on eighty-six marble columns. A 7th/13th century minaret serves as the belfry of the church of San Juan de los Reyes. It is a square tower, with a cradle-vaulted staircase rising round a square central newel. The outside walls are decorated with a pattern of interlaced links in brick. The top band of the tower's decoration is in the form of a frieze of star-shaped polygons. This minaret, which belonged to a small 7th/13th century mosque, has neither the size nor the sumptuousness of the great Marinid minarets of Fez which belong to the same architectural style: it lacks ceramic decoration.

Of the madrasa which was built in 750/1349 only the hall of prayer remains, and now much restored. Some remains of the façade have been assembled in the Museum. Finally, outside the old city, the ermita de San Sebastián is a small Muslim sanctuary of the 9th/15th century, probably a funerary building, of square form, covered by a sixteen-sided cupola with fine and numerous ribs.

Secular buildings. — Nasrid Granada had many public baths: only one has been preserved, that of the Calle Real. It is of thoroughly classical type: its three vaulted rooms, on parallel axes, are preceded by a room for undressing and resting, with a gallery on the first floor.

The hospital—the Mridán—has been destroyed; but its plan has been preserved. Its central court
was bordered by porches with pointed arches on the ground floor, and wooden lintels on the first floor. The rooms opened through twin bays onto galleries. Its façade was symmetrically disposed. Above the first floor, richly decorated, and above its lintel, an arcade contained the foundation inscription: on the first floor there were windows, single or gminated.

Of the many fundúks which Granada boasted, only one has been preserved: the Corral del Carbón. The court, the arrangement of which is similar to that of the Márístán, is surrounded by a two-storied colonnade on lintels. Of purer lines and better proportion, it has the same plan that one finds in Marinid hosteries of the same period in Fez. This utilitarian building, the interior of which remains very sober, had a monumental doorway which was richly decorated. Its approach reveals a short vestibule with a horse-shoe arch, surmounted by a false lintel and a gminated window framed in two arcades. All this arrangement is decorated with moulded plaster. The ceiling of this type of portico is made of stalactites. One enters the court by a door with a lintel surmounted by a gminated arcade. The fundúks of Fez retained, up till the modern period, the tradition of monumental doors, decorated to a greater or lesser extent.

Although the public buildings of Granada have nearly all disappeared, five beautiful dwelling-houses, more or less restored, still remain in part. The convent of Santa Isabel la Real retains the remains of the Daralhorra: a court whose shorter sides consist of three arches on the ground floor and first floor, and whose big halls have an alcove at each end.

In the convent of Santa Catalina de Zafra can be seen the remains of a house with a court which had, in its original form, the same arrangement as that of Santa Isabel la Real, and the decoration of which was mainly painted. These two fairly simple houses, the disposition of which is often to be found in the Morisco houses of the 16th century, seem to date back to the middle of the 9th/10th century.

The Casa de los Girones has been much restored. It too had porticoes along the shorter sides of its court. Its beautiful staircase had groin vaulting. Its richly moulded plaster-work on a coloured background dates it as late 7th/11th century.

Outside the city wall the Nasrid sovereigns and persons of high rank in the kingdom had, extra muros, beautiful country houses.

At the Cuarto Real de Santo Domingo a tower which formed part of the city wall contains a beautiful square room, entered by a portico. The walls are decorated with moulded plaster and with very lovely faience mosaic panels, which, in the older parts, belong to the end of the 7th/11th century. The buildings of the Alcazar Genii have been even more restored than those of the Cuarto Real de Santo Domingo. There remains a tower with a square room flanked by two alcoves with two interior basins. The moulded plaster-work belongs to the 8th/14th century.

These only too rare remains show us the same intention, the same structure, the same decoration in the houses of Granada as in the palace of the Alhambra, and frequently of an equally good quality. Luxury and refinement in their dwellings was not the prerogative of the sovereigns. These private houses testify to the perfect architectural and decorative unity of the art of Granada.

B. — The Alhambra

The Alhambra before the 7th/13th century. — The name of al-Ḥamrā' appears at the end of the 3rd/9th century: it was applied to a small fortress where the Arabs who were being pursued by the rebel peasants took refuge during the revolts that took place under the Umayyad amir 'Abd Allāh. This fortress must have been built on the westernmost point of the plateau of the Sabika. The Nasrid Alhambra was later to cover the whole of this plateau. This castle, built at the end of the 3rd/9th century, was doubtless abandoned during the latter years of the caliphate and during the first half of the 5th/11th century. It was rebuilt and without doubt enlarged by the Jewish vizier Samuel Ibn Nagrello between 443/1052 and 447/1056. The Zirid amir 'Abd Allāh improved it, inspired by the arrangement of the Christian castle of Beillos which he had just captured.

This castle is mentioned several times in the struggle of the Spanish amirs against the Almoravids and the Almohads. It was of small dimensions, for the Christian contingents of Ibn Hamūghī had to camp outside its walls. Some stretches of wall of very hard rubble and some remains of towers and buildings are chained with flat stones and bricks, in the neighbourhood of the present Alhambra wall, show that the fortress previous to that of the Nasrids was very plainly built.

The Alhambra, seat of the Nasrid government. — When Muḥammad Ibn al-Aḥmar entered Granada in Ramadān 635/May 1238 he took up residence in the Zirid Alcazaba, in the town itself. But he lost no time in ordering the construction of the present Alhambra, work on which began after a few months. The new foundation was something quite different in its intention and size from the original fortress. The Alhambra is more than a fortress and a palace: it is a royal city, a seat of government, as had been Madīnat al-Zāhrā', al-Madīna al-Zāhirah and the Almohad Kasaba of Marrākūsh.

Opposite the commercial part of the town there was a kasaba which had been enlarged for the governmental needs of the Nasrids. It contained, in addition to the royal palaces, the State administration: offices, mints, barracks for the guards, accommodation for the palace servants and some high dignitaries; in short, all the organs necessary to the administrative city's ordinary life: workshops, shops, a great mosque, baths.

Never was the separation of town and palace more happily reflected in the landscape: above the Darro and its confluence with the Genil, the hill of the Sabika is the last platform of a spur that comes down from the Sierra Nevada. It is a narrow plateau, rising almost sheer above the Darro, easy to defend in all other respects, and separated by a ravine from the slopes which overlook it from the direction of the mountain. This "enormous boat anchored between the mountain and the plain", as L. Torres-Balbás has described it, has a maximum length of 740 metres and width of 220.

Work began with the construction of an aqueduct which brought in the water coming from the mountains: there was water flowing everywhere in the town and in the palaces of the Nasrids. The enclosure and the first palaces were probably not completed till the time of the second amir Muḥammad II (671-701/1273-1302). The Nasrids never gave up their residence there.
The Alhambra is first of all a powerful fortress. The high rampart flanked by strong towers which surrounds it is not one of the least of its beauties. The interior of the enclosure, sloping at either end, was divided into three parts: to the west a compact block of fortifications: the Alcazaba; on the highest part, the main body of these palaces; on the gentle slopes which stretch to the east, the town itself.

The fortress. — At the end of the hill, facing the Vega, the Alcazaba formed a sort of fortified keep completely independent of the rest of the Alhambra. A large parade-ground, then occupied by small houses, is surrounded by a strong triangular wall made up of high curtains, flanked by towers, reinforced by three powerful vaulted bastions, and with an outer wall to the east. This fortress had its own gateway opening into the exterior.

The wall which surrounded the whole of the Alhambra and which the Alcazaba completed to the west consisted of a single rampart made of concrete. This wall is exceptionally high and is strengthened by twenty-three high, wide towers, in the upper storeys of some of which there are halls or small houses belonging to the palaces. The whole of the surrounding wall was built by Muhammad I and Muhammad II. In the 8th/14th century, during the reign of Yusuf I (723-55/1333-54), were built the towers of Machuca, of the Candil, and the three great monumental gateways of the Justice, of Siete Suelas, and of las Armas. The tower of the Peinador was completed under the following sultan, Muhammad V. So the surrounding wall acquired its present appearance as far back as the middle of the 8th/14th century. The last sultans, in the face of the Christian threat, contented themselves with building platelike or cannon at the foot of the three great gateways.

Three of the Alhambra gates, those of the Justice, of Siete Suelos and of los Picos, opened onto the exterior. Only the gate of las Armas which flanked the Alcazaba linked the Alhambra to the town.

The Alhambra gates, of huge proportions, form deep masses of masonry enclosing vaulted passages with two or even three bends, often cut across by an open bay. They were made of concrete with façades and arches of brick, sometimes set off by ceramic decorations. Quite apart from their military value, they are beautiful examples of architecture. The gate of la Justicia, which is not flanked by towers, but which forms part of a raised bastion, is pierced by an arch with high piers and has a vigorous elegance all its own. The others do not differ from the great gates of the Almohads or Marinids in Morocco, especially when they are flanked by two towers.

The curtains, which are very high, had a sentry-walk edged by a parapet crowned by merlons with pyramidalons. The lay-out of the ramparts, closely following the contours of the terrain, often makes use of re-entrant angles. The spacing of the towers, which is fairly irregular, reaches and sometimes exceeds fifty metres.

The high bastions of the surrounding wall are often big enough to contain, at the top, one of the halls of the palace, or a small house with a courtyard. The Hall of the Throne, or Hall of the Ambassadors, occupies the top floor of a huge square bastion. All these halls and dwelling-houses overlooked, through numerous windows, the beautiful view of the town and of the Vega.

The magnificent group of fortifications built by the Nasrid Sultans was never attacked. The numerous Christian incursions to reach Granada stopped before the walls of the town, which never underwent a formal siege, till the last campaign of the Catholic Monarchs, in 1484-6. The town capitulated and the surrender of the keep took place on 1 Rabii I 897/2 January 1492. Ferdinand and Isabella made their entry into the Alhambra on 6 January. Thus the ramparts of the Alhambra and the palaces they enclosed suffered no damage during the progressive collapse of the kingdom and the fall of the dynasty. The palaces. — The palaces of the Alhambra, like all Hispano-Moorish palaces, are arranged in groups of buildings round courtyards. The main element is not the body of the building, but the court, more or less spacious, with or without porticoes surrounding it, onto which open the state and living rooms. These groups of buildings often have different axes: they are linked together by corridors or by connecting chambers. The palaces of the 7th/13th century were demolished in the following century to make room for the present palaces. A first group of buildings to the west, long since ruined, and recently uncovered by excavations, comprised a square court onto which opened some small rooms and a small mosque. This fairly simple dwelling-house was followed by a huge court, the patio of Machuca, bordered to the north by a portico which gives access to the harem and to the top of one of the towers of the enclosing wall.

The present palaces form two groups built round two courts with perpendicular major axes. The first group, the Cuarto de Comares, preceded by a vestibule, by the Mechouar, and by a small patio, was built by Yusuf I (733-55/1333-54); the second, the Cuarto de los Leones, by Muhammad V (755-94/1368-92). Some older baths and a mosque link these two 8th/14th century groups.

To the south of the Cuarto de los Leones was the burial-ground of the dynasty, the Rawda, the plan of which has been rediscovered through excavations. The Partial, a pavilion bordering a pond, the rich houses which complete the towers of the Peinador de la Reina and of the Captive, form separate groups.

The two big patios are surrounded by porticoes or buildings on all four sides. The reception halls are always on the ground floor: the living rooms, of much smaller proportions, occupied the first floor. Thus each of the quarters of this palace forms a small enclosed world round its patio. But, with happy inconsistency, the higher parts are pierced with bays and open galleries surmounted by belvederes.

The architectural composition. — It is in the patio of Comares, known also as the patio of la Alberca or of the Myrtles, the work of Yusuf I, that we can grasp the methods of composition of the Granada architects. The centre of the court, a very elongated oblong, is occupied by a large pond, emphasized by two borders of myrtles. The buildings which surround this vast patio are disposed in three different styles. The long sides have walls pierced by doors on the ground floor, and by twin windows on the first floor. A mezzanine with single or double windows is inserted along the south front between two colonnades of slender pillars. To the north there is a portico of equally graceful elegance, dominated, above a tile roof, by the huge mass of the bastion that contains the Hall of the Ambassadors, the throne room of the Nasrid palace. This paradoxical composition which contrasts occupied spaces with empty ones, walls with colonnades, which aims at picturesqueness and variety rather than unity, for all its apparent and intentional lack
Classical traditions govern the arrangement of the state rooms, which open onto the south of the court. The gallery gives access to a very long ante-room, which flank the patio, different in size and in shape, grouped the majority of the buildings which Sultan Muhammad V built in the second half of the 8th/14th century. On a plan, the disposition of the four rooms which flank the patio, different in size and in shape, seems to lack severity. But seen from above, the masses of the roofs combine a happy equilibrium with a picturesque variety. The architect has voluntarily deprived himself of the facile resources of symmetry of detail. When one goes through these halls, where perspectives of arches and bays have been skillfully contrived to form axes of light, one cannot help admiring the vital and yet subtle discipline of the architectural arrangement. In spite of the great variety of the decoration the rows of arches re-establish the unity of the composition through the spacing of their lacework of light and shade.

The Court of the Lions itself is of a very classical style: it is divided by two paths which intersect at right angles: their intersection is marked by a fountain whose basin rests on stone lions doubtless belonging originally to a 5th/11th century palace. Four projecting pavilions occupy the middle of the sides. The porticoes and pavilions are made of rich arcades of moulded plaster resting on high and slender marble columns. On the ground floor the portico makes use of one motif only—the ringed column with palm-leaf capitals: here the architecture seems to melt into music. However, the vigorous masses of the tile roofs and pavilions which dominate this ethereal portico save the composition from insipidity. The very placing of the columns shows a rare subtlety: sometimes isolated, sometimes paired, the little columns form symmetrical groupings which link up on successive axes and sometimes overlap. Thus, in the Court of the Lions, the architecture itself becomes a symphony of decoration, through the play of association and repetition of motifs.

At the Partal there is a pool along whose edge runs a long pavilion with a five-arched portico surmounted by tile roofs. This colonnade faces the interior of the palace; but the great hall which opens onto this portico and its central pool have, like the Hall of the Ambassadors, windows which allow one to enjoy the whole panorama of the palace, the mountain, and the town.

The arrangement and classical themes of the Muslim palace have been treated here with true originality. The Nasrid architects have not been seeking what is grand and massive, but have made use of contrast and nuance with incomparable virtuosity in the almost-romantic decoration.

The interior decoration. — The Alhambra is famous all over the world for the beauty and opulence of the decorations which overspread its halls. Throughout the palace the tradition of covering everything with decoration dominates. Examples of walls bare or covered by a fairly large and simply engraved geometrical net-work are rare. The decoration is distributed on three levels. On the floor and on the panels at the base of the walls are to be found ceramic facings. On the floors there are usually geometrical motifs with juxtaposed elements, sometimes star-shaped. But on the panels there are polygonal stars ceaselessly sending out a whole complex of lines, and, through a subtle interweaving, rejoining and forming themselves into frames. In the less important rooms the faience mosaics are sometimes replaced by glazed paintings, composed of geometrical networks in which are set epigraphic and floral motifs. The middle part of the walls is covered by moulded plasterwork. As a rule it is divided into panels, which, especially in the first half of the 8th/14th century, are arranged with as much skill as variety, thanks to the subtle play of axes and levels. The frames, made up of interlacing bands of inscriptions of varying width and content, allow for both precision and nuance in the grouping of these panels. But in the second half of this century, long high friezes tend to cover, with their uniform distribution, a large proportion of these walls.

In this moulded plasterwork one often finds geometrical networks which make up the general plan. But it is in the epigraphs and floral design that we seek the essentials of the decoration. Kufic script expresses eulogies and spreads out into complex arcatures, but it is the naskhi which dominates nearly everywhere: thanks to the balance of its movement it has acquired monumental dignity. Some of the Alhambra inscriptions are perhaps the finest examples of cursive epigraphy. The abundant floral designs, usually disposed in foliated scrolls, unites the palm leaf, single or double, ribbed or smooth, to the pine cone and the palmette. Under Muhammad V an effort was made to renew the forms of the palm and the palmette. But it is not so much a case of innovation as of inspiration rooted in the past, sometimes even in the art of the Cordovan caliphate. But this attempt was short-lived, and apparently limited to the Alhambra.

The quality of the detailed forms is still excellent in the work produced under Yusuf I. But at the end of the 8th/14th century a certain stiffness appears in the moulding and even in the forms. This incipient decadence became more pronounced in the 9th/15th century, in the moulded plasterwork of the Tower of the Infantes, one of the few buildings of the last Nasrid rulers in the palace of this dynasty.

This moulded plaster-work composes delicate symphonies in great wall panels with a shade of its own, because of the distribution of light and shade. The movement of the lines also counts. The double play of light and line prevents any banality or monotony, and gives personality to each panel.

Colour was often used to enhance the moulding, particularly in the background, but sometimes covered the floral or epigraphic forms themselves. The shades—mainly blues and reds—were usually
fairly dark, but gold was not lacking. This polychromy, in spite of its sobriety, sometimes impaired either its methods of composition or the forms of its details, yet shows great artistry and real beauty. Its worth lies in its exquisite sense of nuance: but it has lost the vigour of the art of the 6th/12th century. Above all, it no longer troubles to produce an original composition for each panel. Indefinitely repeated motifs—the background decoration—overrun the whole of the décor. This decorative art of the 8th/14th century, in its delicate classicism and its artistry, is already imprisoned in the past: it lacks the boldness of the architecture which it covers. The main motifs—apart from the quadrangular panels—are the arched doorway, its palm-leaf spandrels, its bold rectangular setting, and its arcing, isolated or in tiers.

The ceilings are always most luxurious. Roofs with an interlacing framework, or artesanados, are still used. They are nearly always painted. But the biggest and most beautiful halls are covered by domes with stalactites. The muskarnas are small in size, and some of their sides are moulded and painted. These small stalactites are created with great variety, and are provided with line and shadow both rigorously and hallucinating. The cupolas of the halls of the Kings, of the Two Sisters, and of the Abencerrajes boast a richness and complexity which have never been surpassed.

The human figure is found in some of the famous paintings which cover some of the vaults of the Hall of the Kings: but these have been painted by artists of Christian upbringing. However at the Partal small paintings have been found which in their subjects—scenes of hunting and war and domestic reunions—belong to the Muslim tradition. The costumes and arms are those of the Muslims of Granada.

The Alhambra is the supreme example of monumental decoration in Muslim Spain in its final stage: an art which is still wonderful, but imprisoned in a past of less vibrant glory. But it has been greatly altered. Nevertheless, the plaster mouldings is excellent. The human figure is found in some of the famous paintings which cover some of the vaults of the Hall of the Kings: but these have been painted by artists of Christian upbringing. However at the Partal small paintings have been found which in their subjects—scenes of hunting and war and domestic reunions—belong to the Muslim tradition. The costumes and arms are those of the Muslims of Granada.
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Nasrid art has left us the chef d'œuvre of its classical age, the greatest testimony of its architecture and art of decoration. And the Alhambra has naturally become nothing less than a place of pilgrimage for all who wish to know, and for all who love, the arts of Spanish Islam in their final flowering.


**(H. TERRASSE)**

**Ghasb,** uspensation, *i.e.*, "highhanded appropriation", is neither robbery as it is often translated, nor larceny (sariba), both of which pertain to the field of criminal law, but the illegal appropriation of something belonging to another or the unlawful use of the rights of another. Ghasb is thus restricted to civil law, so that it is dealt with by the Islamic jurists in the *Kitāb al-Buyāʿ*. While contractual, legal possession by the non-owner (e.g., tenants, depositaries) is regarded as trusteeship (amnā), illegal possession not based on a contract is regarded as *ghāšīb*. The Islamic jurists consider *ghāšīb* from the point of view of an obligation arising from a tort. Hence the question is primarily whether the *ghāšīb* has to return the object obtained by unlawful interference (maghsāb) to the deprived person (maghsāb minhu) or to pay compensation. If the return of the object is no longer possible on account of loss (kašār) or as a result of specification, commixtion and confusion, he has to repay the value. As the *ghāšīb* has illegally taken possession of another's property, a high degree of liability is incurred: in all cases of loss, even through force majeure, he is liable, e.g., if a usurped child dies from lightning or snake-bite. In the case of *ghāšīb* of res immobiles (′abār) jurists disagree over the question of liability. As far as the consequences, under the law of *res immobilis* (′abār) jurists are concerned, two schools exist in Islam, just as in Roman and Jewish law: the Shāfiʿis, like the Sābiʿians or the school of Shamaym, direct their attention to the substance of the resulting article, the Hanafis, like the Procurials or the school of Hillel, to the work performed. The Mālikis represent a media sententia, which, however, diverges materially from the Code of Justinian, while the Jewish media sententia coincides with the Roman and certainly goes back to it.


**(O. SPIES)**

**Ghaššānīya,** (a.), "the covering", particularly, a covering for a saddle*. Among Ibn al-Zubayr, Mamluks etc., this was one of the insignia of royal rank and carried before the ruler in public processions (see C. H. Becker, *La Ghāššāniya comme emblème de la royauté*, in *Centenario M. Amari*, ii, 1948). *Ghsil al-Malāʿīka,* nickname by which Ḥanẓala b. Abī ʿAmir (ʿAbd ʿAmir) b. Saiyf al-Aws, a Companion of the Prophet, is known. The son of a Christian monk counted among the "People of the Interval" (see *Ghānatra*), he embraced Islam and took part in the battle of Uhud; he was about to kill Abū Sufyān (*q.v.*), when he was mortally wounded by one of the enemy (some think that he fell at the hand of Abū Sufyān who, by killing a Ḥanẓala, would thus have avenged his own son Ḥanẓala who had fallen at Badr). On hearing of his death, the Prophet exclaimed: "The angels will prepare his body for burial", and this earned him posthumously the name of Ghāššān-al-Malāʿīka. He was buried at Uhud with the many other Muslims killed in this battle.


**(C. PELLAT)**

**Ghassān,** a division of the great tribal group al-Azd who migrated from South Arabia, wandered in the Peninsula, and finally settled within the Roman times ca. A.D. 490, having accepted Christianness and agreed to pay tribute to Rome. After a short period of coexistence with Ṣalḥi, *q.v.*, as tributaries, ṣapīrōri, they overpowered the latter group and superseded them as the new Arab allies, ṣūmuṣṣā, of Byzantium in A.D. 502-3. Their relations with the Empire were regulated by a treaty, *foedus*, according to which they received annual subsidies, *amnonae foederaticae*, and in return they contributed mounted contingents to the Byzantine army. The leaders in the various provinces were technically called phylarchs, *φυλάρχοι*, and were generally endowed with the rank *clariusim*, *λαμπροτάτος*. The chief Ghassānī phylarch whose seat was Ḥajibiyah in the province of Arabia was accorded the highest honours and titles; he was *patricius*, *bīzāb*, *q.v.*, and *gloriosissimus*, *ἐνδοστάτος*, and was allowed to wear the crown of a client king. Although Romanized in many respects and passionately attached to Monophysitism, the Ghassānids remained Arabs at heart. Poets from the Peninsula, like Nābhīgha and Ḥassān b. Thābit, *q.v.*, visited their courts and composed on them panegyrics which give intimate glimpses into their inner life and document their history for three decades.

As allies, *Ṣūmuṣṣā*, politically and militarily, the Ghassānids performed for Byzantium their most important function: (a) they supplied the Army of the Orient with an efficient, mobile contingent in the war against the Persians. Their most notable political and military contribution was during the reign of al-Ḥārīth b. Ḥajibal b. Ḥajal b. Thābit, A.D. 559-59, and before disagreements with the Roman Emperors Justin II, Tiberius, and Maurice limited and frustrated their military efforts. Harīth participated regularly in the two Persian Wars of Justinian's reign (A.D. 531-63), and fought with distinction at Callinicum (A.D. 532) and in Belisarius' Assyrian
2 — Granada: the Alhambra. General view
3 — Granada: the Alhambra. Patio of Comares
4 — Granada: the Alhambra. Hall of the Ambassadors
GHARNĀṬA

PLATE XXVIII

5 — Granada: the Alhambra. Hall of the Abencerages
6 — Granada: the Alhambra. The Partal
7 — Granada: the Generalife
Campaign (A.D. 541); (b) the war against the Lakhmids was successfully prosecuted. Harith triumphed signal to over the Lakhmid Mundhir at al-Halma [q.v.] in A.D. 541 near Damascus, and his son Mundhir triumphed over Kābūs, possibly at Ayn Uubah [q.v.], in A.D. 570, captured Ḥira, and burnt it. Ghassānid military superiority over the Lakhmids solved for Byzantium its most serious Arab problem; (c) from their main base in Arabia and Palæstina Tertia, the Ghassānids kept the nomads in check and conducted military operations against the Jews of Ḥidżāz. The Arabian aspect of their function included, also, the protection of Byzantine commercial and political interests along the spice-route, and their importance in this sector is reflected by their participation in the diplomatic mission to Abraha [q.v.], the Abyssinian ruler of Arabia Felix.

In the history of Syria Monophysitism the Ghassānids were a determining factor. It was mainly through the efforts of their king Harith b. Diābalah that the Monophysite Church in Syria was resuscitated after its disestablishment during the reign of the Chalcedonian Emperor Justin I, A.D. 518-27. Around A.D. 540, and with the help of the Empress Theodora, Harith secured the ordination of two Monophysite bishops, Theodorus and the famous Jacob Baradaeus, by which the Syrian Monophysite Church was called Jacobite. The indefatigable efforts of these two bishops put the Monophysite Church in Syria on its feet again. The Ghassānids, Kings, Harith and his son Mundhir, continued to protect the Monophysite Church not only against the hostility of the Chalcedonians but also against divisive movements from within: e.g., the Trinitistic heresy of Eugenius and Conon; the discord which broke out between Jacob Baradaeus and Paul the Black; and the patriarchal strife between the sees of Antioch and Alexandria. But they did not neglect the Arabian Peninsula. Their missionary activities, particularly in Nadrān, were important contributions towards the propagation of Christianity in those southern parts. Although their staunch support of the Monophysite movement reflected well the relation of two Monophysite bishops, the Chalcedonian Emperor, and brought about the downfall of their king Mundhir [q.v.], A.D. 569-82, and his son Nu’mān. This considerably weakened the Ghassānid Phylarchate. But it was the Persian invasion of A.D. 613-14 that dealt the crushing blow to the Ghassānids who, however, re-emerged, serving in the army of Heraclius and represented by the Diābalah b. al-Ayham [q.v.] at the decisive battle of Yarmūk, A.D. 536.

The Muslim Conquest of Syria swept away the Ghassānids beyond recall. Some of them went over to Byzantium and settled in Anatolia; others adopted Islam and were assimilated in the new Arab Muslim community; the rest remained Christian and stayed on in Syria. To these, some of the Arab Christian families of the contemporary Near East trace their descent.


(İfRAN SHAHİD)

AL-GHASSANI, ABÖ ʿABD ALLAH MUHAMMAD

section A: Southern Syria, Leiden 1919, 362-3; (iii) the castle in Dumayr, built by al-Mundhir (509-82) (described in Brünnow-Domanszcky, Die Provincia Arabia, Stuttgart, 1909, 554; the foundation inscription (Wetzstein, no. 175, Waddington, 2562c) was lost, but in the summer of 1963 I was able to rediscover it on the site, and the Syrian Service of Antiquities is going to exhibit it in the Damascus Museum).—note communicated by K. Brisch. The prosperity of the province of Arabia in the sixth century, archaeologically attested, can to a great extent be made explainable by the activities of this energetic dynasty whose main base was Arabia, and who, consequently, animated the region and relieved it of its technically insignificant and provincial status.

Rarations between Byzantium and the Ghassānids were not uniformly smooth. Their independent spirit, but more, their unflinching support of Mono-

The urbanization of Syria and to its architectural life in the sixth century: (a) they were credited with the building of a number of towns, e.g., Ḥalif, and of public works, e.g., the cisterns, ṣāḥārdā, of Sergiopolis (Rusafa); (b) generuity pious, and living in an age which witnessed a great building activity, they erected churches and monasteries for the resurgent Monophysite Church, e.g., the Ecclesia extra muros (possibly a fratorium) at Sergiopolis; (c) anticipating later Umayyad practice they built, and in near the desert, palatial residences which were sometimes also military establishments, mašāʿīn. In addition to the dated monument in Sergiopolis there are at least three more, arranged here in chronological order: (i) the tower of the monastery in Kaṣr al-Ḥāyar al-Ḥarbār, of 559 A.D., by Harith b. Diābalah (D. Schlumberger, Les fouilles de Qasr el-Ḥāyar al-Ḥarbār, i, 1920), 560-72; (ii) a house in al-Ḥayān (Ḥawrán) built by Flavios Seos in 578 (H. C. Butler, Syria, Princeton Expedition, division II: Architecture, xix, 12-8, 26-46; Anecdota, ii, 23, 28; Malalas, Chronographia (Bonn), 434-5; 441-2; 445-7; 461-5; Menander Protector, in Excerpta Historica, ed. C. de Boor, Paris I, 180; Evagrius, Ecclesiastical History, ed. Bidez and Parmentier, 216-223; Syriac Sources: John of Ephesus, in Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum orientalium, no. 105 (versio), 90, 129-33: 135-6; 163-70; 212-7; 237, 238; Michael the Syrian, Chronique, French trans. by J.-B. Chabot, ii, 245-8, 285, 308-9, 323-5, 344, 345, 349-51, 364-71; Arabic Sources: Nābiḥa, in The Dianns of the Six Ancient Arabic Poets, ed. W. Ahlwardt, poems 1, 2, 11, 13, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27; Hassān b. Žhabīt, Diwan, ed. H. Hirschfeld, GMS, poems 13, 79, 86, 92, 125, 138, 155, 160; Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī, Taʾrīkh, ed. Gottwaldt, 114-22. Cf. also Th. Nöldeke, Die Ghassānischen Fürsten aus dem Hause Gafnā's, in Abb. Fr. Ak. W., 1887; R. Aigrain, Arabie, in Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclesiastiques, iii, cols. 1200-19; J. Sauvaget, Les Ghassānides et Sergiopolis, in Byzantion, xiv (1939), 115-30; Irfan Karaw, Procopius and Arhetas, in BZ, 1957; idem, The Patriarchate of Arethas, in BZ, 1959. For Ghassānid residences, those certain and those unconfirmed, see further R. A. Cresswell, EMA, i; A. Musil, Arabia Petraea, Vienna 1907; idem, Palmyra, New York 1928 (index); idem, Northern Syria, New York 1928 (index).

(İfRAN SHAHİD)
leads towards southern Tunisia by way of Ghadamat, and to Tripoli either via Ghadamat or via the Fezzan, thus avoiding the mountains of the Tassili and the ergs of the Fezzan.

The region was inhabited in ancient times, as is proved by the numerous rock engravings and more than one necropolis such as those of al-Barkat and of Tin Alloun, but it has never been proved that the oppidum of Rapsa mentioned by Pliny was situated there. Ghat itself does not go back for longer than 700 years and is mentioned for the first time by Ibn Battūta in the 8th/14th century. Its prosperity depended from the vicissitudes of trade across the Sahara, about which our only exact information comes from some 19th century travellers, in particular Muhammad al-Otsman al-Hachaîchi (al-Hâshâshî); he remarks, at the end of the century, that if for the Touareg Ajjer "Ghät is their Paris", most of the traders of Ghat "which is the Marseilles of the Sahara" are people of Ghadames and people from Tripoli; the Touareg hired their camels to the traders, but the essential part of the cross-Sahara traffic already went via the Fezzan. This trade disappeared little by little in the early years of the twentieth century.

For a long time Ghat remained independent, governed by a hereditary amînhâr [q.v.] and an elected municipality, but nevertheless under the somewhat heavy protection of the Touaregs. In 1875, the Turks of Tripoli installed a garrison there and a bââimmakâm, and remained its masters until 1914. Ghat was occupied for the first time by the Italians, conquerors of Libya, from April to December, 1914, and a second time from February 1930 until January 1943. It was then taken by the French troops of southern Algeria at the same time as the expedition of General Leclerc made itself master of the Fezzan; it was annexed to the region of Djent (Fort Charley). French forces left Ghat after the Franco-Libyan treaty of 10th August, 1955, and Ghat was attached once more to the Fezzan, a province of the United Kingdom of Libya. Ghat is a picturesque ksar, fortified in an irregular rectangle 700 by 500 metres in area, surrounded by a crenellated wall with five gates; part of it also are the suburbs of Tadrart and Tounin. Al-Fewet, 10 km. away to the west, and the fortified ksar of al-Barkat, 8 km. to the south, as well as some hamlets scattered within modest palm groves, are under its control. The whole area has more than 2,000 inhabitants. The Kel Ghat fall into five groups: the Tel Talak and the Tel Makammazan who are the oldest, the Idrâh, the Tel Inan Tamalgat and the Tel Khabsa; some Arabized families, Ghadamesians, Touaregs who have become sedentary (especially at Al-Fewet and al-Barkat) and many negro share-croppers of Sudanese origin, called here atâra, complete the population. All speak Tamâhakk but many understand Arabic and even Hausa which is spoken by the negroes.

Ghat is the centre for about 1,000 Imanan and Oraghennomads and for some Imamaghassatien families. Some springs and shallow wells (both the type worked by animal tread with windlass) and a few shallow wells are found, for example at Ghaâl. For a long time Ghat remained independent, governed by a hereditary amînhâr [q.v.] and an elected municipality, but nevertheless under the somewhat heavy protection of the Touaregs. In 1875, the Turks of Tripoli installed a garrison there and a bââimmakâm, and remained its masters until 1914. Ghat was occupied for the first time by the Italians, conquerors of Libya, from April to December, 1914, and a second time from February 1930 until January 1943. It was then taken by the French troops of southern Algeria at the same time as the expedition of General Leclerc made itself master of the Fezzan; it was annexed to the region of Djent (Fort Charley). French forces left Ghat after the Franco-Libyan treaty of 10th August, 1955, and Ghat was attached once more to the Fezzan, a province of the United Kingdom of Libya. Ghat is a picturesque ksar, fortified in an irregular rectangle 700 by 500 metres in area, surrounded by a crenellated wall with five gates; part of it also are the suburbs of Tadrart and Tounin. Al-Fewet, 10 km. away to the west, and the fortified ksar of al-Barkat, 8 km. to the south, as well as some hamlets scattered within modest palm groves, are under its control. The whole area has more than 2,000 inhabitants. The Kel Ghat fall into five groups: the Tel Talak and the Tel Makammazan who are the oldest, the Idrâh, the Tel Inan Tamalgat and the Tel Khabsa; some Arabized families, Ghadamesians, Touaregs who have become sedentary (especially at Al-Fewet and al-Barkat) and many negro share-croppers of Sudanese origin, called here atâra, complete the population. All speak Tamâhakk but many understand Arabic and even Hausa which is spoken by the negroes.

Ghat is the centre for about 1,000 Imanan and Oraghennomads and for some Imamaghassatien families. Some springs and shallow wells (both the type worked by animal tread with windlass) and a few shallow wells are found, for example at Ghaâl. For a long time Ghat remained independent, governed by a hereditary amînhâr [q.v.] and an elected municipality, but nevertheless under the somewhat heavy protection of the Touaregs. In 1875, the Turks of Tripoli installed a garrison there and a bââimmakâm, and remained its masters until 1914. Ghat was occupied for the first time by the Italians, conquerors of Libya, from April to December, 1914, and a second time from February 1930 until January 1943. It was then taken by the French troops of southern Algeria at the same time as the expedition of General Leclerc made itself master of the Fezzan; it was annexed to the region of Djent (Fort Charley). French forces left Ghat after the Franco-Libyan treaty of 10th August, 1955, and Ghat was attached once more to the Fezzan, a province of the United Kingdom of Libya. Ghat is a picturesque ksar, fortified in an irregular rectangle 700 by 500 metres in area, surrounded by a crenellated wall with five gates; part of it also are the suburbs of Tadrart and Tounin. Al-Fewet, 10 km. away to the west, and the fortified ksar of al-Barkat, 8 km. to the south, as well as some hamlets scattered within modest palm groves, are under its control. The whole area has more than 2,000 inhabitants. The Kel Ghat fall into five groups: the Tel Talak and the Tel Makammazan who are the oldest, the Idrâh, the Tel Inan Tamalgat and the Tel Khabsa; some Arabized families, Ghadamesians, Touaregs who have become sedentary (especially at Al-Fewet and al-Barkat) and many negro share-croppers of Sudanese origin, called here atâra, complete the population. All speak Tamâhakk but many understand Arabic and even Hausa which is spoken by the negroes.

Ghat is the centre for about 1,000 Imanan and Oraghennomads and for some Imamaghassatien families. Some springs and shallow wells (both the type worked by animal tread with windlass) and a few shallow wells are found, for example at Ghaâl. For a long time Ghat remained independent, governed by a hereditary amînhâr [q.v.] and an elected municipality, but nevertheless under the somewhat heavy protection of the Touaregs. In 1875, the Turks of Tripoli installed a garrison there and a bââimmakâm, and remained its masters until 1914. Ghat was occupied for the first time by the Italians, conquerors of Libya, from April to December, 1914, and a second time from February 1930 until January 1943. It was then taken by the French troops of southern Algeria at the same time as the expedition of General Leclerc made itself master of the Fezzan; it was annexed to the region of Djent (Fort Charley). French forces left Ghat after the Franco-Libyan treaty of 10th August, 1955, and Ghat was attached once more to the Fezzan, a province of the United Kingdom of Libya. Ghat is a picturesque ksar, fortified in an irregular rectangle 700 by 500 metres in area, surrounded by a crenellated wall with five gates; part of it also are the suburbs of Tadrart and Tounin. Al-Fewet, 10 km. away to the west, and the fortified ksar of al-Barkat, 8 km. to the south, as well as some hamlets scattered within modest palm groves, are under its control. The whole area has more than 2,000 inhabitants. The Kel Ghat fall into five groups: the Tel Talak and the Tel Makammazan who are the oldest, the Idrâh, the Tel Inan Tamalgat and the Tel Khabsa; some Arabized families, Ghadamesians, Touaregs who have become sedentary (especially at Al-Fewet and al-Barkat) and many negro share-croppers of Sudanese origin, called here atâra, complete the population. All speak Tamâhakk but many understand Arabic and even Hausa which is spoken by the negroes.
manufactured goods from the Fezzan. But if oil research to the north and the east comes to ... When cUmar b.
Hubayra al-Fazari [q.v.] was viceroy of the East in
102/721-105/725 all Kays were again in the ascen-


GHATAFÁN, name of a group of Northern Arabian tribes, belonging to the Kays *Ayālān* [q.v.] and represented in the genealogical system as the descendants of Ghaṭafān b. Sa’d b. Kays b. *Ayālān*. Their lands lay between the Hijāz and the Shamar mountains in that part of the Nadīd which is drained by the Wādī al-Rumma. Here lived from West to East their principal tribes: the Banū Ashīdā‘, the Dhubyān (with the sub-tribes: Fazara, Murra, and Tha‘labā), the *Abs*, and—in the region al-Kasim—the Anmar. Of these tribes the Banū *Abs* (b. Baghīd b. Rayyih b. Ghaṭafān) rose to prominence c. 550 A.D., when their chief, Zuhayr b. Dhihmīla, gained power not only over all Ghaṭafān, but also over the Hawāzīn, the other important group of the Kays-*Ayālān*. After Zuhayr was slain by Khallīd b. Dīāfār of the Banū *Amīr* b. *Sa‘ṣa‘a*, the power of the *Abs* declined. A quarrel between Kays b. Zuhayr b. Dhihmīla und Hūdāyfya b. *Badhr*, chief of the Banū Fazāra (b. Dhubyān b. Baghīd b. Rayt b. Ghaṭafān), led to the so-called war of Dāhīs between the *Abs* and Dhubyān; during it nearly all Ghaṭafān took up arms against the *Abs* and forced them to leave their pasture grounds. After many unsuccessful attempts to come to an agreement, both and the Banū *Amīr* b. *Sa‘ṣa‘a* and c. 580 A.D. both groups defeated in the battle of Shi‘b Ḫīdāla [q.v.] the coalition of Tāmil, Dhūyān, Asad, and other tribes (see the poem of Khurāshā b. *Amīr* al-Abīn in Mu‘addalīyyāt, no. 121). Later on peace was restored between the *Abs* and Dhubyān through the good offices of two chiefs of the Banū Murra (b. * Aws* b. Sa’d b. Dhubyān) named al-Hārīth b. * Aws* and Harīm b. *Sinān*, both of whom were praised by Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā [q.v.] in his *Ma‘allaka*. After this reconciliation the *Abs* and Dhubyān stood together against the Banū *Amīr* b. *Sa‘ṣa‘a* (see Bakrī, Mu‘ājam s.v. al-Baghīdā‘a) and were often joined by the other Ghaṭafān tribes, e.g., in the battle of al-Rakam (see the poem of Salāma b. Khurshub al-Anmarī in Mu‘addalīyyāt, ed. Lyall, no. 5). About the same time the Ghaṭafān concluded an alliance with their neighbours the Tayyīr and Asad. There were also fights between the Ghaṭafān and the Hawāzīn and Sulaym till the rising power of Islam ended these clashes. The Ghaṭafān were, like almost all Bedouins, hostile towards Muhammad and his religion. At this time *Uyyayna b. Ḥiṣn al-Fażār* of the famous "house" of *Badr*, was the leading chief amongst the Ghaṭafān and the Meccans tried to win his support, whilst Muhammad was eager to forestall all hostile movements (e.g., in the expedition of al-Kudr against Sulaym and Ghaṭafān). After the expulsion of the Banū *Nādir* from Medina to Khaybar, the Jews and Meccans made an alliance and gained the support of the Ghaṭafān and Sulaym. A contingent of the Banū Fazaʿr and perhaps of the Banū Murra under *Uyyayna* took part in 5/627 in the siege of Medina (the so-called War of the Trench), but when this attempt had failed, the Banū Ashīdā‘, who of all Ghaṭafān lived nearest to Medina, concluded a treaty with Muhammad (Ibn Sa’d, ii/46, and *Uyyayna* thought it best to refrain from open opposition. He was in Muhammad's camp during the conquest of Mecca in 8/630, accompanied him during the subsequent campaign of Ḥunayn, and the Prophet honoured him at Dī‘ā‘āna, where the spoils were distributed, by a special gift of one hundred camels, to the chagrin of al-Abāb b. Mīrād al-Sulāmī, who got only four, though the Sulaym had taken an active part in the fighting. It was only in 9/631 that a deputation of the Fazaʿr and the Murra, led by Ḥārīdāb d. Ḥiṣn and al-Hārīth b. * Aws*, went to Medina to announce their tribes' conversion. But in the revolt (ridda) that broke out immediately after Muhammad's death, the Ghaṭafān and the Banū Asad took up arms. A band of them, led by Ḥārīdāb b. Ḥiṣn, attacked Abū Bakr in his camp near Khaybar but was dispersed by Khallīd b. Al-Halīdī b. al-Wald defeated the Banū Asad under Tulayba and a corps of the Fazaʿr under *Uyyayna* b. Ḥiṣn in the battle of Buzākhā [q.v.] and broke the last resistance of Ḥārīdāb b. Ḥiṣn at Ḥammir in Fazaʿr territory. In consequence of this defeat the Fazaʿr lost part of their grazing-ground. *Uyyayna* b. Ḥiṣn was brought as captive to Medina, but was pardoned by Abū Bakr. His daughter Umnū b. Al-Banīn became wife to *Uthmān* b. *Affān* (Ṭabarī, i. 3956-7).

In the wars of conquest the warriors of the Ghaṭafān joined the armies; some of them settled in the newly conquered countries. The Syrian army which was sent after Mu‘awiyah's death in 69/680 against Medina was led by Muṣlim b. *Ukhb ā* of the Banū Murra. In Kūfah we find members belonging to the leading families of the Banū Fazaʿr, e.g., Manzūr b. Zābbān, father-in-law to Ḥasan b. *All*, Muḥḥammad b. Ṭalḥa b. *Ubayd Allāh*, al-Hādīdāb, Abī Allāh b. al-Zaybār, and Mundhrīr b. al-Zubayr (Ibn Durayd, *Genealogisch-etymologisches Handbuch*, 127 etc.). Hind bint Asmā‘ b. Ḥārīdāb b. Ḥiṣn was married to *Ubayd Allāh* b. Ṭayyād, then to Bīshr b. Marwān, and later to al-Hādīdāb.

In the contest between the Northern (Mudar) and the Southern (Kalb) Arabs the Ghaṭafān naturally sympathized with the former. They fought against Ṭahlīb b. Rāḥiṣ 65/684 under al-Ḍābḥāk b. Kays al-Fażārī against the Banū Kalb. It seems that later on the Fazaʿr at Kūfah supported Zufar b. al-Hārīth of the Banū Kilāb b. *Amīr* und *Umayr* b. Ḥiṣn al-Sulami in their fight against Ḥumayd b. Ḥurayth b. al-Kalb (Ibn al-Athir, iv, 259). When Ḥumayd killed some of the Fazaʿr in their homeland in Arabia the latter took revenge in the battle of Banāt Kayn in the Samāwā c. 74/693 (see Wellhausen, *Das arabischke Reich*, 128 ff.). It was to the advantage of the Fazaʿr that Wāllāda bint al-Abāb, one of the wives of Abī al-Malik and mother of the caliphs al-Walīd and Sulaymān (Ṭabarī, ii, 1174) was a descendant of Zuhayr b. Rawḥa al-Fażārī (see the verses in Abu Tammam, in Abu Tammam, 3056-7). In the translation of the Fazaʿr that Wāllāda bint al-Abāb, one of the wives of Abī al-Malik and mother of the caliphs al-Walīd and Sulaymān (Ṭabarī, ii, 1174) was a descendant of Zuhayr b. Rawḥa al-Fażārī (see the verses in Abu Tammam, in Abu Tammam, 3056-7).
dency. After the downfall of the Umayyad Empire we hear little of the Ghatafan. The Fazara, Ashdja, and Tha'ABA are mentioned in connexion with the revolt of the Bedouin tribes in 230/844-5 which was put down by Bughla al-Kabir (Tabari, iii, 1342 ff.). But the majority of the Ghatafan had left Arabia, and their lands were occupied by the Tayyit. There were apparently no Ghatafan groups among the Northern (Kays) Arabs settled by order of Hisham b. 'Abd al-Malik in 107/725-6 in Egypt (see Haytham b. 'Abd al-Malik, al-Baydani, see 'Id, 39 f., Wustenfeld). Later on we find clans and families claiming descent from Ghatafan tribes in Egypt, Libya, the Maghrib and in Spain.

Amongst the poets of the Musallahabit there are two belonging to the Ghatafan: 'Antara b. Shaddad al-'Absi ('q.v.) and al-Nabigha al-Dhubyani ('q.v.). Lesser poets of the Ghatafan are 'Urwa b. al-Ward and al-Hutayya from the 'Abs; al-Husayra and al-'Asmamah from the Tha'ABA b. Sa'd; Ibn Mayyada (see Ashdja, iii, 261-340) from the Banu Murra b. 'Awf; and Ibn Dara (see 'Id, ed. W. Caskel, iii, 7-14; Wellhausen, Die Beduinen, ed. W. Caskel, iii, 7-14; Wellhausen, Kultur und Vorarbeiten, vi, 7 ff. (J. M. FOSTER)).

The etymology of the name Ghatafan is unknown. Besides the well-known Ghatafan of the Kays-Ayafan there are also clans of the same name amongst the Djiyaha, Djdbam, and iyad (Wustenfeld, Gen. Tabellen, vi, 7 ff. (J. W. FUCK)) who according to a saying attributed to Muhammad was 'a prophet whom his people let perish' (Ibn Sa'd, xii, 42, 7; Ibn Hadjar, Isaba, Cairo 1328 A.H., i, 466 ff.).

The central portion of Ghawar (Ghawar) Oil Field coincides with al-Ghawar proper. Extending north to Fazran and south to Wadi al-Sabah, the oil field has a total length of 256 kilometres. This, with an average width of 20 kilometres, gives it a greater surface area than any other oil field in the world. Discovered by the Arabian American Oil Company in 1948, Ghawar Field yielded an average of 715,200 barrels daily during 1962, nearly one-half of the Company's total production.

flood; in the middle of the 8th/i4th century, the
route was modified to spare couriers from having
to climb too steep gradients; they made use of the
bridge of al-Madhāmī, further to the north, at the
confluence of the Jordan and the Yarmūk.
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Palestine*, i, Paris 1933, particularly 10, 81-93, 423-9; Le Strange, *Palestine*, 30-2; A.-S. Marmardji,
*Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine*, Paris 1935, 158-9; Ya'qūbī, *Buldān*, 326; Ibn Hawkal,
ii, 174; Vāḳūṭ, xi, 521; Dimashki, al-Mehren,
207; Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *La Syrie à l’époque
des Mamelouks*, Paris 1923, particularly 64 ff.;
J. Sauvaget, *La poste aux chevaux dans l’empire
des Mamelouks*, Paris 1941, 73.

2. Another Ghawr is Ghawr Thīhāmāt al-Yaman
or Ghawr Thīhāmā (al-Farazdāk, ed. Boucher, 20), called
also, as a dual, Ghawr Thīhāmā (al-Ṭabarī, ii, 219).
The statements by the geographers regarding it are
ever vague, for it is sometimes identified with
Thīhāmā and sometimes described as a separate
district adjoining it. For example, according to
Kūdāma b. Dīnāfar, it stretched from Nāṣīlī to the
extreme borders of Thīhāmā; on the other hand,
according to a passage in al-Bakrī, it lay between
Thīhāmā (the district from Dīahlūrī to two days’
journey beyond Mecca) and the Saratātī.

3. In al-Tawārikh al-Kudraddābī, 248;
Hamdānī, 46, 218, 210, 233; Bakrī, *Geographisches
Wörterbuch*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 7, 11, 35, 818; Vāḳūṭ,
iii, 521. (F. BuHl-D. SourDEL)

**AL-GHAYB** (a.). The two connotations of the
root are ghāba ʿan, to be absent, and ghāba fi, to be
hidden. In current usage, ghāya (and especially ghāya)
may signify “absence” (and ghāba, of existence, “presence”,
may be a technical term of ʿĪsfīsm); but more frequently ghāya
may indicate what is hidden, inaccessible to
the senses and to reason—thus, at the same time
absent from human knowledge and hidden in divine
wisdom. It is to this second meaning that al-ghayb
refers, as a technical term of the religious vocabulary.
It may then be rendered by “the mystery”. Such is
its meaning with ghāya, “presence”, in the
Kūrān. Its use there is frequent.

“The ghayb belongs only to God” (Kūrān, X, 20);
“He has the keys of al-ghayb which are known only
to Him” (VI, 59), etc. Reference is here made to
the Divine mystery, of itself inaccessible to man. Hence
the translation adopted (by R. Blachere) of ‘Incon-
naisable’, “Unknown”. The idea which reappears
most often is the inaccessibility of al-ghayb, which
remains totally hidden. “God knows the Unknowable
and God, if He wishes, will reveal His mystery to
me” (LXXII, 26), “He does not raise you up to the Unknowable”
(III, 174).

The ghayb nevertheless is an object of faith (II, 3),
just as is the Word revealed to the Prophet (II, 4).
Man ought therefore to cling to the unknown
mystery “where from God is” (laddun), and God, if
He wishes, will reveal His mystery to man. “This is part
of the story (ambd) of the Unknowable which We
reveal to you” (III, 44; cf. II, 49; XII, 102). It is thus,
as Guaderyo-Demombynes emphasizes, that the
ghayb of the Kūrān is “sometimes the Revelation,
sometimes the Unknowable, sometimes both to-
gether” *(Les sens du substantif Ghayb dans le Coran*, in *Mélanges Louis Massignon*, ii, Damascus 1957,
250). In fact, the common denominator is still the
notion of (divine) Mystery, sometimes unrevealed,
sometimes revealed in fragments—to the extent that
this revelation is necessary to lead man along the
straight path (hidddya). The Kūrān does not com-
municate all the ghayb to man, but the whole
kūran is a (partial) communication of the ghayb.
It is in this sense that Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī was to
entitle his great commentary “The keys of the
Mystery”, Mafdtih al-ghayb.

This partial revelation of the ghayb is explained by
L. Masson (Passion d’al-Hallājī, Paris 1922, 500)
as a participation which God vouchsafes to the
prophets in His “essential mystery” (al-sirr al-Īsfī, as
al-Djūrjānī says in *Tawīfīt*, Leipzig 1845, 169).
In the commentaries on the Kūrān and in religious
literature, al-ghayb is in fact applied at times to the
absolute mystery of God Himself, but more often it
is the invisible world taken as a whole. The distinction
frequently appears between ʿilm al-ghayb and ʿilm
al-ghahāda, the world of the invisible mystery,
created and uncreated, and the perceptible world,
also called ʿilm al-μūlīk. These refinements of meaning
are found in the saifīr commentaries on Kūrān, II, 3.
Al-Baydāwī there explains the ghayb in which belief
is required as “that which is not perceived by the
senses or which is not immediately understood by the
reason”. But al-Ṭabarī, on the other hand, there
defines the ghayb which is an object of faith as being
the Will of God—thus an “attribute of the Essence”.
However, this resort to the Divine Will seems to
relate the idea of ghayb to the Decreee of God,
rather more than to the notion of “Divine
Mystery”. In his profession of faith, the Ḥanbalī Ibn
Bāṭa lays down: “One must throw oneself (taslim)
upon the Divine Omnipotence (budra) and have
faith in the Divine Mystery (ghayb), for the individual
reason is unable to raise itself to the understanding
(marafī) of this mystery” (cf. the translation of
H. Laoust, *La profession de foi d’Ibn Bāṭa*, Damascus
1958, 105). This “Divine Mystery” is thus simultane-
ously the “mystery of things” and the destiny of man;
and of each man. It is reserved to God, who reveals
it to his prophets to the extent that He wills.

Other usages of the expression al-ghayb:
— (a) in Shiī theology, the imām has, of himself,
knowledge of the ghayb; a view attacked by the
Ḥanbalī al-Barbaḥārī and others. Mafdtih al-ghayb
is the title of a work of the Shiī Shīrāzī (Muḥāf
Ṣadrā).—(b) Ibn Bāṭa compares astrology and
the idea of this mystery” (cf. the translation of
H. Laoust, *La profession de foi d’Ibn Bāṭa*, Damascus
1958, 105). This “Divine Mystery” is thus simultane-
ously the “mystery of things” and the destiny of man;
and of each man. It is reserved to God, who reveals
it to his prophets to the extent that He wills.

Other usages of the expression al-ghayb:
— (a) in Shiī theology, the imām has, of himself,
knowledge of the ghayb; a view attacked by the
Ḥanbalī al-Barbaḥārī and others. Mafdtih al-ghayb
is the title of a work of the Shiī Shīrāzī (Muḥāf
Ṣadrā).—(b) Ibn Bāṭa compares astrology and
the pretension to know the ghayb” and condemns
both severely (cf. H. Laoust, *op. cit.*, 155).
Under the same title of Mafdtih al-ghayb (Cairo 1327)
the Egyptian Ahmad al-Zarkawī treats of magic and
divination.—(c) Ibn ʿArabī uses the same title
again, but this time to designate Shī Ṣulṭān
marafī. In fact tasawufu frequently interprets the ghayb as
the threefold world of djibarāt, malakūtāt and lākāt (cf.
ʿĀlam), but as the hidden essence of all that is,
whether visible or invisible. It is then the ghayb al-
hwāyiyā (mystery of selfhood) or absolute ghayb
(mutlāb) (cf. al-Djūrjānī, Taʾrīfīt, 169-70).—The
hierarchy of the ābdāl, the “saints apostrophes”
(Massignon), crowned by the κύβ ("Pole"), is called
“the men of the Mystery” (mīḍāt al-ghayb, Lane,
*Arabian Nights*, xxx, n. 17).—And according to C.
Wells (Mehemet the Kurd . . ., 129), ibn al-ghayb
describes a child begotten without a father and
endowed with mysterious intellectual faculties.

Al-ghayb, the Mystery, therefore, may be under-
stood in three possible meanings. — 1) Normal
religious sense: the mystery of the Divine Decree,
unknowable in itself, partially revealed in the
Kūrān.— 2) The invisible world which magic,
ocultism and astrology try to penetrate (but the
man who persists in crossing its boundaries by his
own powers is committing a sin). — 3) In ʿĪsfīsm,
Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
al-ghayb means, according to context, the reality of the world beyond the senses and beyond discursive reason which gnosia (ma'ra'a) experiences,—the hierarchy of the invisible worlds,—the beings of these worlds,—and even the world of the Divine Essence. (The penetration of the ghayb through a pleasurable intellectual experience was to become extremely suspect to the adversaries of tasawwuf.)—Finally, we should note that in Shī‘ism, the ghayb known to the imām recalls the latter's actual condition when he has become ghāyib and his state of absence, or better, "occultation".

Bibliography: Further to references given in the text: Dict. of tech. terms, 1033 f. (s.v. 'ilām), 1900, 1539 f. (s.v. huwiyya): Max Horten, Theologie des Islam, 219 f.

(D. B. Macdonald—L. Gardet)

GHAYBA (masdar of ghība) means "absence", often "absence of mind". The latter sense was developed by the Sūfis as the opposite of hadra (q.v.), absence from the creation and presence with God. The word is also used for the condition of anyone who has been withdrawn by God from the eyes of men and whose life during that period (called his ghayba) may have been miraculously prolonged. It is so used of al-Khadir (q.v.). A number of Shī‘ī groups have recognized the ghayba, in the latter sense, of one or another imām, with the implication that no further imām was to succeed him and he was to return at a foreordained time as Mahdī (q.v.). The first instance of this was that of Muḥammad b. al-Hanafīyya.

Among the Ithna ‘asharī Imāms, the Ghayba became a major historical period, lasting from the disappearance of the twelfth imām until his reappearance in eschatological times. It was divided into two parts. In the "lesser Ghayba", from 260/874 to about 329/941, the Hidden Imām was represented among his followers by safirs (q.v.), held to be in touch with him and exercising his authority. They maintained the organization, in its legal and financial functions, which had grown up around the later imāms (cf. Javād Ali, Die beiden ersten Safire des Javad Ali, 1925). The claimants to this office has been generally recognized by the Durūzs (q.v.), the concept and term were revived to refer to the period of absence of al-Ḥakim and Ḥamza.

(D. B. Macdonald—M. G. S. Hodgson)

GHAYLAN B. MUSLIM, Abū Marwān al-Dimashqī (q.v.), is chiefly known as one of the first advocates of free will [see KADARIYYA], at the same time as Maḥbād al-Dhujānī (q.v.). The son of a freed slave of ʿUṣmān b. ʿAffān, he appears, like Maḥbād, to have been the disciple of a Christian from Irāq, but he lived in Damascus where he held the position of secretary in the chancellery. Al-Dhāḥiq (Bayān, iii, 29) mentions him on the same footing as Ibn al-Muṭṣafqa; Sahī b. Ḥārūn and Abū al-Ḥamīd, and even one so strictly orthodox as al-ʿAskālānī acknowledged his professional ability (Lisān al-Mīṣrīn, iv, 424), while Ibn al-Nadīm (Fihrist, 171) estimated his rādīdī to amount to about 2,000 leaves; they were probably not all of an administrative and diplomatic character, to judge by al-Ḥayyās (Insārīd, ed. and trans. Nader, Ar. text 93, trans. 175) who when answering the accusations of Ibn al-Mukaffa against Ghaylan as one of the proponents of free will, appealed to the content and stated that they were very widely known; he added that Ghaylan believed in the five Muṭtazzīlī principles, but the heresiographers rank him solely among the Kadrās. According to al-Shahrāstānī (margin of Ibn Ḥāzm, i, 194), who names him as one of the Murdīlī Kadrās, his principal doctrine concerned the primary, innate knowledge (maʿra’a) which allows it to be known that the world has an Artificer created by Himself; the imām is only the secondary, acquired knowledge.

The activities of Ghaylan, who apparently embraced the cause of al-Ḥārīrī b. Suraydī al-Kadhībī [see ḤAYHAN B. ṢAFWĀN], earned him the imprecations of ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, but it was only Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (105/724-43) who gave orders that his hadra (q.v.) be cut off and who had him crucified, after al-Awzaʿī (born about 87/706, d. 157/774 (q.v.)) had subjected him to interrogation and given a verdict in favour of his execution.


(G. Pellat)

GHAYLAN B. UKBĀ (see ghwāl b. ʿImām). GHAYN, 19th letter of the Arabic alphabet, here transcribed gh; numerical value: 1000.

Definition: A voiced postvelar fricative; according to the Arab grammatical tradition: rīḥā ba mādhūra mūsulāˈīya. As regards the malārādī: min aḍnā ʾl-halī (from the part of the throat nearest to the mouth). The Arabs thus made ghayn (and ḥād) guttural. They contrasted them with ṣayn and ṣād, min al-ḥalā; and with ʿayn and ḥamza, min aḍnā ʾl-halī (al-Zamakhsharī, Mufīd, 4, 732). The velaric articulation of ghayn is well described by
R. Rüdika as "between the soft palate (velum) and the back of the tongue" (Existence du gh, 182). The soft palate is divided into two areas: upper (prevelar) and lower (postvelar). The articulation of ghayn takes place in the latter area, hence the adjective employed in the definition. To the extent that a channel is formed on the back of the tongue permitting the uvula to vibrate, ghayn approximates to uvular r.

In a few cases the passage from gh to hh is quoted (J. Cantineau, Cours, 94), see Ibn al-Sikkit (al-Kalb wa 'l-idāli, 32). But particularly interesting is the passage from ghayn to gha'ayn which has been illustrated with numerous examples by R. Rüdika, notably in L’alternance de x — x en arabe (JA, cxxxi (1932), 67-115). Since his article in ZA, xii (1907), 293-340, he has sustained and defended the theory of the secondary origin of ghayn in Semitic, by the passage of ‘ayn into ghayn in Arabic and only in Arabic (references to these writings: Ar. Or., xix (1951), 100, n. 4).

One of his last articles summarizes his ideas and his activity in this controversy: La question de l’existence du gh dans les langues sémitiques en général et dans l’arabe oriental ou maghrébin, in Ar. Or., xii (1954), 176-237 (quoted as Existence du gh). K. Petrēček, his pupil, who is loyal to his ideas (Ar. Or., xii (1953), 240-62 and xxiii (1955), 475-8), acknowledges (ibid., xxi, 243, n. 16) that only H. Torczyner has accepted the theory. During the lifetime of its author, and to his great chagrin, it seems to have encountered only indifference or neutrality in the world of orientalists. S. Moscati, in his recent Lessioni di linguistica semitica (Rome 1960) includes ghayn among the phonemes of common Semitic (41-3), as had W. Leslau in the Manual of phonetics (Ed. L. Kaiser, Amsterdam 1957), 327. The existence of doublets is not sufficient to prove the secondary character of the Arabic ghayn (according to the judgment of J. Cantineau, Cours, 94). Further, R. Rüdika appears to have underrated the data of South Arabic epigraphy and to have misinterpreted those of Ugaritic (cf. S. Moscati, loc. cit. and Rend. Lin., series VIII, xxv-34 (1960), 87; compare also the account of C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic manual, Rome 1955, i, ch. 5, 8). We would ourselves also retain ghayn among the articulations of common Semitic.

The most recent documents to be discovered (see GLECS, Comptes rendus, viii, 73; C. Virolleaud, Palais d’Ugarit, ii, 201, Mission Ras Shamra, vii, 1957), pending a fuller report, do not contradict this view.

But the dispute has at least brought to light a certain instability in the Arabic ‘ayn (which can pass into ghayn), at least among certain tribes; (we must also eliminate false doublets arising from simple graphic errors in the manuscript tradition). An analogous case seems to be reproduced in present day dialects, where ghayn is seen to have passed into kāf; dialects of North Arabian nomads: Rōgga, the Mawali; the majority of the dialects of the Algerian Sahara, an immense region which seems to cover also the South Moroccan and Mauritanian Sahara (see J. Cantineau, Cours, 95).

In Classical Arabic ghayn undergoes few conditioned changes (ibid., 94). For the phonological oppositions of the phoneme gh see J. Cantineau, Espuisse, in BSL (no. 126), 109, 227; for its incompatibilities see ibid., 135.

For a general discussion of the phonetics of Arabic as seen by the classical grammarians, see Hūrūf al-}

**Bibliography:** In the text and under Hūrūf al-
GHAYTA — GHAZAL


(Henry G. Farker)

GHAZAL, "song, elegy of love", often also "the erotic-elegiac genre". The term is Arabic, but passed into Persian, Turkish and Urdu and acquired a special sense in these languages.

The semantic development of the word from the root gzl l, "to spin", "spinning", is not in doubt, but presupposes intermediary meanings for which we have no evidence; the ghasal was not in fact a song of women spinning, like that of which Tibullus was not in fact a song of women spinning, like that of which Tibullus

...by loss of emphasis, with the word nasb, "a kind of camelman's lament similar to the ḥīdī" (see al-Dībāsī, Tabbīr*, index; Aghānī*, ix, 135 and also vi, 63, where it is a matter of a single appearing title of the name of al-Naṣīb). The word nasīb, in ancient times, designates the elegiac genre, in a list in which there also figure the poem of praise, the satire and the fahār (thus in Ibn Rashīk, i, 100 and especially Ibn Sallām in Aghānī*, vii, 6, line 4; cf. ibid., 97, line 12); sometimes this genre appears in a five-fold list (see Ibn Rashīk, loc. cit., bottom of page). In certain passages, the verb nasab constructed with bi-

...clearly means "to sing of the beauty of a lady and the agitation she inspires" (thus in Aghānī*, vi, 279, vii, 99, 123). It is well known that in its common meaning nasīb designates the amatory elegiac prologue at the beginning of a ṣāsidā. Kudāmā, 42, attempted very artificially to establish a distinction between the thematic elements of the ghasal and those of the nasīb.

i. — The ghasal in Arabic poetry

1. The amatory elegy in Arabic poetry can be made the subject of historical and critical study only from the last quarter of the 6th century A.D. onwards. Of course, we have no text originating in this era, but those which have come down to us under the names of poets belonging to this period, such as Imrūʿ al-Kays, Tarafa and a number of others, are very instructive. At that time the ghasal was handled according to a tradition which is clearly ancient and honoured. According to all the evidence, this genre was one of those most current in "spontaneous poetry", that is, in the camelman's chant (or ḥīdī?); at this level it must have been improvised and for this reason no example of it has come down to us. Under what influences, where, and when did these appear and become established the custom of prefacing the ṣāsidā with an amatory elegiac prelude, known from the 1st/7th century onwards as the nasīb? We can only guess at the answers to these questions. Since the ṣāsidā was both originally and essentially not a framework but a lyrical movement consisting of a sequence in the key of fahār or a Dionysiac prelude, the nasīb is quite possibly that the nasīb owns its place to the very importance of the carnal and psychic impulses which it evoked; in fact there also occur in the ṣāḥil of the Tuaregs the same lyrical flights introducing identical explosions of boasting; the procedure is not therefore peculiar to the Arabs. Though at first episodic in the poetry of the nomads of Central and Eastern Arabia, the elegiac production known as nasīb seems to have become incorporated in the ṣāsidā under the influence of a fashion current among or created by poets belonging to groups on the Euphrates steppe; certain data accepted among ṣāḥiṣī scholars indeed assume that the nasīb is the invention of a certain Ibn Hīdām (see Ibn Sallām, ed. Hell, 13, line 9) or of the famous Muḥāhalî*. (ibid. and also al-Dībāsī, Bayāmīn, ed. Hārūn, ii, 297) or even in fact of Imrūʿ al-Kays (Ibn Kutayba, 40, 52); as may be seen, these indications demonstrate the existence of a tradition which was still living in the 3rd/9th century and according to which the nasīb was associated with an idea peculiar to the Bakrī poets or others in the orbit of al-Ḥira (see Blachère, Litt., chap. V, § C). This feature is significant since, in so far as it may be historically acceptable, it permits us to infer that this centre, with its musicians and its circle of poets, probably exercised an influence on the ghasal cultivated in the desert. It would seem that this

influence became apparent in the last quarter of the 6th century A.D. at the latest. From certain indications it may be possible to see some phenomenon in other centres closely linked with the *badawi* way of life such as Ta'ayma, Mecca and al-Ta'if. Most probably, though of still uncertain date, the verse texts attributed to ancient poets like Tārāfa, Zubayr, ‘Alkama, Imru’-al-Kays, Ḥassān b. Ṭḥābit, al-‘Aṣḥāb Maymūn, and al-Ḥuṭayrā, to mention only the most representative, evoke reasonably well the themes which were habitually developed in the amatory elegiac *nasib* of this period. The apostrophe to the deserted encampment, the description of the migrating group disappearing into the distance, the sorrow aroused by the separation, the memory left in the poet’s heart by the promises of the beloved, the recital of the efforts made to rejoin her, all constitute a thematic sequence arising from the environment; even the detail of the development, as much as the stock phrases, derive from the same origin; to a certain extent, the thematic elements belong to the real world but they are transposed into a kind of fiction by the use made of them. Already at this time convention may well have been very powerful; everything leads us to believe that the elegiac poet from now on makes use of a vocabulary, of formulas, of stock phrases, whose use is of an entirely different character. 

2. Among the generation of poets which arose about 50/670, the amatory elegiac genre received a particular twist which conditioned its subsequent development. This generation varied degrees freed itself from the grip of the poetic tradition inherited from Central and Eastern Arabia. The three areas of the Muslim Arab East which were to struggle for leadership during the eighty years or so which followed differed in the extent of their contribution to this change. Syria and Palestine were of secondary importance and followed the lead of the Arabian peninsula and Irāk. The latter, while occupying a prominent place in the poetic movement, carried on the previous tradition; the artists and versifiers were led by circumstances to specialize in the laudatory, satirical and descriptive; in the works of the most representative Irāk poets, amatory elegiac themes occur only in the *nasib* of the *ḥāsidas*; in some, like al-Farazdāk, they are in fact noticeably neglected; in all, they are treated in a manner which suggests a mere prolongation of the tradition passed on from the desert and cultivated at al-Hira or under its influence.

In the Hidjāz on the other hand, and more particularly in Mecca, al-Ta’if and Madīna, the situation was entirely different. The influx of wealth from the conquest, the disruption of the social structure resulting from the enrichment and political advancement of certain families such as the Umayyads, the Zubayrīds, and several Ḥakamī clans, the introduction into the population of Mecca and Madīna of foreign elements, particularly captives brought from Palestine and Irāk, as well as the choice of Madīna as political capital, had all played their part in turning this province, with its urban centres, into a world very different from that which the generation of the Caliph Umar I had known. The establishment of the Umayyad dynasty in Syria, the gradual political and religious rise of the cities of Irāk and the ten years during which the revolt of the Zubayrīds cut off the Hidjāz from the rest of the Empire, succeeded in giving society in Madīna and Mecca a character of its own. Certain aristocratic elements renounced an active rūf and sought solace for their unsatisfied ambitions in the pursuit of pleasure and the taste for sentimental intrigues. The anecdotal literature collected by Abu ‘l-Farāgī al-Islahānī from the writings of the ‘Irākī ‘dīwān’ poet, especially the *ḥādi* of Mecca, al-Zubayr b. Bakkar (d. 256/870), subject to the necessary critical adjustments, helps us to form an idea of what life in this circle was like. Women occupied an important place, together with dilettanti, aristocrats with violent passions, intrigues, characters of doubtful morality, singers and singing-girls. The setting was favourable to the development of a new lyric poetry; by a happy chance, the aristocracy produced several poets like al-‘Arḍīlī, al-‘Alwaṣ and ‘Umar b. Abī Rabī’ī, who devoted their talent to the celebration of their love affairs; others of more humble origin like Kuṭhāyyir and Nuṣayb imitated them, without entirely being able to avoid becoming court poets. In this poetic movement a significant part is played by singers and singing-girls, as much by reason of the practices they introduced as because they took part in the composition of the works; often in fact they selected fragments of verse or commissioned them from poets, which implies an artistic production entirely governed by musical considerations.

The study of the amatory elegiac verse which developed in the Hidjāz between about 50/670 and the end of the first quarter of the 8th century comes up against the difficulty posed by the state of the texts. On the one hand a considerable volume of verse has disappeared; on the other, what has survived has often been preserved only in anthologies or late or even very recent recensions, as is for example the case with the poems of Kuṭhāyyir (ed. Perès, Algiers 1928-30) and those of Nuṣayb (ed. Rizzitano in RSO, xxii, 1943); frequently, these recensions consist only of fragments which poorly represent the original outpouring; even in the case of the relatively important *Dīwān* attributed to ‘Umar b. Abī Rabī’ī (ed. P. Schwarz, Leipzig 1901-2, 1909; reprinted by ‘Abd al-Hamīd, Cairo 1952), many problems arise; it is in fact apparent that this collection includes pieces which give evidence of reconstitution, retouching, and indeed the handing over of imitations. The primary condition for the study of the *ghaṣal* of the Hidjāz was born explain the disappearance of these works and the state of those which survive; many were simply extempore compositions, occasional pieces, ephemeral by nature; some seem to have been commissioned by musicians, singing girls or dilettanti from poets forced to compose in haste and to refurbish earlier works. The uncertainties of attribution are great; it was indeed enough for a piece to contain the name of ‘Aza for it to be attributed to Kuṭhāyyir, who was accustomed to celebrate a lady of this name; often too, single lines or pieces attributed to a poet are nothing more than elaborations in verse drawn from fictional biographies or romances about the poet; thus the small historical and literary value to be accorded to such compositions is easily seen. Taken together, nevertheless, the amatory elegiac texts which have been preserved allow us to evoke satisfactorily the general characteristics of the style in the period under consideration. In order to estimate the extent to which this is possible, however, we must constantly keep in mind the fact that our texts contain passages where the influence of the courtly style of ‘Irāk appears, as indicated below.

The poetic instrument used by the poets of the Hidjāz was substantially different from that of their contemporaries in Central and Eastern Arabia.
Under local influences the connexion between poetry and music remained very much alive; this is shown especially in the use of metres practically unknown to the poets in the desert tradition; thus, the hashid, the kasidà, the roza, etc., are found quite often represented among the elegists, and the identity of these with the musical modes of the same names must be emphasized. Among the poets of this school emjambment is much less rare than among their desert rivals. The vocabulary is equally characteristic; free from rare words and khasas legomena, it aims at simplicity and naturalness; the dialogue form is frequent and corresponds to the description of real scenes; naturally, many expressions are proper to the evocation of feelings connected with the excitements of the heart and the flesh.

The elegists of the Hijaz were primarily poets of the desert school. Their surroundings simply brought about a development which set them aside from the main stream of the badawi tradition. This can easily be shown from some texts. Often, for example, the elegist of Madina and Mecca invokes the deserted encampment, describes the departure of a migrating group, bewails his sorrow at a separation; thus thematic elements proper to the nasib of the kasida continue to appear (cf. specimens in Kuthayyir, ed. Perès, no. 44, and 'Arджì, no. 2, lines 7 ff. and no. 5, lines 1-4). These remnants of the desert setting lead quickly to stylization, but they still do not preclude a certain realism of description. This derives from the abiding nature of things. The elegist is above all a lyric poet and self-expression cannot do without a minimum of sincerity in its references to life. The various themes which he develops are in effect the highlights of the more or less stylized narration of known circumstances or real events; even the poetical texts inserted in fictional or romantic narratives still represent elements of verisimilitude within the pattern of the whole. It is clear that the elegist of the Hijaz loves to note those details which evoke reality. We can therefore say that this lyric poetry was above all marked by an effort to express sentiments and emotions which were really felt, to represent scenes where the participants retained their attitudes and reactions; this is so unquestionable that in many cases the poet felt obliged to allude to the lady by a name other than her own.

A rapid examination of several themes treated by the elegists of the Hijaz demonstrates the trends just sketched and emphasizes the persisting badawi influences. The thematic sequence relating to the obstacles encountered by the poet in seeking to find his lady reproduces the essential features of what is found in the desert tradition. There are few novelties; at the most we may note a certain harping on the obstacles arising from the separation of the sexes and the rigour of the new ethic in the society of Madina and Mecca; we may also note the realism concealed beneath the fiction of conventional personages such as the rabì or "censor", the hāθīḥ or "ill-wisher", the ḥālīḥ or "blamer"; according to our biographical information, these personages correspond to known real persons. The poetical texts also refer very often to the difficulties which arise from human nature, to the quarrels and misunderstandings between lovers, to the rupture of relations never to be resumed (thus 'Umar b. Abì Rabi'a, ed. 'Abd al-Hamīd, no. 1, line 25 ff.; no. 6, line 10 and no. 258); among the Hijaz poets rediscoveries are given substance by the description of details designed to emphasize the reality of the experience; thus, the lover, either alone or with companions, surprises the lady amusing herself with her women; sometimes the event is prearranged and organized by the lady; the two lovers meet in a secluded spot (thus in 'Arджì no. 13, line 15, no. 23, line 2); the account very frequently ends with a description of the beloved and the evocation of sensual excitement between the two lovers (thus 'Umar b. Abì Rabi'a, no. 1, lines 35-41, no. 5, lines 10 ff., no. 258, lines 9 ff.; al-'Arджì, no. 47, lines 6-26).

There emerges from the whole pattern of these amatory elegiac themes a certain literary concept of love, which, for convenience, we shall call the Hijaz manner. This concept is seen primarily in the images formed of the lover and his lady. The latter remains a somewhat unfocussed character, owing to the lack of any poetess able to express herself in verse with the authority of such men as 'Umar b. Abì Rabi'a, Nuṣayb or Kuthayyir; her physical appearance is described according to the canon already established in the traditional nasib, evoking a softness and luxury that correspond with an ideal of womanhood having little in common with the generality of real badawi women; socially, she belongs to a noble family, which does not at all imply any insistence on the part of the elegist on celebrating her intellectual merits; on the contrary, under the influence of a tradition which may have already been established for centuries, the lady is depicted as a creature formidable in charm, coquetry and beauty, which she wields with a kind of unselconsciousness and at times with manifest cruelty. Nevertheless, on this point, the feminine ideal differs from what seems to have been the ideal of the desert poets; in the texts we are considering, there is a certain contradiction in the fact that the Hijaz elegist takes pleasure in saying that his lady is the embodiment of womanly love, humble in the face of Destiny, eagerly submissive to her seducer (as in 'Umar b. Abi Rabi'a, passim, and esp. no. 7, lines 1-4, nos. 181 and 182, lines 13-18, and no. 242); this attitude is what distinguishes the Hijaz lady most completely from her 'Irākī sister, so imbued with courtly spirit. The poet-lover, in contrast to the lady, emerges from our texts with more defined features; two thematic sequences can be distinguished: in the first the lover represents himself according to the psychology and in the attitudes already familiar in the desert tradition; like his badawi brother, the elegist of Madina and Mecca appears to us as a victim of his love for his lady, a prey to the hostility of a world in which he is alone with his agony and despair; his
tears flow easily and his complaints are shrill; a fairly large number of clichés strengthen the already apparent links with a completely traditional manner. In this field are those fragments of passages in which the poet portrays himself as a breaker of hearts, a kind of Don Juan whom no beautiful woman can resist (see details in Aghdni, ii, 119, 139, 144, 166 f.; Umar b. Abi Rabâ’î, no. 10, lines 10-18, and no. 45); the realities of life are also evident in the developments which might be grouped under the title “love withers with age”; indeed, the poet often stresses the transience of the passions he has aroused or felt; this theme is further linked with the tendency of the desert poets to replace the elegiac nasib with a stereotyped sentiment-sentiment on the flight of youth (thus al-Farazdak, ed. Şâwi, 78 and 89). Whatever the reason, the Hîdîjâz manner stands in absolute contradiction here to one of the basic principles of the courtly spirit, which imposes on the lover the obligation of submission to the lady of his choice. The poet claims for himself, in this connexion, his right to refuse on his own terms, on which this contradiction is accentuated even more decisively; the Hîdîjâz manner excludes the sofâ, that is, a refusal to yield to desire, both in the lover and the lady. These poets adhere to what is human and do not seek to transcend it; their sensuality is as much part of their love as is their constancy (cf. the strikingly sexual passages in al-’Ardjî, no. 15, lines 19-21, no. 5, lines 11 f., no. 131, line 7, no. 28, lines 1-9; and frequent also in Umar b. Abi Rabâ’î, as no. 28, lines 2, 5). In view of this, these poets have been named ibâdîyyun, “licentious”; it is justifiable, provided one makes it clear that their licence does not descend to indecency or depravity; it is very noteworthy in this connexion that the Hîdîjâz manner never offends against nature and a certain respect for a code remains. Nevertheless, the worldly occupation of the poet carriers with them the spirit which had favoured the flourishing of the Hîdîjâz manner; without creating it, this current could not but make the curiosity of the court continue to pose questions regarding tales which had spread about the elegists of Madînâ or Mecca. From the end of the 2nd/8th century and in the following twenty-five years, there developed in Basrâ and Baghdâd a semi-romantic, semi-historical literature, of which Ibn al-Nadîm, Fihrist, 306, cites several authors, such as Ibn al-Kalîbî, al-Madâ’înî, or al-Hayyâm b. ’Adî; these writings, widely utilized by Abu ’l-Faradj al-İsfâhânî in his Kitâb al-İshâriyya, demonstrate that the poet-lovers sometimes underwent a genuine transfiguration, which in certain cases turned real persons like Djamî into veritable heroes of love. From then on the poetical works collected or mis-attributed under the names of these poet-lovers could not but reflect the psychology of the heroes who figured in the romances or romanticized biographies. Can certain tribal groups of Western Arabia have been familiar in their folklore from the 1st/7th century or even earlier with love stories centred on a more or less legendary personality? It is very possible. In particular it seems that the little tribe of the Udhra, which in the 1st/7th century frequented an area extending from the oasis of Taymâ to the Wâdî l-Kûrâ (see Aghdni, vii, 123, 126, lines 4-5) prided itself on having produced one of these annual bard-poets, the famous Djamî. The Udhra were not, however, the only ones to claim such a title to fame; the Nâdh of the same area were equally proud of having given birth to the sayyîd Ibn ’Adîjân, who later became the hero of a love saga (cf. Ibn Kutaybah, Poetry, 449; Aghdni, xii, 102-4 and xx, 22; Blachère, Litt., ii, chap. IV, § B). Under the pressure of tribal particularism, other groups seem later to have developed creations of a similar kind in the lIrâkî centres where they had installed themselves; such seems to have been the case with the ’Amîr b. Șa’â’a and Madînûn, their “fool of love” who became a famous hero through his passion for Laylâ. Before it was finally established in a closely defined system, the courtly spirit seems to have spread through these influences as a kind of heightening of the Hîdîjâz spirit. There is no doubt that the poet Bashshât’î b. Burd (b. about 95/714, d. about 169/784) played a considerable part in popularizing certain themes at Baṣra; in his Dîwân, which is unfortunately incomplete, it is easy to note, among verses or fragments addressed to ʿAbdab and other female personalities of the city, lyric pieces where in fact his love is from the first known to be hopeless and draws its lasting character from this certainty. The setting in which Bashshât’î was composing his ghâzals was in any case favourable to such emotional exaltation; it was the time indeed when at Baṣra mystical experiences were particularly to be observed among women; it was also the time when, in this centre as at Kûfâ, a giddy society, free thinking and morally lax, was plunging into easy pleasures which, in occasional flashes, inspired a thirst for purer and serener joys. Bashshât’î himself seems to have experienced such disillusion, like his contemporary of Kûfâ, Mu‘tâb b. Iyâs (d. 170/787); here and there in Bashshât’î’s elegiac works he gives evidence of a fruitless desire to detach himself from carnal pursuits. The merit of having achieved such an escape must be ascribed to his younger compatriot, al-‘Abbâs b. al-’Abî, who a little later than 193/808). The work of this poet is unique in the history of Arabic poetry; it is exclusively a song of
courtly love. Inspired by real love for a lady designated by various names, this elegist composed occasional pieces and more elaborate works all concerned with one ideal; for the poet, the lady is the unattainable, the distant incarnation of a desired being which one owes it to oneself to love while obeying a self-imposed rule never to try to go beyond dreaming. Renunciation is the law imposed by the ayyubid al-Baha3 Zuhayr (b. 581/1187, d. at Cairo 656/1258) frequently manages to achieve tones which are beyond dreaming. Renunciation is the law imposed by obeying a self-imposed rule never to try to go beyond dreaming. Reason; nothing can permit one to dream of being Alya, as lady of Al-atika, as

khafif, ramal, purposes; he employs the same metres, khafif, ramal and hazadi; he shares their taste for a flexible vocabulary free of lexical pathos; for him even

hazadi', he shares their taste for a flexible vocabulary free of lexical pathos; for him even faris, pi. zarif[.v], this courtly poet turns to the instrument developed by the elegists of the Hidjaz for their own experience, this courtly poet turns to the instrument developed by the elegists of the Hidjaz for their own purposes; he employs the same metres, khafif, ramal and hazadi; he shares their taste for a flexible vocabulary free of lexical pathos; for him even

hazadi', he shares their taste for a flexible vocabulary free of lexical pathos; for him even faris, pi. zarif[.v]

but his school; the courtly spirit occupies a secondary place in these works and must be sought in some pieces addressed to the enigmatic Djanan. These poems prefer to develop, with significant exuberance and insistence, an Epicureanism which embraces every kind of satisfaction; to a certain extent the Bacchic pieces verge, in certain episodes, on the elegy of sentiment; but the poet's eyes are no longer turned towards a chosen lady but towards loose women, or towards young men who, in these works, inflame passions which are hardly Platonic. If, as one may be justified in accepting as a hypothesis, the collection attributed to Abu Nuwas is not the work of one individual, it follows that this lyricism, so definite in character, corresponds to the taste and manners of one sector of Baghdad society. The break with the courtly spirit and romantic love on the part of this sector is clear; in opposition to an idealism lacking relation to the human, there now arises an unashamed naturalism which refuses to blame itself. 4. The 3rd/9th century saw the elaboration of a coherent doctrine of the courtly ideal under the growing influence of neo-Platonism. This ideal is represented by the kind of treatise on sophistication which the Khāl al-Muwāshshād of al-Waghsa3a [q.v.] constitutes; it is also illustrated by that notable anthology of love which we owe to the zahir theologian Muhammed b. Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī (d. 397/990), called Khāl al-Zahrā, It is unnecessary here to recall the characteristic traits of this spirit [see 'ugra]. But we must indicate the connections which seem to have existed between this concept of love and its reflections in the neo-classical poetry whose principal representatives in the East are Abu Tammān, al-Buhturi and al-Mutanabbi. Among the poets of this period the field of expression of the amatory elegiac genre became more restricted; the only developments to be found are confined in fact to the nasībīs prefacing kāṣidas. In several respects this is a recollection of the badawi tradition, but the tone differs completely and the themes are treated more intellectually and are reduced to the notation of states of mind, and the expression of aphorisms on the vanity and fleeting nature of love, on the sorrow it inspires and the dissatisfaction to which it leads. This lyricism is sinking into conventionality and frigidity. Nevertheless, some urban poets of lesser fame, both in ʿIrāk and in the Muslim West, composed poems of a more personal lyricism in the ghazal manner. Their tone is given by certain pieces by the ʿAbbasid prince Ibn al-Muʿtazz (b. 247/861, d. at Baghdad 296/908), but the influence of the courtly spirit is perceptible in these works but it does not go so far as to exclude references to a lived experience, in which emotion seeks to express itself with a spontaneity which is frequently suppressed. During the 4th/10th century, similar efforts are visible in other Baghdad poets, particularly those who flourished in great numbers under the Bāyids; many names could be cited, but the most typical seem Ibn Sukkara (d. 385/995) and al-Salāmī (d. 393/1003). In this group of poets the influence of Abu Nuwas is undeniable. Like their predecessor these artists sing as much of the joy of loving as of the emotional troubles which passion brings; in all of them we find a stylistic simplicity which in its directness of expression is decidedly a characteristic of the genre. Certain works of the Baghdad poet Ibn al-Hādirī (d. 391/1001) raise the question already put regarding Abu Nuwas; should they be cited in connexion with this genre? As far as Ibn al-Hādirī is concerned, the reply is of even greater delicacy, since the amatory elegiac inspiration of this poet is usually nothing but cynical eroticism. A more elaborate analysis of the genre at this stage in its development may lead to the conclusion that two currents are forming: the one idealistic and courtly; the other realistic, either with the moderation of the Hīḍās manner or with the extremism of the obscene poems of Ibn al-Hādirī. Whatever the case may be, the latter tendency shows itself only sporadically, since the conventionalism and the religious ethic of society do not offer it a favourable soil in which to develop. In the period we have now reached, poetry in Arabic was cultivated in all the intellectual centres of the Muslim world. The amatory elegiac genre naturally therefore had its representative figures in each of these centres. In ʿIrāk under the Saljuqīs, they were numerous, competent in the manipulation of their instrument, but entirely without originality (see al-Tahir, ii, 97-102 and the examples given). In Egypt, the same comment is valid, though under the Ayyubīs al-Bahā3 Zuhayr (b. 528/1132, d. at Cairo 656/1258) frequently manages to achieve tones which
recall Abū Nuwās in their sincerity. In Spain, the Cordovan Ibn Zaydūn (b. 394/1003, d. at Seville 447/1055) contributed also to give the genre a somewhat more personal and refined accent, but with a deeper vocabulary and the substitution here and there in the traditional thematic material of more acute psychological analyses. Similarly, Ibn Hamdīs of Syricus (b. 447/1055, d. at Bougie (?) 527/1132) achieved the combination of a generalized lyricism with amatory elegiac movements of real charm. It seems also that the cultivated society of the cities of Spain particularly relished this spirit, which induced a sort of “sad delight”.


ii. — IN PERSIAN LITERATURE

The ghazal is one of the most common instruments of Neo-Persian lyrics. In its present form it consists of a few bayts (verses, or distichs), generally not less than five and no more than twelve, with a single rhyme (often accompanied by a radīf); in the first bayt, called mafā`a, both hemistichs too rhyme together; the last bayt, called makhša`, contains the nom-de-plume (shakhla) of the author; the contents of the ghazal are descriptions of the emotions of the poet in front of love, spring, wine, God, etc., often inextricably connected.

The problem of the origin of the neo-Persian ghazal coincides practically with the problem of the origin of neo-Persian poetry. Various hypotheses have been proposed, e.g. : (a) the neo-Persian ghazal originated from the baḥšīb or nasīb of the Arabic bašīla [q.v.], isolated from its context and later developed into an independent form (Shibli Nu`mānī, etc.); (b) its origin lies in Persian folk-songs, antedating Arabic influence (Braginskiy and other Soviet authors); (c) a distinction between a “technical ghazal” and a more generic ghazal should be made: the first can be said to have found its final form only in Sa`dī (7th/8th century), the second owes its origin to folk poetry, later refined at the courts under Arabo-Persian kings (Mizrave). All these hypotheses have their share of truth. Actually it should always


be borne in mind that neo-Persian poetry in its specific sense has its origin in the literary experiment of adapting the Persian language to Arabic metres and forms, an experiment first begun at the courts of the first independent Persian dynasties of Khurāsān by people with a perfect knowledge of Arabic. On the other hand "Arabic", in this case, does not imply an ethnic meaning, as many Arabic poets of the time were, ethnically, Persians, and, from the point of view of its content, Arabic poetry of that period was in its turn influenced by Persian ideas. A very useful distinction is that between ghazal in its technical sense and ghazal in its generic sense, proposed especially by Mirzoev. In its generic sense the ghazal may also have been influenced, in its origins, by elements from folk-poetry, though this can in no way be demonstrated by documents, as we know nothing about Persian folk-poetry of the 3rd/9th century, and the very little we know about pre-Islamic Persian poetry shows us something totally different, technically, even from the oldest and least specific and formal terms of the neo-Persian post-Islamic ghazal.

The formal history of the neo-Persian ghazal can be divided roughly into five periods. The first is the period of the origins, rather obscure, as we have seen, for which we possess actually only fragments of poetical compositions not too different from fragments of generic "ghazals". Many elements of the "technical" ghazal still are lacking (e.g., taḥallus, regular maṣ'la and maḥfaṣ) and the style is rather decorative/descriptive, with a certain unity and congruity of meanings in the same composition (as compared with the conceptual incongruity of the "technical" ghazal) accompanied by a lack, or rarity, of taḥārūz (the name given to the hardly definable general Stimmung of the classical ghazal). Rudāḡi and Daḵšīḏ may be regarded as the greatest poets of this period (3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries).

The second period could be called the formative one (4th/10th to 7th/13th centuries). In it the proto-ghazal acquires a very important element: the mystical experience. At the end of this period the classical ghazal is perfectly formed, though the "atmosphere" of the ghazal is either mystic in tendency (e.g., ʿĀṭār), or predominantly profane, as in Anwārī, best known as a kasīda:ι of many elements of the "technical" ghazal still are lacking (e.g., taḥallus, regular maṣ'la and maḥfaṣ) and the style is rather decorative/descriptive, with a certain unity and congruity of meanings in the same composition (as compared with the conceptual incongruity of the "technical" ghazal) accompanied by a lack, or rarity, of taḥārūz (the name given to the hardly definable general Stimmung of the classical ghazal). Rudāḡi and Daḵšīḏ may be regarded as the greatest poets of this period (3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries).

The third period (7th/13th to 10th/16th centuries) could be called the classical period. The ghazal finds its perfectly defined present shape, both from the point of view of form (all the technical elements implied in the definition of ghazal given above are present) and from the point of view of content: the decorative style of the origins, after the mystical injection of the formative period, passes into a highly refined and complex symbolic style. Saʿdī and Hāfiz are the supreme ghazal writers of this period. Especially in Hāfiz the chief object of the ghazal, the maṣ'la, the (earthly) Beloved, becomes inextricably connected not only with the maṣ'la, the divine Beloved (God, or better His representative on earth, the mystical Initiator) but even with the madīd, the traditional object of the kasīda: it has been demonstrated recently especially by Lescot, that the Beloved of the ghazals of Hāfiz is often his Prince or patron.

The fourth period, that of the so-called Indian style (10th/15th to 12th/18th centuries) [see sanā'ī hindi], sees an intellectual reflection on the accepted symbols of the classical ghazal, which becomes an arena for a quasi-philosophical exercise of the mind.

The ghazal finds a renewed congruity of meaning, and its protagonist, instead of the maṣ'la/madīd, maṣ'baḏ seems to be the Mind of its Author, creating ever new purely intellectual combinations of the old worn-out symbols. (The greatest poet of this period is probably Šāh Šāhīn).

The fifth and last period is not easily definable: in Iran a tendency to revive the classical and even pre-classical ghazal is followed by attempts to use the ghazal for more modern and profane purposes, for which this poetical form, with the refined neo-Platonic symbolism acquired in its classical period, seems rather inadequate.

A description of classical ghazal at the time of its "perfection" can be given only by showing the features and symbolic motifs of a single concrete example. We have selected for this purpose the ghazal of Hāfiz whose maṣ'la is:

rasanak-ī ʿālā-ī ṣabāḥ-ast digar bustān-rā
mirasad moshfāl-yi gol bulbul-i Ṣ̱uḥ.-ahān-rā
(for full text see edition by M. Kazwini and K. Ghani, Tehran n.d., 7-8).  
1. Once more the age of youth has returned to the garden—and the sweet-singing nightingale receives the good news of the Flower.
2. Oh, gentle breeze! should you once more reach the budding plants in the meadow, give my greetings to the Basil, the Rose, the Cypress tree.
3. The young Son of the Magi, the Vintner, appears before me in such charming motions that I am ready to sweep with my eyebrows the dust of the Tavern.
4. Oh, thou who coverest with purest amber the face of the Moon, do not perturb yet more this man perplexed by love.
5. I greatly fear that those who laugh at wine-bibbers may at last make a tavern of their Faith in God.
6. But mayest thou remain a friend of the Holy Men, for in the Ship of Noah there is still a handful of Mud that knows how to dely the Deluge.
7. Go out from this Dwelling, that has the Heavens for roof, and do not ask it for Food, for that Vile One at the end shamelessly kills her Guest.
8. And say to those whose last resting-place will be a handfull of Dust: "Friend, what avails it to raise high palaces to the Skies?"
9. Oh, moon of Canaan! The throne of Egypt has been allotted thee; it is now high time that thou shouldst say farewell to the Prison!
10. Oh Hāfiz, drink wine, and be a libertine, and live joyfully, but take care not, as others do, to make a snare of the Book of God!

We have here an excellent example—the poem has been chosen almost by chance—of many features characteristic of the style of Persian lyrical poetry of the golden age. Let us list, first of all, the several motifs: of the images indeed none, without exception, is original.

(1) Nightingale-Rose. It may seem strange, but this motif, perhaps the one that occurs most frequently in Persian lyrics, has never been the object of historical research.

It appears in the most ancient Persian lyrics of the 4th/10th century. In the mature lyrical forms (Hāfiz) it contains the following meanings:

The rose is Beauty aware of itself, the supreme, inaccessible symbol of the divine širīgān; or, the rose disdainfully derides the nightingale but as soon as it blossoms it dies. This is the cause of the twofold
sadness of the nightingale, which mourns over the rapid death of the rose and its disdainful rejection of union. But between the two there is a kind of mysteri-
ously intimate moment, when the rose and the nightingale are in love, when the former is frequently applied to the nightingale ) alone under-
stands the secret language of the rose. The nightingale sings in Arabic—the sacred language—invitations to take partake of the mystic wine. Inebriated with the perfume of the rose it fears to end as did the magician-
angel, Mārid. As the prayer offered at dawn is of special value and has special power (cf. Kurān, XVII, 78), so the mention of the nightingale is the auroral prayer. But it is a doleful offering, to offer something inaccessible, for, as Muḥammad says in his charming book translated in the middle of the last century by Garcin de Tassy, “my song is a song of grief and not of joy . . . Each time that I flutter over a garden I warble of the affliction that will soon replace the gaiety that reigns there”. In an Indian Muslim allegory, the romance of the Rose of Bakāwāli, the in-
accessible Rose, so difficult to find, is the only remedy that can restore the sight of King Zayn al-
Mulkū, etc. The God-Rose identity of the famous preface of the Gulistān of Sa'dī can be clearly seen when the Mystic who travels in the transcendental world is unable to bring back any gift from his travels because: “I had in mind that when I reached the Rose-tree I would fill my lap with this perfume for my friends, but when I reached it I was so inebriated with the perfume of the Rose that the hem of my robe slipped from my hand”.

The enthusiastic pan-Islamist, Pizzi, has endeav-
oured, but without adequate evidence, to show influence of the Persian Rose motif in the mediaeval Roman de la Rose, whose symbolism is reminiscent of this. But in the absence of definite documentary evidence and of preparatory studies we cannot exclude the opposite hypothesis, namely that a Hellenistic motif may have penetrated into both cultures, derived from that civilization which in various ways and forms fertilised them both, i.e., the late Hellenistic symbolism. One should, however, bear in mind that what we refer to is a motif and not an emotional and original perception by Hāfīz of the “romantic” and vivid reality of the Spring and the flowers.

(2) And here we have another “personage”, the sabā, “the zephyr”, the springtime breeze, generally held to be—and not for the first time by Hāfīz but by innumerable poets before and after him—the Messenger par excellence. The breeze also is personified in a bird, more especially the hoopoe. Why? because with a very slight change in the transcription, the pronunciation of its name is identical to that of the famous region of Sabā whose Queen, we read in the Kurān, sent a hoopoe as her messenger to King Solomon. Thus the “secondary images” aroused in the mind of the listener by the word sabā are quite other than those awakened in us by the word “zephyr”, now ineradicably associated in our minds with Metastasio and Wateau. Sabā is a sound that reverberates with a rich symbolism which can be traced back historically and clearly to a “gnostic” world. Basil (rayshān), mentioned soon after, which to us suggests little more than the idea of “perfume”, is instead a word used in the Kurān. The fragrance of basil is one of the chief components of the olfactory joys of the Islamic paradise (cf. Kurān, LVI, 89), and singularly enough, of the Zoroastrian paradise also (cf. Mānūk Xrad, ch. II). Basil, on the other hand, the Cypress, familiar to all amateur collectors of Persian carpets and miniatures, in its charming con-
ventionalized shapes, is the sacred tree of Zoroaster. It is identified with the Prophet himself who planted a specially memorable cypress (that of Kāghmar) just at the time when the ecstatic-prophetic ex-
perience first thrilled him. It is a motif that seems to have come straight from a Central Asian spiritual area: the Shaman, indeed, plants a tree when starting on his “prophetic” career. Thus, even if in the case in point the words are not always intentionally and knowingly symbolical, they are not merely descriptive but are related to verbal-psychological cycles with which we have no connexion in our languages.

(3) In the springtime scenery summoned before us, the nightingale, the rose, the zephyr, the cypress, basil and the “young” plants of the meadow are playing a part in a scene which, even from our descriptive standpoint, might acquire a certain unity. But now there enters a character who to our eyes may seem truly extraneous. He is the young Magian (moghbāt), the vintner, and the Tavern. The “Zoroastrian” character of the images connected with wine, with the Superior of the Magi, and with the Young Magian (cf. Kurān), sent a hoopoe as her messenger to King Solomon. Thus the “secondary images” aroused in the mind of the listener by the word “priest”, “bishop”, “Brahmin” “Magian”, “temple of fire”, “church”, “monastery” in the same poem. The ideas that these lyrical-symbolic images summon up are not something precisely and theologically Zoroastrian (wine is not a secondary element in the Zoroastrian ritual); they serve as signs indicating an esoteric rite. As lyrical poetry was traditionally condemned both by Islam and by Zoroastrianism, the motif of self-abasement is added to this intricate image-motif. The poet, the Initiate, is willing even to wipe with his face the door of the tavern-temple where the Young Magian reigns. Here is summed up the material inherited from the frankly libertine poetry of the Arab mutāšākbīrin (wine-drinkers) of ancient and modern, to evoke this idea use indi-
scriminately the words Magian, Christian, temple of fire or church. Sa’dī, although by differences well known to him, uses indiscriminately the words “priest”, “bishop”, “Brahmin” “Magian”, “temple of fire”, “church”, “monastery” in the same poem.

The ideas that these lyrical-symbolic images summon up are not something precisely and theologically Zoroastrian (wine is indeed only a secondary element in the Zoroastrian ritual); they serve as signs indicating an esoteric rite. As lyrical poetry was traditionally condemned both by Islam and by Zoroastrianism, the motif of self-abasement is added to this intricate image-motif. The poet, the Initiate, is willing even to wipe with his face the door of the tavern-temple where the Young Magian reigns. Here is summed up the material inherited from the frankly libertine poetry of the Arab mutāšākbīrin (wine-drinkers) of ancient and modern, to evoke this idea use indiscriminately the words “priest”, “bishop”, “Brahmin” “Magian”, “temple of fire”, “church”, “monastery” in the same poem. The ideas that these lyrical-symbolic images summon up are not something precisely and theologically Zoroastrian (wine is indeed only a secondary element in the Zoroastrian ritual); they serve as signs indicating an esoteric rite. As lyrical poetry was traditionally condemned both by Islam and by Zoroastrianism, the motif of self-abasement is added to this intricate image-motif. The poet, the Initiate, is willing even to wipe with his face the door of the tavern-temple where the Young Magian reigns. Here is summed up the material inherited from the frankly libertine poetry of the Arab mutāšākbīrin (wine-drinkers) of ancient and modern, to evoke this idea use indiscriminately the words “priest”, “bishop”, “Brahmin” “Magian”, “temple of fire”, “church”, “monastery” in the same poem.

(4) And now, as in a filiform succession of images, the Young Magian takes on the ambiguous appearance of a beautiful boy. The fourth verse should more accurately be translated as: “Oh thou, who drawest across the moon a polo-stick (damdīg) of the purest amber, do not make me, whose head whirs (like a polo ball), yet more confused”. And we must then add that the game of polo, which is of Persian origin, supplies a wealth of images to this lyric. The polo stick, with its characteristic hooked shape, is the suf, the long wisp of hair, black as the night, and the moon is no other than the face (the roundness of the face is traditionally greatly admired in this lyric). The Child-Magian who is also the Beloved of the Poet (or his Initiate, or God) has the brilliant and round face of the moon. By mischievously half-veiling it with his black curl, shaped like a polo stick, he only makes the already confused head of the poet whirl like a polo-ball.

(5) In this verse the poet introduces another motif: he upholds the doctors of the law, the orthodos. But Hāfīz must be thought of as the other hand, a “progressive”. There may be cases in the traditional poetry of Persia of mutāšākbīrin who, when indulging in
this literary style, are obeying its conventions in abusing... as themselves as a class. This... that confers on it a special kind of style of its own.

(6) The verse that follows contains a transparent allusion to the superiority of the Saint (the man of God) over the Doctor of the Law, very skilfully expressed. Noah's ship is the human race, the handful of mud that it contains, possessing, however, the supreme faculty of overcoming any deluge, is the Perfect Man, the Saint, the mystic Master. He is "earth", mud indeed, but one which—as the original puts it—be-abt naskhur fā'fmār, that is to say "would not buy the deluge for a drop of water", i.e., gives no importance to external "deluges" (and here note the word-play water-deluge-earth). We should therefore be friends of those Masters and not of the doctors of the law.

(7-8) The ethical-mystical warning continues. But, be it always remembered, without undue personal tension. The world is seen as a house, an "old dilapidated convent". But the world—in Arabic a word of feminine gender—is also often compared by the Persian poets to a malicious, faithless old woman. Here the word we have translated by "Vile One" is siyah-kāse, "of the black pot", also "miserly" "despicable"; hence the play of words "food"-"pot".

(9) The following verse contains a metaphor which may be familiar to the Westerner also: Joseph the Israelite, the symbol of perfect beauty, or of the Soul, for whom the throne of Egypt is prepared, but who yet groans in prison (a typical Neoplatonic metaphor). The last verse reiterates the traditional accusation of hypocrisy addressed to the mullahs.

In classical ghazal each verse forms a closed unit, only slightly interconnected with the others. Some modern scholars, to explain this, have invoked the "psychology of depth" to show that there is unity, but an unconscious one, in the ghazal. However this may be, external incongruity would seem to be a real rule in modern Persian poetry. We are here the presence of a bunch of motifs only lightly tied together.


Further bibliography will be found in the above mentioned works.

(A. Bausani)

---

### iii. OTTOMAN LITERATURE

(Circumstances beyond our control have obliged us to refer the reader to the Supplement. Editors' note.)

---

### iv. IN URDU LITERATURE

In spite of its difficulty the ghazal enjoyed a wide popularity in all literatures belonging to the Islamic cultural cycle. Urdu literature was born under the strong influence of Persian culture, more precisely, of the Persian literature of the period wrongly called "decadence", or the period of Indian style (10th/16th to 12th/18th centuries). This fact accounts for some special features of the Urdu ghazal. Its history should be divided into some four periods. The first period is that of daḵšīn Urdu (9th/15th to 10th/17th centuries). Its influence is only one, and not the most successful, of the instruments of Urdu lyric, that prefer indigenous poetical forms. Dakhāl ghazals are generally descriptive and more congruous than the classical Persian ones. With Wall (1665-1741) the experiment of adapting the contemporary Persian style to Urdu poetry is widened and deepened. Urdu ghazals, more or less imitating the contemporary Indian-style Persian ghazals, find acceptance also in the literary circles of North India; so begins the classical period of the Urdu ghazal, culminating perhaps in Mr. Taqī Mr. (d. 1810), Ghalib (d. 1869 [q.v.]), who uses the ghazal in his peculiar ideological way as a symbolic channel to introduce ideas, Ashgar of Gondwāna (1884-1936), Hasrat Mohānī (1875-1951), Fānī of Badāyūn (1879-1941) and Dīgār of Murādbād (b. 1890).

The Urdu ghazal, born under the influence of the Indian-style Persian ghazal (e.g., Bidil of Patna, d. 1721, who left almost no trace in the development of the Persian ghazal of Iran, had an enormous influence in the Urdu Dīwān, a reform of the classical ghazal, together with a comparatively greater congruence in meaning. In later times this led ghazal writers to use this form too as an ideological instrument, especially under the influence of Hālī (d. 1914) and Ikbāl (d. 1938). Hālī advocated, in his stylistical treatise Muḥaddāsīn-i āhir u ʿalāri, added as a preface to his own Dīwān, a reform of the classical ghazal in a modern sense, based on a widening of the scope of ghazal so as to include real love, and other human emotions of our times; the rather limited Wortschatz of the classical ghazal should also be widened, according to Hālī, while the mālāmātī and anacreontic aspects of the old ghazal should be abandoned. The renovation brought about in Urdu ghazal by the aforementioned personalities led to the result that now, in the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent the ghazal has become a serious instrument of modern poetry and its old popularity has found an interesting development in a modern sense.


(A. Bausani)
sexes having tapering horns which are ringed for the lower two thirds and curve forward at the tip. Gazelles are creatures of the semi-desert steppe and the savannah; thus they bulk large among the fauna of the Arabic-speaking countries in general, and among those of the Muslim world in particular. The desert-dwellers, nomads and camel-drivers, have from ancient times distinguished different species of gazelle, and the Arabs early gave them different names according to their coats; the modern systematic classification accords perfectly with these denominations, so that the gazelles are:—

a. the Goitrous Gazelle, *Gazella subgutturosa* (*ghazdi*), in western Persia, Mesopotamia, and northern eastern Arabia;

b. the Rhom or Loder's Gazelle, or Slender-horned Gazelle, *Gazella leptoceros* (*rimrim, pl. *ārum*), with the sub-species *G. l. litori* on the fringe of the Sahara and *G. l. marica* in Arabia, Palestine and Sinai;

c. the Dorcas or Atlas Gazelle, *Gazella dorcas* (*ādam*, pl. *udm, ādam, sin, śīt*), with the sub-species *G. d. saadiya* in northern Arabia, Palestine and Sinai, *G. d. dorcas* in Egypt, *G. d. neglecta* in the Sahara and *G. d. massaeyslae* in Morocco; and the three subspecies *G. d. litoralis*, *tīloura* and *Feltzmi* occurring by turns along the Red Sea coast;—d. the Dama Gazelle or “Biche Robert”, *Gazella dama* (*aryal, adra*), with geographical sub-species the Mhorr or Tursi Gazelle (*aryal*), *G. d. melleri*; the southern Moroccan, *G. d. dama* (the sub-species bearing the specific name) in the central Sahara, the Red-necked Gazelle or Addra Gazelle, *G. d. ruficolis*, and the Korin or Red-fronted Gazelle, *G. d. rufifrons* (*umm ḍjāba, ḥamra*), the last two named being widely scattered throughout the scrub zones of Arabia and Africa; while the distribution of the Soemmering's Gazelle, *G. d. soemmeringi*, extends from Somalia across into the coastal border of southern Arabia;—e. the Arabian Gazelle, *Gazella gazella* (*afrī, yāfūr*), with the sub-species *G. g. arabica* in the mountainous areas of Arabia, *G. g. gazella* in Syria and Palestine, and *G. g. cuvieri* (Maghribi; *ādam*) throughout the Sahara and the Maghreb.

The excellence of its meat, a food permitted by the Koran and the dictates of capturing a beast so fleet-footed, made the gazelle, “daughter of the sand” (*bint al-raml*), from earliest times highly prized game alike for the nomad in search of sustenance and the prince whose main pastime was hunting. Methods of capture varied with the hunter's rank. For the well-to-do, there was the noble chase (*tarad*, Sahara: *talād*) with gazelle-hounds (*sulibya*), usually in the heat of the day (*taḥmiš*); this hunting down in strength, together with the lighting of the trained cheetah [*see PAHDI*], were the forms which venery most often took in the Orient, the Arabs preferring them to the spectacular massacres in a closed battue (*halba*) in which the Sāsānids took pride. The gazelle was also hunted by means of falconry, with eagles, gerfalcons, sakers and the increasing ages of the young animals as determined by teeth development.

Without the gazelle, Arabic literature would have been without an important source of inspiration. The treatises on falconry and hunting [*see BAYZARA and PAHDI*], in the first place, would virtually have lacked a raison d'être, the antilopinae being in Arab countries the noblest game of all for the highborn, or for the West. Then poetry, classical and popular, would have been without its hunting themes (*tarādiyyāt*) in *radžas*, with their vivid descriptions of the hunt in full cry and triumphant hallow, and erotic writing, in its search to idealize feminine grace and attractions, without countless metaphors drawn from the slender delicacy of the gazelle, its wild starting shyness and maternal tenderness, and the velvety glance owed to the contrast (*hawar*) of the ebony pupil set in ivory; such transports of earthly beatitude were induced by these eyes in the heart of the Oriental that the gazelle was to surrender them to the virgins of Paradise, the “hours” (*al-tūr al-šīn*), promised to the Muslim elect in the after-life (*Kūrān*, XLIV, 54, LII, 20, LV, 72, LVI, 22).

The aura of lyricism enveloping the gazelle must not obscure the saddening fact that in our day the number of these gracious animals has dwindled considerably in the Islamic countries as a result of modern vehicles; if stringent measures are not taken for the gazelle's protection, the species will be severely in the way to extinction, and the term *ghazlāl* will become an archaism in the Arabic language.

For the *ghazāl al-mišk*, see *mišk*.

the musician Ziryāb (q.v.) introduced the game of chess to Cordova, where it had a great success. But it was not approved by al-Ghazal, for in a poem addressed to a nephew of his who was a keen chess-player he declared it to be sinful and an invention of the devil. Al-Ghazal’s unusual diplomatic mission and the memory of Viking incursions gave rise to the legend invented in the 12th or 13th century by the Valencian Ibn Dihya (Muṭrib, Khartoum 1954, 330 f.) according to which ‘Abd al-Rahmān II, satisfied with the way in which al-Ghazal and his companion had carried out their mission, entrusted to them, later years another embassy to the North with the aim of dissuading the king of the Vikings from attempting a fresh landing in Andalusia. According to this story the poet and his companion fulfilled their task in northern Europe and returned to Cordova after a dangerous voyage of nine months in Atlantic waters. The falseness of this is obvious at a glance. The more or less marvellous elements of which it is formed are copied for the most part from episodes attributed in the 9th century to al-Ghazal’s journey to the Greek emperor. No doubt the unusual activity of the Byzantine emperor in Cordova and the daring landing of the Vikings on Spanish territory, enriched with romantic details, finally amalgamated in the popular beliefs of Andalusia and so gave rise to a combined legend which little by little distorted the historical reality.


(A. Huici Miranda)

AL-GHAZALI, ABD AL-HAMID MUHAMMAD B. MUHAMMAD AL-TASI (455/1063-455/1115), outstanding theologian, jurist, original thinker, mystic and religious reformer. There has been much discussion since ancient times whether his nisba should be Ghazal or Ghazzal; cf. Brockelmann, S 1, 744; the former is to be preferred in accordance with the principle of difficilior lectio potius.

1. Life

He was born at Tus in Khurāsān, near the modern Meshhed, in 455/1063. He and his brother Ahmad were left orphans at an early age. Their education was begun in Tus. Then al-Ghazāl went to Diurḍiān and, after a further period in Tus, to Naysābūr, where he was a pupil of al-Duwānī Imām al-Harāmāyin (q.v.) until the latter’s death in 478/1085. Several other teachers are mentioned, mostly obscure, the best known being Abū ʿAli al-Farmāndī. From Naysābūr in 478/1085 al-Ghazāl went to the “camp” of Niṣām al-Mulk (q.v.) who had attracted
many scholars, and there he was received with honour and respect. At a date which he does not specify but which cannot be much later than his mouillah date of 1060/1649, al-Ghazālī passed through a phase of scepticism, and emerged to begin an energetic search for a more satisfying intellectual position and practical way of life. In 484/1089 he was sent by Nizām al-Mulk to be professor at the madrasa he had founded in Baghdād, the Nizāmiyya. Al-Ghazālī was one of the most prominent men in Baghdād, and for four years lectured to an audience of over three hundred students. At the same time he vigorously pursued the study of philosophy by private reading, and wrote several books. In 488/1095, however, he suffered from a nervous illness which made it physically impossible for him to lecture. After some months he left Baghdād on the pretext of making the pilgrimage, but in reality he was abandoning his professorship and his whole career as a jurist and theologian. The motives for this renunciation have been much discussed from the contemporary period until the present day. He himself says he was afraid that he was going to Hell, and he has many criticisms of the corruption of the ulama of his time (e.g., Ḥuyā', i); so it may well be that he felt that the whole organized legal profession in which he was involved was so corrupt that the only way of leading an upright life was to leave the profession completely. The recent suggestion (F. Jabre, in MIDEO, i (1954), 73-102) that he was chiefly afraid of the Ismā'īlīs (Assassins) who had murdered Nizām al-Mulk in 485/1092, and whom he had attacked in his writings, places too much emphasis on what can at most have been one factor. Another suggestion is that of D. B. Macdonald (in EJ) that contemporary political events may have made al-Ghazālī apprehensive; shortly before he left Baghdād the Saldjukīd sultan Barkiyaruk [q.v.] executed his uncle Tutush, who had been supported by the caliph and presumably al-Ghazālī; and it was soon after the death of Barkiyaruk in 498/1105 that al-Ghazālī returned to teaching. From al-Ghazālī's abandonment of his professorship in Baghdād to his return to teaching at Naysābūr is a period of about seven years, and it is sometimes said, even in early Muslim biographical notices, that al-Ghazālī spent ten years of this in Syria. Careful reading of his own words in the Munkīd, (see below), and attention to numerous small details in other sources, makes it certain that he was only "about two years" in Syria. On his departure from Baghdād in Dhu 'l-Ka'dah 498/November 1095 he spent some time in Damācus, then went by Jerusalem and Hebron to Medina and Mecca to take part in the pilgrimage of 489/November-December 1096. He then went back for some time to Damascus, but his own phrase of "nearly two years there" (Munkīd, 130) must be taken loosely. He is reported to have been seen in Bagdād in Djuhumādah II 499/May-June 1096 (Jabre, op. cit., 87; cf. Bouyges, Chronologie, 3), but this can only have been a brief stay in the course of his journey to his home, Tūs. It is sometimes said that al-Ghazālī visited Alexandria, but scholars are now inclined to reject this report; if he did go to Egypt it can only have been for a short time.

In this period of retirement at Damascus and Tūs al-Ghazālī lived as a poor sīfī, often in solitude, spending his time in meditation and other spiritual exercises. It was during this period that he composed his greatest work, Ḥuyā' al-Salām al- ḏin ("The Revival of the Religious Sciences"), and he may have lectured on its contents to select audiences. By the end of the period he had advanced far along the mystic path, and he had convinced that it was the highest way of life for man.

In the course of the year 499/1105-6 Fakhr al-Mulk, son of Nizām al-Mulk and vizier of Sandjar, the Saldjukīd ruler of Khurasān, pressed al-Ghazālī to return to academic work. He yielded to the pressure, partly moved by the belief that he was destined to be the reviver of religion (mudaddid) at the beginning of the new century, in accordance with a well-known Tradition. In Dhu 'l-Ka' ḏah 499/July-August 1106 he began to lecture at the Nizāmiyya in Naysābūr and not long afterwards wrote the autobiographical work al-Munkīd min al- ḏalāl ("Deliverance from Error"). Before his death, however, in Djuhumādah II 505/December 1111, he had once again abandoned teaching and retired to Tūs. Here he had established, probably before he went to Naysābūr, a khāndāk or hermitage, where he trained young disciples in the theory and practice of the sāfī life. Several names are known of men who were his pupils at Tūs (cf. Bouyges, Chronologie, 4 n.).

2. Works and doctrines

(a) Questions of authenticity and esotericism. A great difficulty in the study of al-Ghazālī's thought is that, while he undoubtedly wrote many books, some have not been attributed to him which he did not write. Bouyges in his Essai de Chronologie (composed before 1924 but only published posthumously in 1959 with additional notes on subsequent publications by M. Allard) lists 404 titles. Many of these are taken from lists of his works and no copies are known to exist. In other cases the same book appears under different titles, and a great deal of work has still to be done on manuscripts before scholars know exactly what is extant and what is not. Further, at least from the time of Muhuyī 'l-Dīn b. al-ʿArabī (d. 638/1240) allegations have been made that books have been falsely attributed to al-Ghazālī (cf. Montgomery Watt, A Forgery in al-Ghazālī’s Mishkāt?, in JRAS 1949, 5-22; idem, The authenticity of the works attributed to al-Ghazālī, in JRAS, 1952, 24-45). The works whose authenticity has been doubted are mostly works expressing advanced sūfistic and philosophical views which are at variance with the teaching of al-Ghazālī in the works generally accepted as authentic. There are difficulties, owing to the richness of his thought, in establishing conclusively the existence of contradictions. Ibn Ṭufayl (d. 581/1185), however, who called attention to contradictions, also suggested that al-Ghazālī wrote differently for ordinary men and for the elite, or, in other words, that he had esoteric views which were not divulged to everyone (Ḥuyā b. Ṭākūsīn, Damācus, 1358/1939, 69-72). This complicates the problem of authenticity: but there is no reason for thinking that, even if al-Ghazālī had different levels of teaching for different audiences, he ever in the "higher" levels directly contradicted what he maintained at the lower levels. An alternative supposition, that he adopted extreme philosophical forms of sūfism in his last years, seems to be excluded by the discovery that Ḥuyā' al-ʿawāmm, in which he holds a position similar to that of the Ḥuyā', was completed only a few days before his death (Bouyges, Chronologie, 80; cf. G. F. Hourani, The chronology of Ghazâlî’s writings, in JAOs, lxxix (1959), 229-33). In the present state of scholarship, the soundest methodology is to concentrate on the main works
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of undoubted authenticity and to accept other works only in so far as the views expressed are not incom-patible with those in the former (cf. Montgomery Watt, The study of al-Ghazali, in Orieni, xiii-xiv 1961, at 271).

(b) Personal. A year or two before his death al-Ghazali wrote al-Munkhid min al-dafal, an account of the development of his religious opinions, but not exactly an autobiography, since it is arranged systematically not chronologically; e.g., he knew something of Sufism before the stage of development at which he describes it in the book. Most of the details about his life given above are derived from the Munkhid. He is also concerned to defend himself against the accusations and criticism that had been brought against his conduct and the views he had expressed. A small work answering criticisms of the Ihyad is the Imlad.

(c) Legal. Al-Ghazali's early training was as a jurist, and it was probably only under al-Djuwayni that he devoted special attention to kalâm or dogmatic theology. Some of his earliest writings were in the sphere of fikhr, notably the Basîf and the Wasif, but he apparently continued to be interested in the subject and to write about it, for a work called the Wadías is dated 495/1101, while the Mustasfâ was written during his period of teaching at Nayshâbûr in 503/1119 (Bouyges, Chronologie, 49, 73). The latter deals with the sources of law (usl al-fikhr) in a manner which shows the influence of his earlier philosophical studies but is entirely within the juristic tradition. It is reported in biographical notices that at the time of his death al-Ghazali was engaged in deepening his knowledge of Tradition.

(d) Philosophy and logic. After the period of scepticism described in the Munkhid, al-Ghazali in his quest for certainty made a thorough study of philosophy, a subject to which he had been introduced by al-Djuwayni. This occupied all the earlier part of the Baghdad period. What he studied was chiefly the Arabic Neoplatonism of al-Fârâbi and Ibn Sînâ. Though his final aim was to show in what respects their doctrines were incompatible with Sunnî Islam, he first wrote an exposition of their philosophy without any criticism, Makâsid al-falasîfia, which was much appreciated in Spain and the rest of Europe in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. This he followed by a criticism of the doctrines entitled Tahdîf al-falasîfia, "The incoherence (or inconsistency) of the philosophers"; this was finished at the beginning of 488/1095 (Bouyges, Chronologie, 23). In it he noted twenty points on which the philosophers' views were objectionable to Sunnîs or inconsistent with their own claims; in respect of three of these they were to be adjudged unbelievers. In the Tahdîf al-Ghazali concentrates on demonstrating the inconsistencies of the philosophers and does not argue for any positive views of his own. Because of this he has been accused of having remained something of a sceptic. This accusation falls to notice that the Tahdîf was written just before the crisis which caused him to leave Baghdad; it is therefore possible that at the time he was somewhat uncertain of his positive beliefs, but a few years later when he was writing the Ihyad he was in no doubt about what he believed. What impressed al-Ghazali most of the various branches of philosophical studies was logic, and in particular the Aristotelian syllogism. For the sake of Sunnî jurists and theologians to whom philosophical books were not easily accessible or, because of their technical language, not readily understandable, he wrote two books on Aristotelian logic, Mu’yar al-sîm and Mi’ashk al-nazar. A justification of the use of this logic in religious matters is contained in al-Kisâf al-mustakâm, apparently written for some comparative philosophical students who were attracted by Bâjînî (Ismâ’ilî) doctrines. While full of enthusiasm for philosophy al-Ghazali wrote a work on ethics, Misân al-samâl, though whether the whole of the extant text is authentic has been questioned (JRA, 1952, 38-40, 45). Since al-Ghazali does not appear to refer to the Misân in his later works, and since he became very critical of philosophical ethics in Ihyad (99 ff.), it is possible that, as his enthusiasm waned, he rejected much of what he had written in this work.

(e) Dogmatic theology. His chief work of dogmatics is al-Ihtisâd fi ‘l-i’tibâd, probably composed shortly before or shortly after his departure from Baghdât (Bouyges, 34). This book deals with roughly the same topics as the Ihyad and al-Djuwayni, but it makes full use of Aristotelian logic, including the syllogism. In this respect Ibn Khaldûn (iii, 47) is correct in making al-Ghazali the founder of a new tendency in theology, although there is no striking novelty in his dogmatic views. In Kitâb al-Arabîn, (Cairo 1344, 24), written after the Ihyad, al-Ghazali says that the Ihtisâd is more likely to prepare for the gnosia (ma’rifâ) of the sîfîn than the usual works of dogmatics; and this continuing approval strengthens the view that al-Ghazali never ceased to be an Ash’arî in dogmatics, even though he came to hold that intellectual discussions in religion should range far beyond the limited field of dogmatics, and that detailed discussions in dogmatics had no practical value. To dogmatic theology might also be assigned Fuyûl al-lafîka bayn al-Islâm wa-l-zandâba. This is partly directed against the Bâjinîyya, but is in a sort of the philosophers' views were objectionable to Sunnîs or inconsistent with their own claims; in respect of three of these they were to be adjudged unbelievers. In the Tahdîf al-Ghazali concentrates on demonstrating the inconsistencies of the philosophers and does not argue for any positive views of his own. Because of this he has been accused of having remained something of a sceptic. This accusation fails to notice that the Tahdîf was written just before the crisis which caused him to leave Baghdad; it is therefore possible that at the time he was somewhat uncertain of his positive beliefs, but a few years later when he was writing the Ihyad he was in no doubt about what he believed. What impressed al-Ghazali most of the various branches of philosophical studies was logic, and in particular the Aristotelian syllogism. For the sake of Sunnî jurists and theologians to whom philosophical books were not easily accessible or, because of their technical language, not readily understandable, he wrote two books on Aristotelian logic, Mu’yar al-sîm and Mi’ashk al-nazar. A justification of the use of this logic in religious matters is contained in al-Kisâf al-mustakâm, apparently written for some comparative philosophical students who were attracted by Bâjînî (Ismâ’ilî) doctrines. While full of enthusiasm for philosophy al-Ghazali wrote a work on ethics, Misân al-samâl, though whether the whole of the extant text is authentic has been questioned (JRA, 1952, 38-40, 45). Since al-Ghazali does not appear to refer to the Misân in his later works, and since he became very critical of philosophical ethics in Ihyad (99 ff.), it is possible that, as his enthusiasm waned, he rejected much of what he had written in this work.

(f) Poetry. The Mustashiri, edited in abridged form by Goldziher as Streitschrift des Gesalî gegen die Bâjinîscha-Setke (1916), is a searching theological critique of the Nizârî Ismâ’îlîs or Assassins. A Persian work, edited by O. Pretzl as Die Streitschrift des Gesalî gegen die Ihbâhiya (1933), attacks the antimo-nianism of certain mystics. The authenticity of a work of anti-Christian polemic, al-Radd al-ğamîl ǧâlî sunnî al-înîfî (ed. and tr. R. Chidiac, Paris 1939), is doubted by Bouyges (26), but defended by Louis Massignon (in REI, 1932, 491-536).

(g) Sufistic practice. Al-Ghazali’s greatest work, both in size and in the importance of its contents is the Ihyad ʿulûm al-dîn, "The revival of the religious sciences", in four volumes. This is divided into four "quarters", dealing with ʿibâdât (cult practices), ʿaddî (social customs), musâkhîl (vices, or faults of character leading to perdition), munjîyût (virtues, or qualities leading to salvation). Each "quarter" has ten books. The Ihyad is thus a complete guide for the devout Muslim to every aspect of the religious life—worship and devotional practices, conduct in daily life, the purification of the heart, and advance along the mystic way. The first two books deal with the necessary minimum of intellectual knowledge. This whole stupendous undertaking arises from al-Ghazâlî’s feeling that in the hands of the ʿulamâ’ of his day religious knowledge had become a means of worldly advancement, whereas it was his deep conviction...
that it was essentially for the attainment of salvation in the world to come. He therefore, while describing the prescriptions of the Shari'a in some detail, tries to show how they contribute to a man's final salvation. Biddatay al-hiddiya is a brief statement of a rule of daily life for the devout Muslim, together with counsel on the avoidance of sins. K. al-ʿArbaʿīn is a short summary of the Iḥyāʾ, though its forty sections do not altogether correspond to the forty books. Al-Mašجاد al-asnād discusses in what sense men may imitate the names or attributes of God. Kimiyyā ʿal-ṣāda is in the main an abridgement in Persian of the Iḥyāʾ (also translated in whole or in part into Urdu, Arabic, etc.), but there are some differences which have not been fully investigated.

(II) Sufistic theory. It is in this field that most of the cases of false or dubious authenticity occur. Miḥḥāl al-anwar ("The niche for lights"), tr. W. H. T. Gairdner, London 1924; cf. idem, in IJL, v (1914), 121-53) is genuine, except possibly the last section (JRAS, 1949, 5-22). Al-Risāla al-ladāniyya deals with the nature of knowledge of divine things, and its authenticity has been doubted because of its closeness to a work of Ibn al-ʿArabī and because of its Neoplatonism (cf. Bouyges, 124 f.). There are numerous other works in the same category, of which the most important is Minhāj al-ʿabādīn. These works are of interest to students of mysticism, and their false attribution to al-Ghazālī, if it can be proved, does not destroy their value as illustrations of some branches of Sufistic thought during the lifetime of al-Ghazālī and the subsequent half-century.

3. His influence

A balanced account of the influence of al-Ghazālī will probably not be possible until there has been much more study of various religious movements during the subsequent centuries. The following assessments are therefore to some extent provisional.

(a) His criticism of the Bāṭinīyya may have helped to reduce the intellectual attractiveness of the movement, but its comparative failure, after its success in capturing Amāriz, is due to many other factors.

(b) After his criticism of the philosophers there are no further great names in the philosophical movement in the Islamic east, but it is not clear how far the decline of philosophy is due to al-Ghazālī's criticisms and how far to other causes. Its continuance in the Islamic west, where the Tahāfūt was also known, suggests that the other causes are also important.

(c) Al-Ghazālī's studies in philosophy led to the incorporation of certain aspects of philosophy, notably logic, into Islamic theology. In course of time theologians came to devote much more time and space to the philosophical preliminaries than to the theology proper. On the other hand, his speculations about the nature of man's knowledge of the divine realm and his conviction that the upright and devout man could attain to an intuition (or direct experience — ʿaḥāk) of divine things comparable to that of the worldliness of the 'ulamāʾ does not seem to have led to any radical changes.

(d) He undoubtedly performed a great service for devout Muslims of every level of education by presenting obedience to the prescriptions of the Shari'a as a meaningful way of life. His Munkidh at Tūs, where he and his disciples lived together, was not unlike a Christian monastery; and it may be that he gave an impetus to the movement out of which came the dervish orders (but this requires further investigation).

(e) His example may have encouraged those forms of Sufism which were close to Sunnism or entirely Sunnī. Before him, however, there had been much more Sufism among Sunnī 'ulamāʾ than is commonly realized. His influence on the Sufi movement in general, however, requires further careful study.


been investigated. His sermons were very popular in Baghdad, and were collected in two volumes by Şâfi’î b. Fâris al-Labbâni; of these, however, only extant are preserved in Ibn al-Djawzi. In them he undertook the defence of Satan (al-ta’asub li-bîbi), popular in many Sufi circles since Hallâjî, which was soon afterwards further developed by ‘Atîr (see Das Meer der Seele, 536-50), and which presumably gave the so-called Devil worshippers, the Yazidis, the justification for their worship of Satan (Abjad Taymûr Pâsha, al-Yazidiyya, Cairo 1352, 59-64).

**Bibliography:** Brockelman, S I, 756, I*, 546; ʿUmar Rîdash Khâhîlî, Muʾjâdî al-muʿalîsîn, Damascus 1597, iii, 147; L. Massignon, Recueil de textes inédits concernant l’histoire de la mystique en pays d’Islam, Paris 1929, 95-8; H. Ritter, Das Meer der Seele, Leiden 1953, index; Ibn al-Djawzi, al-Mundâmâm, s. a. 520; idem, ’Akbhûr al-buṣâs wa-l-muḥakkarîn, ms. Istanbul 2156, fol. 77 a-b; Ibn Khallîkân, no. 37; Subkî, Tabâkât al-râfîyîya, iv, 54.

AL-GHÂZĂLî, Dânîbirdî, governor of Damascus under Selîm I. Originally a mamlûkh of Kâfît Bây (873/1468-901/1495), he took his niṣba from the Egyptian village of Minyat Ghažal (Sharîkiyya), where he was šādî (superintendent). He obtained promotion, ultimately becoming nâbî (governor) of Damascus (1521). After the battle of Mârdj Dâbîk (24 Râjdah 922/23 August 1516), he was nominated governor of Damascus, first by fugitive amîrs in that city, then in Cairo, whither he had fled, by Tîmûn Bây. He commanded an expedition against the Ottomans in Syria, but was defeated by Sinân Pâsha near Baysân (Dhu ’l-Ka’dâ 922/December 1516). On 18 Muḥarram 923/10 February 1517, after the Ottoman victory at al-Râyâniyya, he submitted to Selîm I, with whom he had secretly secured the safe passage of the Pilgrimage caravan. He was killed, and his head sent to Istanbul. Korkud grew in a short time to like both Ghažali’s company and his witicism and made him his inseparable companion, even taking him with him to Egypt. Although Korkud became angry with him at one point there and ordered that he be executed, Ghažali was successful in winning over the kapîlé-bâbkhîş and thus saving himself (for details, see the Tedkhore of Āṣîgîh Celebi).

Ghažali wrote for Piyaṭê Bây, who had introduced him to Korkud, a risâla entitled Dâfîṣ al-ʾaḥûtâm wa-raʿîṣ al-ʾumûmîm (Istanbul Un. Lib., Turkish MSS nos. 1400, 9659), in imitation of the ʾAlîyyâ wa-shâlîfiyya of Ḥakîm Azrâq, and presented this risâla to Korkud. According to one account, Korkud was angered by this indecent risâla and sent Ghažali away; but a more reasonable tradition relates that they were not separated until Korkud was put to death by Selîm I, and that only after Korkud’s death did Ghažali become shâykh at the tekke of Geyîkîlî Baba in Bursa. It was at this point that he adopted the malâhîs “Ghažâlî”.

Quickly becoming bored with the life of a shâykh, he became mûdîrîs in Sivrihisar with a daily salary of 50 akîd and then at the Hûseynîyye medresse in Amasya. Through the good offices of Kadî Efendi, he went from there to become mîṣṭî in Aghras.

Not happy in any place to which he had been, he finally went to Istanbul with a pension of 1000 akîd and built in Beshiktash a garden, a bath, a mosque and a sâwîye. He began to operate the bath with Aṭeqâzâde Memî Shâh, but after a very short time complaints were lodged with the Grand Vizier İbrahim Pâsha. İbrahim Pâsha sent 100 ṣâbînîm and the bath was pulled down, so much to the joy of some that chronograms were written to commemorate the event. Ghažali wrote a poem of 25 bayt, the Kapîlûğanîne, in which he expressed his grief. Following the death of Memî Shâh and the execution of İskendeîr Celebi, he made his way in 938/1531 to Mecca where he built a garden, a mosque and a sâwîye, and where he remained until his death. Although there is disagreement about the date of his death, the date 942/1535, which is given in a chronogram, seems acceptable.

His risâla Dâfîṣ al-ʾaḥûtâm wa-raʿîṣ al-ʾumûmîm shows clearly Ghažali’s outlook on life. Although Ghažali grew ashamed of this risâla in his old age and tried to collect the copies of it in order to destroy them, he was not successful in doing so. The work is divided into seven chapters and is filled from beginning to end with indecent stories. Along with this aspect of Ghažali’s nature, however, it is worth noting the sincerity which he showed to those whom he loved. After the executions of Prince Korkud and İskendeîr Celebi, he wrote for each an elegy in which he manifests the grief he felt.

He also wrote a risâla entitled Mîfîdî al-hîdâyâ concerning precepts relative to the ritual ablution and the prayer. This risâla was extracted from the Bîdâya and the commentary upon it called the Hîdâyâ (Istanbul Un. Lib., Turkish MS no. 3273, fol. 3a). His various anecdotes, short poems (hîsâs) and chronograms are very fine. Both Kâtîb Celebi...
and Bursali Tahir record that he wrote a history in Persian entitled Mirād-i kādīndt, but Bursali Tahir adds that no copy has yet come to light. He received the nickname "Deli Birader" because of a bayt which he wrote.

**Bibliography:** Taşköprü-zade, al-Shaṭābī ḥiṣnānī, 527 (G. tr., Rescher, 299; Turkish tr., Meğdi, 471); Ṭeḏḏākher of Sehī and Latīfī, s.v.; Hasan Celebi, Ṭeḏḏākher, Istanbul Un. Lib., Turkish MS no. 2579, 232b; Râyiḏā, Ṭeḏḏākher, Istanbul Un. Lib., Turkish MS no. 761, 108b; Benekho Ṭeḏḏākher, Istanbul Un. Lib., Turkish MS no. 2568, 72a; ʿAshīk Celebi, Ṭeḏḏākher, Istanbul Un. Lib., Turkish MS no. 2406, 356b; Hāfīz Hūseyn al-Aʿwāyān-Šarīḵ, Ḥīḏkāt al-ʿawāmīdīsī, Istanbul 1281, i, 115; Ismāʿīl Bēlīgh, Gūčaste, Bursa 1287, 496; ʿAllī, Kunh al-aḏẖāb, Istanbul Un. Lib., Turkish MS no. 2377, 204b; Fuat Köprüli, in IA, s.v.; Bursali Tahir, ʿOṯmānī maṭṭālīfīnī, ii, 34b; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, iii, 36; Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. d. osm. Diethkunst, ii, 198. (G. ALPAY)

**GHAZĀN, MAḤMŪD, Ilkhan [q.v.] from 694/1295 until 713/1304, was born on 20 Rabīʿ I 670/5 November 1271, being the eldest son of Arghūn [q.v.], then only in his thirteenth year. Upon his father's accession Ghażān was appointed governor of Khurāsān, Māzandārān and Khūzestān, to administer during the reign of Ghiyāṭhī [q.v.]. He had been brought up as a Buddhist and, whilst governor, had ordered the construction of Buddhist temples in Kḥābūshān (Kūzān); but shortly before his accession, during the war with Bāydū [q.v.], he had been persuaded by his general Nawrūz to become a Muslim. In his reign Islam was recognized as the state religion, the regime was organized on a basis of Muslim culture, charitable endowments, mosques, theological schools etc., were erected in and around the new capital Tabrīz, descendants of the Prophet were sometimes mentioned in the first place in the state record before princes and princesses of the blood, and lastly the turban was introduced as the court headgear. But Ghażān was more a Mongol than a Muslim; as rules and legislators he was entirely free from biased pietism. Particular attention was devoted to the finances of the country, the currency etc.; Ghażān no longer appears on the coins (the inscriptions on which in Arabic, Mongol and Tibetan), like his predecessors, as representative of the Great Ḥān in Pekin, but as ruler "by the grace of God" (in Mongol inspi-yin kūlūndār "in the power of heaven"). He carried out his plans with ruthless vigour; everyone whom he believed to be opposed to the peace of the realm or to his autocratic rule was disposed of without compunction; among these was the Amir Nawrūz himself, to whom he owed his throne. On the other hand Ghażān's measures increased the prosperity of the country and in particular protected the peasantry from oppression and extortion. The revenue of the state is said to have risen during his reign, from 1700 to 2100 tumāns. Like other Mongol rulers Ghażān particularly esteemed those arts and sciences which might be useful to the State; he himself is said to have been conversant with natural history, medicine, astronomy, chemistry and even several handicrafts; attached to an observatory built by his orders in Tabrīz was a special school for secular sciences (khiṣmīyātū). In addition to his native Mongol, Ghażān is said to have had some knowledge of the Arabic, Persian, Hindi, Kāšmīrī, Tibetan, Chinese and Frankish (i.e., French or Latin) languages.

Notwithstanding his conversion to Islam, he took a great interest in the history and traditions of his own people, on which indeed he was an authority. It was at his suggestion that his minister the famous historian Rashīd al-Dīn [q.v.] compiled his Dīmānī al-tawārīḵā, in which he drew in particular the information of the Mongols was none other than Ghażān himself. Continuing the anti-Mamlūk policy of his predecessors, Ghażān twice invaded Syria. In the first campaign (1299-1300) he occupied Aleppo, defeated the Egyptian army before Hims and entered Damascus; but upon his return to Persia in Dūmākād I 699/February 1300 the country was at once re-occupied by the Mamlūks. For the second campaign he sought the alliance of Christian Europe. There has been preserved in the Vatican archives a letter from Ghażān to Pope Boniface VIII dated 12 April 1302. "We for our part", says the Ilkhan, "are making our preparations. You too should prepare your troops, send word to the rulers of the various nations and not fail to keep the rendezvous. Heaven willing we [i.e., Ghażān] shall make the great work [i.e., the war against the Mamlūks] our sole aim." The expedition to which Ghażān refers was undertaken in the spring of 702/1303: the Mongols were decisively defeated at Shādkāb near Damascus (2 Ramadan 702/20 April 1303) and never again attempted the conquest of Syria.


**GHAZĀT [see GHAZW].**

**GHAZĪ, Arabic active participle (pl. ghāṣūd) used to indicate those who took part in a razzia [see GHAZW], later in a ghazwa [q.v.] "raided against the infidels". This name later grew to be a title of honour reserved for those who distinguished themselves in the ghazwa, and it became part of the title of certain Muslim princes, as "the ghazī" of Anatolia and more particularly the first Ottoman sultans. Corporations of ghāṣīs are attested in Transoxiana and Khurāsān from the Sūmānīd period: these wandering bands who obtained their living chiefly from booty won in the ghazwa, and who offered their services wherever war was to be waged against unbelievers or heathens. Their leaders often achieved great fame and even an official status. But these soldiers of fortune, for whom war was an economic necessity and who were easily transformed by lack of occupation into brigands, became, in times of peace, a danger to the government which employed them; al-Ṭabari records, in 205/821 (iii, 1044), a revolt in Khurāsān, stirred up by one of these mercenaries; Ibn al-Aṣḥāb (viii, 155) mentions that these seditionary elements took part in the revolt of Būkhrā against the Sūmānīd Nasr, about 318/930. However, these groups, referred to by historians as ghūṣūl, fiṣṭān, ʿayyārūn [q.v.], etc., formed a reserve of troops always available to whoever had need of them; Maḥmūd of Ghazna drew on them extensively, taking with him to India as many as 20,000 ghāṣīs ("Ubbī- Manbīnī, ii, 262 f."); he was always in need of money to pay his mercenaries, burdening his people with taxes for this before each campaign (ibid., ii, 168). These groups of soldiers of fortune mentioned by the historians in Transoxiana and Khurāsān offered at the
same time a refuge for political or religious dissidents and an occupation for adventurers of all races, attracted by the lure of plunder. However, for centuries in these eastern provinces the Turks especially were the reservoir from which Persians and then Arabs recruited their mercenaries; hence, although these groups were originally without any national character, the Turkish element, as constituting the military class par excellence, was soon to predominate. Such organizations were not peculiar to the eastern provinces; they existed everywhere where there was fighting to be done, especially in the regions of the frontier zones. Thus they were also found in the Arab-Byzantine frontier zones where, even since the Umayyad period, a state of war had existed. In these regions, where, since the reign of the caliph al-Mu'tasim (218-27/833-42), the Turkish element formed the majority of the fighting men, the Arab-Byzantine frontier battles were more and more to become Turk-Byzantine wars. In this zone where the ghazis were fighting against the abkralis, guardians of the Byzantine frontier who were themselves often recruited from among Turkish mercenaries, there came into existence a population of the marches which to a considerable extent was ethnically the same on both sides of the frontier. We find proof of this state of affairs in the epic literature, both Byzantine and Arabic: the Turcos of the Turkish story of Digenis Akritas, the Arabic epic story of Dhul-Himmah [see ghzu 'l-Himmah], or the Turkish story of Sayyid Ba'ttal [see Ba'ttal]. In this area where pilgrimages maintained a continual state of crusade, the defence of both sides of the frontier was organized in the same way: on both sides there was a spontaneous organization, growing up independently from the frontiers and outside the framework of the state, imbued with the same half-military half-religious spirit. In about 595/1200 the caliph al-Nasir, seeking to strengthen the caliphate against its enemies, reorganized the corporations which were already linked to the principles of the futuwa [q.v.], the code of rules for a virtuous life, according with the tenets of Islamic mysticism and held in common by the artisan, military and administrative classes of the state, to which was added the habit of giving alms and charity; he turned his attention to the military element, which he bound to his own person by new bonds of vassalage. The ghazis, who had at first consisted of a popular movement in which were mingled adventurers and dissidents, were grouped into a corporation which possessed the attributes of a Muslim chivalry and was organized like a religious fraternity, with a ceremony of investiture conferring the title of ghazi, the granting of arms and of ritual emblems, and which was joined henceforth by princes and rulers. In the marches of Asia Minor, however, where in the 5th/11th century the ghazi element was re-inforced by the massive immigration of Oghuz tribes, the movement retained a popular and nomadic character, opposed to the settled and Persianized population of the Saltuk towns. It was these turbulent elements of the marches, taking advantage of the slackening of Byzantine defences after the defeat of Mantzikert, impelled by the need to obtain their livelihood from plunder and at the same time inspired by the ideal of the Holy War, who, without the acquiescence of the Saltuk government, carried out the conquest of Anatolia. The first Turkish conqueror of Cappadocia was a ghazi leader, Emil Danothmend; with him ghazi makes its appearance among the Turks, but the term is even given as a personal name to the elder son of the emir; the Greek legend on the coins of Danothmend's successor reads: Ο ΜΕΓΑΣ ΑΜΗΡΑΣ ΑΜΗΡ ΓΑΖΙ (cf. I. Melikoff, Geste de Melik Danothmend, 1, Paris 1960, 106). But this first ghazi principality of Asia Minor, and which figures in its first inscriptions, as is shown in the inscription of 737/1337, concerning the building of the
Bursa mosque, where Orkhan is called “sultan ibn sultan al-ghusi, ghazi ibn al-ghazi, Shudâ’ al-Dawla wa l-Din, marbân ibn al-âifâ, pahlavan-i dîyân,Orkhan ibn ‘Uthmân-i Ashâq-pa’shâzâ, also reveals that in the first centuries of the Ottoman empire there were four corporations, the first of which he calls the ghâsîyân-i Râm, the others being the akhiyân-i Râm, abdâl-din-i Râm and badjiyân-i Râm. But when the Ottoman principality grew into an empire and the central power became firmly established, the ghâzî, who had taken an active part in the conquest of Anatolia, were subjected to the authority of the state and the corporations were gradually disbanded. The work of the conquerors was accomplished and they had now to give place to the organizers of the empire.


**GHAZI,** King of 4râk, son of King Fâysâl I and his cousin Hâzîma, was born in the Hidjaz in 1212, moved to Baghâdî in 1221, and spent his childhood there until he was sent to Harrow School in England. He mounted the throne in the autumn of 1234, equipped with excellent social gifts; but he lacked seriousness or any taste for public affairs. He married ‘Âliyya, daughter of ex-King 4Ali shortly after his accession, becoming the father of the future Fâysâl II in 1235. His short reign was marked by repeated military interventions in the Government, including the short-lived coup of General Bakr 4Sîdî, 1236-7. He died in a motor accident in the spring of 1237.


**GHAZI,** Sayyf al-Din, Zangid prince of al-Mawâsîl from 541/1146 to 544/1149. See al-Mawsil, nûr al-Din, zandids.


**GHAZI CELEBI,** ruler of Sinope (700/1300 - circa 730/1330 ?) known especially for his piratical exploits against the Genoese, and sometimes with and sometimes against the Greeks of the Crimea, and skill (he is said to have been able, by swimming under water, to pierce the hull of enemy ships), all of which testify to his reputation (see the episodes and the sources, Genoese, Byzantine (Panaretos) and Muslim (Abû ‘l-Fidâî and Ibn Battûta), in W. Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant en Asie, iii, 485 and especially 457, and it is real that this maritime activity represents the most important feature of his policy—certainly nothing is known of him beyond this; indeed—and this is not without significance—even his identity is in doubt. According to 4‘Ali, Kunk al-akhbâr, v, 22 (following Rûhî), he was the son of the Saljûq sultan of Râm, Masûd II, and on the death of the last sultan, 4Alû al-Dîn (at the beginning of the 8th/14th century), was granted by the Ilkhan Ghiyân the northern coastslands of Asia Minor; but this is a late version, perhaps entirely due to the fact that the tombstone of Ghiyân Celebî (TOEM, ii, 422) calls him the son of Masûd Celebî, or to the fact that the career of Masûd Celebî II and of his father Kay-Kâhs in the Black Sea was well remembered; more nearly contemporary authors (Ibn Battûta, ii, 450-2, tr. Gibb, ii, 466-7, and, less clearly, Abu ‘l-Fidâî Takwîm, ed. Reinaud-de Slane, 453) make Ghiyân Celebî a descendant of the famous Mu’nîn al-Dîn Sulaymân the Pervâné, whose sons Muhammed and, more especially, Masûd had retained Sinope, their father’s fief, until 1300 (cf. Mûnedjûm bashî, iii, 31), and this version, although dubious, is not impossible. Ghiyân Celebî died, if the inscription on the tombstone has been read correctly, in 722/1322, a date which conflicts with reports of his being active in 1324. In any case when Abu Battûta passed through Sinope (in 1331 or 1333 ?) he was certainly dead—from an excess of hashîsh it was said—and the town had been occupied by the Isfandiyârî of Kamastâmî, but it is possible that Ghiyân Celebî had accepted the suzerainty of this prince; his death is probably therefore to interpret al-‘Umarî, ed. Taeschner, 23). It is in any case impossible to deduce—as some authors have done—from the confused data on the Isfandâyîrîs (cf.) that Ghiyân Celebî lived until 1356.

**Bibliography:** apart from the sources mentioned in the article, see Ahmed Tewhid, in TOEM, i, 199, 257, and 317, and xv (1925), 305; Zambaur, 448 (inaccurate); Ibn Battûta, tr. H. A. R. Gibb, ii, 466, n. 195; Ep., art. Sinûb. (C. CAREN)

**GHAZI ‘L-DIN HAYDAR** (not Haydâr al-Din Ghiyân as given in the Cambridge History of India, v, 575, 578), the eldest son of Nawâwîb Sâ’dât All Khân, ruler of Awâdî (1212-29/1798-1814), was born at Basawll in Rohilkhand in 1188/1774. He succeeded his father as the Nawâb-Wazîr of Awâdî in accordance with the rule of primogeniture, in 1229/1814.

Right from the time of his accession he was under the influence of the British Resident, Col. John Bailey, who did not hesitate to interfere in the day-to-day administration of the state. Supported by the Governor-General of British India, Lord Hastings, who wanted to reduce the prestige of the Mughal emperor of Delhi, he declared his independence in 1234/1819 and assumed the royal title of Abu ‘l-Muzaffar Mu’izz al-Dîn Shâh-i Zamân Ghiyân ‘l-Dîn Haydâr. A huge sum of two crores of rupees (20,000,000) was spent on the manufacture of a throne, made of pure gold and silver and studded with precious stones, and a canopy richly decorated with pearls and gold and silver thread. The same year he struck his own coinage bearing the legend: stika sad bar sim-u zar az fadl-i rabb-i dhu ‘l-minan, Ghiyân ‘l-Dîn Haydâr-i ‘all nasab shâh-i sman. The obverse bore a coat of arms with two fishes (the insignia of the House of Bârâhân al-Mulk [q.]), supported by two tigers bearing banners. These coins, which replaced the pahiyahh-dâr rupee of Shâh ‘Alî II, were in circulation from 1235/1819 until 1247/1827.

A fine silver medal, commemorating the commence-ment of his rule, was also issued during the first year of his reign. This medal carried his full-faced portrait. An unsuccessful ruler, Ghiyân ‘l-Dîn Haydâr
was a debaucher. He was under the baneful influence of rapacious and unscrupulous ministers like Sayyid Muhammad Khan, commonly known as Agha Mir and entitled Muhhammad ad-Dawabri, who had been one of the pages of Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar before his accession. His maladministration, combined with his extravagance and dishonesty, hastened the decline of the Awadh dynasty.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar was benevolent towards the poor and the needy, and provided dowries for innumerable poor girls from the public treasury. Among the notable buildings constructed during his reign are: the Qadam Rasul, where a piece of stone, said to contain the footprint of the Prophet, was enshrined and the Imambafah Shah Nadjaf, an imposing building dedicated to mourning for the son of Agha Mir. This building.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar died in 1243/1827 and was buried in the building.

Ghazi Giray II, known as Bora ("tempest"), twice Khan of the Crimea (996/1588-1002/1596 and 1002/1596-1007/1607). Born in 901/1554, he first distinguished himself in 986/1578 as general of Crimean forces operating in support of the Ottomans against Persia. In 1588 he invaded Moldavia and captured their capital, Tervet, which is ascribed to him, is in fact Burhdn-i fcdti*.

The Ottoman Sultan (Siileyman I) refused to rebel against Persia in 1594. Ghazi Giray, unable to resist, had been one of the pages of Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar before his accession. His maladministration, combined with his extravagance and dishonesty, hastened the decline of the Awadh dynasty.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar was benevolent towards the poor and the needy, and provided dowries for innumerable poor girls from the public treasury. Among the notable buildings constructed during his reign are: the Qadam Rasul, where a piece of stone, said to contain the footprint of the Prophet, was enshrined and the Imambafah Shah Nadjaf, an imposing building dedicated to mourning for the son of Agha Mir. This building.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar died in 1243/1827 and was buried in the building.

Ghazi Giray II, known as Bora ("tempest"), twice Khan of the Crimea (996/1588-1002/1596 and 1002/1596-1007/1607). Born in 901/1554, he first distinguished himself in 986/1578 as general of Crimean forces operating in support of the Ottomans against Persia. In 1588 he invaded Moldavia and captured their capital, Tervet, which is ascribed to him, is in fact Burhdn-i fcdti*.

The Ottoman Sultan (Siileyman I) refused to rebel against Persia in 1594. Ghazi Giray, unable to resist, had been one of the pages of Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar before his accession. His maladministration, combined with his extravagance and dishonesty, hastened the decline of the Awadh dynasty.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar was benevolent towards the poor and the needy, and provided dowries for innumerable poor girls from the public treasury. Among the notable buildings constructed during his reign are: the Qadam Rasul, where a piece of stone, said to contain the footprint of the Prophet, was enshrined and the Imambafah Shah Nadjaf, an imposing building dedicated to mourning for the son of Agha Mir. This building.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar died in 1243/1827 and was buried in the building.

Ghazi Giray II, known as Bora ("tempest"), twice Khan of the Crimea (996/1588-1002/1596 and 1002/1596-1007/1607). Born in 901/1554, he first distinguished himself in 986/1578 as general of Crimean forces operating in support of the Ottomans against Persia. In 1588 he invaded Moldavia and captured their capital, Tervet, which is ascribed to him, is in fact Burhdn-i fcdti*.

The Ottoman Sultan (Siileyman I) refused to rebel against Persia in 1594. Ghazi Giray, unable to resist, had been one of the pages of Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar before his accession. His maladministration, combined with his extravagance and dishonesty, hastened the decline of the Awadh dynasty.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar was benevolent towards the poor and the needy, and provided dowries for innumerable poor girls from the public treasury. Among the notable buildings constructed during his reign are: the Qadam Rasul, where a piece of stone, said to contain the footprint of the Prophet, was enshrined and the Imambafah Shah Nadjaf, an imposing building dedicated to mourning for the son of Agha Mir. This building.

Ghazi 'l-Din Haydar died in 1243/1827 and was buried in the building.

Ghazi Giray II, known as Bora ("tempest"), twice Khan of the Crimea (996/1588-1002/1596 and 1002/1596-1007/1607). Born in 901/1554, he first distinguished himself in 986/1578 as general of Crimean forces operating in support of the Ottomans against Persia. In 1588 he invaded Moldavia and captured their capital, Tervet, which is ascribed to him, is in fact Burhdn-i fcdti*.
GHAZI GIRAY II — GHAZI MIYAN

to advance through Shirwan to attack Persia (Feridun, Munshîât al-sulûti, ii, 119), but died soon after of plague (Sha‘bân 1016/November 1607). His son and kâlehyak Taktamish Giray, whom he had nominated to succeed him, was proclaimed khan by the bâgs of the Crimea, but the Porte refused to recognize him.

Ghâzi Girây, one of the greatest khanen of the Crimea, managed to steer a course between the Porte, which wished to have the Crimean forces always at its disposal, and the Crimean aristocracy, which was seeking independence of the Porte. During his reign the Khanate co-operated more closely than ever with the Porte, and Ottoman influence, in culture and in administration, greatly increased: the haspâ-aghâsî (esmak-aghâsî, bash-aghâsî), appointed from among the Circassian slaves, came to occupy a prominent place in the government comparable with that of the Grand Vizier; and a corps of mounted musketeers (tufânkähir), bound to the ruler’s person, was formed. Ghâzi Girây was at the same time a genuine literary artist, occupying a unique place in Crimean literature and in the Ottoman diwân tradition. In a sincere and fluent style, he wrote prose and poetry in Persian, in Arabic, and in Crimean, Câghatay and Ottoman Turkish (he used as makhlûs ‘Ghazîiyî’ and ‘Khan Ghazîî’), introducing into Ottoman poetry the new theme—later much imitated—of the valiant sentiments of the soldier. His works include (1) a complete manuscript published in fascimile by I. H. Ertaylan (see Bibli.); (2) a mathnawi entitled Gûl u Bûlûbul, in Câghatay Turkish (Ertaylan, 50-3, 62 n. 2, where the suggestion that it is a nasîrî to Fudullî’s Nûk u bud is rejected); (3) a lost ‘contention-poem’ (munshanâra) between Coffee and Wine (see Pedewî, Târîxhî, ii, 251); and (4) several letters in prose and verse (to be found in various însâd collections, e.g., British Museum MS Or. 6261; see also Abdullah-oglu Hasan, Kurîm tarîxhine ait nollar ve vesikalar, in Azerbeycan Yurt Bilgisi, iii (1932), 162-4, iv-v, 159-66, vi-vii, 249-52). He figures prominently in a romantic novel by Nâmîf Kemâl (q.v.).

Bibliography: Hasan Ortekîn, Bora Gazi Giray and his exileri (unpublished manuscript thesis), Türkîyet Enstitüsi, Istanbul; C. M. Kortepeter, The relations between the Crimean Tatars and the Ottoman Empire, 1578-1650, ... (unpublished University of London Ph. D. thesis, 1962); I. H. Ertaylan, Gazi Giray Han, hayat ve exilerleri, Istanbul 1958; IA, s.v. Gâzi Giray II (by Halil Inalcik), with further references.

(GALIL INALCİK)

GHAZİ GIRAY İII, KÂNîn of the Crimea from 1116/1704 until 1118/1707. In Radjab 1110/ January 1699 he was appointed Nureddin (Nûr al-Dîn [q.v.]) by his brother Dewlet Giray II, but rebelled, in collusion with the Noghay, and was dismissed. He came to Edirne and was exiled by the Porte to Rhodes. Upon the accession of his father Salar Giray [q.v.], in 1114/1702, he was recalled and made kâlehyak [q.v.], and at his death succeeded him as Kânîn (3 Ramadân 1116/30 December 1704). In spite of the Porte’s pacific attitude, he himself followed the Porte’s efforts to bring the Noghay directly under Ottoman control, and was deposed (Rûbû 1–8 Hidilja 1116/March 1707) and ordered to reside at Karin-abad (Karnobat, in Bulgaria), where in Rabî‘ II 1120/June 1708, aged 36, he died of plague.

Bibliography: Rûshid, Ta‘rîxh, iii, 168, 172, 201, 215; Fînîkûllî Mehmed Aga (Silâhder), Nusrî-nâmé, MS; Sayyîd Muhammad Râdî, Al-Sahî al-sayyîr fi al-khâbîr al-mulakat al-Tâhir, Kasaân 1832, 270 ff.; IA, s.v. Gâzi Giray III (by Halil Inalcik), with further references.

(GALIL INALCİK)

GHAZİ KHAH [see Supplement].

GHAZİ MIYÂN, popular title of Sîhâb Salar Masûd‘în Giray, one of the earliest and most celebrated of Indo-Muslim saints, who lies buried at Bahraîc in Uttar Pradesh, in the district of Bahraich in the Banaras subdivision of the Allahabad district. The tomb, which is now lost, has been a place of pilgrimage for hundreds of thousands of Hindus and Muslims every year. The legend of Salar Giray passed his youth in the field by the side of his father Salar Sâhî. At the age of fourteen, he started on his invasion of Hindustân. With Sâtrîk (in Bâra Banka) as his base of operations, he sent out his lieutenants in every direction to conquer and proselytize the country. Sayyîd Sayf al-Dîn and Миyân Radjab of his army were sent to Bahraîc but they failed to achieve their objective. Sâlîr Masûd‘î then marched in person to Bahraîc. He was successful in the beginning but was ultimately overthrown and slain with his followers on 18 Radjab 124/30 June 1633. His servants buried him at a spot he had earlier chosen for his resting-place. The fact that his name and his grave survived through the long years between the Ghaznavid invasion and the Ghûrid occupation of northern India shows that there was some Muslim population to look after the grave and to preserve the tradition of Salar’s martyrdom. Some aspects of religion and politics in India during the 13th century, (Allgar, 1961, 76-7). Iltêmish’s son, Nâsîr al-Dîn Mahmûd, was the first prince of the ruling house of Delhi to live in Bahraîc and during his governorship Muslim colonization began in that region; but there is no reference to Sâlîr Masûd‘î in Minhäjî’s account of the prince. According to Fîhîr (Archaeological survey report, ii, 292), the first building over his grave was constructed by Nâsîr al-Dîn Mahmûd. Muslim b. Tughlûk (725/1325-732/1351) was the first sultan of Delhi to visit his grave. Frîzû Shâh Tughlûk also made a pilgrimage to Bahraîc in 776/1374 and was so overwhelmed by its spiritual atmosphere that he had his head shaved (masâlûk shud) in the mystic fashion and adopted an other-worldly attitude (‘Aftî, Ta‘rîxhî-I Frîzû Shâhî, 372). Some buildings, wells, shades and verandas are said to have been constructed by him.

The tomb of Sâlîr Masûd‘î is one of the most popular centres of pilgrimage in India. Hundreds of thousands of Hindus and Muslims visit it every year. The legend of Ghûrî Miyân—aalso known as Bâlâyî Miyân, Bâlâyî Pîr, Hataylî Pîr etc.—occupies a unique place in the cultural life of the people of northern India, particularly in the villages of eastern Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and eastern Bengal. Many tales about him are current amongst the people, and many fairs,
festivals and feasts are held in different towns and villages of Uttar Pradesh (e.g. Meerut, Sambhal, Badaun) to commemorate different events of his life. Of all the places, Ghazi Miyan was born in the town of Ghauspur in the northern Indian province of Uttar Pradesh in the town of Meerut. Certain old graves are considered to be those of his martyrs-companions (e.g., the grave of Miran Mulhim in Badaun, see Radi al-Din, Kanz al-tawârîkâh, Badaun 1907, 51). The tradition of Ghazi Miyan has assumed the form of a popular superstition in the villages of eastern Bengal, where large number of symbolic graves of the saint have been put up and thousands of Hindu and Muslim villagers make offerings to them. As it is believed that he was slain while his nuptial ceremonies were being celebrated—which thus became in a double sense his *urs*—marriage processions in his memory are held at many places with *talams* (banners) on the first Sunday of the month of Dhiayth (May-June). As this festival led to some immoral practices, Sikandar Lodî (894/1489-923/1517) banned it, but it was revived later.

Once the Emperor Akbar (963/1556-1014/1605) had assumed the form of a popular superstition in the vicinity of Agra. The death of the saint is commemorated on the 12th, 13th and 14th of Radjab every year. 


**GHAZI MUHAMMAD** (see Kâpu Muhammadd).

**GHAZIYAPUR** (see Supplement).

**GHAZIYA** (l.) plur. *ghawzi*, the name for Egyptian public dancing-girls. In the 19th century, according to Lane, they came from a single tribe and married only within it. They gave lascivious performances in the streets and courtyards, and performed privately in the *harims* for certain celebrations or in special places for upper-class Turkish and Armenian ladies, but among the most beautiful women in Egypt and as common prostitutes; they distinguished the *ghawziya* from the *alîma* [*q.v.*] or female singer.

Today this distinction is less sharp. In Egyptian cities both the dancing-girl and the singer are now called *alîma* (colloquial), while in the villages the dancer is still often called *ghawziya*. The dancers do not come from a distinct tribe but from various sorts of low-income families, usually urban. They are taught the art, after showing some natural ability, by female teachers who are sometimes called *sunûlîm* (plur.) too. Both the *ghawziya* and the *alîma* must now be distinguished from the better-paid, better-trained "Oriental" dancer (*rahîsha*) who performs in the modern night clubs and films and at private celebrations.

The *ghawzi*, according to Lane, preferred to call themselves *Baramika*. *Ghawziya*, the origin of which is uncertain, is still a derogatory term avoided by the dancer herself. In the villages it connotes a woman outside the pale of respectability. *Ibn ghawziya* is thus a serious insult. See further RAKS.

**Bibliography:** Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, ch. xix; Dozy, Suppl., s.v.; M. Berger, *The Arab Danse du Ventre*, in Dance Perspectives, x (1961). (M. Berger)

**GHAZNA,** a town in eastern Afghanistan situated 90 miles/145 km. south-west of Kâbul in lat. 38°18' E. and long. 33°44' N. and lying at an altitude of 7,280 feet/2,220 m.

The original form of the name must have been *Ganak < gandia* ['treasury'], with a later metathesis in eastern Iranian of *-ns/-nd*- to *-zn*-. This etymology indicates that Ghazna was already in pre-Islamic times the metropolis of the surrounding region of Zâbulistân. The parallel forms *Ghanî* (in present-day use) and *Ghaznin* must go back to forms like *Ghanî* and *Ghaznin*; the geographer Mukaddasî and the anonymous author of the *Hudud al-Sulam* (end of 4th/10th century) have *Ghaznin*, and Yâqût says that this is the correct, learned form.

The oldest mention of the town seems to be in the second century A.D., when Ptolemy gives Ganijazka in the region of Paropamisâdâs, locating it 1,100 stadia from Kâbul, but to the north of that town. It must have been of some significance under the successive waves of military conquerors in this region, such as the Kushans and Ephthalites. The Chinese Buddhist pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang (7th century A.D.) mentions it as Ho(k)-si(k)-na = Ghaznik, and describes it as the chief town of the independent kingdom of Tsau-ku-ch'a = Zâbulistân. Buddhism was known in the region, for recent excavations at Ghazna have uncovered a Buddhist site and many clay and terracotta buddhas have been found. (It should be noted that A. Bombaci, in *East and West*, vii (1957), 255-6, doubts the accepted identification of Ghazna with the places mentioned by Ptolemy and Hiuen-Tsang.)

The history of Ghazna in the first three Islamic centuries is most obscure. The armies of the Arab governors of Khurâsân and Sîstân penetrated into Zâbulistân in *Abû al-Malîk*’s reign and fought the local rulers, the Znibîl, whose summer quarters were in Zâbulistân (Balâbduri, Futâh, 397; *Tabarî*, ii, 488).

The population of this area was doubtless basically Iranian, but with a considerable admixture of Turkish and other Central Asian peoples brought in by earlier waves of conquest; as the homeland of Rustum, Zâbulistân plays a part in the Iranian national epic as a place of land and romance, as among the most beautiful women in Egypt and as common prostitutes; he
the Zunbil of that time, but it is only with the 4th/10th century that the history of Ghazna, by then a major centre of trade, becomes reasonably clear.

It has been suggested that AlpTigin, a Salar commander, set up a palace in Ghazna, but this is speculative. The Zunbi of Ghazna is known to have been a major centre of trade and religion. The city was known as a busy entrepot for goods from Persia and India, and the region was known for its abundance of provisions.

After the Ghaznavids' loss of their western territories, Ghazna and Lahore became two main centres, and the minting of coins was concentrated on these two towns. In the first half of the 6th/12th century, Ghazna was twice occupied by Seldjuk armies (510/1117 and 529/1135), but it suffered much lesser disaster than other Seldjuk possessions. In 545/1150-1 when AlpTigin's army was defeated by Seljuk forces at Kanawdj and Muttra, the city was sacked and its markets and houses were destroyed.

Ghazna was then again taken by Ziauddin Ayubi in 558/1163, and after an occupation by a group of Ghuzz from Turkestan, passed into the hands of the Seldjuk armies. The city was then sacked by the Seljuk Sultan, a few miles to the north of the town, has survived to this day. For all these building works, Ghazna had no artistic traditions of its own.
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request, the alleged Gates of Somnath captured by Mahmud of Ghazna eight centuries previously.

Today, Ghazna is a town of some importance; it lies on the Kabul-Kandahar road and is the junction for the roads eastward to Gardiz and Māṭūn, Urgun and Tōdī. It is the administrative centre of the province (wulāyat) of Ghazna. The great majority of the people are Persian-speaking and are Sunnī in religion.


2. Geographical. Travellers’ narratives. Iṣṭakhrī, 280; Ibn Ḩawḵālī, 450; Ḩudud al-ʿīlām, 311, 345-7; Ṭuḥaddīs, 296-7, 303-4; Thāʾilībī, Latīf al-maʿārif, ed. de Jong, 122-3; Yāḵūt, ii, 904-5, iii, 798; Kazwīnī, Ḩudūd al-ʿīlām, 117-8, 139-40.

3. Archaeological, architectural, epigraphic, numismatic. E. Thomas, in JRAS, 188, 1886; Lane-Poole, Cat. 1; S. Flury, Das Schriftband an der Türe des Mahmud von Ghazna, in ISL, vii (1918), 214-7; idem, Le décor épitaphique des monuments de Ghazna, in Syria, vi (1925), 61-90; A. Godard, Ghazni, in ibid., 58-60; D. Sourdel, Inventaire des monnaies musulmanes anciennes du Musée de Caboul, Damascus 1953; J. Sourdel-Thomine, Deux minarets d’époque seljoukide en Afghanistan, in Syria, xxx (1953), 108-21; A. Bombaci and U. Socrato, Summary report on the Italian Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan, in East and West, N.S. x (1959), 3-55; Bombaci, Ghaznavid, in Encyclopédie Universelle de l’Art, Venice-Rome, vi, 6-15 (this author is also preparing a study of the ʿArḍs al-Falak Mosque at Ghazna); Socrato, Islamic glazed tiles with moulded decoration from Ghazni, in East and West, N.S. xii (1962), 263-87.

('C. E. Bosworth)

GHAZNAWIDS is the name given to the dynasty of Turkish origin which was founded by Sebūtkīnī, a General and Governor of the Sāmānīds [q.v.]. With Ghazna [q.v.] for long its capital, the dynasty lasted for more than 200 years, from 367/977-8 to 538/1147, in eastern Iran and what is now Afghanistan, and finally only in parts of the latter. Its last ruler, ‘Umar, held the title of Ghur (where native potentates had submitted to his overlordship), northern Balūcīstān (around Ḳusdār), Afghanistan, and Ghūzni, as well as Ḳazak and Ghur (where native potentates had submitted to his overlordship), Ṣūṭān, Khūrāsān, and Persia although historians call them Sultan from the start; on coins, ‘Ībrāhīm (no. XII below) was the first to bear this title.

From the time when Alptūgīn established himself in the region of Ghazna in 144/955-6 and made himself to a great extent independent of the Sāmānīds, the area surrounding this town remained in the hands of Turkish rulers (for details see Ghazna). In 367/977-8 (I) Sebūtkītnī gained power, and continued to rule until his death in 387/997. The new ruler, on the evidence of his coinage, acknowledged the overlordship of the Sāmānīds, and gave them help against the Smīḏjidīs [q.v.] in 992 and 995. He also turned his attention to the Hindū Empires in the Pāṇḍīga [q.v.] and in particular the Ṣūṭān dynasty, whose head, Ḳiyāpūlī, he defeated in 979 and 988, thereby acquiring the fortresses on the Indian frontier. His empire furthermore included northern Balūcīstān, Ḳūr, Zābulūstān and Bactria (Tukharistan) (on the subject of these and all further geographical references in this article see the entries under individual words). In this way, Sebūtkītnī, an extraordinarily powerful and ambitious ruler, and a convinced Sunnī, laid the foundations of one of the last lasting empires in the Indo-Afghan border regions.

On this foundation, Sebūtkītnī’s son (III) Māḥmūd, who after quarrelling at one time with his father but reconciled himself towards the end of the latter’s life, was able to embark upon the conquest of the Pāṇḍīga. By so doing, he created for Islam an extensive territory in India, and laid the foundation for the religious division of this area, the latest effect of which has been the creation of the independent state of Pakistan. Māḥmūd swiftly superseded his brother (II) Ismāʿīl, who had been designated by his father as his successor, and by 389/999 had finally made himself secure. There is no doubt that he is the most important ruler of the dynasty. Culturally already strongly inclined towards Iran and receptive to the developing new Persian literature, he perseveringly encouraged Firdawsī [q.v.], although he did not fulfill the exaggerated demands made by the latter since he could not overlook the expenses for his task of spreading Islam in India. Politically Māḥmūd was in a fortunate position, since on his ascending the throne the Sāmānīds had lost their influence and he was able to come to an agreement with the victorious Karākhānīds [q.v.], which in essence laid down that the Oxus should be the frontier between the two kingdoms. A convinced Sunnī like his father, Māḥmūd exchanged the ties which Sebūtkītnī had had with the Sāmānīds for an allegiance to the ʿĀbbāsīd Caliph al-Ḳādir [q.v.], an allegiance which remained purely nominal, since at that time distant Baghdad could not exert any influence so far east, and the Caliphs were in any case dominated by the Shīʿī Būyids [q.v.]. The latter had passed the zenith of their power and were several times the target of attacks by Māḥmūd, who thereby also rendered a service to the Caliph. At the same time as his 17 campaigns in the Pāṇḍīga, Māḥmūd was able to push the Būyids back a considerable distance and exert his influence in Khūrāzīm [q.v.]. On his death (23 Rabiʿ II 421/30 April 1030), his empire comprised the Pāṇḍīga and parts of Sīn (plus a series of Hindū states in the valley of the Ganges which acknowledged his overlordship), northern Balūcīstān (around Ḳusdār), Afghanistan, Khūrāsān, Ghūzni, as well as Ḳazak and Ghur (where native potentates had submitted to his overlordship), Sīṭān, Khūrāsān, and Persia.
GHAZNAWIDS
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I. Abū Mansūr Sebūktigin
977-97

II. ʻIṣmāʻīl
997-8

III. Māhmūd
998-1030

(b. 970)

IV. Mūhammad
1030 and 1040-1

(b. 997)

V. Masʻūd I
1041-8

(b. 1021-2)

VII. Masʻūd II
1048-9

(b. ca. 1043)

IX. ʻAbd al-Rashīd
1049-52

(b. 1022-3?)

X. Toghril
(usupe, 1042)

XI. Farrukhzād
1052-9

(b. 1026)

XII. ʻĪbrāhīm
1059-99

(b. 1033)

XIII. Masʻūd III
1099-1115

(b. 1060)

XIV. Shāhrazd
1115-16

(b. 1081-2)

XV. Malik Arslan
1116-8

(b. 1083-4?)

XVI. Bahram Shāh
1118-57 (?)

XVII. Khusraw Shāh
1157-60

XVIII. Khusraw Malik
1160-87

(d. 1190?)

The numbers in this table correspond with those given in the text of the article.

opponent of his own calibre in Persia. Now, however, just at the time when Masʻūd came to the throne, the Saldjiḳs [q.v.] began to cross the Oxus and little by little to occupy Khurāsān. Masʻūd's resistance had little success; considerable parts of his army were engaged in the Pandhār, and his forces were made up of very diverse elements: Iranians of various races, and also Indians; his own fellow Turks were only sparsely represented. On 8 Ramādān 431/23 May 1040, on the steppes of Dandān(a)kān, Masʻūd was decisively defeated by the Saldjiḳs under Toghril [q.v.], a defeat which cost him his Persian possessions (cf. B. N. Zakhoder, Dandanekan (in Turkish), in Bulletin, xviii/2 (1954), 581-7). On a march to India Masʻūd was overthrown by a conspiracy and murdered forthwith in prison (433/1041). (For details see Masʻūd b. Māhmūd.

An attempt to restore the blinded (IV) Mūhammad on the whole to maintain the power of the dynasty in India, even though some areas were temporarily lost and even Lahawur was threatened for a time. Mawdūd was about to set forth himself on a campaign against the Saldjiḳs to attempt the recovery of Sistān, when he died in Ghazna on 20 Radjab 440/9 Jan. 1049 by Mawdūd's brother (VIII) ʻAlī b. Masʻūd I and on his overthrow, in
May 1049, by (IX) ʿAbd al-Raḥīd b. Māhmūd. Although this ruler lived in peace with his neighbours, he did not succeed in restoring internal stability. Of all the Ghaznavid princes, he was the only one to his relations with a certain slave, Tāmīn, who was forcibly removed as soon as ʿAbd al-Raḥīd himself was murdered on 10 Shawwāl 443/February 1052. The murderer, a former slave of Masʿūd I and now Commandant of Zaranj, (X) Togḥī, fled, disposed of other members of the royal house and himself attempted to seize supreme power, but was murdered by followers of the dynasty on 17 Dhu ‘l-Ka‘da 443/21 March 1052.

With (XI) Fārūkhīzād b. Masʿūd I the hereditary ruling family returned to the throne. With the help of General Nūḥ-tīgin, who had already served ʿAbd al-Raḥīd loyally, the new ruler was able to repel the Saldjuks, who in the meantime were making further advances on Bāhdād and Anatolia, when they attacked his central territories; on the other hand, Mārkān was lost to them. Fārūkhīzād died at the early age of 34, in Safar 451/March 1050 apparently of cholera.

His brother and successor (XII) Ibrāhīm b. Masʿūd I, signed a treaty of friendship with the Saldjuks, being obliged to cede to them Khūttalān, Caghānīyān and ʿAvidāyān. Marriage alliances and later rich presents sealed the settlement thus reached with their long-standing main opponents in the West, who for their part promised to abandon their expansionist policy in the East. In other ways too, the new ruler proved himself an able diplomat and a cautious politician, avoiding dangerous undertakings, but essentially capable of preserving and defending his possessions. Ibrāhīm thus had his hands free for exploits in India (455/1063-6). He succeeded in capturing a number of fortresses and in re-establishing the influence of the Ghaznavids in the Pandjak. Thenceforward Ibrāhīm called himself ʿSūlṭān’ on his coinage. Finally he delegated the continuation of the campaigns to his son Sayf al-Dawla Māhmūd, whom he made Governor of Lāhāwūn, and who succeeded immediately in capturing Agra, and later other strongholds. When he attempted to seize power for his father, he was thrown into prison with his friends (481/1089). Ibrāhīm died on 5 Shawwāl 492/25 August 1099, after a reign of 40 years, the longest recorded in this dynasty.

His son and successor, (XIII) Masʿūd III, immediately embarked on an attack on Kanawdī, whose Hindu rulers were forced to submit and were brought to Ghazna in chains; a later attempted revolt in the town was suppressed. Otherwise, Masʿūd III kept up the ties of friendship and marriage with the Saldjuks and had a peaceful reign, until his death, at the age of 56, in Shawwāl 508/February-March 1115.

As had happened two generations earlier, the death of Masʿūd III meant the outbreak of fratricidal war. Three of his sons took their turn as head of state. (XIV) Shārūzād was forced after one year (Shawwāl 509/Feb.-March 1116) to flee to Tabaristān before his brother (XV) Malik Arslān, and early in 510/middle of 1116 he fell in an attempt to regain control of Ghazna. But Malik Arslān’s days were also numbered. Another brother, who had escaped his sword, (XVI) Bahārām Shāh, won the help of Sandjar [q.v.], and was able to march into Ghazna in his train on 12 Shawwāl 511/6 February 1118 after two successful battles; Malik Arslān had fled to India.

Bahārām Shāh had to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Saldjuks and pay them high tribute; as a guarantee of this one of their tax controllers remained in Ghazna when Sandjar vacated the town after 40 days, taking with him the State Treasure. Although these conditions were onerous, they also guaranteed Bahārām Shāh Sandjar’s solid support. It was only with Sandjar’s help that he could fend off an attack by Malik Arslān from India; his brother fell into his hands and was executed in Diwānād II 512/September-October 1118. Bahārām Shāh then established his authority in the Pandjak in three campaigns (Ramadān 512/January 1119, Diwānād II-Shawwāl 514/end of 1120, and 523/1129). Otherwise the first decade and a half of his reign appear to have passed peacefully; at any rate no records of battles have survived. In 1135-6 Bahārām Shāh tried in vain to rid himself of Sandjar’s overlordship together with the crushing tribute, of 10,000 dinārs per day (so at least according to the sources). Nevertheless, in spite of his defeat by Sandjar, Bahārām Shāh was confirmed in his hereditary territories just as was the Khwarizm Shah Atsiz [q.v.] after his rebellions. Like the latter, Bahārām Shāh now remained loyal to the Saldjuks Sultan, although he fell out with the rulers of Ghur, and had one of them—his son-in-law—poisoned whilst visiting Ghazna. A brother of this man, after losing a battle (2 Muḥarram 544/12 March 1149), was publicly hanged on Bahārām Shāh’s orders, with many of his advisers. Both these acts were revenged in the most terrible way by a third brother, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Ḥusayn, in an attack on Ghazna towards the end of 1150. The complete destruction of the capital and the utterly ruthless murder, rape and deportation of the inhabitants— who were certainly not responsible for the conduct of their ruler—rightly gained for this monster the name of Dhāhānsūr (Burner of the World), by which he is known to history.

Bahārām Shāh had meanwhile fled to India; thence, when ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn had been taken captive by the Saldjuks, he apparently returned to Ghazna and died, it is thought, early in 552/February-March 1157. There is no doubt that by his treacherous murders and the personal cowardice with which he deserted his subjects in a moment of crisis Bahārām Shāh contributed, in a completely personal way, to the disintegration of his ancestors’ empire, which now could no longer be checked.

The rule of Bahārām Shāh’s second son (XVII) Khusraw Shāh, was restricted to Ghazna, Zabulistan and Kābul—from the Pandjak. Further parts of the empire, Zambilwār and Bust, had in the meantime been taken over by the Ghūrids [q.v.]. Teginālūd also fell into their hands after a clash with Khusraw Shāh in the middle of 552/summer of 1157. As Sandjar died just at this time, Khusraw Shāh lost his only helper against his ever more powerful enemies in Ghur. By Radjāb 555/July 1160 he was dead.

His son and heir (XVIII) Khusraw Malik, saw his possessions dwindle bit by bit, until the empire of the Ghaznavids ceased to exist. Already at the beginning of 558/1163 he lost Ghazna and all his Afgān lands to the Oghuz (q.v.) of the Oguz (q.v.) to whom Eastern Persia too was exposed after the death of Sandjar. It was not long before the Ghūrids seized power here also; a member of their ruling house, Shībāb al-Dīn, was put in charge of these territories, and used them, as Māhmūd had done before him, as a jumping-off ground for an advance on the Pandjak, where Khusraw Shāh still retained Lāhāwūn (his capital), Peshwār, Mūltān and Sind. On the pretext that he was obliged to take action against the
native Karmatls, Shihâb al-Dîn took Multân in 571/1175-6; in 575/1179-80 Peshawar fell into his hands. Finally he forced Khusraw Malik in Lâhâwûr to pay him tribute and give up his son, Malik Shâh, as hostage. Even so it was no easy task for the Ghurid prince to dispose of Ghaznavid rule completely, for the Indian tribe of the Khokharas was collaborating with Khusraw Malik. Only after Lâhâwûr had been besieged several times was Khusraw Malik forced by hunger to yield, in Djmâdâ I and II 583/July-August 1187. After some delay he was sent to Ghuristan and imprisoned in a castle in Ghuristan. There he was put to death with his sons, probably at the end of 585/beginning of 1190, when the Ghurids found themselves threatened by the Khârizm Shâhs.

"Thus Sebûktîgin's house came to an end, and nothing was left of these mighty rulers but the historical memory" (Mîrkhând, Bombay (lithograph) 1849-50, 135), almost at the same time, incidentally, as the last Saljûqs also disappeared from history before the advance of another new dynasty, the Khârizm Shâhs.

In contrast to the Sâmânîs and the Saljûqs, the cultural significance of the Ghaznawids after Ma'hmûd's death was slight. As far as can be seen, the dynasty assimilated Persian influence in the realms of language and culture as quickly as did other Turkish ruling houses. But, leaving Firdawsî aside, they were not privileged to have a really important poet at their court. On the other hand, we are indebted to one of their leading officials, Bayhâkî [q.v.], for a uniquely detailed picture of early Islamic-Iranian history; for the period of Sultan Masûd I, it is also a mine of information on cultural and diplomatic matters and the technique of government.

The life of the court, with its receptions and parties, and the form of government were in accordance with the customs of other Sunnî empires on Persian territory at this time. It is however worth noting that the principal ministers rarely changed, and therefore must on the whole have worked in harmony with their rulers.

Accession to the throne took place with the customary ceremonials, especially when the succession was peacefully established. The rulers counted among their principal duties a reverent attitude to the Caliphs, and the protection and dissemination of the Sunna—in opposition to the Hindus as well as the Shî'is and the Karmâtîs in Multân. The fact that at the same time execution and torture were allowed in the repression of revolts or the "punishment" of defeated enemies was in accordance with the ideas of the time. The financial demands made on their subjects certainly varied according to what was required for waging war, paying tribute, and possibly also supporting an extravagant court, although it would appear that they did not exceed the usual average elsewhere, just as the rulers of the dynasty after Masûd I were average personalities. Of the longer-lived members of the dynasty, Bahrâm Shâh can be considered the least conscientious and indeed also the least capable.
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Art and Monuments

Corresponding with the pre-eminence of the Ghaznavid dynasty there was, for about a century, an efflorescence of architecture and craftsmanship promoted by the tastes and opulence of those powerful patrons, and with its geographical centres in the eastern provinces of Iran, which for so long were a meeting-point of Islamic and foreign artistic currents. Quite certainly, this flowering sprang directly from the earlier experiences of the Sâmânî centres in Khrûsân or Transoxania and, in its last phase, it intermingled with the development of the art commonly denoted by the name Saljûqî, which was destined to achieve a renown that reached far beyond the limits of the empire of the Great Saljûqs. But the style developed within the Ghaznavid territories, from the reign of Ma'hmûd b. Sebûktîgin and under his immediate successors, took an equally significant part in innovation, thus allowing us to emphasize its importance as well as the exemplary character, for the later evolution of Islamic art, of the works of art then executed in the residences, distant though they were, of Ghazna, Bust, Balûk, Harât or Nîshâpûr.

Too often, we have to deplore the ruin and disappearance in the centuries that followed, of these monumental works, as well as of their furnishings. The sites of the ancient Ghaznavid capitals are today deserted, and the chroniclers' accounts can restore nothing to us save the astonishment of contemporaries at the ornateness of their edifices, the brilliance of the official ceremonies that were performed in them and the collection of objects of value which the conquest of India had made it possible to bring together. This is the point that emerges for example from the unfruitful attempt made earlier by A. U. Pope to evoke Ghaznavid art by starting from the imprecise facts contained in the literary sources (cf. A survey of Persian Art, ii, 797-80).

On the other hand, the various archaeological remains which have survived to our own time, our knowledge of which has been considerably increased within recent years, provide an insight,
stimulating in itself, into the art that flourished under the aegis of the Ghaznawids, and it is to be deplored that they have not yet given rise to any general work, pending the coming of the new discoveries which will perhaps one day complete the instruction they have imparted.

In these remains, traces of imposing edifices can be found, from the minarets at Ghazna to the castles in the "royal town" of Bost [q.v.], all situated within modern Afghanistan, to which no doubt should be added the half-ruined remains of the so-called mausoleum of Arslân Dîjâhîb at Sanghâbêt, of which we have only a description made some time ago (cf. E. Diez, Churussanische Baudenkmäler, Berlin 1918, 52-5).

The minarets had long been known in the field of ruins at Ghazna, where their prism-shaped brick plinths still stand, entirely covered with decorations and inscriptions; but only recently have both been attributed to Ghaznawid sovereigns of the last period, Mas'ûd III (d. 508/1114) and Bahârân Shâh (d. 547/1152), after having formerly been incorrectly described, on the strength of ancient travellers, as "victory towers" of the conqueror of India and his son Mas'ûd I. Their archaeological significance has thereby been slightly modified, particularly in regard to the date of the appearance in Ghazna of these brick buildings, described by the simple use of brick decorations, which adorn the silhouette of the last minaret, so long regarded as being a century older.

The ruins of Lâshkârî Bâzâr, on the other hand, on the site of Mahmûd's "camp" in the suburbs of Bost, which also became a favourite residence of Mas'ûd I, constitute an architectural ensemble, the great extent of which has only just been revealed by excavations conducted by the French Archaeological Mission in Afghanistan—and still incompletely, since as yet only a preliminary report has been published. Three palaces built in a line along the bank of the Helmand, formerly surrounded with enclosures and gardens, as is shown by their high outer walls, testify to the vigour of an architectural tradition directly related to the customary methods of construction in use in palaces of the Caliphs in Abbasid 1'ârak. But the details of their plans, in which traces of successive alterations do not fail to raise delicate problems of date and attribution, also deserve attention, starting with the cruciform lay-out of the mausoleum round the central courtyard of the South castle, where we can see the application of a typically Khurâsânian formula and a clear statement of the welcome subsequently accorded in Iran to the niche reveals a lobed profile, and tombs attributed to Seleucid and Mahâmîd.

Finally, in the third category are the various products of luxury crafts, of which interesting specimens have been preserved, though without attracting any but the most spasmodic attention, except for ceramics. Here, in fact, the discoveries at Lâshkârî Bâzâr, enriched by the results of digging on the actual site of the town of Bost, have been subjected to a methodical analysis; there is a sufficient range of material for comparison to provide significant fixed points for the hitherto highly confused chronology of certain main categories of Muslim ceramics. The significant features of Ghaznawid pottery, glazed and unglazed, are in any case now precisely defined in its two principal stages, firstly in the 11th century, in its relation with Sâmânid pottery, which provided it with its first models, and later at the end of that century and the beginning of the 12th century in relation to Persian Saldjûkid ceramics, from which it then began to draw inspiration.

One could wish that the Ghaznawid bronze objects, which for the most part are in the museum at Kâbul, might be studied in the same way. As for the carved woodwork, of which the doors of Mahâmîd's tomb provide the most famous illustration, it occupied in the art of the period a place which some have already underlined, but which has not yet been defined with the requisite precision or based upon sufficiently detailed analyses.

In its most common sense, *ghazwa* (and the dialectal variants) signifies a raid or incursion, a small expedition set on foot by Bedouins (both in the Sahara and in northern Arabia) with booty as its object, and also the force which carries it out.

The term has passed into French in the form *rezou*, which preserves the original meaning of *ghazwa*, whilst it is the synonymous *ghouya* (pl. *ghouwaz*) which has given the English word *razzia*, current also in Italian (*razzia*), German (*razzia*), and French (*razzie*). *Razzia*, thus, is the English word for a small raid mounted on perhaps 20-30 camels (or horses), or on camels and horses if the section to be raided was not far distant. The objective was to keep the section under constant pressure until the moment of departure, which would be postponed if necessary until the omens were favourable. Scouts (*'uyan*) were then sent out to reconnoitre the ground over which the raiding party would pass. When these reported that the objective was nearby, an advance-party (*sabr*, pl. *subur*) made a final estimate of the position and brought back a report (*'ilm, pl. *'ulam*) and if possible a prisoner. The attack itself, provided the raiders were genealogically and socially close to the section to be raided, was made at sunrise (*sabah*) or sunset, or at such times in between as the herds were not scattered (cf. Hess, *Beduinen*, p. 98). A night-attack (*bayd*), though it would succeed most easily, was considered dishonourable (*'ayb*, colloquial *'eb*).

The captured herds were driven back to the *saddid*, and the raiders divided into a rear-guard (*hamin, *haim*), to ward off the inevitable counter-attack (*faz'a*), and a party which drove the captured camels to the raiders' last camp, and then as fast as possible to their home-camp.

Although the community attacked was seldom taken by surprise and counter attacks were often effective (Musil, *Arabia Deserta*, 181), most raids would seem to have been successful.

When the extent of the theft from further afield the raiding party was likely to be larger, and the concern with protocol and the desire to avoid bloodshed would then appear to have been less, since in these circumstances genealogical ties were more likely to be remote (Doughty, *Travels*, ii, 393). In general the more closely related were the parties involved, the more stringent were the rules governing the actual raid.

In its heyday the institution of the raid permeated the whole of Bedouin society, its social and economic life, and its folk literature. It reinforced the fissiparous and predatory nature of tribal society, and for long prevented the emergence of any political organization more complex than short-lived confederations. However, the rise of a strong central power in Arabia under Ibn Sa'd marked the end of the traditional mode of life based on the *ghazu*. More recently the rise of the oil industry has further hastened the decline of traditional society by accelerating the trend towards the de-tribalization of the Bedouin and their re-grouping along modern industrial lines.  

Contes pottiques bedouins, in BEO, v (1935), 33-119. See further GHAZI (as frontier-warriors).

GHAZZA, a town in southern Palestine which from ancient times had been an agricultural and caravan centre, situated 4 km. from the sea, on the route leading from Palestine to Syria and at the junction of the caravan-routes coming from Arabia. A frontier-town which often changed hands through the course of the centuries, the ancient Ḥazza, which had been one of the capitals of the Philistines, later became, under the Greek name Gaza, a flourishing Hellenistic city, and afterwards a Roman town belonging to Judæa. In the Byzantine period it formed part of Palestina Prima and was christianized in the 5th century; the seat of a bishopric, it was also a flourishing junction of the caravan-routes coming from Arabia.

The town of Ghazza was afterwards occupied by the Crusaders, who found it in ruins. They started to rebuild it in 544/1149, and the new citadel was given to the Templars by king Baldwin III of Jerusalem. In the Mamluk period, Ghazza became the chief town of a district that for the most part belonged to the province of Damascas, though at times the town was independent. The town was then very rich and very extensive, if one is to believe the accounts of contemporary geographers and travellers, all of whom stress its economic prosperity, which derived partly from the richness of the surrounding district, abundantly irrigated by subterranean water, and partly from the energy of its merchants. Its most sought-after products were the grape and the fig, but the abundance of its saḥāls was also a source of pride and, according to the Arab authors, it combined three types of social life represented by the merchants, farmers and stock-breeders. The population, belonging to various tribal groups, was very turbulent and always involved in strife. Ghazza eventually possessed numerous public buildings—mosques, madrasas, convents, a hospital and caravanserais, some of which still survive. The chief mosque, built on the foundations of the Crusader church of St. John through the efforts of the governor al-Djawfi at the beginning of the 8th/14th century, remained standing until the 1914-18 war.

The arrival of the Ottomans in 922/1516 brought suffering to Ghazza. The inhabitants, misled by a false report of a Mamluk victory into thinking that they could massacre the new Turkish garrison, were the victims of severe reprisals and a certain number of them were executed. They seem, however, to have made a good recovery. The Ottoman taṣu registers [see DASTAR-E GHAZĀNI] show an increase in population in the city from under 1000 households in 932/ 1525-6 to well over 2000 in 955/1548-9; the survey of 965/1555-7 shows a slight decline. The population was predominantly Muslim, with Christian and Jewish minorities and a small group of Samaritans—18 households in 963-4. The registers also show a number of retired members of the former Qawwāl families who, Husayn Pasha, succeeded in putting a stop to the periodic raids of the Bedouins, while he maintained good relations with the Christians and Europeans. As the Chevalier d'Arvieux put it, the town at that time acted as the capital of Palestine, and Arabic, Turkish and Greek were all spoken there. Among its principal buildings were six mosques, besides the Great Mosque, numerous baths and markets and two churches, one Armenian and the other Greek.

The 18th century, on the other hand, was characterized in Ghazza by various disturbances and by the turbulence of the Bedouins, whom the Ottoman authorities had some difficulty in subduing; it closed with Napoleon's victory in 1799 immediately outside the town. In the 19th century Ghazza shared the fate of Palestine, being for a time attached to Egypt and then made directly subject to Ottoman governors; at the end of the 1914-18 war, it formed part of Palestine under the British mandate.

The period of peace experienced by Ghazza at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century brought about a marked increase in its population, which rose from 16,000 inhabitants in 1862 to about 40,000 (of whom 750 were Christians and 160 Jews). By 1932, however, the population had declined to...
The food of the inhabitants of the Arabian peninsula (apart from the agricultural and civilized states of the south) was—and in large measure still is today—typical of the diet of a pastoral people in a desert region with scattered cultivated oases. We can get an idea of this food from ancient poetry, the classical texts and the Qur’ān (the sources have been examined by G. Jacob, *Altarabisches Beduinenleben*, Berlin 1897, 88-109; 246; M. J. Darwaza, *4urar Al-Nabi*, Damascus 1365/1946, 80-6; M. Sh. Alósí, *Bulūgh Al-arak fi ma’rifat ākhwî Al-‘Arab*, i, Cairo 1934/1924, 380-5; M. Kurd ‘All, *Malakî Al-‘Arab*, in *Al-Muktabas*, iii (1908), 569-79). We have examined in addition the *hadiths*, the data of which are acceptable on this matter, since even forgers took great pains to add to the credibility of their work by the archaism of the customs to which they referred.

The essential product from the raising of domestic animals was milk (labān rather than halāb), one of the two basic foods of the Arabs. The Qur’ān (XVI, 68-66) pays an eloquent tribute to this liquid, calling it “sweet to drinkers”, and numerous traditions witness how greatly the Bedouin longed for it (*‘ayma*) when they were deprived of it (H. Lammens, *Etudes sur les sources des Omayyades*, Beirut 1930, 25-5 MFOB, iv (1939), 91 ff.). Milk was drunk, also that of goats and sheep. It could be drunk diluted with water, but sour milk (*ḥāzir*) was despised (G. Jacob, *Altarab. Beduinenleben*, Berlin 1897, 95). Milk-products from it were: *samm* “clarified butter” which was used for cooking and which disgusted the Romans of Aelius Gallus when they found it used instead of oil in the *hidjāz* (*strabo, iv, 4, 24*; it is probably his *poliruvi*; *akbi* “sour-milk cheese” (al-Bukhārī, lxx, 8, 16; Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 27; Ibrū’ al-Kays, ed. Ahlwardt, *The divans*, London 1870, 162, no. 68, verse 5); *gūm*, cheese of an unknown sort (Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 38). Camel’s milk was slaughtered only in cases of great necessity. In general it was rare for meat to be eaten, but this made it all the more appreciated (Abmāb b. Ḥanbal, iii, 303 c.). They seem to have eaten chiefly mutton, sometimes from sheep kept near the house and specially fattened for the table (*iddjim* (Ibn Ḥishām, 735), of which the Prophet preferred the shoulder and the fore-leg (al-Bukhārī, lxx, 26, 58; Ibn Ḥanbal, vi, 392; cf. Ibn Sa’d, ii/2, 108, 109; Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 20; Ibn Ḥishām, 764). The Medinans were extremely fond of the fat from its fall (*alayha*) and of that from the camel’s hump, which they cut from the living animal, a practice which Muhammad forbade (al-Dārimi, vii, 9; references in poetry *aqd* G. Jacob, *Altar. Beduinenleben*, 94; the same practice in the eastern Sahara: W. Besnard, *Que mangent-ils*, Paris 1947, 47 f.). Specially prized parts of the camel were the udder, the liver, the foetus, etc. but the stomach and the tail were the food of slaves (Ibn Ḥishām, ibid.). It seems that it was not only in time of famine that they ate blood drawn from the veins of a living camel and allowed to coagulate or put into pieces of gut and cooked (al-Maydānī, ii, 119; Ḥamāsī, 645; *Agkhīni*, vii, 107: 20; W. R. Smith, *Lectures on the religion of the Semites*, 234). They ate very little beef (ibid.; Lammens, *Bureau de l’Islam*, Rome 1914, 132) or goat meat. *Pig le d’tow* (Jacob, ibid.) was the camel to have been scarcely known, although some *hadiths* relate that the Prophet ate the latter (al-Dārimi, vii, 22).
The agriculture of the oases provided mainly dates, another basic food of the Arabs (Lammens, Berceau de l'Islam, 62 f.; idem, Fatima, 44, n. 2). In the oases they were almost exclusively grown. When the Prophet died, we were nourished only by the two black things: dates and water” (saying attributed to 'Ali: al-Bukhari, Ixx, 6, 41; cf. Lammens, Berceau, 105, n. 3; for the inhabitants of the Fertile Crescent, on the other hand, the staple foods, even in the oases, were bread and water: Genesis, XXI, 14; I Kings, XVIII, 14). A scarcity of dates is the equivalent of famine, (al-Darimi, viii, 26; Abu Daud, xxvi, 38; Muslim, xxxvi, 152, 153; cf. Aghdni, i, 161). They liked to stress their therapeutic qualities and they formed the stock provisions when setting off on an expedition (Abu Daud, xxvi, 46). They were eaten also at festivals, such as the wilada in honour of the marriage of Muhammad with Safiyya (al-Bukhari, Ixx, 8, 10; Abu Daud, xxvi, 2). They were eaten dried (lamr), fresh (rawāb)—when they were especially relished (Muhammad was particularly fond of them eaten with cucumber, bukul, or oil). They were also eaten raw—oils (cf. Genesis, xxv, 38)—or disguised by a corruption in the text), the pomegranate (Kur'ān, VI, 99, 142/141; lv, 68), the grape (cf. Kur'ān, VI, 142/141; cf. Lammens, Berceau, 90 f.; the dried raisins of Tā'if were famous). The apple and the fig are scarcely mentioned by the poets (Jacob, Altor. Bed., 230) or in hadiths (Wensinck, Concordance, s.v.).

The pastoral nomads were able to use also, in addition to the meat and the milk-products provided by their flocks, wild vegetables, game and small desert animals. Among the plants may be mentioned havuq, the ripe fruit of the thorn tree areb (Capparis), sedata; cf. Lammens, Berceau, 69; al-Bukhari, Ixx, 50; Muslim, xxxvi, 163), desert truffles, which, according to a saying attributed to Muhammad, came from the manna sent to the Israelites (Muslim, xxxvi, 157-6; cf. Abu Daud al-Antāk, Tadhkira, Cairo, 1326/1937, 252; Lammens, Berceau, 49), etc. The game mentioned in the traditions are the hare (Abu Daud, xxvii, 26; al-Darimi, vii, 7) and the bustard (būhrā). Among the plants may be mentioned the ripe fruit of the thorn tree areb (Capparis).

Bread may not have been such an aristocratic food as has been thought, for barley bread at least was not uncommon among the settled populations. All the same, the Prophet and his family never ate bread made from wheat flour three days running (Ammianus, xiv, 4, 6; al-Bukhari, Ixx, 29). Among the nomads, however, bread was very rare (Amianus, iv, 4, 6; Lammens, Berceau, 141; Noldeke, Neue Beiträge zur altorientalischen Sprache, Strasbourg 1910, 56 f.).

The inhabitants of coastal regions could also add fish to their diet (Kur'ān, V, 97/96).

Besides milk and water (often muddy and seldom plentiful), the Arabs were familiar with a certain number of fermented drinks prepared from dates, honey, wheat, barley, raisins. But wine made from grapes, which (in spite of the fact that there were vineyards at Tā'if for example) was generally imported, was an expensive luxury. It was drunk in the taverns (būn), which were visited by the Jews, the Christians of Hira (Ibnu Shabbal, 2, i, 5, iii, 397), and even the Islamic monarchs (Zayd b. Shaward, 141; cf. Noldeke, Jahrh. 19, 90 f.).

The settled agricultural populations were able to enjoy also some vegetables. Among the bukār, "herbs", the Prophet preferred hindāh, "chicory". He was also fond of beets (sedāt, al-Bukhari, Ixx, 17) and of some vegetables belonging to the gourd family which are difficult to identify exactly (dūbbā, a kind of marrow?", kuštah, "a kind of cucumber", harbour, "marrow"). Leeks (kurrāth) were forbidden, though not barley (Ibn Ḥanbal, 1, 15, iii, 397), and were used instead of garlic and onions. But according to other traditions, Muhammad merely expressed his personal dislike of them and forbade those who had recently eaten them to come to the place of prayer (references in Wensinck, Handb. s.v. Garlic, Onion, and Concordance, s.v.; also al-Dārimi, vii, 21). Olives also were eaten (Kur'ān, V, 142/141) and the pith of the palm-tree (dīmmār, al-Bukhari, Ixx, 42, etc.). Fruits mentioned are the citron (wurṭuṣqā), the pith of the palm-tree (dīmmār), the dried raisins of Tā'if (multiq). The apple and the fig are scarcely mentioned by the poets (Jacob, Altor. Bed., 230) or in hadiths (Wensinck, Concordance, s.v.).

The pastoral nomads were able to use also, in addition to the meat and the milk-products provided by their flocks, wild vegetables, game and small desert animals. Among the plants may be mentioned havuq, the ripe fruit of the thorn tree areb (Capparis), sedata; cf. Lammens, Berceau, 69; al-Bukhari, Ixx, 50; Muslim, xxxvi, 163), desert truffles, which, according to a saying attributed to Muhammad, came from the manna sent to the Israelites (Muslim, xxxvi, 157-6; cf. Abu Daud al-Antāk, Tadhkira, Cairo, 1326/1937, 252; Lammens, Berceau, 49), etc. The game mentioned in the traditions are the hare (Abu Daud, xxvii, 26; al-Darimi, vii, 7) and the bustard (būhrā). Among the plants may be mentioned the ripe fruit of the thorn tree areb (Capparis).
Arabia, were prepared in a very elementary fashion. The meats were roasted (roots sh.w.y, h.n.dh, s.l.y.) or baked (t.b.kh). The meat was cut in slices or in thin strips which were left to dry in the sun (hdad) (e.g., Abu Dâwûd, xxvi, 36a; Abu ‘Hîndi apud Alûsî, Bulûgh, i, 380; in general on the methods of cooking, see Jacob, Altar. Beduinienleben, 90 ff.). A hadîth is cited according to which the Prophet announced "I am only the son of a woman of the Kuraysh who fed on kûfut" (cited in an epigraph by Bint âl-‘Sâ’îlî, Umm al-‘Nabî, Cairo 1938, 5). The oven proper is to this day little known. The only word for oven attested in early Arabic, tannur, is a borrowing from Aramaic (cf. Landberg, Glossaire, 150; cf. Robertson Smith, op. cit., 150); Hûghâli poets reproach the South-Arabian tribe of Marhad for eating grasshoppers (Dîwân Hudhayl, 57, 147), but this was rather a special distaste for this food, or an affectation. A later saying claimed that the Bedouin ate “everything that crawls or walks except the chameleon” (umm bâ’ây; Ibn ‘Abd Rabbîn, 87d, ed. A. Amîn, etc., iii, Cairo 1942, 485; Ibn al-Ughûwîa, Ma’dîn al-harbûd, ed. Alasî, Bulûgh, i, 380; Kurd ‘All, Ma’dîhî, 570). According to Sozomenus (5th century A.D.), the Saracens abstained from pork and observed a number of Jewish ceremonies (Ecclesiastical history, vi, 38 = PG, lxvii, 1412); it was probably a case of the Arab neighbours of Palestine coming under Jewish-Christian influences. But Plînî had already noted (Nat. Hist., vii, 78 = 15, 212) the absence of pork in Arabia. In case of vital necessity, which often arose in the severe conditions of desert life, all the taboos were relaxed, even the general taboo on human flesh (Dîwân Hudhayl, 161 ff.; Procopius, Bell. Pers., i, 19, 4) though it should not therefore be thought that cannibalism was general (J. Henninger, Kannibalismus in Arabien?, in Anbropos, xxxvi (1940-1), 631 ff.), but during battles the heat of passion or the desire to break the taboo was made use of by men to drink or lick up the blood or the brains, to gnaw the liver of the dead, etc. (Ammanius, xxxii, 16; Ibn Hûghâm, 581, etc.; cf. Robertson Smith, Kinschî, 75, n. 2, 295 f.; Nallino, Raccolta, iii, 86). Vows were made of temporary abstinence: from sâm, milk, meat, wine, sometimes even to fast completely (see nâyyâ). In some regions wine must have played a religious part. Some rather doubtful texts speak of libations of wine poured on tombs (Jacob, Altar. Beduinienleben, 143; Wellhausen, Reste, 182 f.; Lammens, Arabie occid., 204). In Liybân it is perhaps a case of a large offering of wine to Dhû Ghabat to expiate a murder (W. Caskel, La religion des Palmyrénien, Paris 1931, 194 f.; R. Dussaud, in RHR, xiv (1927), 200 ff.). It is perhaps to this sacred importance that we attribute the frequent use in Saphetic of names such as Shîrî (Shîrî? “drinking companion”) and Skrn (Sâkran “drunk” “intoxicated”: G. Ryckmans, Noms propres sud-sémitiques, Louvain 1934, i, 212, 249, ii, 130, 99). At Mecca, at the moment of deconsecration which concluded the hdâdîth, there was ritually drunk a fermented beverage with a basis of grapes (shârâb, nîbdîh) or of barley and honey.
and this rite was continued under Islam until the 2nd/8th century; a similar rite at... (drr, Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, 8).

"chamois"). The domestic animals mentioned... reflected in the rock engravings which accompany... dates (CIS, v, 4902, 4384).

Musaylima (cf. Auxoupycx; (inscr. Waddington 2286a), who was possibly with polemic intent, "does not drink (or

An example is Sayy b. ʿAmr from the ʿAdl clan of the Kurayah, who is said to have abstained from animals which had not been ritually slaughtered, from blood and from meat which had been sacrificed to idols (Ibn Hishām, 144). Others, probably from asceticism, under the influence of the earlier practices mentioned above and of the abstinence which was enjoined by Manicheism, by the Christian ascetics and certain Christian sects, and which was practised by other Semitic peoples (if the fact is indeed true), are said to have abstained from drinking wine—e.g., another Kurāṣhī, ʿUthmān b. Maʿzūn, who was later to embrace Islam (Ibn Saʿd, iii/1, 286). Musaylima forbade wine as well as sexual relations to those who were already fathers (Sayy b. ʿUmar, apud al-Tabarī, i, 1916; as against Ibn Hishām, 90). It has been possible to compile a list of those who abstained perhaps for food (wrl), (ibid., i, 7). Flour (šn, flour in general, ḏb, the flour of cereals, perhaps ḥbr?, was made with wheat (br), barley (ḏbr?), dates (lmr), āḏhūl, which was perhaps a kind of wheat (it seems difficult to translate it literally as its Arabic equivalent āḏhūla “wheat husked and crushed”), and in addition semolina (ṣbl, cf. Ethiopic sendlle, CIS, i, 390-40, 83, 86-8; 541: 120). We may have in CIS, 408 a reference to a field (mʿnsıt); with the emphatic, ʾl in which would be grown the variety of wheat called in Arabic ʿalas; this inscription seems to refer to it in two aspects ybr and ʿfr (cf. CIS, 352: 7, 11; cf. also ḏbr, in RES, 2774: 4). Vegetable gardens (bblk, in RES, 4563: 6, 7), orchards (mghr, in CIS, 204: 3, 546: 11; ḏbwt, in CIS, 308: 9), vineyards (šnbl, in CIS, 342: 11-2, 604: 3, ym, in CIS, 228: 2, 276: 3, etc.) were numerous. They produced vegetables (bbl, in SE, 48, translated “broad beans” by Conti-Rossini) and fruit (ṯmnr). The country produced sesame oil (Pliny, Nat. Hist., VI, 28 (32), § 161), but not enough for its needs and had to import it via Moscha (Periplus, § 32). As a condiment they used capers which they soaked ʾḏbr wbl, in RES, 2845; cf. N. Rhodokanakis, Studien . . ., i, 1 (1934, no. 107) and they imported saffron (Periplus, § 24) for the same purpose. Cinnamon, also imported in transit, obtained too high prices on the Roman market to be used locally (Pliny, Nat. Hist., XII, 93). The dbś which was distributed in large quantities to the workers on the dam of Mārib (CIS, 540: 96; cf. also 541: 12 f.) must have been a treacle of grapes or of other fruits, different from the honey which according to Pliny was produced in abundance in the kingdom of Saba (Nat. Hist., VI, 32: 18, § 161). Eratothenes mentions numerous ariās (μελιτουργεῖς) in Southern Arabia (Strabo, XVI, 4: 2, § 768).

The meat (ḏbr, in CIS, 503: 3) was in the main that of animals slaughtered (bblk, in CIS, 541: 122-3, cf. Hebrew ḏbḥabaḥ) probably according to the usual Semitic rite. For the workers engaged on the repairs to the dam of Mārib they slaughtered thousands of cattle (ḥbr) and probably also sheep (cf. Dionysios, Periegetes, 942 f.), one sort of which had the characteristic name of āḏḥy (Ar. ʿāḏhāb “victims”) and the other the enigmatic name of brš, and, on one occasion, 207,000 bnt, which seems to represent...
portions rather than head of sheep and goats (cf. Gl. 1142: 9). They were given also noo *dh (“lambs used for sacrifice” to judge from Ar. addhīb, pl. of ḏāhibīya) and ḏad (perhaps “fat lambs” to judge from Ar. ṣa’dī), CIIH, 540: 43 ff., 88 ff.; 541: 122 ff. The sheep were called elsewhere ḏhrif, in RES, 2959: 2 (Min.), Van Lessen 1: 9 (Katab.), and in the Manean colony of the Ḥiǧrāj dh’n (in contrast to the goats ṣ’ayz, in JSa, 19: 11, called in Saba sfr, Gl. 1000 A 3). According to Eratosthenes they ate also birds, except for geese and hens (Strabo, XVI, 4, 2 = 768). On the shores of the Indian Ocean, some communities ate mainly fish (Periplus, § 27) and the nomads lived on game (Pliny, Nat. Hist., VI, 32: 18 = § 161). These people drank milk (ibid.) and the workers of Mārib were supplied with butter (khāmāth, Hebrew ḥemāth, Akkadian khimēṣa, etc.; CIIH, 540: 96 ff.). The main drink (CIIH, 563: 27) seems to have been palm wine (Strabo, XVI, 4, 25, § 753; Pliny, Nat. Hist., VI, 28 (32), § 161), which was called mar dh-tmr (CIIH, 540: 50-1; cf. Ar. mazār, mizr, the word for various fermented drinks) or ṣkṭ dh-tmr, perhaps with a north Arabic gloss al-ḥalab (CIIH, 541: 129-30, but the hypothesis of J. M. Solá Solá, Las dos grandes inscripciones sudarbigas del dique de Mārib, Barcelona-Tübingen 1960, 37, raises some difficulties). However, the numerous vines (cf. above, and the popularity of the Dionysiac themes making use of the vine in sculpture) provided grape wine (Periplus, § 24) and a certain amount was imported (ibid., §§ 24, 28). The workers on the Mārib dam were provided with more of this than palm wine. A distinction was made between the fermented beverage (ṣkṭ) made with the excellent grapes of Ghirib (ghribb, cf. the classical dictionaries) and that prepared from dried raisins (ṣkṭ, cf. fusa; CIIH, 540: 46-8, 91-4; 541: 127 ff.). The grape wine in a temple (CIIH, 548) is probably the ḥašān “wey or milk diluted with water” known in various Arab countries (cf. the classical dictionaries and Dozy). We do not know whether the thermal springs of therapeutical value, which according to Ammianus (XXIII, 6, 46) were numerous, were used for drinking. Almost nothing is known about the ritual use of foods. Libations (ṣkṭ, in CIIH, 553: 27) were made on special altars (mstm, in RES, 3512), but we do not know what was the liquid used. Nor is anything known about the prohibitions concerning food. Nevertheless Eratosthenes mentions the absence of pigs among the domestic animals of the region (Strabo, XVI, 4, 2 = 768).

iii. — Regulations concerning food in early Islam

Muhammad’s reforms were made under the influence of a milieu in which each religious community was distinguished by its own regulations concerning food. We have seen how in the pagan milieu the situation was rather chaotic, and there was the influence of the Noachic code, imposed on proselytes by the Jews and coinciding more or less with the original Christian code. The Revelation (texts conveniently brought together by D. Masson, Le Coran et la Révélation judéo-chrétienne, Paris 1958, ii, 577-86) in this respect also was to put an end to ignorance and errors and the Prophet was to declare lawful (ḥalād) “good” foods (al-tayyībīt) and unlawful (ḥarām) unclean foods (al-ḥabībūd; ḏurān, VII, 156/157). But the ḏurān insists above all on the beneficent nature of food in general. Food is one of the greatest of Divine blessings (often in the Meccan sūras (cf. index of Blachère’s tr., s.v. nourriture), which, however, must be used with moderation (VII, 29, Medinan) and which must not be rejected except in specific circumstances. The word “eat (ḥaṣa)…” occurs nearly in every sūra. Moreover the Jews and the Christians have obliged two newly converted ḏiyyīfs to eat heart, taboo in their tribe, without which their conversion would have been incomplete ( Ibn Sa’d, i/2, 62, 1: 5 ff.). The ḏurān inveighs against men who arbitrarily deprive those who listen to them of certain foods (II, 163 f. 116 f.; V, 89 f. 87 f.; VI, 118 ff.; VII, 30/32; XVI, 117/116, texts which seem to belong to the beginning of the Prophet’s stay at Medina). In such cases it is certain that the adversaries aimed at are pagans observing the prohibitions described above (II, 165; VI, 139-138-50; X, 60/59); but at Medina it became important to define Islam as against Judaism.

The mass of Jewish prohibitions concerning food led to the emphasizing of the fact that Allah does not wish to impose too many burdens on His faithful people (II, 88). It seems that the ḏurān is sometimes criticizing Judaizers or ḥanifs who imposed on themselves excessive restrictions (VI, 118 ff.) and who wanted to influence the Prophet to do the same (VI, 116). The Jewish prohibitions (rather inexact) defined in VI, 147/145 are explained as a Divine punishment of the sins of the Israelites (IV, 158; XVI, 119). This is proved by the fact that they were not imposed on them before the revelation of the Torah, except for a prohibition, not of divine origin, which ḏaṣr’ād (Jacob) had imposed on himself (III, 87/93), a reference to the prohibition of the sciotic nerve after the struggle of Jacob and the angel (Gen., XXXII, 33). They were moreover partially lifted by Jesus (III, 44/50). “Today” (V, 7) these forbidden foods are therefore permitted. We have here ideas taken from the Christian polemic against the Jews, particularly as exemplified by the Syriac writer of Iran, Aphraates (4th century A.D.); cf. his fifteenth homily (ed. Wright, London 1869, 309 ff.; cf. H. Speyer, Die biblischen Erläuterungen im Koran, Gräfenhainichen 1931, reprinted Hildesheim 1962, 318 ff.). Only a limited number of prohibitions were retained: blood (and consequently “strangled” meats), milk (and blood) and the flesh of a dead animal (one not killed specially for meat, pork, animals consecrated to a pagan divinity (II, 166/173; V, 4/3; VI, 146/145; XVI, 116/115; on the date of these passages, see J. Schacht, in ET, s.v. maṭā’a). In addition, during the Pilgrimage it was forbidden to those in a state of ritual purity to kill or eat game (V, 1, 95/94 ff.), but fish was permitted (V, 97/96; cf. XVI, 14). It was necessary only to invoke (ḏḥāhara) the name of Allāh on lawful foods (VI, 118 ff., 33/32 ff; XXII, 35/34). Involuntary infringements of these rules, through force majeure or compulsion, are moreover regarded by Allah with indulgence (II, 168/173; V, 5/3; VI, 119, 146/145; XVI, 116/115). They defined the Muslim community, but only as a particular category within the wide family of the Possessors of the Scripture, since it is permitted to eat the food of the abd al-ḥitāb and vice-versa (V, 7/5). In fact, these prohibitions go further in conformity to the Jewish regulations than the Noachic regulations, which the Jews theoretically admitted as sufficient for any strangers allowed to live with them (only not to eat unbleed meat, according to Gen.; IX, 4; cf. E. Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, Leipzig, 1901-11, ii, 164 ff., 178, n. 77). There was, as a sort of solution, a falling into line with the primitive Christian
position (which remained very closely observed in the East) as it is defined by the decree of the Apostles (Acts, XV, 29; this apparently influenced K. Baier, Speise- satzungen mosaischer Art in mittelalterlichen Kirchen rechtsquellen des Morgen- und Abendlandes, Münster i. W. 1907). They went further in demanding also abstention from pork. This abstention, one of the first to be practised by Judaizing pagans (Juvenal, xiv, 98 f.), was also the rule among certain Judaean-Christians (Didascalia, 121, 27 ff.; cf. H. J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums, Tübingen 1940, 342, n. 2) and it was presumably through this route that it became adopted in Arabia (see above, col. 1059 b); it was also adopted by the Christians of Ethiopia in imitation of the Old Testament (Confesso fides Claudius regis Aethiopiae, ed. J. M. Wansbrough, London 1661, 3 and n. 11; E. Ullendorff, in JSS, i (1956), 240-3.; J. Baeteman, Dictionnaire amarigna-francais, Dire Dawa 1929, col. 574; cf. M. Rodinson, in Bibliotheca Orientalis, xx1 (1964), 241). The insistence on the lawfulness of fish arose perhaps from opposition to a Judaean-Christian and Samaritan practice (Schoeps, op. cit., 189 f.). In addition, an entirely new restriction appears in the Divine revelation: at first it praises the virtues of wine (XVI, 69), which is one of the delights promised to the elect in Paradise (XXXVII, 445 ff.); but later it makes reservations about it (II, 216/219), and then forbids it (V, 92/90). The commentators and the historians disagree on the causes and the date of this prohibition (see EHM). The association with the prohibition of maysir suggests a link between wine and pagan usages (W. Montgomery Watt, Muhammad at Medina, Oxford 1936, 298 f.; M. Gaudefrey-Denomyves, Makomet, Paris 1957, 570 f.; cf. above, col. 1059 b) and we have seen above that abstention from wine was a religious practice fairly common in Arabia in various milieus and on various occasions. It does not seem easy to agree with W. Montgomery Watt that it was also partly a case of discouraging the import of an expensive commodity which came from enemy countries. The initial indifference about it and the injunction contained in verse IV, 46/43 seem to indicate a prohibition not essentially a reaction against the deplorable effects of drunkenness within the Medinan community, one of them perhaps being excessive extravagance. This does not exclude the possibility that the practices of abstention mentioned above contributed to the enactment of the prohibition. In addition to these general prohibitions on the eating of specific foods, Islam decreed a general temporary abstention from food at periodic intervals—the fast of Ramadān (see SAWM). iv.—FOOD IN THE TRADITIONAL MUSLIM WORLD

In the Arab empire, which after 132/750 became the Muslim empire, the food in the various occupied countries naturally continued to be the same as it had been before they were conquered. The Arab conquerors adopted it, after a certain period of adaptation, perhaps adding certain dishes or practices of their own. For the food of each country reference should be made therefore to works describing the diet in the pre-Islamic civilizations. For Egypt, see A. Ruffer, Food in Egypt, Cairo 1919 (= Mémoires présentés à l'Institut d'Egypte, i); A. Erman and H. Ranke, Ägypten und ägyptisches Leben im Altertum, Tübingen 1923, 219-29; A. Wiedemann, Das alte Ägypten, Heidelberg 1920, 287-309 and also 250 ff., 259 ff., 271 f., 275 ff. On Syria and Palestine see especially R. A. S. Macalister, art. Food in J. Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, ii, Edinburgh 1859, 27-33; A. Bertholet, Kulturgeschichte Israels, Göttingen 1919, 130-4; F. Thomsen, art. Nahum, Zeitschrift des Deutschen Orientvereines, Berlin 1924-32, viii, 429-31. On Mesopotamia, see B. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien, Heidelberg 1920-5, i, 413-20. The picture had been somewhat modified by the influence of Greek and Roman customs, on which see especially Orth, art. Kochkunst in Pauly's Realenzyklopädie d. class. Altertumswissenschaft, Neue Bearb., xii/1, Stuttgart 1921, 944-82 and J. André, L'Alimentation et la cuisine à Rome, Paris 1961 (= Études et communications, 38). For Sāsānīd Iran, see A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassamides, Copenhagen-Paris 1944, 477-9.

However, the Muslim conquest created a relatively coherent cultural area which survived the fragmentation of the political unity which had brought it into being. Yet the differences between countries are important. To give a picture of the food and its variations throughout the whole of this area would be a vast and difficult enterprise for which the necessary detailed monographs do not exist. We shall limit ourselves here to indicating the main factors which influence all these diets. References to precise facts have in most cases only the value of examples taken at random.

1. Products consumed. The formation of new cultural frontiers leads to the spread throughout the territory concerned of products which have formerly been known only in one section of it. In the case of products too heavy to transport, this spread can take place only by their being grown or made locally. The most striking phenomenon in the Muslim world was the spread of the growing of rice and of sugar cane.

Rice, originally from India, was already in pre-Islamic times being cultivated in Iran, in Irāk and in Syria, but had hardly been used as food in the Roman world (only as a thickening for sauces); it spread as a crop and as food as far as Spain. It became a common item of food and especially of the poor (particularly in the form of bread made from rice flour) in the areas where it was intensively cultivated, but elsewhere it remained relatively a luxury food, used only in recherché dishes. In any case it did not take the place of wheat and did not acquire the importance which it had in India and in the Far East (cf. M. Canard, Le ris dans le Proche-Orient aux premiers siècles de l'Islam, in Arabicas, vi (1959), 113-31, and art. RIZ).

Sugar, introduced to Iran from India perhaps shortly before the Muslim conquest, spread after this through the whole of the Mediterranean world (cf. N. Deer, The history of sugar, i, London 1949, 68 ff., 74 ff.; and art. SUKKAR). It was used in the food of princes and wealthy people, but among the poor was found chiefly as a medicine (a significant text in the K. al-Harb al-ma'dah ... tr. J. Finkel, in Zeitschrift für Semitistik, viii (1932), 5). Honey was generally less expensive, and in particular dīb, a treacle of grapes, carob etc., was the sugar of poor people (cf. M. Rodinson, Recherches sur les documents arabes relatifs à la cuisine, in REI, 1949, 147).

Large-scale transport was particularly necessary to bring to the towns from the surrounding country-side food products such as wheat which were consumed in large quantities. Wheat was everywhere a commodity traded on a large scale (cf. for example R. Le Tourneau, Prix avant le protectorat, Casablanca 1949, 377 ff., and art. KAMH).
Certain heavy products regularly consumed were however transported by caravans or by ships (river or sea transport) considerable distances from the specific region in which they were originally grown. Examples are Syrian olive oil coming down the Euphrates, the dates of Lower Iraq or of Arabia, etc., familiar with long distances, and melons or rice, the latter of Transoxania were transported to Baghdad packed in ice inside lead boxes (al-Tha'labi, Latafi' al-ma'rif, ed. P. De Jong, Leiden 1867, 129). Drying was a less expensive and more widely used process. We have seen that before Islam the Arabs were already familiar with long driers, enabling the inhabitants of Desert truffles were also dried (Wusla, ch. viii, § 44), also figs, pistachio nuts, etc. (Ibn al-`Awwâm, i, 675 ff., tr. Clément-Mullet, i, 634 ff.). Fruits were often preserved in a sealed air-tight container which was sometimes buried in the ground (Ibn al-`Awwâm, i, 662 f., 664 f., tr. i, 624, 626, etc.). The curing or smoke-drying of meat seems to have been very little known among the Arabs; it is described in the Wusla (ch. viii, § 45, mss. A, B, D) as being a Greek process. It was, however, one of the processes applied to gur`atib, slices of meat, in particular to those known as mīriṣiyat, “Egyptian” (Wusla, ch. v, § 2a), and known in some places as mudakkhhānas “smoked” (ibid., § 2d). The crystallizing of fruits in honey or sugar, a process known to ancient Rome and a speciality of modern Damascus, was known there at this time according to A. von Kremer, Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen, Vienna 1875-7, ii, 333, who however quotes no evidence. Kidād, or dried meat, must have been coated with fat (cf. the modern Algerian recipe in J. Desparmet, Enseignement de l’arabe dialectal moderne, Algiers 1913, ii, 184, tr. H. Péres and G. H. Bouquet, Coutumes, institutions et croyances des indigènes de l’Algérie, i, Algiers 1930, 260). But the chief method of preservation was by means of antiseptic agents, particularly salt and vinegar, often used together and with the addition of many condiments; hence the names of these preserves: muqallalat, muqallab. In addition to vinegar and salt (steeping in salted water, impregnating with salt), a great deal of honey, or its substitutes sugar and treacle (dhb), was used in these preparations, also lemon juice, oil, mustard, walnuts or hazel nuts roasted and crushed, all kinds of herbs and spices, etc. In this way we were preserved for long or short periods according to the preparation used, vegetables, fruits and also (using vinegar, oil, etc.) small fishes and birds (hafitra). Special preserves were made (often to be kept for a shorter period) to be used, so called misriyya, a kind of mixture of meat, fish, herbs mixed into salted goat’s laban. In their preparation, laban and banbars (curds; Wusla, ch. viii, §§ 1-25) were sometimes used. Spices made possible also the preservation of sausages, of which those considered the best contained only mutton without beef, goat-meat etc., and not too much semolina; their name, labbi’ and labbi’, betrays their Roman origin (locumacae, sausages of Lucania; Ibn al-Ukhwawa, ed. R. Levy, London 1938, 94 f., 107; H. Zayyât, al-Khizna al-sharkiyya, iv, Beirut 1948, 21, 3, 23, l. 6). The principal method of preserving milk was in the form of cheese. The eastern Jews sometimes transported kosher (halal) cheese very great distances (S. D. Goitein, Jews and Arabs, New York 1955, 112); the transport of food over medium or longer distances is a privilege of the larger cities to enjoy a rich variety (e.g., for Mamlûk Egypt, list in K. al-Harb al-ma’qub, apud J. Finkel, Zeitschrift für Semitistik, ix (1933-4), 11 f.). Generally speaking, the preservation of food was sometimes done by the producers for home consumption or for sale (e.g., cheeses), sometimes by the wives or the servants in private households or in

2. Storage and preservation. The preservation of food is an important problem in all societies. The Muslim civilization had inherited processes from the ancient East and from the classical civilizations. Cereals were stored either in granaries (see agadir) or in silos (mâlmûra [q.v.]) and the agronomists recommended various processes to preserve them from decay, worms, etc. (Ibn al-`Awwâm, K. al-`Utldi, ed. J. A. Bousquet, Madrid 1802, i, 678 ff.; tr. J.-J. Clément-Mullet, Paris 1864-7, i, 638 ff.). For fruit, especially grapes, there were handed down various recipes for preserving them from any deterioration and keeping them fresh (e.g., Ibn al-`Awwâm, i, 660 ff., tr. Clément-Mullet, i, 619 ff., to be compared with processes used by the Romans, J. André, L’alimentation... , 89). Preserver
palaces (whence the chapters of recipes for preserves in books of cookery like the Wusla), and sometimes it was the work of specialist craftsmen and prepared to be sold at a 'table libre', the commercial compliment.

The manuals of hísba [q.v.] enjoin the muḥāsib to make sure for example that any fish left unsold was salted (al-Nabrāwī apud W. Behrmauer, Mémoire sur les institutions de police chez les Arabes les Persans et les Turcs, Paris 1861, 135; Muḥammad b. Abī Muḥammad al-Ṣaḥḥ, ed. G. S. Colin and E. Lévi-Provençal, Un manuel hispanique de ħisba, i, Paris 1931, 25). But there was very little which resembled the modern food-preserving industry, though one might so classify the sausage-sellers (naḥānīshī‘iyūn), and the sellers of confectionery (halāwānīshī‘iyūn), traders who themselves preserved food for sale. Among them should also be included the bawdīrādī‘iyūn, makers and sellers of bawārīd, cooked green vegetables preserved in vinegar or other acid liquids (cf. M. Rodinson, Recherches... 142 and the treatises of ħisba).

3. Preparation. Foods often went through varying degrees of preparation before reaching the consumer, thus reducing the work done domestically (cf. S. D. Goitein, in JESHO, iv (1961), 193-7). Flour-grinding, work done by the women in country districts, was often in towns done by mills which provided flour ready prepared (taḥkān “miller”). Kneading of dough was generally done at home, but sometimes by bakers (khābābāsīn). The Mālikī and Abādī schools sometimes stipulated that a wife could not be obliged to grind corn and that her husband, in this case, was to supply her with flour and not grain (‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Muṣṭaf‘ī, K. al-Nīl, tr. E. Zeyn, Droit mosâbîle, Le Nil, Du Mariage, i, Algiers 1891, 71; Saḥnūn, apud M. Ben Cheneb, in Revue indigène, xxxiv (1909), 68). But in most cases dough was taken to the owner of a bakehouse (farrān) to be cooked (see, e.g., R. Le Tourneau, Fès avant le protectorat, Casablanca 1949, 327 f.). Pastries and sweetmeats were also made by craftsmen, as were the various dishes which were sold ready cooked by the ‘abbādībī‘ān “keepers of cook-shops”, the ḥarrāṣīn or barṭī‘iyūn, sellers of harīsa in its popular form (barṭī‘ “wine”), the bawārdīdī‘iyūn “sellers of bawārīd” (see above), etc., to be taken away or eaten in the shop (lively description of a shauwīd, proprietor of a restaurant where all kinds of food could be cooked, in the Maḥāma baqāddī‘iyūna of al-Hamādhānī, ed. M. ‘Abduh, Beirut 1889, 57 ff.). European visitors to Cairo in the Middle Ages speak of 10,000 to 12,000 cooks in the streets, the ‘Saracens’ seldom doing any cooking at home (G. Wiet in Revue du Caire, August 1944, 351 f.). Meat was dealt with by specialists who carried out the slaughter (dhabbāb), the cutting up and the final marketing (bāṣṣāb, bīṣṣār with variations in terminology). More specialized products were prepared by the maker and seller of sausages (naḥānīshī, see above), or of slices of meat (gārādī, see above), the roaster (ṣauwi), the seller of cooked livers (bābādī), of cooked sheep’s (or other animals’) heads (rawa‘da, etc. The manufacture of oil gave rise to a real industry, using presses which were sometimes very costly (P. S. Girard, apud Description de l’Égypte, État moderne, ii/1, Paris 1821, 605 ff. = 2nd ed., xvii, Paris 1824, 229 ff.). The industries of wine and other fermented drinks were widespread, for the use of Christians and Jews, although varying numbers of Muslims did not fail to take advantage of them; thus in the Mamlūk period Syria was a wine-growing country while Egypt was not (al-Kalāqṣāndī, Šaḥīr, tr. Gaudfroy-Demobnyennes, La Syrie à l’époque des Mamlouks, Paris 1925, 28). The prohibitions applied to this manufacture were of fairly limited extent; e.g., under the Ottoman empire in the 11th/12th century it was forbidden to make wine or rābī (rābī) within Istanbul (A. Refik, Hicret on birinci asırdan İstanbul hayatı, Istanbul 1931, 32, no. 63; cf. R. Mantran, Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle, Paris 1962, 205 ff., 257, 448 f.). The extraction and refining of cane sugar formed an important industry; Ibn Dīkūmī mentions 58 factories at Fustāt (iv, Būlāk 1309, 47-6); it is known that it was an important state monopoly under the Mamlūks (M. Sobernheim, Das Zuckermonopol unter Sultan Barbar, in ZA, xxvii (1912), 75-84; A. Darrag, L’Égypte sous le règne de Barbars, Damascus 1961, 146-51); later it was at Cairo that sugar was refined for the use of the palace of the Ottoman Sultan (Kāmnānām, in Digeon, Nouveaux contes turcs et arabes, Paris 1781, ii, 276 f.). Sugar was also refined in Syria (al-Kalāqṣāndī, ibid.), in Sicily (M. Amari, Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, Florence 1854-68, ii, 445, iii, 785 f.), in Iran (Spuler, Iran, index), etc. The confectioners used sugar and honey in various ways (see, e.g., a good description of the work of the maker of kundf, a kind of vermicelli with sugar or honey, etc., in G. Martin, Les bazars du Caire et les petits métiers arabes, Cairo-Paris 1910, 60). Fish was dried and salted so that it could be transported long distances (Spuler, Iran, 407; Gibb-Bowen, i/1, 299); in Egypt the production of botargo (batrakh, bātrīkh) from mullet roes, was of fairly limited extent; it should be noted that the handbook on trade by Abu ‘l-Faḍl Dījarīr b. ‘Allī al-Dimīshqī (5th/6th/11th-12th centuries?) classifies grocers as half traders and half craftsmen (see H. Ritter, in Jfj., vii (1917), 6). The peasant producers came to sell their produce either in the country and often already set up regional markets (cf. R. Brunschvig, Coup d’œil sur l’histoire des foires à travers l’Islam, in Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin, v (1953), 43-75; F. Benet, Weekly suqs and city markets, in Research for development in the Mediterranean Basin, a proposal, ed. C. A. O. van Nieuwenhuize, The Hague 1961, 86-97), or in the towns, in markets which were more or less permanent.

In the larger towns there were wholesale markets supplying the large markets which served the whole of a large town district and also the small local markets. Private householders bought their provisions from the two latter types (good description by R. Le Tourneau, Fès avant le protectorat, Casablanca 1949, 368-97 and R. Mantran, Istanbul ... , 185 ff.). These retail markets consisted of specialized little shops: fruit and vegetable sellers, butchers, dried fruit merchants, sellers of spices (ṣaffār), grocers who sold various kinds of fats (bakhīl in Morocco, elsewhere usually sayyid, ṣammān, etc. with many variants, cf. Djāmāl al-Dīn al-Kaṣmī, Kāmās al-ṣindā‘ī al-ḥāmīšiyā, Paris-The Hague 1960, 48), etc. There are found in the works on the corporations extensive lists of these retailers (e.g., L. Massignon, Enquête sur les corporations musulmanes d’artisans et de commerçants au Maroc, an offprint from RMM, Paris 1925). As we have said, many variations are
to be found in the demarcation and naming of specializations in the different regions. In certain countries at certain times the state played an important part at several stages in the distribution of commodities.

5. Food consumption and its variations.

In the sociological study of food, special attention must be paid to how consumption varies with different groups and categories of individuals (R. Firth, *The sociological study of native diet*, in *Africa*, vii (1934), 410 f.). These variations are due either to natural, geographical and economic differences in the food resources available to each group, or to cultural traditions of varying origins. Muslim civilization provides many instances of this phenomenon, which is worthy of more detailed study; here we shall give only some examples.

The geographical variations are obviously due to the variety of the resources available, and thus to natural conditions. But, at the sociological level, based on these conditions and extending beyond them, the establishment of cultural traditions regarding the choice and the preparation of dishes has created regional specialization. Thus, in the Middle Ages, Egyptian cuisine had a high reputation (cf. H. Zayyāt, *al-Khṣāṣa al-ثاركِيَّة*, iv, Beirut 1948, 14). In Turkey, the cooks of Boulu and remain very famous (see *Bozlu* and Nazım Hikmet, *Les traditions alimentaires franco-turques*, Fr. tr. by J. Chabas, Paris 1950, 155 f.). Cooks from places which were renowned for their food were employed in far distant regions. Al-Tāhir brought to Bagdad a Khursānī cook (Tayfūr, *apud* Spuler, *Iran*, 510), and Egyptian women-cooks were employed everywhere (even in the household of an orientalized Frankish knight of Antioch, cf. Usāma b. Munkīd, *K. al-Ṭibīb*, ed. P. K. Hitti, Princeton 1930, 140; tr. P. K. Hitti, *New York* 1929, 169 f.). This specialization gave rise to the numerous adjectives of geographical origin which accompany or represent the names of many dishes: e.g., there are cakes called *akhmīmīyā*, *as-yātīyya*, a sweet called *halwāt makkīyya*, etc. (cf. M. Rodinson, *Recherches*, ..., 150). For the regional specialities of Andalus, see A. Hūci Miranda, in *Revista del Instituto de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid*, i (1935), 139; a recent ethnographic survey in Turkey traces the local variations of the same dish, see Z. Koşay and A. Ülkücan, *Anadolu yemekleri ve Türk mutfağı*, Ankara 1961; similarly, on local varieties of *pelāb* (Ottoman *pişev*, *pastıf*) in Uzbekistan, see Karim Mahmudov, *Uzbekhsı bilya*, Tashkent 1963, 6, 77 f., and cf. N. K. Alhazov, etc., *Azerbaijanian kitchen*, Baku 1963, 65 ff. Regional foods or dishes were made far from their place of origin, the recipes being transmitted orally or in writing. Thus as early as the 7th/11th century we find in the East recipes for Maghribi couscous (ibid., 138; for the longing for couscous felt by Maghribi exiles in the East, see Maškārī, Būlāk, iii, 137; cf. H. Perès, in *Bull. des Études Arabes*, iii (1943), 140; R. Brunschvig, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Hafsides*, Paris 1940-7, 271). Food today one of the channels for patriotic fervour. In literature and films, Egypt’s national food (ta’mīyya, Egyptian beans—*fūl mudammās miṣrī*, Jew’s mallow or *muš’tābīyya*) is contrasted with the cosmopolitan dishes affected by snobs (see, e.g., Mahmūd Taymūr, *La belle aux lièvres charmées*, Fr. tr., Paris 1952, 87). A school textbook relates how an Egyptian student is delighted to find in Oxford an anachronistic Egyptian country hotel in a restaurant kept by an Egyptian and serving *fūl mudammās* (Sa’d al-Uryān, A. Duwaydār and M. Zahrān, *Mudammās Uṣūlīd*, Cairo 1950). Egyptian emigrants returning home dream of a good hot *ta’mīyya* rissole (*Yusuf Idrīs, Umm al-dunyā, in his collection *Dilmūk al-layyīd*, Cairo 1954, series *al-Kiṭāb al-ghāhabi*, 94).

When massive emigrations take place, the emigrants introduce their traditional dishes into their new habitat. Thus, the great emigrations of Muslims from Spain at the time of the Reconquista brought many Andalusian recipes to the Maghrib (see E. Gobert, in *Cahiers de Tunisie*, iii (1935), 529 ff.), for example the famous *bābāla* (from Span., *pastel*) of Morocco (see L. Brunot, *Les textes arabes de Rabat*, ii, Paris 1952, 52; detailed recipe in Z. Guinaudeau, *Fès vu par sa cuisine*, Rabat 1957, 33 f.).

Variations according to the different religious groups are of more importance ideologically. We shall deal later with the development of the principles laid down in the *Kūrān*, and it is necessary to mention here only that each group tended to mark itself off distinctly from the others by having its own series of rules concerning food. To eat just like others implied, generally speaking, that a group did not consider itself completely split off from them. In principle one should not eat with the *kāfīr* (Goldziher, *Vorlesungen*, 182, Fr. tr. Paris 1920, 152), which gave rise to the vast question of who exactly is to be regarded as *kāfīr*. The *Kūrān* allowed Muslims to eat the food of the *kāfīr* mentioned and vice versa (V, 7, see above). But there is attributed to the Prophet a letter to the Mazdeans of Hadjar according to which Muslims were not to eat meat which they had killed as a sacrifice (*Ibn Sa’d*, ii/2, Leiden 1917, 19, 1, 8; *al-Balādūrī*, *Futūḥ*, 80; cf. Spuler, *Iran*, 154, n. 5). Even in relation to the *Aḥī al-kīṭāb*, the law was more restrictive than the *Kūrān*, at least concerning animals killed while hunting or by ritual slaughter. It was not forbidden but reprehensible (*makrūḥ*), according to certain Mālikīs, to eat what a *Kitāb* had slaughtered for himself; according to others, on the contrary, this applied to meat slaughtered by a *Kitāb* for a Muslim. In all cases it was reprehensible to obtain meat from a non-Muslim butcher (Mālikīs). It was advisable to make sure that the name of Allāh had been invoked. However, a *jātā‘* of Muhammad *Abūd* supporting the same position, issued in about 1903, seems to have provoked heated arguments (M. Rashīd Riḍā, *Ṭabīb al-ustād al-imām*, iii, Cairo 1924, 84, 767; see also C. C. Adams, in *Macdonald presentation volume*, Princeton 1953, 13-29).

But it was reprehensible to eat anything destined for the synagogues, the churches or the feasts of the *Aḥī al-kīṭāb*. In any case meat obtained from a idolater, a Mazdean, a pagan or an apostate was prohibited. To this list was sometimes added Christian Arabs (prohibited by Shafī‘īs, and reprehensible according to certain Mālikīs) (*Abūd al-Raḥmān al-Dijāzīrī*, K. al-Fībī *ala ‘lamadāḥīb al-arba‘a*, ii/3, Cairo n.d., 21-6, etc.). The application of these principles has remained fairly strict until the present day. In China, many of the Muslim carriers take their own bread with them on journeys in order to avoid eating food prepared by infidels (M. Bromhall, *Islam in China*, London 1910, 230 f.). Usāma chose his food carefully in the house of the *kāfīr*, and vice versa (V, 7, see above). However, it is well known that Jewish food conforms to the Muslim rites and thus may be eaten, unlike...
that of Christians, hence a well-known proverb giving the advice to sleep in Christian beds (which are clean), but to eat Jewish food (Freytag, Arabum prosobria, iii, 13, no. 73; W. Marçais and A. Guilha, Textes arabes de Tabarodna, ii, Glosses, vii, Paris 1959, 259, ed. E. Westermarck, Ritual and belief in Morocco, London 1926, ii, 4). However the eastern Christians often tended to conform with the Muslim regulations (Barhebraeus, Nomocanon [in Syriac], ed. P. Bedjan, Paris 1898, 463 ff., tr. J. A. Assenmain apud A. Mai. Scriptorum veterum nova collectio, x, Rome 1838, 229 ff.; Ibn al-Asqâli, Nomocanon, ch. 23, ms. Paris, ar. 315, fol. 94 ff., fol. 14, Fatha Nagâdî, apud I. Guidi, Rome 1877, 147 ff., tr., Rome 1890, 209 ff.), at the same time Christians and Jews often avoided Muslim food. The Christians of Ethiopia reproached Europeans with eating meat killed by Muslims, which they considered as amounting practically to apostasy (Abba Tekla-Halmanot, Abouna Jacob ou le vénérable De Jacobis, Milan 1877, 333, Eng. tr. Constantinopoli, London 1878, 234 f.). The excursions of groups of women of leisure for picnics etc. were accompanied also by purchases of cakes, fruit, ices, etc. (ibid., 306 f., Engl. tr., 214 f.; L. M. J. Garnett, Turkish life in town and country, London n.d., 67). Hence a regulation of the 10th/16th century forbidding women to go into the shops of the kaimakchis of Eyyub and laying down that the Christians should avoid them (A. Refik, On alliances asrida Istanbul hayatsu, Istanbul 1935, 40, no. 5; cf. R. Mantran, Istanbul dans la seconde moitié du XVIIème siècle, Paris 1962, 68). Similarly when in the baths women ate sweetmeats and special dishes (Kulsam Naneh, Le livre des dames de la Perse, tr. L. Thonneller, Paris 1881, 28, 35 f.). In Iran, the offerings to Fatîma are eaten only by men, at least in one of the first phases of the rite (H. Massé, Croyances et coutumes persanes, Paris 1938, ii, 302). Moreover, in some places, customs based on magic forbid certain foods to women (E. Westermarck, Ritual and belief in Morocco, London 1916, ii, 363). Differently from the above, the following anecdotes are based on theoretical (and even scientific) opinions concerning food. We shall deal with them below.

On the other hand a certain number of differences according to social classes can be traced to economic and social factors. Naturally considerations of price alone restricted the food of the poor both in quantity and quality and had the same effect on that of misers, who were voluntarily poor. In some of the literature about misers, particularly in the master-piece of al-Dîbâhî, the K. al-Bukhâlî, much is said about their meagre diet. The food of the poor and of misers was apt to include in particular “filling” dishes which were, at least in appearance, rich in nutritional value while consisting of inexpensive ingredients, like Harpagon’s haricot of mutton. Several such dishes are mentioned in the time of al-Dîbâhî: tifghâla, harisa, fudjisîya, hurumbiyya (Bukhâlî, ed. Hâdîjîrî, 60; tr. Pellat, 99). At the beginning of the 17th/18th century lentils also were mentioned as a dish of poor people (M. Rodinson, Recherches ..., 133) and they were again despised as the food of the fallâbî by al-Shirîbînî. The distinction between the dishes of the poor and those of the rich was clearly understood by the collective consciousness, as expressed in proverbs, popular literature,
Examples of this are found in current proverbs about burghul (Turkish bulgur) "crushed wheat", a dish of the poor and peasants in Syria-Palestine and Turkey in contrast to rice, the dish of the wealthy town-dwellers. (M. Feghali, Proverbes et dictons syro-libanais, Paris 1938, 248, no. 1097; cf. X. de Planhol, De la plaine pamphylienne aux lacs pittois, Paris 1938, 177.) The K. al- Harb al-ma'āṣik has precisely as its main theme the contrast between the food of the poor and that of the rich (J. Finkel, in Zeitschrift für Semitistik, vili (1932), 122-48, ix (1933-4), 1-18; cf. M. Rodinson, Recherches..., 113 ff.). The food of the rich was distinguished by the variety of the dishes, their complexity, their expensiveness, the length of time needed for their preparation, an ostentatious freedom of choice expressed by eating foods of little nutritional value. There was obviously an effort to improve the quantity and quality of the diet, but still there were applied the rules of "conspicuous consumption" in food (Thorstein Veblen, The theory of the leisure class, ch. iv, New York 1934, 73 f.) intended to set apart the elite from the masses. The members of the elite were expected to be familiar with the most esoteric dishes, and they either wrote themselves such treatises on cookery as those produced by people of importance in the ʻAbbāsīd period (M. Rodinson, Recherches... , 99 ff.) or had these books written for them (cf. introduction of the book of Ibn Sayyūr al-Warārä in H. Zay'yāt, al-Khizāna al-sharqiyya, iv, Beirut 1948, 10). Those who aspired to refinement in 4th/10th century Baghdad, the juruḍa, had strict rules in this matter (Al-Washshā, K. al-Muwæṣṣah, ed. R. E. Brünnnow, Leiden 1886, 94 f., 130 f., etc.; cf. M. F. Ghazi, in Studia Islamica, xi (1959), 61). The rulers had huge kitchens for themselves and their court, well stocked and equipped, staffed by numerous cooks and their assistants, under the direction of officers such as the ḏījaḏmān, the ʿabd al-gharāb- khāna and the uṣṭādār al-sūba at the court of the Mamūša (Gaudefroy-Demombryne, La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, Paris 1923, LX f.). the ḥiļārjī bāği, "master of the larder" and his assistants like the ḫeṣqīk bāği, etc., all supplied with their provisions by the muḥākkām emīn and his staff at the Ottoman Palace (Gibb-Bowen, i, 78, 85, 332 f., 336 f.). The quest for the exotic, the partial adoption of the cuisine of foreigners, especially when their civilization enjoys a certain prestige, is another means by which the elite may demonstrate its distinction from ordinary folk. Hence, in the Arab world, the vogue for Iranian dishes, which have begun in pre-Islamic times (cf. ʻAbd Allāh b. Ǧuḍān's introduction of fāṭḥādā at Mecca, Alūsī, Bulğa', i, 381) and was very pronounced in the ʻAbbāsīd period (Rodinson, Recherches..., 148 ff.), and later the fashion for things Turkish (ibid., 151). European influence began in the period of the Crusades (ibid., 150; Rodinson, in Comptes Rendus du Glecs, ix (1960-3), 106 f.), and has naturally been very powerful since the 19th century, as all modern cookery-books demonstrate (see, e.g., H. Stummer, in Islamica, ii (1926), 538-49). Deep though its influence has been (see, for example, on the influence of Russian diet in Central Asia, K. Mahmudov, Uṣbekskie blyuda, Tashkent 1963, 6, with illustrations of how this trend has been resisted by the Muslim 'dergi', who call potatoes 'food of Satan and tomatoes 'fruits made of human blood'), in all countries the tradition of disdain for popularity has not disappeared. Conversely, Muslim diet exercised a pronounced influence on Christian Europe in the Middle Ages (see M. Rodinson, in Romanus, lixi (1950), 433-49, in Scritti orientalistic in onore di G. Levi Della Vida, Rome 1956, ii, 425-35, and in Études d'orientalisme... , Ldti., iii, Cairo 1949, 320 f.). But generalizations of a "magic" type are often found: they can grow up from a basis of real attributes which have been observed (birds are timorous, testicles are connected with sexual activity, honey is sweet, etc.), or be deduced from systems of symbolic connexions (yellow is beneficial, black is ill-omened, etc.; cf. the remarkable and unfortunately unique study by J. Jouin, Valeur symbolique des aliments et rôles alimentaires à Rabat, in Hesperis, xlv (1957), 299-329). But these wide and rash generalizations are based on the magic principles of contagion by propinquity, the law of similarity and of opposites, etc. Thus we have seen that in north-western Arabia it is believed that whoever eats birds' hearts becomes himself timorous (see above, col. 1059 b); similarly medical treatises explain that sheep's liver, heart or kidneys strengthen the liver, heart or kidneys of whoever eats them, while to eat sheep's brains causes loss of memory and stupidity because the sheep is senseless and stupid (Dāwūd al-ʾAntākī, Taḏḥīḥa, Cairo 1356/1937, i, 207; cf. the conversation recorded by Na'mān (anno 1663, A.H.) and translated by B. Lewis, Istanbul and the civilization of the Ottoman Empire, Norman Okla. 1963, 171-2); in present-day Morocco young boys newly-circumcised are made to drink soup made from sheep's testicles to strengthen them, and it is also the recognized diet for people who are exhausted (J. Jouin, op. cit., 309). Ḫalēṣ made with saffron has been recommended because yellow is a source of gaiety (Nizāmī, Haft paykar, Tehran 1334, 197b, tr. C. E. Wilson, London 1924, i, 156). Honey with its sweetness assuages mental suffering (J. Jouin, op. cit., 315) as does takbīna, a dish made with honey (see above, col. 1059 a), hence their consumption at funerals. It is possible that the dictum attributed to the faḥāṣ of Medina, Raḥīma b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 136/753-4), according to which the eating of ḥabāṣ (jelly made with starch) fortifies the brain (Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, Al-ʿĪḍ al-فارīd, vi, Cairo 1949, 293), belongs to this class of popular opinions. But as well as these there was also the corpus of scholarly opinions, transmitted by books and stemming for the most part from the scientific medicine systematized by the Greeks. It consisted of generalizations based sometimes on systematic research on data which were certainly not self-evident (such as the presence in the human body, besides blood, of the pituitary glands, yellow and black bile), from which the Greeks had drawn up a carefully worked out system, avoiding symbolic
The prohibitions concerning food are part of the vast system of Muslim ethics. For this reason there are used for them the usual categories, which include all the degrees, from obligation to prohibition, by way of recommendation, indiffERENCE, permission and reprobation. Efforts are made to state the attitude to be taken in every possible case, and even in some very unlikely cases. Procedures are established to settle doubtful cases, all else failing, by ordeal: drawing lots to indicate which animal of a flock has been the object of an act of bestiality and is therefore impure (Abu 1-Kásim Dá'ífr b. Mūh. al-Hillī, Shá'arā’ 1s-Is-lām, al-Qal’at 1839, 402, tr. Querry, Droits musulman, ii, 233, § 17); in cases of doubt as to the provenance of birds' eggs, which would decide whether they were lawful, to use those whose ends differ in width (ibid., 403 = Querry, ii, 233 f., § 37 [Shāfī’i]).

The categories of the permitted and the forbidden in this field are (apart from some exceptions) identical with those of the clean and the unclean. There follows from this the obligation to apply to these cases the general idea of contagion, of the contaminating power of uncleanness, which gives rise to a number of delicate problems to determine the limits of this contagion. The milk and the eggs of unclean animals are obviously unclean; but does an animal who has drunk wine or sow's milk, both of them unclean, become by this act unclean itself? (al-Hillī, op. cit., 402; tr. Querry, ii, 230 f.). A dog, being unclean, makes unclean any liquid which it has begun to lap or game which it has begun to eat (D. Santillana, Le précis de droit d'Ibn Qudāma, Beirut 1950, 230). The question was much discussed as to how far a mouse (or other unclean animal) which had fallen into a food which was clean caused it to be unclean (al-Dārī, viii, 47; Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 47; cf. Santillana, Istituzioni, i, 321). In general it is admitted that the uncleanness is transmitted to the whole of any liquid or fluid matter, but only to the parts of any solid matter which are near to the part touched (unless the mouse has remained there for a long time, according to the Mālikī Saḥnūn: Ibn Abī Zayd al-Kayrawānī, Risāla, ed. and tr. L. Bercher, Algiers 1948, 158). The crossing of a clean with an unclean animal makes their progeny unclean (e.g., the mule; see also, e.g., Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alī al-Shirāzī, K. al-Tannīb, ed. and tr. Bouquet, i, Algiers 1949, 123 [Shāfī’i]). It became necessary also to lay down the course to be followed when there arose a conflict between the system of regulations concerning food and other principles and exigencies of social life, and to make general rules also for borderline cases. Thus, suicide being forbidden, man has a duty to keep himself alive and in good health. From this is deduced the prohibition of injurious substances, notably intoxicants (cf. al-Ghazālī, Ihyā, ii, § 83, 16 f.; concerning bandīg [g. ‘ychane’], in the Mughal Empire, non-Muslims as well as Muslims were, from social and humanitarian motives, forbidden to use it, see Sri Ram Sharma, The religious policy of the Mughal Emperors, London 1962, 25 f., 93, 109 f.; but nowadays this prohibition is stressed especially with regard to opium, hashish, cocaine, etc., cf. 1s-Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dāzīrī, K. al-Filsa ’l-madhabīh al-arba’a, ii, 85 n. 24). But in cases of famine and of extreme necessity, the
principle of keeping one's self alive conflicts with the prohibition of what is unclean, and it is acknowledged that the latter must be sacrificed, at least to the minimum degree necessary to maintain life. But limits are set, and also a graduated table of degrees of uncleanness is established (cf. al-Hilli, 406-8, tr. Querry, *Droitmusulman*, ii, 242-6, which is especially detailed). The question arose and still arises particularly in relation to medicines prescribed by doctors. In the same way a compromise is established between the duty to keep alive and the rights of property: in certain conditions and within certain limits it is permissible to seize by force from a reluctant owner the means for sustaining one's life. In some cases the duty of acting humanely towards animals can also have an influence on what food is eaten (e.g., the recommendation not to slaughter a sheep which is suckling, *Muslim*, xxxvi, 1408).

The fiqh naturally upheld the food prohibitions laid down by the Kur'\textsuperscript{a}n, endeavouring only to define their scope. The prohibition of blood, linked with that of the meat of animals which are dead without having been ritually slaughtered, led to many developments. It was necessary to define very precisely the method and conditions of slaughter [see *ma\textsuperscript{d}h\textsuperscript{a}*, etc. Although "carriorn" (may\textsuperscript{a}ta), an animal simply found dead, remains completely free from impurity (\textit{munkar}, etc.), attempts have been made to mitigate a little the more precise prohibition, given in Kur'\textsuperscript{a}n, V, 439, of the flesh of animals found strangled or gored, victims of a fall or killed by a blunt instrument. If even a breath of life remains in them they may still be ritually slaughtered and thus rendered lawful to eat. This is the "purification" mentioned in the Kur'\textsuperscript{a}n. It was necessary to define in the greatest detail the signs by which the presence of this flicker of life could be recognized or presumed to exist (a good summary of the position of the Sunni schools in al-Djaz\textsuperscript{a}r, *K. al-Fikh*, iii, 4 and n. 3). More serious difficulties are caused by hunting. In general it is necessary to perform the ritual slaughter of the animal before its death, if this is possible. But where this is impossible it is conceded that the fact of having killed an animal while formulating the intention of slaughtering it ritually and pronouncing the *tasmiya* ("in the name of God") at the moment of sending off the missile may take the place of this ritual slaughter. Naturally the pilgrim who has entered the state of ritual purity (\textit{fihr\textsuperscript{a}}) is defined by the intoxicating power of the liquor concerned (taking advantage of the meaning of *kh\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}mar\textit{a}* "to be mixed together"), and that on the other hand the prohibition makes it, in accordance with the logic of the system, a drink impure in itself to produce drunkenness. The result is a logical contradiction, which is illustrated when al-Ghaz\textsuperscript{a}l\textsuperscript{i} contrasts the Muslim law with the supposed prohibition of wine by Jesus, based solely on its ability to intoxicate. G\textsuperscript{a}h\textsuperscript{a}z\textsuperscript{a}l gets over the difficulty by asserting that the drinking of small quantities leads to that of large quantities and drunkenness (*ih\textsuperscript{a}n*, iv, 81, l. 31), which is the line taken in the modern interpretation, which emphasizes the moral, hygienic and social justifications for this prohibition (cf. al-Djaz\textsuperscript{a}r, K. *al-Fikh*, ii, 6-9).

Food can sometimes be affected by impurities which have nothing to do with the food itself. Thus the impurity of menstruation (Kur'\textsuperscript{a}n, II, 222, and much developed later) leads to the conclusion that the meat of menstruating female animals is impure (e.g., the hare: Ab\textsuperscript{u} D\textsuperscript{a}w\textsuperscript{d}w, xxvi, 269), just as the impurity of women in this state can be transmitted to the food which they prepare (al-Hilli, 406, tr. Querry, *Droitmusulman*, ii, 242, § 97 f.; a regulation which was applied at Nabulus according to Jaussen, *Napoule*, 311). The same applies to food prepared by infidels (including the *ahl al-dhimma*, according to certain authors), perhaps even to that eaten in their company (ibid., 404, 405, tr. Querry, ii, 236, 239, and col. 1065 b above) or, in practice, that prepared in utensils which they have used (a pathetic case cited by M. Broomhall, *Islam in China*, 226).

The M\textsuperscript{a}lik\textsuperscript{a}i school endeavoured to limit the prohibitions to foods declared impure by Kur'\textsuperscript{a}nic prescription, with only those restrictions set out above: that the food eaten should be neither harmful nor the property of others. But in general the idea of uncleanness was extended, as we have seen, to other foods. It concerns always animal food, except where it relates to edible earth, which was sometimes discouraged or forbidden, and, among the Shi\textsuperscript{a}is, to water from hot springs, which was discouraged. Lists are given of the impure parts of animals, generally faecal matter and urine (the urine of the camel is, however, permitted as a medicine); to these are sometimes added the sexual organs and other parts. Similarly, acts of bestiality make unclean the meat of the animal concerned, also the eating of excrement. This leads to the case of the *di\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}ll\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}* (Ab\textsuperscript{u} D\textsuperscript{a}w\textsuperscript{d}w, xxiv, 24-33, etc.) and developed in great detail by the fiqh, which specifies in particular the length of time which the animal must be kept in supervised isolation and fed with clean food in order to regain its cleanliness and be eaten lawfully.

But, above all, a certain number of animals are added to the pig, which is the only one actually prohibited as such by the Kur'\textsuperscript{a}n. For some of these, such as humans and dogs, it is obvious that all that is being done is to make explicit prohibitions which are implicit in the sayings reported from the Prophet. In the case of certain others, a thorough study would be necessary to determine which are of pre-Islamic Arab origin and which arise from the customs already existing among peoples who have become Islamicized. In general, however, Islamic jurisprudence has developed extensively the chapter on the juridical classification of the various animals, with perceptible divergences among the schools: a summary of the attitudes adopted by the principal juridical schools will be found in the article *hayaw\textsuperscript{a}n* —iv.
Over and above the categories elaborated by the schools, on the basis of the Kur'an and Tradition, of foods whose consumption is forbidden or reprehensible, the zealous Muslim may wish to carry the imitation of the Prophet so far as to abstain from foods which, according to Tradition, displeased him personally, but which he did not forbid to others (at least according to most of the texts), although he forbade those smelling of them to enter the mosque: garlic, onion and often leeks (kurrâh; cf. references apud Wensinck, A handbook of early Muhammadan tradition, Leiden 1927, s.vv.; recommendations to wash before and after paid today, cf. J. Jomier, Le commentaire coranique du Mandar, Paris 1954, 142), which is probably the reason why according to the commentators (ad. loc.) leeks are excluded from the bukhâl laid out on the "spread table" sent from Heaven to Jesus and the apostles (Kur'ân, V, 111 ff.). Perhaps the lizard should also be added to this list (see above, col. 1058 b).

In the course of the centuries there have come to be added to this list of prohibited goods new edible products; the fact that they were bid'â reinforced their qualities of being harmful, intoxicating etc., to induce—but in vain—their prohibition. This has been the case with coffee (see ҚAHWÂ), bât [q.v.], tobacco [see ҭўтыт], etc.

Each Muslim sect, formulating for itself a complete doctrine on all points of dogma and practice, has had to make its decisions on the problem of prohibitions concerning food. In general the Kur'ânic prohibitions have been adhered to, but some have considered them to have only an allegorical significance or that an era was beginning in which there was no further justification for them. The extra-Kur'ânic prohibitions have been deliberately criticized in some circles. The consumption of dogs, habitual in the Saharan Maghrib, was regarded with indulgence by some jurists (cf. M. Canard, in Herestîrî, xxxix (1952), 298, n. 1; H. R. Idris, La Berbérie orientale ..., 592, 631). The Қaрматîs of Bahrayn allowed the meat of cats, dogs, donkeys, etc. to be sold, dogs to be fattened for the table and, at one time at least, seem to have permitted wine (De Goeje, Mémoire sur les Cermatîches du Bahrayn, Leiden 1886, 174 f.; cf., e.g., M. b. Malik al-Ҳamâdi, Kashf asrâr al-bûtînîyya, ed. M. Zâhîb, Cairo 1933, 133). But Ӆaatorial dogma follows the classical pattern of regulations concerning food, forbidding the flesh of carnivorous animals and birds of prey, that of the hyena and the fox, the mule and the donkey, disfranchising that of the lizard and the hedgehog, authorizing that of the hare and the horse (on condition that the latter should not be ritually slaughtered unless it is exhausted with fatigue) as well as that of locusts and fish with scales, both to be caught alive; condemning the eating of marrow, spleen, kidneys or the genital organs of animals, etc.; forbidding all fermented drinks and discursing the use of wine-vinegar (Қâdî Қumân, K. al-Ӣîtîsâr, ed. M. Wahid Mirza, Damascus 1957, 95-7). Al-Ҳâkim forbids in addition to this some plants: mulâkhiyya ("Jew's-mallow"), rashâd (cress or rocket), mutawakkhiyâ (a dish related to the turnips, because of their name or because they were liked by ҜAıha, Abû Bakr, Mutawakkil, etc. (S. de Sacy, Exposé de la religion des Druses, Paris 1838, i, CCCIX f.). As a further example we may mention the prohibition among the Yazidis of the chicken and the gazelle, of cauliflower and lettuce, accompanied by a tolerance towards the use of alcohol (R. Lescoat, Enquête sur les Yazidis de Syrie et du Djebel Sinjar, Beirut 1938, 76 f.). Among the Ңusayrîs are found in general at least those Muslim prohibitions which are very widespread (camel, eel, cat-fish), the prohibition of the hare, which is strictly Ҝifî, and, among the Shamsîyya, a tendency to interpret them in a rational way. Thus, at Maârîn and often among the Bedouin of Arabia, there are eaten crows and eagles, which are forbidden by the majority of the schools (A. Jaussen, Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab, Paris 1908, 67, n. 1; C. Doughty, Travels in Arabia Deserta, Cambridge 1888, i, 604). Rich Ottomans had sent to them by Christians (to celebrate Bayram) mussels, concealed under green cloth (Marie Sevadjian, L'amira, fr. fr. T. Macder, Paris 1927, 35 f.), etc.

In the category of religious prohibitions should be included those which the ascetics imposed on themselves, and which are now prescribed by the Law. Among these is abstinence from meat, which is an ancient practice (Goldscheider, Vorlesungen, 150, 152, Fr. tr. Le dogme et la loi de l'Islam, Paris 1920, 122, 124), probably adopted in order to rival the zeal of Christians, Manicheans, etc. (L. Massignon, Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, Paris 1954, 61), and which may have been reinforced by Hindu and Buddhist influence (for Abu 'l-Âlâ al-Maârî, see H. Laoust, in BEÔ, x (1943-4), 152). The dervish-orders too propagated various prohibitions, thus provoking the protests of the reformers (J. Jomier, Le commentaire coranique de Mandar, Paris 1954, 209).

It would be interesting to study the way in which the jubâh, the theologians, the mystics and the philosophers have attempted to justify the prohibitions concerning food. We cannot do it here, but it would merely mean that there has always existed a tendency to interpret them in a rational way. Thus al-Marghinâni points out that the aim of the prohibition is to preserve the nobility of the human body by preventing its being sullied through absorbing the substance of base animals (Hidîya, ms. Paris ar. 6763, fol. 247v., tr. C. Hamilton, London 1791, iv, 74). This tendency has developed particularly in modern times, when the apologists lay especial
stress on the social advantages and the benefits to health of the prohibition of wine (e.g., J. Jomier, Le commentaire coranique du Mandr, Paris 1954, 209 f., and above, col. 1069 a.) Then Ibn 'Abbas recited the Kur'an, VI, 146/145" (Abū Dāwūd, xxvi, 30; cf. M. Rodinson, in Trudi fiqh al-lugha, Thāminatione, 1, Moscow 1962, 362-6). The mystics favour rather alibi, c Fikh al-lugha, Tha
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of dishes of varying flavours. It was introduced in Cordova in the 3rd/4th century by the Baghdadl Ziryab (E. Lévi-Provençal, Hist. Esp. mus., i, 571). This arrangement seems to have been less generally adopted in the East than in the West.

It is natural that some preferences and abstentions which have a national or religious origin or are the result of an arbitrary social tradition should sometimes be justified also by aesthetic arguments. The preferring of mutton to beef is perhaps an example of this.

Aesthetic considerations which have nothing to do with taste are also important. Among them is the visual appeal of dishes, to which there are many references in the mediaeval culinary treatises. Great care is always taken over how a dish is served, and saffron, for example, is often used more for its "rich" golden colour than for its flavour. Also with the aim of delighting or surprising the beholder there were evolved an increasing number of the "disguises" (to use a term from ancient cookery) which were so popular also in Europe in the Middle Ages.

Hence dishes with such significant names as musawwar(a) "counterfeited", maynâ "artificial", etc., and recipes such as those for "mock brain" or omelette in a bottle (M. Rodinson, Recherches ..., 157 f.), or the dish composed of 5 animals each inside the other which was devised for Abu l-Ula, the governor of Ceuta and brother of the Almohad caliph Yusuf I (A. Huici Miranda, in Revista del Instituto de Estudios Islámicos en Madrid, v (1957), 140, 142, n. 3). Nowadays, on the contrary, names of this sort are given rather to economical dishes which are imitations of the more luxurious ones (e.g., Turkish yalanç dolma). But attention is always paid to the appearance of a dish, so that even one so common as purée of chick-peas (hummus be'dhime), a specialty of Damascus, is always decorated with powdered red pepper, whole chick-peas, etc.

The systematic discrimination of the foods with the pleasantest taste, the drawing up of the rules which govern this according to increasingly subtle criteria, and the search for the most delicious combinations of food, formed the preoccupations not only of head cooks but of a whole distinguished circle of gourmets and gastronomes. Gastronomy was especially esteemed in the 'Abbasid period, hence the gastronomical gatherings organized by several of the caliphs (cf. H. Zayyât, al-Khizâna al-gharbiyya, iv, 4 ff.). Gourmets at the highest level of the social hierarchy took pleasure in preparing and in inventing dishes which were often called by their names (cf. M. Rodinson, Recherches ..., passim and, for the Muslim West, A. Huici Miranda, op. cit., 138 ff.). The abundance and the popularity of their writings on this subject were already arousing the anger of Sâlih b. 'Abd al-Kudôd (d. 167/783); Goldziher, Transactions of the 9th International Congress of Orientalists, London 1893, ii, 104 ff.; they wrote especially many treatises on cookery (Fikrist, 317, l. 6-10; cf. M. Rodinson, Recherches ..., 100 ff.) which are now unfortunately lost; poems were composed to celebrate certain dishes (op. cit., 112). The interest of the 'Abbasid upper classes has left its trace in the names of dishes created by its most eminent members, for example the 'ibrâhîmiyya, which is named after the prince (at one time anti-caliph) Ibrâhîm b. al-Mahdî. Within the Muslim world, gastronomy, although later less widespread and certainly less paraded because of the growth of puritanism, nevertheless always had its adherents and its poets (cf. Rodinson, op. cit., passim).

Bibliography: In the article. For the manuscript works on cooking mentioned (especially the Wusla ila 'l-habb), see M. Rodinson, Recherches sur les documents arabes relatifs à la cuisine, in REI, 15, 1943, passim; Rodinson, 175, 1943.

Banû Ghifar b. Mulayk b. Đamra b. Bake b. 'Abd Manât b. Khinana, a small Arab tribe, being a subdivision of the Banû Đamra b. Bake, who in their turn formed a branch of the Khinana. The Ghifar lived in the Hijaz between Mecca and Medina; some of their abodes are mentioned by the geographers. Very little is known of their history in pre-Islamic times: one of their members is mentioned (Aghdani, xix, 74, 5) in the brawls preceding the Fidjar-war [q.v.]. A quarrel between the Ghifar and the Banû Tâlîbâ b. Sa'd b. Dhubayân is referred to in a poem quoted by Yâkût, Muđdam, ii, 202 f. A woman of the Ghifar was wife to the poet 'Urwa b. al-Ward al-Abîl (Ibn Hishâm, 653 f.). A confederacy (bif) between them and the Banû Mallik of Khinana is mentioned in 'Aghdani, xi, 126 ff. Living as they did in the neighbourhood of Medina it was essential to the Prophet that they should not take sides with the Kûryaš; he therefore guaranteed them in one of his letters the protection (ghimma) of Allâh and His messenger for their lives and goods (Ibn Sa'd, 1, 2, 26 f.). In this treaty Muhammad did not insist on their conversion; but by 8/690 they had embraced Islam and took part in the conquest of Mecca. Some of them had settled at Medina, e.g., Abû Dharr [q.v.] and his nephew 'Abd Allâh b. al-Sâmî; Sibâ' b. 'Urfaša as well as Abû Ruhm are even said to have been left by the Prophet as his representatives in Medina during some of his expeditions (Ibn Hishâm 668, 810, 896, 966).

After the Prophet's death the Banû Ghifar did not join in the revolt (ridda), nor were their deeds outstanding in the time of the conquests (jâhîd). We hear of the quarter (khifta) they had in Fustât, when 'Amr b. al-As conquered Egypt in 20/641 (Yâkût, Muđdam, ii, 745).

In 45/665 Ḥakam b. 'Amr, a younger Companion of the Prophet (see Ibn Ḥaḍâr, Isbâb, s.v.), was appointed to the governorship of Khurâsân; he died at Marw in 17/671. He was called al-Ghifâr, though his ancestor was not Ghifar, but the latter's brother Nu'sâyla, whose descendants being few in number had affiliated themselves to the Banû Ghifar (Tabâri, ii, 80 f., 84 f., 109-11).

Bibliography: Indexes to Ibn Hishâm; Wâṣâdi (transl. by Weilhausen); Tabâri; Yâkût, Muđdam; Aghdani, Tables; Wüstenfeld, Genealogische Tabellen, N 13, index 172; W. M. Watt, Muḥammad at Mecca; idem, Muḥammad at Medina (indexes). For Ghifar in the tradition see Wensink, Concordance, iv, 539, 42-6.

(G. W. F曦C)

GHILZAY [see GAJALAY].

GHINA' (a), song, singing. This is the specific meaning of the word, although it stands for music in its generic sense, an interpretation accepted by the Tkhâwân al-Sâfâ' (16/18th century) who say (Bombay ed., i, 87): "mâsîkît is ghînâ', and the māsîkîr is the mughannî" (see R. Payne-Smith, Thes. Syr., 977, s.v. hedhrula). The origin and development of the song must be traced through the folk. From a musical point of view there is no difference between the simple chant of the farâb and the artless song of the sakkâ (water-carrier), or between the elaborate cantillation of the mūsâ'īdât (caller to prayer) and the highly festooned vocal work of the professional
mughanni (singer). In some lands ghinda is classified according to the structure of the music whether classical or popular, whilst in other lands it is grouped according to the class of the music used. In Morocco the song is divided into folk song or popular song called hartha (natural talent), and the art song called ala (classical) or jan’a (art work). In Algeria it is grouped under kaldim al-hasli (profane song) and kaldim al-ididd (serious song).

The Dhahiliyya. Just as we see the double meaning of the Latin carmen (charm, song), so the Arabic labana and ghirta (from which we derive lahn (melody) and ghirr (poetry) have, in some of their pristine significance, the meaning of ‘be understood’ in the cryptic sense. Perhaps the huda (caramel driver’s) song was, at first, a ‘charm’ against the djinn (genii) of the desert. The huda’i hidda was not confined to the caramel driver. The toil or industrial song was to be found on every hand. Indeed we read of the Arabs of old singing at toll for their Assyrian taskmasters. That dominating factor of repetition not only relieved the monotony of work but it regulated the water carrier, the boatman, the weaver, the gleaner, and even the water of the tent or household song at work just as they do today. Al-Mas’udi avers that the huda was developed out of the labana (lament) of the women. Out of this came the nasb (elegy) and the nasb (secular song) which found expression on all occasions of joy, and would include wedding songs, children’s songs and lullabies.

We know nothing of the verse or music of these early folk songs, any more than we know the character of those mentioned in Exodus, XV, 21 or Numbers, XXI, 17, although the names of some singers have been preserved. Al-Djawhari (d. 396/1002) and Ibn Sida (d. 458/1066) reaffirm that the nasb was peculiar to the Arabs but was no more than a refined huda’, and al-Ghazzali (d. 505/1111) says that its measure (nasb) was based on the prosody (tartil) of the verse. Probably much of pre-Islamic poetry was sung, as Brochelmann suggested. Only by this means could full justice be done to the poetic language. It was not a mere guess which prompted St. Guyard and Landberg to suggest that Arabic prosody was based on musical principles. That verse was originally in the colloquial may be accepted, hence the term labana came to imply the colloquial. Certainly the folk song is partly responsible for perpetuating corruptations in speech, and both melody and measure are sovereign perpetuators, as we see in the mughan of Morocco. The melodic framework of folk song is quite simple, a solitary musical phrase being the general rule, and that is repeated with each bayt (verse) or even each mihrd (hemistich). The compass is generally tetrachordal or pentachordal, although even two notes might carry the limit of a toll song. Adornments (laqsin) of the melody by means of grace-notes—always the mark of ability in the professional mughanni (singer)—is rarely indulged in by the folk. Three types of ghinda are practised—

- the solo, chorus, and antiphon. Both the measured (mihr al-khir) and unmeasured (ghyur mawzin) are in use. The former is called the nasb, inshad, unshida, and the latter the tariji.

Needless to say the art song existed with the baynnda, dalqinat, mughanita, or barinda (professional singing-girls) of the tribes, wine shops, and private families, the term musmari, found in al-Ash’ah Maymün, being probably post-Islamic. History—or legend— mentions these singing-girls among the old Banu ‘Amalik (see al-Tabari, i, 231; al-Mas’udi, Muradi, iii, 296), and certainly the himis was known to ancient Assyria. That all played a prominent part in social life is evident from the story of the Prophet Muhammad himself. Lyall, in his Mufaddalishiyat (XXVI, 87), opines that these baynda were ‘all foreigners’ and that they sang ‘probably to foreign airs’, but he gives no evidence; whilst the statement of von Kremer that they did not even sing in Arabic is likewise unacceptable. That some of them came from Persia, or more likely, al-Hira, and even Byzantium, and that some of their songs were sung in an alien tongue is quite admissible, but we know that some came from Mecca. Al-Nābiha the poet was corrected by a bayna for using faulty rhymes (iwm). That one—at least—was scarcely a foreigner (Aghani, ix, 164; xvi, 15). Most of the great pagan poets were entranced by those singing-girls, and among them Bishr b. ‘Amr, al-Ash’ah Maymün b. Kays, and ‘Abd Vaghfū. Even Tarafa, Labīd, and ‘Abd al-Mas‘i were overjoyed to hearken to the djuhan (harp) and tariji (refrain) of the tavern bayna. Perron says that before Islim, ‘music was little else than unpretentious psalm-singing (taranorum), varied and embroidered by the singer’. Everyone sang in unison or octave, harmony—in our sense of the term—being unknown. What took its place was what the Arabs called kād (rhythm) supplied by a ḥadī (rhythmic wand), duf or mishar (tambourines), or, failing the latter, a ḥirbāl (a parchment-bottom sieve). Every singer decorated her melody with vocal ornaments (sawd). ‘Tarafa reveals how the song began on a low note, whilst another describes a singer who ‘prolonged the final vowels with a high trill (tufdir)’ and clearly enunciated the syllables in the tartil fashion.

Under Islām. At the birth of Islam there was no opposition to singing, since even the Prophet Muhammad himself had joined in the toll-song at the digging of the trenches at Mecca, yet the four Orthodox Caliphs are reported to have been more— or less—in opposition to any indulgence in listening (al-samād) to singing or any music. As a result, the rigid school of religious law in ancient Assyria, and that, more accommodating, of Madina, allowed singing, and a whole library of literature—both for and against—came into existence on al-samād. Indeed a legal fiction arose which argued that the cantillation (taṣbīr) of the Kurān was not the same as singing, as we read in Ibn Khaldūn. Yet, as Ibn Kutayba pointed out, the rule and practice of cantillation and singing were identical; and—as we read in the ‘Jd of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīh—if the artistic song was illegal, so was the chanting of the Kurgan. Human nature, being what it is, could not accept the bigoted ruling of the pious, and so there arose, in addition to the privately owned bayna or singing-girl, the professional musician (mughanni), the first recorded being Tuways (10/632-92/711). He, and a mughaninya named ‘Aziz al-Mayād (10/632), are said to have introduced a new type of song called the ghinda al-muθab (artistic song) or ghinda al-rabīk (graceful song). According to Ibn al-Kalbi, ‘the ghinda is of three kinds—

1. the nasb, which was the song of the riders (ghinda al-rudabīn) and the singing-girls (kaynā); (2) the sinād, which had a slow refrain (tarjīs), but was full of notes (naghmād); and (3) the kusarī which was quick (kafirī). Yet a new element had arisen, called ‘alr (rhythm), which was distinct from ‘araḍ (metre), and was external because it was supplied by tafsīb (handclapping), or...
a pulsatile instrument such as the ḥabd (wand), ḏuff, mishar, or ḡhirāb (tambourine). All the aswdt (songs) contained in the Kitāb al-ʿAḏghīn are in the ḥabd (wand) or ḏuff (fiddle) forms. All the aswdt (songs) were made by Yūnus al-ʿAṭbī (d. c. 1487/1565), Ibn Djamī (d. c. 1873/1893), Yahya al-Makki (d. c. 205/819), Ḥishāk al-Mawṣīlī (d. c. 235/850), Ḥasan b. Mūṣā al-ʿAṣīrī (d. c. 245/850), Ibn Bāna (v.r.) or Bānata (d. c. 278/892), and al-Wazīr al-Maghribī (d. c. 417/1026). Later new popular forms of songs appeared such as the muwāṣṣāt, sadīq, manāwī, būnaq, ḍāḥānīn. Indeed the first named were lifted to a premier position by Muslim Spain. Alas! not a note has been preserved. All that we know of the songs in the Kitāb al-ʿAḏghīn of al-ʿIṣfāhānī, is the name of the tonal mode (tashīʿ) and rhythmic mode (darb) in which they were sung. It is not until the time of ʿṣāfī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Muʿmin (d. 693/1294) that we get a notation—or rather a tablature—of a song in Arabic books on music, whilst ʿAbd al-Kādir b. Ghaythī (d. 836/1435) is the earliest of the Persians to use a notation or tablature for a song. In the 8th/14th-9th/15th centuries three definite types of vocal music were recognized—the naṣīq, the ṣawī, and what was contained in the nawba, the latter being a vocal and instrumental suite of pieces. The naṣīq comprised two parts, the first being an un-rhythmic setting of two verses called the naṣīq al-ṣawī. The latter is complete in itself, i.e., it contains a compact phonic, rhythmic, and melodic setting called the naṣm al-naḥḥāmī. The ṣawī was a ṣawī in one of the ʿṭalā rhythms. All singing in the Islamic East is basically homophonic, i.e., purely melodic. Harmony, in our connotation of the term, is unknown. The greater part of the Islamic East conceives music horizontally, whereas Europe views it vertically. All melody is modal. In the days of Ibn Muḥirīz (d. c. 961/1551) there were but eight modes, but with the later impingement of Iranian culture there were eighteen or more. These were originally called asāṣī (fingers), but later were named nāḥmāt (notes), māḥkāmāt (places), or ṣawī (natures), the latter term revealing the belief in the innate character of a particular mode. Then there are the melodic or patterns in the melody, some being both in 2nd and 4th antiquity. As every verse is complete in itself, i.e., it contains a compact thought, it originally consisted of the same melodic phrase, but from the time of Ibn Muḥirīz (d. c. 961/ 715) the second verse was set to a different melody. These factors do not imply monotony, because the singer varies her or his rendition of the melody differently by means of ornaments (raʿād, fākhdīn or ṣawīwāt). For vocalizing these latter, special syllables are introduced such as ah, yā, and lā, when the more conventional yā layli or tīr tār do not suffice. These occur in various places, viz., in the bosom of a word, and the end of a phrase, or the close of a hemistich, verse, or song, and in the last position it is called ʿuqūl (work). Of course in the folk or toll songs none of the above artifices occur, although some chants of the pearl fishers off the Bahrain coast reveal something of the sort. It is highly probable that the metric melodies (nāḥmāt al-būḥīr), which are still used in North Africa to probe the scansion of verse, may be survivals of many of the old types of songs, even as far back as the days of early Islam.

GHIYAR (Arabic: distinguishing, distinction, cognition) is a term denoting the compulsory distinctive mark in the garb of dhimmis (q.v.) subjects under Muslim rule. It is considered probable that the ghiyar became the prototype of the Jewish badge in Christian Europe.

In Islamic lands it was part and parcel of the dispositions concerning the status of the dhimmis which can be traced back to the time of Mutawakkil's enactments (233/849), but had been known even earlier; thus under Harun al-Rashid they were stipulated colour (red, blue, yellow) placed over the garment which bears the mark. Both the wider connotation and indeed the garment itself the badge of the Jew. On the other hand, in various sources the word denotes any kind of garb distinction imposed upon dhimmis, and indeed the garment which bears the mark. Both the wider connotation and the narrower seem well attested. Thus the zuwar (a special belt) of the Christians often comes down as the badge of the Jew. In the Maghrib the name ghiyar occurs for the distinctive mark in the garb of dhimmis.

The Tâfiq mentions that some considered it the badge of the Jew. On the other hand, in various sources the word denotes any kind of garb distinction imposed upon dhimmis, and indeed the garment which bears the mark. Both the wider connotation and the narrower seem well attested. Thus the zuwar (a special belt) of the Christians often comes down as the badge of the Jew. In the Maghrib the name ghiyar occurs for the distinctive mark in the garb of dhimmis.
GHIYAR — GHIYATH AL-DIN TUGHLUK I

GHIYATH AL-DIN [see dihil SULTANATE, KAY-KHUSRAW, MUHAMMAD].

GHIYATH AL-DIN NAKKASH, Timurid courtier. If he was an artist, as the name indicates (naksh = painter, etc.), his speciality is unknown. He was a protegé of Bâysonghor, etc., the gifted son of Shâh Rukh, and was attached by his patron to the Timurid embassy to China in 823/1420-825/1422, with the special duty of drawing up a day-to-day descriptive account of the embassy. This report of the journey from Harât to Khânbâliq (Pekin) and back, giving first-hand information about China is not to be found elsewhere, at one time consigned to the archive of the Zudbat al-tauârikh of Hâjî Abru, the Mâtia' al-sa'dayn of 'Abd al-Razzâk al-Samarkandî, etc. On the 15th century Turkish translation, called Aqâ'ib al-latâ'ij, by Kücük Celebizade, see Babinger 293-4.

Bibliography: E. Quatremère, Notices et extraits, xiv, 1, 1843, 308 ff., 367 ff. (Persian text and Fr. tr. of the version of 'Abd al-Razzâk al-Samarkandî); M. Shafl, Oriental College Magazine, vii, 1 (Lahore Nov. 1930), 1-66 (Persian text, with notes, of the version of Hâjî Abru); K. M. Maitra, A Persian Embassy to China; being an extract from Zudbatâ'it Tawarih of Hajî Abru, Lahore 1934; D. M. Dunlop, Hâtish-i Abrâ's Version of the Timurid Embassy to China in A.D. 1420, in Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions, xiv, 1946, 158 (Persian); D. M. Dunlop.

GHIYATH AL-DIN TUGHLUK I (Ghâzî Malik), founder of the Tugluq dynasty and ruler of India from 720/1320 to 725/1325, was by origin a Karawân Turk and an immigrant from Shâh Rukh, who took service under the Khalîjis. In 705/1305 he was appointed governor of Dipâlpur in the Punjâb, and as warden of the marches he held the Mongols at bay for fifteen years, conducting annual raids against them in the Kâbul and Ghaznîa areas. The prestige thus gained was his main asset when he rose against Khusraw Khân, a Khalîji general of low-caste Hindu Parâwâr origin, who had massacred the last Khalîji ruler, Kûtib al-Din Mubârâk (726/1326-720/1320) and all the Khalîji princes, seized the throne, apostatized from Islam and begun a reign of terror in Dihîl. Most of the Muslim governors had accepted Khusraw Khân's rule passively, probably owing to the lack of reliable intelligence from Dihîl. Ghâzî Malik addressed his da'wâ' of dâhikâ to only six governors of western India, of whom one joined him, two who refused to join were murdered by their own troops, while another who promised to help was restored to authority by his formerly rebellious troops. The Tugluq revolution was therefore the work of the rank and file of the Muslim army, rather than of the Muslim ruling elite. Three decisive victories ending in the capture and execution of Khusraw Khân left Ghâzî Malik the undisputed master of the Sultanate. Despite his refusal, he was raised to the throne by the idgâh of the nobles, as the defender and restorer of Islamic power in India against the double challenge of Mongol threat and Hindu subversion. He assumed the title Ghiyath al-Din.

Contemporary Muslim historiography eulogises him as the saviour of Islam in India, and Barânî presents him as the ideal sultan who combined a heroic rôle-personal virtues of continence, chastity and piety. The hagiographical tradition is much less complimentary owing to the Sultan's differences with the Chîshîtî mystic Niżâm al-Din Awlîyâ on two points: acceptance by the latter of a large gift of money from Khusraw Khân, which he was unable to restore to the treasury when called upon; and the practice of the Chîshîyya (q.v.) to listen to music (sâma') To settle the second point the Sultan convened a great congress of 'âlamî and Şûfîs, and finally imposed some restriction on the sâma' of the heterodox Şûfîs, without interfering with the practices of the Chîshîtî leader. Anecdotes of subsequent bitterness seem to be later apocryphal legends connected with the death of Ghiyath al-Din which found their way from later hagiographical writings like those of Ŝâmîlî to the serious historical works of Firîshât and others; they are not traceable either in contemporary chronicles or near-contemporary hagiographies like Hamîd Kalandar's Khâyr al-majâlis.

Administratively Ghiyath al-Din's first problem was to restore the economy of the state after its upheaval and thorough fiscal chaos under Khusraw Khân. He had to resort to a policy of confiscation of dâjâirs granted by his reckless predecessors, and to the more unpopular measures of appropriating land-grants and army pensions (İsâmî, 389-91). His taxation policy, which affected mainly the Hindu agricultural and land-owning classes, was to strike a via media, denying them opportunities of accumulation of wealth which might lead to rebellion, but granting them security of subsistence to enable them to pursue their husbandry; between 722/1322 and 723/1323, consolidation and expansion of the Sultanate was effected by this son Diawân Khân (also known as Ulûg Khân, later Sultan Muhammad b. Tugluq (q.v.)), who re-subjugated the rebellious Kakâtyâ radja Prâtaparavurava II of Warangal after an initial reverse; annexed the Pândyâ Hindu kingdom of Madura (Ma'bar); invaded Dwâdînagar and made incursions into the independent Hindu principality of Orissa. Ghiyath al-Din personally led an expedition intervening in the civil war in Bengal, which was partly annexed to the Sultanate and partly placed under a vassal ruler Nâşîr al-Dîn. During his five years' rule Ghiyath al-Din had thus consolidated the sultanate and extended its borders considerably beyond the Khalîji frontiers.

On his way back from Bengal in 725/1325 Ghiyath al-Din was crushed to death under the roof of a wooden pavilion constructed hastily upon the orders of his son Diawân Khân, which collapsed during an elephant parade after a banquet. Diawân has been accused of parricide by two near-contemporary chroniclers, Ibn Bâttûtâ and İsâmî, both with strong prejudices against him. Other historians of the age, Barânî and İyâbî b. Âhmâd Sarhanî, make no such accusation. Sir W. L. Haig's theory of the assassination of Sûfîs in this alleged intrigue seems to be far-fetched.
GHIYAH AL-DIN TUGHLUK I — GHUDJDUWAN


GHUBAR [see ḤISĀḤ, KHAṬṬ].

GHUBRIN, nisba of the B. ʿGhurbīn, a branch of the Ṭawwāb Berwās who formerly inhabited the eastern end of Great Kabylia in Algeria (Ibn Khālid, Berbères, Index s.v. ʿGhurbīn) and who are still represented in the same area by the Ait Ghoubi (Brunschvig, Berbérie orientale, i, 436). Two ʿGhurbīnīs played a rôle in Ḥafṣīd history: (1) Abu ʿl-ʿAbbās ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh, b. 644/1246 at Bidjāya (Bougie) where he spent all his life and attained the rank of kābīr ‘l-kudādāt. In 704/1304 he was sent by the Ḥafṣīd ruler of Bougie, Abu ʿl-ʿBaṣk Kāḥīl, as an emissary to establish friendly relations with the rival Ḥafṣīd at Tunis, ʿAbd Allāh. On his return he was accused of treason and of having been implicated in the death of Abu ʿIsāḥ Ḥāwī (whom had been captured in ʿGhurbīnī territory 22 years previously) and was put to death. He wrote a collection of biographies of Bougiotes entitled ʿUmnān al-dīrāya . . . which was edited by ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Shāh (Mohammed Ben Cheneb) and published at Algiers in 1910.

Bibliography: Ibn Farhūn, Dībādī, Cairo 1352/1932, 80 (correct the date to 704); Nubāhī, Ta’rikh kudāt al-Andalus, 132; Ibn Khālid, Berbères, ii, 394, 418; Ben Cheneb, Iṣdāq, no. 354. (2) ʿAbd Mahdī ʿĪsā, who became kābīr ‘l-jamā‘a at Tunis in 787/1385 and died there about 813/1410.

Bibliography: Ibn Nāḍī, Maʿṣūmus al-īlm, Tunis 1406, ii, 40. (Azīz Ahmad)

GHUDUWAN (today Gidjduwan), a large village in the northeastern part of the oasis of Būkhārā, on the tributary of the Zarafshān River at present called Pirmas, formerly the Kharān Kūdā.

The origin of the village and etymology of the name are unknown. It is mentioned several times in the town of Rāmītān by Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Khālid (267/879), but no notices are found in other geographies. Al-Samʿānī (460/1069) says the village was six farsakhs from Būkhārā, and was an important commercial centre. It is mentioned several times in Islamic texts as the home of several learned men. A lieutenant of the heretic Muḥammad-ʿīnāmah came from there according to Nārāghāl (see below). Bābur in 918/1512 was defeated here by the ʿOzbekīs. Thereafter little is heard of the village although the citadel was the scene of fighting several times. At present the village is sixteen kilometres/10 miles from the railroad station of Kyzyl-Tepe and ca. 50 km/3o m. from Būkhārā.

GHIYAH AL-DIN TUGHLUK SHAH II IBN FATH KĀHAN IBN SULTĀN FIRDĀS SHĀH TUGHLUK [q.v.] (790/1385-791/1389) succeeded to his grandfather's throne according to his will, superseding a number of relatives. This led to the internecine dynastic wars which drove to the decline, and finally the overthrow of the Tugluq dynasty. The Sultan's inexperience, his love of pleasure and his tactlessness in imprisoning his own brother Sāḥīr Kāhān led to the revolt of his nephew Abu Bakr son of Zafar Kāhān, who defeated and killed him with the aid of the wāzir Rukn al-Dīn Canda. The reign of Ghiyāh al-Dīn Tugluq II marks the acceleration of chaos and civil strife in which the Delhi Sultanate rapidly disintegrated: a process which also marks the provincialization of Muslim culture in India during the 15th/16th century.

GHIYAH AL-DIN TUGHLUK IIBN AMR ALI AL-MUWALLAD, famous sūfī Ṣayyīd b. Ḥishām b. al-Muẓaffar b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ṣāliḥ, b. 643/1246 in Ghudjduwan (according to al-Samʿānī) or Ghudjduwan (according to Ūkūt). His father, whose name is sometimes written as Abu Bakr, was born in ʿGhurbīnī and lived at Malātāya (Melitene); he migrated from there to the vicinity of Būkhārā, where his son received his education. Certain writers trace his
ancestry to a royal dynasty of Rûm (Asia Minor); others consider him to be a descendant of the imām Mālik b. Anas and another source traces him back through ten generations to Abu ʿAmir al-Husayn b. Maslama al-Nakhrānī, a famous šīfī Shaykh who died in 424/1033; this seems inadmissible, since only 193 years separate the date of death of Kharākānī from that of the death of Ghuḍjduwānī (which appears the more exact) and during that time ten generations cannot be admitted; moreover Kharākānī lived in Khurasan (exact) and during that time ten generations cannot seem inadmissible, since only 193 years separate what is more correct because he twice mentions the date 600/1204 in his Risāla-i Ṣabībiyya, which is more, his successor in the tarība, Khādija Ahmad Siddīk, died in 657/1259, so that if Ghuḍjduwānī had died in 1259 his successor would have disappeared 80 or 82 years after him, which is hardly likely. He was buried in Ghuḍjduwānī.

He has left a work in Persian comprising: several quatrains, the Risāla-i tariqat, the Waṣīyyat-dīna (which was the subject of a commentary composed by Fadl Allah b. Rūzbihān Isfahānī, known under the title of Khādija Mawlānī, died after 921/1515), the Risāla-i Ṣabībiyya, eulogies of his master Yūsuf Hamadānī, a Dīkorī Khādija Muhammad Parsa, Faṣl al-Khāʿīb, Tashkent 1311, 518-20; The Naṣṣāfah al-Ins min Hadarāl-qods by Mawlānī Noor al-dīn Abī al-Khāliq, Dāhījī, Kāshān, 1329, 15-22; Cawnpore 1912, 18-27; Muhammad Murād b. ʿAbd Allāh Kāzānī, Tarjaman-i Ṣabībiyya, Mecca 1307, 25-23; Dārā Shakhū, ʿAyn al-ʿawānī, Bittern 159, 76; Amlān Ahmad Rāzī, Ṣabīl ilim, Tehran, iii, 425-3; Rīdā Kūrī Khān, Hidayat, Maṭbāʿ al-fusahd, Tehran 1329, 15-32; i, 1055; Said Naficy, Tarikh-i nazm wa nathr, Tehran 1342/1963, 110-1, 220, 252.

**GHUFRAN.** The Kurʾān contains none of the above terms, but the Prophet was aware of popular beliefs on the subject of the ghul, according to one ḥadīth he denied their existence, but some commentators consider that he denied only their ability to change shape, all the more because, according to another ḥadīth, he advised the repetition of the call to prayer.
as a way of escaping their evil deeds (cf. La, s.v.; al-Damlrl, s.v.). Hence it is not surprising that this belief survived in Islam to the point that al-Kazwlni, followed by al-Damlrl, does not hesitate to state that these beings are not uncommon in the thickets and reedy marshes and that if they can seize a man they play with him “like a cat with a mouse”.

However, the Mu'tazila, in the first place al-Dāḥibī, but also for example al-Zamākhshāri (commenting on Kur'an, XXXVII, 46), set out to demonstrate that this fabulous being did not exist. Al-Dāḥibī considers that the poets, in their vanity, have bolstered up the legend, for the interpretations, in which the imagination of the ruūdū has had a free rein, are based to a great extent on verses such as those of Taʾābbaṭa Shāriʿa who boasts of his familiarity with the saʿūlī or the ghiṭān which he met in the desert (cf. Ağhānī, xviii, 209 ff.). Al-Masʿūdī (Murūdī, iii, 314-22) devotes to the ghiṭān a whole chapter in which he tries to bring the discussion on a higher level; unable to deny their existence, for ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb himself is said to have seen and killed one (and other Companions too, see al-Kazwlni and al-Damlrl, s.v.), he reports a philosophical opinion—taken up later by al-Kazwlni—according to which the ghiṭān is a freak animal, naturally defective, which has strayed from all other orders of creation to rise from the deserts; he suggests also that these beings are the offspring of the constellation Perseus (Ḫūmīṯ raʾs al-ghiṭān) which, on rising, begets shapes and objects which are to be seen in deserts and even in inhabited regions.

In Berber lands, belief in ogres and other fabulous creatures is of great antiquity and manifests itself in a great many stories, where, however, they tend to be islamized (see Westermarch, Ritual and belief in Morocco, ii; E. Laoust, Des noms berbères du Maroc, 65; idem, Essai sur la lifi des Berberes, ii, 2 vols.; H. Basset, Cones berberes du Maroc, 65, and Mayer, Metalworkers, 14).

Every person of a certain rank in Arab Muslim society of the first centuries had in his service, sometimes in addition to free ghiṭām an, a number of ghiṭām of servile status whose exact origin is not usually indicated and who are usually distinguished from the eunuchs, khudam (see Khādīm) (as for example in the description of the household of the vizier al-Ṭārib under al-Muktafl, preserved in the Niğār of al-Tanḏūqī, ii, 159). Rulers owned an often impressive number of slave ghiṭām who served as attendants or guards and could rise to fairly high office in the hierarchy of the palace service, as well as others who formed a component of varying importance in the armed forces. It is with these latter ghiṭām and the role which they played in the running of various eastern and western Muslim states that this article is chiefly concerned.

1.—THE CALIPHATE

We find hardly any mention of ghiṭām at the court or in the palace of the Umayyad caliphs, but Slavs and Berbers who were or had been slaves are already found in the entourages of certain princes or in their armies (T. Lewicki, in Folia Orientalia, iv (1962), 319 ff.). Certainly from the time of the foundation of the “Round City” of Baghdād, there is no mention of the presence of ghiṭām in quarters inside the wall of the main fortification. But it is only under al-Muʿtaṣīm that the ghiṭām proper took their place in the history of the Muslim world, after the slave element, notably in the person of the famous eunuch Masrūr, had begun to play a rôle in the processes of government under Hārūn al-Raṣīl.

At the end of the reign of al-Maʿmūn, his brother, the future al-Muʿtaṣīm, had caused to be bought at Samarkand about three thousand Turkish slaves who were to form the nucleus of the new guard of the caliph and of the new army. The constitution of this guard is said to have been the cause of the transfer of the capital to Sāmarrā in 221/836, although there must also have been other causes, connected with the policy followed by the caliph at that time. To the Turks recruited in Transoxania were added various slaves, also Turkish, who were in the service of certain dignitaries of Baghdād and who, according to al-Yaʿṣūbī, were bought by the caliph. The new militia thus grew rapidly and, at Sāmarrā, the Turkish ghiṭām were housed in special quarters, away from the Arab or Arabicized population, and obliged to take for wives young slaves of the same origin as themselves from whom they were never allowed to separate. They were divided into several groups under the command of leaders such as Aṣḥān, Wāṣfī and Aṣḥān who were themselves

GHULAM (A., pl. ghiṭām), word meaning in Arabic a young man or boy (the word is used for example of the ʿAbdāl princes al-Muʿtazz and al-Muʾayyad, sons of al-Maʿmūn, but not necessarily, a slave servant (on this use see Aṣḥān); or a bodyguard, slave or freedman, bound to his master by personal ties; or finally sometimes an artisan working in the workshop of a master whose name he used along with his own in his signature (cf. D. S. Rice, in BSOAS, xv (1963), 67, and Mayer, Metalworkers, 14).
freedmen, and whose duty it was to lead their troops when on campaign.

What was the reason for the establishment of this force of slaves? What was its importance? It was not supplant not only the earlier Arab contingents but also the Khurṣānī troops who had appeared with the 'Abbāsid dynasty and who, not long before, had effectively supported al-Ḥārūn? It was almost certainly the anxiety of the Abbasid dynasty about the possibility of the eunuch freedman Dājdhar [q.v.], also a Slav, who was the right hand man of the caliph al-Muqāziz, are well known by enabling it to rely on forces free from all local attachments. In fact, these ghilmān, whose numbers grew rapidly to several tens of thousands (20,000 or 70,000 according to the estimates of Arabic writers), did not remain aloof from partisan struggles; their appearance, though it caused profound changes in the functioning of the political régime, did not make the caliphate any more stable.

It was not long before their commanders, usually freedmen, who enjoyed the unconditional loyalty of their troops, began to occupy important positions, either as governors in the provinces, or at the court where they ended by interfering in affairs of government and in the problems of the succession to the caliphate. It was some of these officers who assassinated the caliph al-Mutawakkil in 247/861 and, during the following years, their disputes were the basic cause of the dynastic troubles which constantly recurred until the reign of al-Muwaffak and then his son al-Mu'tādīd succeeded in imposing their authority on the solideri. Meanwhile there were numerous quarrels between these Turkish officers and the representatives of the secretarial class which they tried to dominate.

Although the situation appears calmer during the reign of al-Mu'tāṣid (279-89/892-902), the military chiefs still belonged to the new aristocracy formed by the descendants of the first ghilmān; thus Bārī, who was the caliph's supreme general and was often given the title of ghūlām—in the broadest sense—of the Caliph, was the son of a freedman of al-Mutawakkil. The regiments of ghilmān, whose importance had grown during the war against the Ẓanī, were at this time very numerous. Each regiment bore the name of the commander officer who commanded it (thus the Buğārīya was no doubt called after the name of an officer of al-Mutawakkil, Buğār al-Ṣāfārī [q.v.] and the Nāṣirīya after that of the regent al-Muwaffak al-Nāṣir li-dīn Allāh), though this name did not indicate with any certainty in whose service they actually were. Among these ghilmān of the army of the caliph, those of which we know most, thanks to the list of the court expenses preserved by Ḥīlāl al-Sāfī (K. al-Wusārā, 11-18), are the ones who formed the various detachments of the guard. There was first of all a group of former slaves of varying origins, white such as Daylamis and Berbers, or black such as Nubians and former Zandī prisoners taken by al-Muwaffak during the preceding reign, who were employed to form a line of troops (masāf) in the reception rooms and who were probably the origin of the corps of the Maṣā'īfīya mentioned below. There were also others bought especially by al-Mu'tāṣid to be on duty in the "halls" (buqjar) of the Palace, from which they took their name (al-Buqjarīya), and placed under the command of eunuchs called ustādāh; to these were later added an elite of soldiers chosen from among the various detachments. In addition to these the personal guard of the caliph was made up of freedmen of al-Muwaffak, called al-ghilmān al-ḥāṣaṣa.

During the reign of al-Muqāzīd (295-320/908-32), these corps of ghilmān, the respective size and importance of which it is difficult to assess (we know that only the Maṣā'īfīya, who were under the command of the Chamberlain, numbered 10,000), commanded by leaders who were often rivals, once again influenced political events and the palace intrigues. Thus in the two abortive coups d'état of 296/908 and 317/929 against the caliph, the guards played a decisive rôle and, in 317/929, it was the Maṣā'īfīya who forced al-Kāhir to flee. In addition, the demands of the ghilmān, on whom in large measure the fate of the caliphate depended (in the capital as well as in the provinces where they were often sent as reinforcements), gave rise to financial difficulties and several times they procured the removal from the vizierate of figures such as 'Ali b. ʿĪsā, who tried to restore financial order by making cuts in this expenditure. The interference of the ghilmān in political affairs led to the elimination of one regiment after another. The Maṣā'īfīya were massacred in 318/930, then the Sādāqīya (on the origin of the name, see M. Canard, tr. of al-Suli, Aḥḥār ar-Raddī, i. 49 n. 3) were imprisoned in 324/936 by the amīr al-umārī Ibn Rābiʿ, who shortly afterwards had the Ḥudjariyya exterminated in order to deprive the caliph of all power.

By this time the caliph had lost practically all control over the regiments of ghilmān. At Baghdād their commanders no longer respected his authority. Furthermore, persons such as the viziers were in a position to form in due course for themselves personal bodyguards capable eventually of repulsing the troops of the caliph. The provincial governors, who more and more often combined military and fiscal functions, for their part maintained troops who were completely loyal to them. Thus certain governors went so far, with the aid of their own regiments, as to seize effective power for themselves, and a number of them forced the caliph to recognize them as amīr al-umārī; after several years they were replaced by the famous Buwayhid amīrs, whose Daylam contingents were from then on installed in the palace of the amīr side by side with the Turkish ghilmān who were still used.

In the western provinces it was the same development that had already given rise to local attempts to attain autonomy from the second half of the 3rd/9th century onwards. Thus ʿAbdād b. Ṭūlān [q.v.], who in Egypt achieved a large measure of independence from the central government and managed to establish a short-lived dynasty there, was the son of a slave bought at Buğārā under al-Maʾmūn. Similarly al-Ikhshīdī [q.v.], who was later to repeat this success in the same country, was the descendant of a Turk who came to Sāmārā under al-Muʿṭasīm. The ephemeral dynasties thus formed themselves formed slave armies. The army of Ibn Ṭūlān is said to have included 24,000 Turkish and 42,000 black slaves in addition to the smaller number of free soldiers; al-Ikhshīdī also had a large slave army, and had as minister, as regent for his sons and ultimately as successor, the famous black slave Kafur [q.v.].

The tradition continued in Fāṭimid Egypt. There were at the Palace, as retainers holding more or less honorific offices and as guards, black or white slaves, some eunuchs and some not, most of the former originating from the Sudan and the latter from the Slav countries. The rôles of Diwārī [q.v.], who was a freedman of Slav origin, and of the eunuch freedman Diwārī [q.v.], also a Slav, who was the right hand man of the caliph al-ʿUmrī, are well...
known. Later Turkish and Daylami units were added. (On the rivalries between the different ethnic groups see FATIMIDS, 858.)

A little later, the Saldjukids, who were not of slave origin, but employed slaves of various origins for their personal bodyguard, such as those who assassinated Zangâd q.v.), but their army does not seem to have been based on the recruitment of slaves. On the other hand, their successors the Ayyûbid, who were the descendants of a Kurdish officer, recruited Turkish slaves along with the Kurdish contingents, and the former slaves who were finally to found the first regime in which the power was officially wielded by the slave militi, that of the Mamlûks q.v.

In Muslim Spain, the slave element of European origin had also played an important rôle both in the army and in the palace service. The freedmen, usually called fud'ûn [see FATÁ], but also ghilmân as in the East, came to control the main governmental offices and even to found, as the Umayyad state disappeared, small local dynasties [see AL-ANDALUS, 495].

In the Maghrib the name ghulâm does not seem to have been in current use for the slave mercenaries, and although the rulers of the Maghrib had almost all had, since the Aghlabid period, black bodyguards (the members of which are generally called 'abdâd) and employed, in proportions which varied and which are difficult to ascertain, slave mercenaries of diverse origins, often Europeans, the slave militias never had in this region the importance which they had in the East. See further DÂYIH, MAMLŪK.

Bibliography: There is no thorough study of the subject. General information is given in R. Levy, The social structure of Islam, London 1958, 416-51 passim. On the situation at Sâmarra and at Baghdad under the Achaemenids, Seleucids, Arsacids and Sasanids, it was essentially for temple service, for state purposes like building or for domestic duties. At no time in the pre-Islamic period does slavery seem to have been as widespread in the Persian world as in other parts of the Middle East (R. N. Frye, The heritage of Persia, London 1963, 152-3). Military organization under all the historic pre-Islamic dynasties of Persia was based on the classes of greater nobility and lesser nobility or gentry (vuturgân and da'âghân in Sasanid terminology), and the free cavalryman was the backbone of the army. Within the army there was usually an elite body surrounding the Emperor, the Achaemenid "corps of immortals" or the Sasanid gyûn-avespar "those who sacrifice their lives", but there is no indication that these were anything but freemen and probably they were sons of the nobility (cf. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, 206 ff., 368). Any slaves in these armies can only have been employed in the little-regarded infantry rump, which was basically a rabble of conscripted peasants.

The carrying of Arab arms beyond the borders of Armenia and Persia opened up vast reservoirs of slave labour from the South Russian, Central Asian and northern Indian worlds. In particular, the Turks early acquired the reputation of being fierce fighters, skilled riders and archers, who because of their nomadic way of life in the basins of the Euphrates, Tigris, and the rivers of the Eurasian steppes were inured to danger and discomfort (cf. Dâhî, Risâlah fi manâkıb al-Turk, tr. C. T. Harley-Walker, JRAS, 1915, 631-97, analysed by F. Gabrieli, RSO, xxxii (1957), 477-83). Turkish prisoners-of-war began to fall into the hands of the Arab governors of Armenia and Khurâsân, and it is with the military use of these captives—a writer of the 5th/11th century, Ibn Hassâil, emphasizes that the Turks are too proud a race to make good domestic slaves—that the institution of the ghulâm in Persia begins. The Tâhirid governors of Khurâsân forwarded to the 'Abbâsid caliph in Baghdad Turkish slaves for use in the Caliphal palace guard. Whilst details of the Tâhirids' own use of ghulâms are lacking, their example here must have been decisive for succeeding dynasties in Persia.

The spread of military slavery in Persia also reflects the growing economic and commercial prosperity of the land during the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries, for this enabled rulers to pay professional, slave armies rather than to rely on the Arab elements settled in the garrison towns or on local Persian troops. The advantage of slave troops lay in their lack of loyalty to any owners but their master and the fact that they had no material stake in the country of their adoption. Such ties were deliberately avoided

by the most strictly professional of slave commanders: the Sámanid ghulám general Karátigin Isfídjabí (d. 317/929) laid down that "a soldier must be able to take with him everything which he possesses wherever he may go, and nothing must hold him back" (Ibn al-Áfír, viii, 157).

Juridically, the slave soldier belonged to his master and was heritable property like any other chattel. In practice, personal loyalties and attachments were usually taken into account. When in the middle of the 9th/16th century the Saffárid Amr of Sástán, Ábd b. Áhmad ʻUsáýn b. ʻAbd, died, his ghuláms should have pushed to his successor ʻAbd al-Áhmad b. Áhmad, but the latter gave them the choice of entering his own service or of seeking independent careers; in fact, they elected to stay with Khálaš, and he assigned them houses, estates and concubines (Tárikh-i Sástáni, 341). One of Masʻúd I of Ghaznázi’s old and trusted ghuláms commanders was manumitted before his death and the Sultan respected his last wishes concerning the disposal of his personal ghuláms (Bayhaḵl, cited by C. E. Bosworth, Ghaznavid military organisation, in Ist., xxxvi-ii, 2 (1960), 49-50). It was clearly in the interest of the master to treat his slaves well, for the particular concern of the ghuláms was normally to act as a dependable elite force within the wider body of the army and as a personal bodyguard. Under such dynasties as the Ghaznavids and Saljuqs, the ghuláms filled such important household and palace offices as Keeper of the Stables, Keeper of the Wardrobe, Keeper of the Sultan’s Armour and Weapons, Bearer of the Ceremonial Parasol or ʻátár and Keeper of the Racing Vessels (cf. Bosworth, op. cit., 47-8; I. H. Uzuncársili, Osmanlî devleti teskildtten medhal, İstanbul 1941, 35-41; I. Kalesoğlu, Sultan Melikşah devriinde Bûyûk Solyuklu imperatorluğu, İstanbul 1935, 143-5).

This last office of taq̄-dar was held during the reign of the Saljuq Malik Sháh by the ghulám Anûthiğin Gharçáli; it was the stepping-stone to his appointment as governor of Kháraḵš, the consolidation there in the 6th/12th century of his descendents as Kháraḵš-sháhs. When a ruler or commander lost the loyalty of his ghuláms, his position could become very insecure. The Zíyárid Mardáviḏ b. Zíyár was not always successful in bad times (Eclipse of the ʻAbbáсид Caliphate, ch. xv, for more recent information. Yaʻqúb b. Layṭ’s known skill as a military organizer makes it unlikely that he would pass over the adoption of an institution so useful for buttressing a despotic ruler’s power. Both Masʻúd I, Murád b. ʻAbd, viii, 49-54, and the Tárikh-i Sástáni, 222, say that he had a corps of 2000 ghuláms who on ceremonial occasions paraded on either side of his throne, richly clothed and armed with golden and silver shields, swords and maces, all captured from the treasury of Muḥammad b. Táhir at Nisháhpúr. Masʻúd I adds that there was within this general body the Amr’s personal bodyguard, the ghuláms of the khsás, who slept round his tent and executed his personal orders. The equipment and functions of these Saffárid ghuláms bear a remarkable resemblance to those of the Ghaznavid ghuláms of 150 years later as depicted on the walls of Lashkár-i Bázár (see below).

Contemporaneously with the Saffárids, the Sámanids in Transoxania and later in Kháraḵš were making a slave guard the nucleus of their army. Nášr b. Áhmad (d. 331/943) is said to have had as many as 10,000 ghuláms. The Amrs hoped that these Turkish troops, with their personal bond of fealty to the ruler, would counterbalance the military influence of the indigenous Iranian díkhán class, which was hostile to the dynasty’s centralizing policy, but the rôle of the ghuláms in various palace revolutions and assassinations shows that this hope was not always realised. However, the geographer İṣṭáḵhrí praises the Sámanid slave army for its discipline and boldness in battle. It was, of course, from the slave guard of the Sámanids that Alptigin, the conqueror of Ghazná, and Sibúkštigín, founder of the Ghaznavid dynasty in Afghanistan and northern India, arose.

In the course of the 21st/17th century, the use of military slaves spread throughout the Persian world to such Daylam dynasties as the Zíyárís and Búyíds and to Arab ones like the ʻHamidánís. The Turkish cavalry of the Búyíd armies soon grew more numerous than the free Daylamí infantrymen, and under Muṣíż al-Dawlá (d. 556/967) were preferred above the Daylamí in pay and the granting of ʻišá’s (Miskawáýh, ii, 99-100, 163-4, 166-7, 234, tr. v, 104-5, 175-6, 178, 186-8, 248; Ibn al-Áfír, viii, 343).

Amongst the Persian dynasties of ʻAḏharbayjáñ and the eastern Caucasus, as amongst the Christian principalities of Georgia and Armenia, slave troops were drawn from the Kházar and Russian lands to the north. The Yazídí Shárván-Sháhs had personal guards of ghuláms, and the Hâshiím ruler of Darbánd, Maymún b. Áhmad, had Rúš ghuláms who were still pagan, although these may have been adventurers of Slav-Scandinavian origin (cf. Minorsky, A history of Shárván and Darbánd in the
The Ghaznavids, themselves of servile origin, built their multi-racial army around a slave core, mainly of Turks but also including some Indians. In the reign of Mas'ud b. Mahmud (d. 432/1041), the ghulāms numbered between 4,000 and 6,000. Headed by their own general, the Sādār-i Ghulāmān, they were used in battle as a crack force, and on ceremonial occasions they had rich uniforms and bejewelled weapons; the depiction of these ghulāms in the recently-discovered murals of the palace of Lashkar-i Bāzār at Bost accords well with the descriptions of them in the written sources. We also see at work at this time, as under the later Sāmānis, the process whereby provincial governors and commanders themselves collected extensive slave guards (cf. Bosworth, Ghaznavid military organisation, 40–50).

The Turkish dynasties who in the 11th/12th century irrupted into the Persian world from the Central Asian steppes soon adopted slave troops as a more reliable fighting instrument than the tribal bands who were their original following. As early as 398/1008 the Kārkhandī Ilīg Khān Naṣr had a body of Turkish ghulāms archers which he used against Māhmūd of Ghazna (Utbī-Manṣīr, Yāmīnī, ii, 85), and in the next century, the Kārkhandī ghulāms numbered several thousand (Māhidūs al-bāndāh), whose amirs are described as being especially influential under Mas'ud b. Mahmud (ibid., 193, cf. R. R. Waddell, 243). The great Saljūq found that a paid, professional army was necessary to extend and protect their empire, since their original supporters, the Turkmen, were an anarchic and uncontrollable force. Within this professional army, the Saljūq ghulāms were prominent; their commanders were active on ghaww in the Cauca- casus and Armenia and against the Arab dynasties of the west. They usually remained loyal to their masters the Sultans even when the fidelity of other Turkish and Turkmen troops wavered, e.g., in Malik Shāh’s battle of 465/1073 with his uncle Kāwūr and in the battle of 526/1132 of Dāūd b. Māhmūd and Aḵ Sonḵūr Aḥmadīlī against Toghīrī b. Shihāb al-Dīn Muhammad (Bundārī, 48, 160–1). As well as Turks, the ghulāms of the Saljūqs included Greeks, Armenians and even negroes (al-khuddām al-hubush), whose amirs are described as being especially influential under Mas'ud b. Muhammad (ibid., 193, cf. R. R. Waddell, 243). The great Vizier Niţār al-Mulk collected around himself a corps of ghulāms of regal dimensions, and after his death this body, the Niţāmīyya, still acted as a cohesive body in politics. In the 10th/11th century we see the seizure of power by ghulām commanders of the increasingly ineffective Saljūq Sultans, nominally as Atabaks or tutors for young Saljūq princes. Hereditary lines of slave Atabaks tended to form in such parts of Persia as Ādharbāyjān, Fārs, Khūzistān and Khūrāsān, and in this latter province the ghulāms of Sandjār claimed to carry on the admin- istrative traditions of their old master before they were swept away by the rising tide of the Ghurids and Khārīzms-Sāhās.

Both the Ghurids and the Khūrīzms-Sāhās relied heavily on slave troops. Dīlahī al-Dīn Mīngburnu’s ghulāms were armed with the traditional weapon of such troops, the mace (Nasawi, 232, tr. 386: ḥumābdārīyya). The Turkish ghulāms of the Ghurids did not always act harmoniously with the native Ghūri troops (cf. Duidaynī-Boyle, 461), but the troops of Muʿīz al-Dīn or Shihāb al-Dīn Mūhammad, the Māhidūs, continued to revere that Sultan’s name and in the 11th/12th century the palace of Lahjārdi, which they founded in northern India were ostensibly constituted in his name.

The invasions of the Mongols brought into Persia an entirely new set of military traditions. The Mongol commanders used the captured populations of towns as auxiliaries and as professional and sappers (cf. Spuler, Mongolen, 402, 416–19), but ghulāms in the older sense of professional slave soldiers did not reappear until the Mongols and their successors had been assimilated to Persian ways. The institution may be discernible in the 9th/10th century amongst the Turkmen Aḵ Koyūnlu in western Persia and eastern Anatolia. In an ʿArdā-nāma dating from the time of Uzbek Ḥasan (d. 883/1478) are mentioned 3,000 kulluḫğīlī “servants” in the total of some 10,000 for the Right Wing of the army; it is unclear whether these were mounted or went on foot (W. Hinz, Iran. A ufentst zim zum Nationalstaat in fünfzehn Jahrhundert, Berlin-Leipzig 1936, 107–8; Minorsky, A civil and military review in Fārs in 881/1476, in BSOAS, x (1939–42), 153, 164).

The military basis of the Ṣafawī state was originally the Kūfī-bāgh tribal divisions, but Shāh ʿAbbās I (995–1037/1587–1628) invited men of all tribes and nations to enroll in a new salaried body of troops, the Shāh-sawāns, who would be entirely devoted to the sovereign and free from tribal ties (cf. Minorsky, EP, s.v.). Also notable in this reign was the increased rôle of the Ṣafawī state of Geor- gians, Armenians and Caucasians; in particular Khāchars were swept away by the rising tide of the Ghurids and entered the Ṣafawī state as slave converts to Islam. In 994/1586 a Georgian was lala or tutor to the Ṣafawī prince Tahmāsp b. ʿAbbās, this office corresponding in many ways to the old one of Atabak (R. M. Savory in BSOAS, xxiv (1961), 84–5). With such soldiers and officials as these, the institution of the ghulām takes on a new lease of life as an important component of the new troops. The Ṣafawī “slaves” (kullar or ghulāmān-i ḥassā-yi sharīf) were mainly slaves or sons of slaves. The military ghulāms were numbered by Chardin at 10,000 and by Tavernier at 18,000 (a substantial proportion of the whole body of ghulāms was used for court and administrative service; in the Ṣādghīrat al-mulūk, tr. Minorisky, 56–7, 127–8, the term ghulām is also used for the young eunuchs and pages of Shāh’s private household). The ghulām in general was headed by the extremely influential Kullar Āghāšt, and there was for it a special Vizier and Mustawfī of the Department of the Ghulāms (Ṣādghīrat al-mulūk, tr. 46–7, 73). Tavernier noted that the ghulāms very rarely rebelled, “For being all Slaves, and of different Nations, there are no ties of Affection or Kindred between them: And if the King has an occasion to punish any of them, the chief of their Body is to execute his orders” (Travels, Eng. tr. London 1684, i, 224–5).

In the reign of the Kādārī Fath ʿAll Shāh (1211–50/ 1799–1834), the term ghulām was still applied to the royal bodyguard, and Georgians were still prominent here (Sir Harford Jones Brydges, An account of the transactions of His Majesty’s mission to the court of Persia in the years 1807–11, London 1834, i, 325, 331, 382); but in the course of the 19th century, as western influences grew in Persia and personal slavery disappeared, ghulām simply came to denote a runner or messenger employed by a foreign diplomatic or consular agency.

The term is still in current use in Persian Balūcīs- tin, where until recently the ghulāms were slave retainers of the local Balūc chiefs or sardāls; and even now legally free, they are still regarded as a socially inferior class (see B. J. Spooner, Kūch u Balūcī and

Bibliography: given in the article. There are no special surveys of the institution in the Persian world up to and including the Ghaznavids are given by C. E. Bosworth, Ghaznavid military organisation, in IsI, xxxvi:i-2 (1960), 40-50, and idem, The Ghaznavids: their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 954-1040, Edinburgh 1963, 98-106. (C. E. Bosworth)

iii. — India.

The Muslim conquest and occupation of Hindustan at the end of the 7th/13th century, although initiated and directed by the free chiefs of the Ghurid dynasty, was mainly the achievement of Turkish ghulams (more frequently referred to as bandagān in the Indo-Persian histories). In the frequent absences of Mu'izz al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Sām, his slave Kutb al-Dīn Aybak, who began in India as military commander (sipāh-sādār) of Kuhrām, led the Ghurid forces against Rādōpūr strongholds. On the death of Mu'izz al-Dīn in 602/1206, Kutb al-Dīn assumed power in Lahore, at that time probably without having been manumitted. The so-called Ta'rīkh-i Fāhrāl-Dīn Mubārak Shāh, ed. E. Denison Ross, London, 1927, 35-6, intended for Kutb al-Dīn, has a remarkable eulogy of Turkish slaves for their fidelity and for their capacity to win advancement to the rank of amīr and sipāh-sādār, without regretting their former free life in Turkistan.

Hindustan was not, however, conquered exclusively by slave agents of the Ghurids whether as commanders or as troopers. Lakhnawī was conquered by the free Khādījī Muhammad Baḥāthīyār; Khādījī also formed part of the Ghurid armies.

Until the reign of Djalāl al-Dīn Khādījī (689-99/1290-6) the sultans of Delhi were all either military slaves or their descendants. Iltmīshī was not manumitted until after appointment as amīr of Gwāliyār, mālīk of Badā'ūn and after functioning as ikhtāṣ of the baṣra of Banī (Minhāj al-Sirāḍā, Taḥābāt-i Nāṣīrī, Calcutta 1864, 159-70). Balban had presumably been free before his marriage to the daughter of Sultan Nāṣīr al-Dīn Mahmūd. Under Iltmīshī (and there is no reason to conclude that his successors changed the practice) Turkish slaves rose to provincial military command through service in the royal household as Keeper of the Stables, Keeper of the Washing Vessels, Keeper of the Leopards or royal bodyguard (Taḥābāt-i Nāṣīrī, 229-324, passim). Slaves did not, however, enjoy a monopoly of office; Barani, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, Calcutta 1862, 26, speaks of the Turkish slaves ousting the free officers (muṣālik-i aḥrār) in the reigns of Iltmīshī's children. Some of these officers were fugitives from the Mongols. Antagonism appears to have been evinced by Turkish slaves towards certain non-Turkish slaves, the habbātī Djamāl al-Dīn Yākūt and the Hindu eunuch Imdād al-Dīn Rayhān. Minhājī (Taḥābāt, 300) specifically states that Turkish and Taglīk slaves resented Rayhān because he was of the tribes of Hindustān (as habbātī-i Hindustān).

Under the Khādījī and Tughlūq sultans, slaves continued to become high officers and to form an important component of the sultan's army. The Turkish element among the slaves appears to have been diluted somewhat and the rise to power of Hindu slaves is noteworthy in this period. How far the historian Barani's hostility to their elevation was shared by his contemporaries is a moot point. The Hindī Khusraw Khān Barwārī, recipient of the homo-

sexually-inspired favours of Sultan Muhārāk Shāh Khādījī, murdered his master (720/1320) and assumed the throne before being deposed by the free mālīk, Ghiyāsh al-Dīn Tughlūq. The Telengana Brahman, Khān-i Diāhān Mākbūl, became wazīr to Fīrūz Shāh Tughlūq. Slaves were apt to resent a former member of their number usurping the position of the ruling family. Slave commanders of fifty and a hundred, raised by Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Khādījī, successfully plotted the overthrow of the famous eunuch, Mālik Kāfrūr, conqueror of the Deccan, when he began to kill off the sultan's family after 'Alā' al-Dīn's death (Barani, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, 370).

Sources for the Khādījī and Tughlūq periods give figures for the number of slaves in service. The army of Muhammad ibn Tughlūq was reputed to have 20,000 Turki ghulams, 10,000 eunuchs as well as large numbers of slave bodyguards always accompanying him (al-'Umarī, Masālik al-abṣār fi mamālik al-amārī, edited text and Urdu translation by Khānīshī Ahmad Fārūkī, Delhi 1962, 25).

'Affī, Ta'rīkh-i Fīrūz Shāhī, Calcutta 1891, 267-73, gives the most elaborate account available of the slave establishment in the sultanate period. Fīrūz Shāh is said to have encouraged the provincial mukta's to collect slaves to present them to the sultan, receiving in return an allowance from the revenue to be remitted to headquarters equal to the value of the slaves. Such slaves stationed in the principal fortress towns (e.g., Multān, Dīpalpur, Sāmlān) and were paid both in cash and by the grant of revenue from villages. 'Affī says that Fīrūz Shāh had 180,000 slaves in the capital and in the provinces. A diwan separate from the diwan-i wazārat existed to manage the slaves. They were to be found not only in such familiar household offices as Keeper of the Washing Vessels, Keeper of the sultan's armour and weapons, Bearer of the Ceremonial Parasol, but also employed in the diwan-i wazārat and as mukta's, parganādārs and ghānānagān (market overseers), becoming amīrs and mālīkhs. Under the Sayyid sultans too, slaves are found as mukta's and parganādārs. Under the Lodīs, the sources yield the impression that the majority of officers were free Afghans.

The role of military slaves in the provincial Muslim kingdoms did not differ substantially from that in the Dīlī sultanate. Indeed, Ahmad Nizām Shāh, founder of the independent sultanate of Ahmadnagar, Yusuf 'Alī Shāh of Bidājpūr, Kullā Kōhī Shāh of Golkonda and Malik Sarwar of Dīwānpūr had all been ghulams. Habbātī [q.v.] slaves were prominent in the politics of Gudjarāt, Ahmadnagar, Bidājpūr and Bengal. In Bidājpūr, habbātīs took over the regency (nizābat) in the last phase of the sultanate, while in Bengal the former habbātī slaves Shāhāzāda and Sidi Bāzir seized the throne at the end of the 9th/13th century. The latter had 5,000 habbātīs in his service. Under the Fārūkids [q.v.] of Khāndesh, habbātī slaves were employed to guard the junior members of the ruling family in enforced seclusion (cf. C. F. Beckingham, Amin, Gelen and Astragarh, in JSS, ii (1957), 182-8).

Under the Mughals, slaves played a very minor part in administration and in the army, though not in the household. Mughal rule was established by free Mughal, Turkish and Persian officers and the Mughal army was commanded by mānsābdārs, the vast majority of whom were free in origin. A test-sample of 225 of the 730 biographies of Mughal dignitaries in Šamsān al-Dawla Shāh-nawī Khān, Ma'dār al-amārī, Calcutta 1888-91 (pānāsīs and
upwards under Akbar, *sit hazāris* and upwards thereafter to the middle of Aurangzib's reign and then *pandār* (e.g., *khaf hazāris*) shows that only one of Khān's *sīh-hazdris* or *haft hazdris* existed under Khān as a system. Of *sīh-hazdris* or *haft hazdris* shows that only one of Khān's *sīh-hazdris*, the system of Shahānshāh, had been a slave. One, *Uṭrūz Khān* a eunuch, and two, *Āṭīkh Khān* and *Hābsh Khān*, were *habāshis* who had entered Mughal service from the Deccan sultanates. The *Ma'ādhir al-umār*’s list is, however, not exhaustive; a number of slaves, including three of Bābur’s and Hūmāyūn’s, were given *mansāb* and *gājīs* under Akbar and one, *Ṭūbān Khān*, was appointed provincial governor of Dihlī (see *Āṭīn-i Akbari*, tr., Calcutta 1872-39, 442, 444, 481, 485, 488, 491). Such promotions, however, form a very small proportion of Akbar’s appointments.

Mughal *mansābādārs* did on occasion, however, employ slaves as their own subordinate commanders. Mirzā Nathan, *Bahāristān-i ḡulām*, a history of Bengal in 1262/1842–1843’s time (trans. M. I. Borah, two vols., Gauhati 1936) shows a slave, Islām Khūl Gūlām, and a slave, *Īlibān Khān*, was thus employed as *Mir Bāḥr* (Commander of the fleet of boats). Examples of slaves holding minor military commands may be met with in the *Bahāristān-i ḡulām* under the names (see index) *Ṣa’adat Khān* Khādīja, Khādīja Lal Beg, and Shīr Maḍyān. Akbar employed a contingent of slave foot soldiers, described as *telas* in the *Āṭīn-i Akbari*, Calcutta 1872, 190. An interesting account of the *talas* by a provincial governor in the period of the decline of the Mughal empire under Farrukhshīyār and Muḥammad Shāh is given in W. Irvine, The Bangash Nawāb of Farrukhabad, *a chronicle* (1173-1857), Calcutta 1927-39, 442, 444, 483, 484, 594-6 *passim*; see also Muhammad Khan, *Ṣa'īda*, ed. E. Denison *ṣafar al-wadlih*, b. Umar al-Makki, Istanbul 1941, 85-94, 108-22; M. F. Kopriilu, *Bizans miyesselerinin Osmanlı miyesselerine tesiri*, in *THİTM*, i (1931), 208-21, 242-6; idem, *Osmans İmparatorluğunun etnik menseli meseleleri*, in *Belleten*, viii/28 (1943), 273; the names of various prominent commanders of *ḡulām* origin in the service of this Seljuk Sultanate are known, e.g., Ṣahār al-Dīn Gūlām, Khāṣṣ Balaban and the brothers Karatay (see Ta'rīkh-i Ḭālīl Solṭān, facsimile of Paris, Bibl. Nat. M.S supp. pers. 1553, publ. F. Uzluķ, Ankara 1952, 52, 57, 66, 71). These *ḡulāms* were used only for military duties; when Kaykāvūs II granted important posts as *amr* to various of his *ḡulāms*, the other *amirs* opposed him (ibid, 52-3).

*oghān Ghażī* appointed *hī ṣal Balabanbīd Bahādūr* to supervise the investment of Bursa (Neğhri, *Ghiyāsīnāmeh*, ed. Fr. Taeschner, i, Leipzig 1951, 35). Barāk Baba, who was flourishing at this time (ca. 725/1325), advises in his *Ḳiṣṣāt* that on the *ḳhās* the leaders of the Christians should be flung into the sea and their ‘*우브irds*’, i.e., the young men following them, should be taken into the army. In documents surviving from the reign of Orkhan there are indications that the training of slaves as Palace and administrative officers existed. Under the first Ottoman rulers (e.g., the names Evrenkush Khādīm and Shabīn b. Ṣāḥib Allāh, in Orkhan’s
The explicit statements of contemporary Western and Ottoman writers show that this system was developed from the practice of taking into Palace service or into the army the young sons of members of the local military class in newly-conquered regions. It is natural that in the Ottoman Empire and in Ottoman society, an adj state always in contact with the dār al-karb, slaves gained a more important place than in other Muslim societies.

Under Bâyezîd I [q.v.], who endeavoured to found a centralized Empire, the ghulâm system came to full development. Notes in taht-i-registers of the 9th/15th century which refer to conditions in his reign show that in all parts of the Empire he granted to buhls trained by the ghulâm system not only important military and administrative posts but also timârs. Reactions to this radical innovation are to be detected in the anonymous Tawdšh-i Āl-i 9th/15th century which records reactions made a weighty contribution to his fall. Circles; and these reflect the sentiments of Tewdrikh-i Al-i C.Z. (ed. Fr. Giese, Breslau 1922, 31), which does not show that the Grand Vizierate included, to buhls (see H. Inalcik, art. Mehmed II, in IA, fasc. 75, 512): the "ul âmâ" of the period regarded the vizierate as a post reserved to those of slave origin (see Tashkîrîzâde, al-Shâbâ'î al-nüvâmîyya, Arabic text, i, 144, Turkish version by Medjdl, Istanbul 1269, 104). According to Angloello, most of the military commanders and other holders of important offices were, during the reign of Mehmed II, persons trained by the ghulâm system. Literary sources and archive documents enable us to visualize in detail the system as it prevailed in this period (for Western descriptions, see Donado da Lezze [G.-M. Angloello], Historia Turchesca, ed. J. Ursu, Bucharest 1909; Fr. Bahinger, Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen Iacopo de Promontorio-de-Caro, Munich 1957; J. B. Telfer, The Palace School of Muhammed the Conqueror, Cambridge Mass. 1941, 10 ff) that the Palace system (in 880/1475 the kapi-kullari numbered 18,300) and on "passing-out" (Turkish: heft-i sak-a, caravan) in the Palace, where they received privileged treatment, and on 'passing-out' (Turkish: dâmâ, or below) were appointed, with the title of beg to the most important offices. Thus at this period many members of the Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian and Albanian aristocracies served the Ottoman state in high posts. Nevertheless, as it had been under the Seljûks of Rûm, only military posts were granted to these products of the ghulâm system; the post of Grand Vizier and the posts of head of the financial department and of the chancery were usually reserved to Muslim-born Turks of the 4imâyî cÎsâf circles; and these reactions made a weighty contribution to his fall. Under Bayezid II, a highly-influential palace of 'selected children' belonging to various circles; and these reflect the sentiments of the title of beg, or vizier. The sons of the local nobility in newly-conquered regions. It is natural that in the Ottoman Empire and in Ottoman society, an adj state always in contact with the dār al-karb, slaves gained a more important place than in other Muslim societies.

For the reign of Murâd II we possess abundant information about the system, not only from contemporary chronicles (e.g., Ducas, ed. Grecu, 179, 187, 191, Turkish tr., 83, 88, 90; Chalcocondyles, book 5, Fr. tr. by Blaise de Vigenère, Histoire de l'empire by Mehemmed II under the influence of Byzantine models after he had taken Constantinople, 187, 191, 201-3, 210, 214) exaggerates the degree of rivalry between native-born Turkish statesmen and the converts, it is indisputable that such a rivalry was an important element in the early centuries (see H. Inalcik,Fatih devri . . ., 69-136). In pursuit of his policy of establishing an absolutist and centralized empire, Mehemmed II expanded the ghulâm system (in 880/1475 the kapi-kullari numbered 18,300) and on 'passing-out' (Turkish: heft-i sak-a, caravan) in the Palace, where they received privileged treatment, and on 'passing-out' (Turkish: dâmâ, or below) were appointed, with the title of beg to the most important offices. Thus at this period many members of the Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian and Albanian aristocracies served the Ottoman state in high posts. Nevertheless, as it had been under the Seljûks of Rûm, only military posts were granted to these products of the ghulâm system; the post of Grand Vizier and the posts of head of the financial department and of the chancery were usually reserved to Muslim-born Turks of the 4imâyî cÎsâf circles; and these reactions made a weighty contribution to his fall. Under Bayezid II, a highly-influential palace of 'selected children' belonging to various circles; and these reflect the sentiments of the title of beg, or vizier. The sons of the local nobility in newly-conquered regions. It is natural that in the Ottoman Empire and in Ottoman society, an adj state always in contact with the dār al-karb, slaves gained a more important place than in other Muslim societies.

Seat of the local military class in newly-conquered regions. It is natural that in the Ottoman Empire and in Ottoman society, an adj state always in contact with the dār al-karb, slaves gained a more important place than in other Muslim societies.
applied and expanded with a conscious appreciation of the advantages it offered. In the reign of Murad II 'Yaz'gii-oghlu 'Ali wrote (Sel'uk'hnme, Istanbul Topkapı Sarayi, MS Revan Koskii 1390, fol. 560) that in order through the possession of slaves that a sultan could exercise power (cf. Machiavelli, The Prince, chap. iv); according to Kemal Paşa-zâde (Istanbul, Millet Lib., MS 25, fols. 11-12), because all the ghulâm were equal at the Porte of the Sultan, none tried to rise above his fellows or dreamed of laying claim to the throne; in the 11th/17th century Paul Rycaut noted (Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi, 1528), according to Menavino (Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi, 1534), those who excelled at these would become mujahid, a personal interest in the boys' education (Menavino, i, 75; Bobović, karatasi, i, 75; Bobović, 31, 70, 73-4; these are still unexploited).

In the early days the principal source for ghulâm was the penelik [q.v.], supplemented by prisoners purchased on the slave-market for the Palace; the most important of these sources were a powerful counterpoise to the provincial troops. The ghulâm system reached its fullest development under Süleyman I and his first two successors. The close link which the Ottoman administrative system aroused in Europe in this period led to the writing of numerous detailed descriptions (for a fairly complete bibliography see K. Göllner, Turcica, i, Bucharest and Berlin 1961; for the Venetian relations, see Lybyer, 305-22). These descriptions, especially the memoirs of persons who, like G. A. Menavino (Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi, Florence 1548), had served as ic-oghlan in the Palace, are of great value for filling out the rich but bare data of the Ottoman archives (for the principal collections relating to the Palace see M. Sertoğlu, Muhteva bakımdan Basvekle Arşivi, Ankara 1955, 31, 70, 73-4; these are still unexploited).

According to Yunis Beg (apud B. Miller, 263), in 944/1534 there were 700 ic-oghlanlar, aged between 8 and 20, in the Sultan's palace (but Ramberti speaks of only 500 in 340/1534). An official account of expenditure, dated 900/1494, mentions 3 aqgas of the Enderun and only 178 ghulmân-i eredân (Ö. L. Barkan, in Kitsat Fabuleesi Mecmuasi, xv (1953-4), 308), but the numbers grew to about 400 in the Büyük Oda and 250 in the Küçük Oda (Miller, 129-30; Uzuğurulu, 310-1); at the beginning of the 11th/17th century, 'Ayni-i 'All notes 709 persons, aqhas and ghulmân together (Kawdnin-i Al-i 'Oğlu, Istanbul 1280, 97).

The lads in these two odas spent all their time at lessons and physical training. Their teachers were the Palace mu'allims (mu'âllimân-i Enderun) and 'ulama and dânisgâms who visited the Palace at set times to give lessons; 12 of the lads were appointed khalife, 'tutor'. All had to begin by learning reading and writing, the principles of the Muslim faith, and the Kur'an; after that each could 'specialize' according to his own capabilities and inclinations (‘Atâ, i, 155). As they advanced, they learned the Muslim sciences, and the sarf, nahuw and literature of Arabic, Persian and Turkish. Bâyezid II used to take a personal interest in the boys' education (Menavino, apud Miller, 83). Those who made great progress in the religious sciences were allowed to pursue the 'simaye' career (‘Atâ, i, 75; Bobović, apud Miller, 180). All kinds of skills were also taught in the Odas: calligraphy, inşâ, arithmetic and siyâhat, music; those who excelled at these would become hübe. One point stressed both by Ottoman and European writers is the emphasis given to physical training, and to horsemanship and the management of arms (the Hasan bâhşih dwells on this). The chief sports were weight-lifting and putting the weight, wrestling, archery, riding, throwing the lance, and the games of jereid and djerid [q.v.] (‘Atâ, i, 177; Ramberti, 119); on feast-days competitions would be held at the Djerid-Meydân in the Palace garden and at the
Oğ-Meydani and the Sultan would award prizes. Literary works with such names as Sildfyshor-ndme, Bdz-ndme, ... bonus (Kemankes İdyühasi, 472-4). All promotions and awards were made according to efficiency and seniority.

were composed mainly for craft; many masters of miniature-painting, drawing, who had exercised by the Kaplı-oğlanl ketkhuddsl, Ali, Mendkib-i hiinerverdn, (training was to inculcate absolute loyalty and obedience. It was they who maintained discipline and service. It was they who supervised the overall supervision of the odas was exercised by the Kaplı-oğlanl kekbudsl, who had under him eunuchs (between 16 and 30 in number).

The White Eunuchs (Ab Aghalar) constituted the permanent staff of the palace; these were slaves who had been castrated to make them eligible for this service. It was they who maintained discipline and were responsible for the lads' behaviour. Under Mehemmed II they were 20 in number (Angirolello), under Selim I, 40 (Ata, i, 164). Their chief, and the general overseer of the palace, was the Kaplı-aghasi or Bâb al-sâda aghasî. Beneath him were three odâ-bağâl, in the order of precedence: Khâs-oda baghi, Kaplı-aghasi (or Ser-khâsînîn), Külâr-ı baghi. The Khâs-oda baghi might be an ic-oğlanî. These eunuchs were responsible for the protection of the Sultan. The numbers of its members was to care for the Kaplı-sîcâl (shadows); to them was later added a miftdh- (or anakhtar-) ghulâmî (or aghasî). These five aghasî were also called the zülufü aghasî. The numbers in the Khâs-oda were increased to 40 under Selim I. In 880/1475 these three higher odas together numbered 80 pages (I de Promontorio, 40). In 1090/1679 the Khâs-oda comprised, besides the Oda-bağî, 6 aghasî, 12 eski (i.e. senior) pages and 22 sâdemsîs (juniors). Later still, there was more specialization in the duties carried out and new ranks were introduced (for details, see Ata, i, 139-97).

Early in the 16th century, a fourth oda, known as Şeferrî odasî, was created from among the attendants with various duties in the Buyuk Oda (according to Ata, i, 153, it was created under Ahmed I, cf. Kemankes îdıyhasî, 472; according to Uzuncarsîlî, 311, in 1045/1635). Its head was the Ser'dâ aghasî. It comprised first those who washed the Sultan's clothes, and included later the bath attendants, the clowns, the mutes, the teachers, the musicians and the singers; the total numbers were in 1090/1679 134 and in 1186/1772 149. The bandsmen (Endêrûn mehterîhânesî) also belonged to this oda.

All matters relating to the pages—promotions, transfers, etc.—were settled by a kaplı-i humâyûn of the Sultan in response to a proposal (ârd) made by the Kaplı-aghasî or the Khâs-oda baghi (Uzun- çarsîlî, 304, 324). From time to time the Sultan would visit the odas, attend competitions, and encourage the pages by awarding prizes. Each oda had a fixed complement, known as gedîk. Appointments and promotions went usually by seniority (known as oğah yölüyle); even the Sultan was obliged to respect this principle (Kemankes îdıyhasî, 473), but exceptions were made in promotion to posts which required special aptitude, e.g. the position of imam, clerk (wazîdî), bandmaster (mehterbâshî). Each oda has its own bath, imâm and mi'eddîhîn. There were special libraries in the palace for the use of the pages (M. Reîfîk, in TOEM, vii/4o, 236; I. Baykal, in Tarih Veskîalarî, i/9, 188). Messages were carried by hollûkîlîlar. Food for the pages and their clothes were provided by the Sultan. Each received, according to his rank, a stipend (zülufû), an issue of clothes, and the occasional bonus (Kemankes îdıyhasî, 472-4). All promotions and awards were made according to efficiency and seniority.
When the Sultan went out on campaign, the Enderun kâhil were provided with horses and weapons and accompanied him, only the Sârây ağaçalı remaining behind to guard the palace.

Besides the 'Inner Service', the Enderûn, which we have considered above, there was a second complex of departments in the palace known as the Birûn, the 'Outer Service'. The Enderûn was the milieu in which the Sultan spent his private life, and at the same time a school where the ghulâms were educated and trained. The Birûn was the section composed of the services concerned with the Sultan's relations with the outside world. According to the Kânûnînâmë of Mehmed II, the heads of departments of the Birûn were, in order of precedence: the Yeñi-lerî ağaçalı, the Mir-âlem, the Kapîdî-bashlî, the Mûskâne-bashlî, the Kûshûdî-bashlî, the Yeçil-bashlî, and the Topîl-bashlî (in 933/1527 the order was: Yeñi-lerî ağaçalı, Mir-âlem, Kapîdî-bashlî, Mir-âkhrû, Mûskâne-bashlî, Sûvûdi bülûkler ağaçalı, Kûshûdî-bashlî, Wûhûdî-bashlî, Cawçuh-bashlî, Cadîr mehterleri bashlî, Kapîdîlar-kêtKHudsûdûsûdûlûsûdû, see Ö. L. Barkan, in Ikitâsî Fak. Mecm., xv (1953-4), 308. Since (with the exception of the Kâtîl-ashbîr-kêtKHudsûdûlûsûdû and the Dîbedjî-bashlî) these officers were entitled to ride beside the Sultan, they were known as ozengi-aghalî or rûkî-abâlgâlî (‘Agas of the Stirrup’). In addition to the bodies of men under these officers, the Birûn included also the müteferrika[see mutafarrika]under the Müteferrika-bashlî, the Cawçuh-âgashlî, the bâqiaîddîs [q.v.] under the Dâr al-sa’dîdî ağaçalı, and the topângâs [q.v.] under the Bostandîjs-bashlî [q.v.] (for details on these and other groups belonging to the Birûn see Uzuncarsîlî, 336-9). All these bodies belonged to the ghulâm organization of the Ottoman Empire.

An idea of the relative importance of the various numbers annual numbers in pay in in 933/1527 akçes 1018/1609

mûskânehere-birûn (i.e., those with a monthly stipend, cauçuhes, câşûฏîrîns, poets, physicians, etc.) 424 4,381,458 1200-1300
Janissaries 7,886 15,423,426 37,627
Sipâhîs of the Porte (the Alî Bûlûk) 5,088 30,973,300 20,869
Kapîdîllar, Teber-dâlar 319 758,622 2,451
Dîbedjîler 524 1,016,688 5,730
Topîllar 695 975,624 1,552
Tailors 301 641,094 319
Cook 277 654,900 1,129
’Alem mehterleri 185 466,570 228
Cadîr mehterleri and Divân sâhitleri 277 562,860 871
Craftsmen (jewellers, swordmakers, etc.) 585 1,422,726 947
Top sarakbâlgâlîleri 943 985,890 947
Falconers 259 509,760 592
Employed in the Imperial stables 2,830 5,133,000 4,322
Adjemî oglanlar and Bostandîjs in Istanbul 3,553 1,993,020 9,406
Totals 24,146 65,882,938 87,927

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II

The institution which ensured that these ghulûm groups and the provincial administration should function together as a harmonious whole was the Çîmûma, that is, the promotions and transfers which were made at intervals (of from two to eight years) and at each accession (according to Ta’rîkhi-i Çîmûma, TOEM, supp., 99, every 7 or 8 years; according to Miller, 128, every 2 or 3 years in the Bûyük and Kültûk Odas; cf. Uzuncarsîlî, 330-9). At the Çîmûma, the most senior (eskî) of the pages in the Bûyük and Kültûk Odas were promoted to higher odas, i.e. (in ascending order) the Seferî, the Kûlî and the Khasîn. The best of the Bostandîjs in the provinces. We
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groups comprising the Birûn can be obtained by

comparing the data of an official list of 933/1527

(published by Ö. L. Barkan, in Ikitâsî Fak. Mecm.,

xxv (1953-4), 300) with the data for 1018/1609 given by ‘Aynî-i ‘Alî (82-99): the table shows

that in less than a century the number of the kâpli-bûlîrî of ghulâm origin increased well over three times.

The institution which ensured that these ghulûm groups and the provincial administration should function together as a harmonious whole was the Çîmûma, that is, the promotions and transfers which were made at intervals (of from two to eight years) and at each accession (according to Ta’rîkhi-i Çîmûma, TOEM, supp., 99, every 7 or 8 years; according to Miller, 128, every 2 or 3 years in the Bûyük and Kültûk Odas; cf. Uzuncarsîlî, 330-9). At the Çîmûma, the most senior (eskî) of the pages in the Bûyük and Kültûk Odas were promoted to higher odas, i.e. (in ascending order) the Seferî, the Kûlî and the Khasîn. The best of the Bostandîjs in the provinces. We

At the time of a Çîmûma each group in the Enderûn and in the Birûn was on the move. The Ozengi Aghalari of the Birûn moved to the command of a sandjak or a beglerbegli; ordinary members were granted zîmîms in the provinces. But after the 10th/16th century they too, like the ağaças of the Enderûn, began to receive appointments as beglerbegi and vizier; in fact an Ağa of the Janissaries might be appointed directly Grand Vizier. Çâşûฏîrîns and müteferrika of the Bostandîjs were given zîmîms; cauçuhes, bâqiaîddîs and senior Janissaries were generally given timârs; thus they passed into the ranks of the ‘feudal’ sipâhîs in the provinces. The best of the Bostandîjs and the ağaças of the Birûn could reach was a timâr in the provinces. We
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have seen that so early as the first half of the 9th/15th century kuls of the Sultan and of beggs were granted not only posts as sandiğ-begi and beylerbeği, but also sandiğ-begi and beylerbeği to have his own forces of hası-bullari, their numbers being regulated by hânum. To own slaves was regarded as a necessary qualification for the exercise of executive power. Even the timarito had a small 'Porte', composed of şeybeğis and ghulams (əğlamın), its strength determined by the value of his timâr (the proportions are given in the Kânûnname of Suleyman I, but the text published by M. 'Arif, TOEM, sup., contains many errors; cf. Sưret-i Deftet-i sanâhi-i Arwandî; thus in 835/1431 the ghûlâm-i mir 'Yungûçî held a timâr of 6089 akbîr, and hence had to put in the field one şeybeği and one ghûlâm (Arwandî, 34). Paşgas and beggs endeavoured to support more şeybeğis and ghulams than the hânûn obliged them to (when Rüstem Paşa died he left 1700 slaves). Diebelis, ghulams and nôkers, in origin prisoners of war or purchased slaves, were, like their masters, subject to the regulations that applied to the 'asâr class (see H. İnalci, 15. asr Türkiye ihtisâdî ve şimatî tarihi kaynaklari, in Iktisat Fak. Mecm., xv (1953-4), 53), and thus their status in society differed from that of the ordinary 'âbd; all the same, the şari'a rules relating to the 'âbd, to 'âšh and to wa'âlî (qq.v.) applied to the relations between the ghulam of the military class and his master.

Some of the boys levied by the devshîme were placed in the mansions of prominent men. Beggs and paşgas, after training their ghulams in various duties in their konâbâh, each a microcosm of the Sultan's pashas, but also to beggs, after training their slaves who rendered military service, while ghulams, in amounts proportionate to the hânûn and its strength determined by the value of his timâr, had to have his own force sandiak-begi su-bashi (fasc. 49, 1960), 91-3). One factor encouraging this was the legal principle of wa'lî (qq.v.). The şari'a was supplemented by detailed 'urfi regulations relating to slaves (see O. L. Barkan, Kamalînlar, i, Istanbul 1943, index s.vv. 'ül, ece). The Ottomans did, in practice, extend the benefits which the şari'a ensured to the 'âbd. Slaves, whether in the service of the state or in private ownership, were not regarded as composing a base class in society: indeed in certain circumstances the name of ḵul procured influence and esteem. The hâds' registers reveal that 'âšks, who had grown up in an active world of business and enriched themselves, without encountering any social obstacles, were surprisingly numerous in the upper classes of Ottoman society. Right from the time of Orkân Ghaţl, prisoners of war had also been used by the state as slave-labourers, being settled on agricultural land and in villages with the name ortaţel-kul (qq.v.) (see O. L. Barkan, Külâhlar ve Ortâşhî kullar, in Iktisat Fak. Mecm., i (1939), 29-74, 108-245, 397-447). There is no resemblance at all between these and the ghulams belonging to the military class.

The classical Ottoman administrative system, based on the use of ghulams, developed greatly in the second half of the 10th/16th century, the number of the hası-bullari passing 80,000. With the decline in the authority of the Sultan at the end of this period, the hası-bullari lost their monopoly of the palace, the government and the provincial administration, and endeavoured to monopolize the military fiefs and the other sources of state-revenue. Their power became such that they could depose, appoint, and even murder (Oğhnum II) the Sultan. Although the ghulams of the palace sometimes made common cause with them, in general it was to their advantage to support the authority of the Sultan. Thus the palace attempted to pit the cavalry regiments against the Janissaries. Ottoman historians and writers on government in dealing with this period (Kâtib Cebeli, Hasân Beg-zâde, Na'imâ, Koç Beg (qq.v.)) attribute the anarchy in the first place to the disruption of the ghulam system. The revolt of Abaza Mehmed Paşa (see ABAZA-i, and H. İnalci, art. Hüsrev Paşa, in IA, fasc. 49, 606-9) is to be explained as a violent manifestation of the reaction which this domination of the kul provoked in Anatolia. Later attempts on the part of the palace and the government to reduce the numbers of the hası-bullari troops and bring them under discipline were fruitless; only when Köprüli Mehmed Paşa (qq.v.) assumed dictatorial powers was it possible to make some resistance to them. The lack of discipline among the hası-bullari was reflected in the Enderen: when the Şîma due at the accession of Mehmed IV was delayed, the şê-
Ghulam — Ghulam Husayn Khan Tabaṭābāt

Sayyid Ghulam Husayn Khan Tabaṭābāt was born in Delhi (Shahjahānābād) in 1140/1727-8 in a poor family. When he was five years old the family migrated to Murshidābād and settled there. Gradually he acquired extensive property and eventually became the naib of the province of Azīmābād under Zayn al-Dīn Ahmad Khan Ḥaybat Djang. In 1156/1743 his father lost his post and returned to Delhi with his family. Early in 1158/1745 Ghulam Husayn Khan went to Azīmābād, married a daughter of his maternal uncle ʿAbd al-ʿAll Khan, who was employed in the army of Ḥaybat Djang, and took part in the defence of the town against Muṣṭafā Khan. In 1161/1748 Ghulam Husayn entered the service of Saʿīd Ahmad Khan Šawlat Djang, son-in-law of Allah Wirdī Khan, who was then at Moughyr. Soon afterwards he went to Purniya where Šawlat Djang had been deposed and appointed himself governor of the province. In 1160/1745 Ghulam Husayn refused to serve under his son and successor Šawkat Djang, but was prevailed upon to change his mind. In 1170/1756, when Šawkat Djang revolted against Sirāḍī al-Dawla [q.v.], the independent ruler of Bengal, and was defeated and slain in battle, Ghulam Husayn, fearing reprisals at the hands of the victor, fled to Benares and took refuge with his relations living there, who had earlier been banished by Sirāḍī al-Dawla.

In 1170/1757, on Mir Dīnār’s assumption of power as the de facto governor of Bengal, Ghulam Husayn returned to Azīmābād and through the intercession of Rādā Rām Nārāyān, the local governor, recovered some of his family estates and was allowed to live in the town. He soon gained favour with Rām Nārāyān, but when prince ʿAlī Gūhar (Ṣah Shāh ʿAlī II) attacked Bengal in 1172/1759 he threw in his lot with the invaders. The attack having failed, he again went to Benares but soon sought the pardon of Rām Nārāyān and returned to Azīmābād. Thereafter he involved himself in Bengali politics, siding now with Mir Kāṣīm [q.v.] and now with the British, gaining favours from both sides. In 1176/1762 Mir Kāṣīm gave him a cash present of Rs. 5000 and also ordered the payment of the arrears of his salary with a view to retaining his allegiance, for he was intimate with the British and Mir Kāṣīm entertained strong suspicions of his loyalty (cf. Siyar al-mutaḥādhrin, Eng. transl. 1926, ii, 436). His subsequent rôle as an intermediary between the various contending groups is a very dubious one (cf. Siyar . . . , Eng. transl. 1926, ii 458, 513, 517, 524-5, 532, 535-7, 553). It was through his efforts that the baṣīrāt of Rūḥān arranged to surrender the fortress to the British. In 1187/1773-4 he was in Calcutta making preparations for a pilgrimage to Mecca but having been suddenly impoverished, gave up the intention. Some four years later he tried to ingratiate himself with Warren Hastings, the British Governor-General, but, without success. In 1194/1780 he again approached the British but with the same negative results. The exact date of his death is not known, but according
to the Bankipur MS. (No. 282) he was alive till 1230/1815. According to Nuzh:at al-baday'at (vi, 200) he died at Huzaynabad, a village founded by his father, Mir Muhammad. His descendants are still living in Patna.

An Iranian by extraction, he was thoroughly conversant with the art of Persian letter-writing. He was a munshi by profession and his letters and writings drew praise from, among others, Warren Hastings (Mislar 1112sh ... mubarradat-i fahr-râ mi-stidqad, Siyar ... , ii, 674). Among all his activities as a Mir Munshi, a political negotiator, a soldier and an intermediary, he found time for literary activities, undaunted by periods of penury and vicissitudes of fortune. His fame rests chiefly on the Siyar al-muta'ahkhârin, his magnum opus, a detailed history of India from Awrangzib's death in 1118/1705 to 1195/1781, begun in Sha'dar 1194/February 1780 and completed in Rama'dân 1195/August 1781. An autograph copy of this work is preserved in the Oriental Public Library, Bankipur (vii, 582). Editions: Calcutta 1248/1836; Lucknow 1282/1866, 1314/1897; Eng. transl. by Hájjí Mu'stâfá, originally Raymonald, Calcutta 1789 (most of this edition was lost at sea); reprint Calcutta 1926.

Urdu translations: (i) Ikhâl-nâma by S. Bakhshish (Ed. Delhi 1233/1817). (ii) Mu’tadîdîn by Góñná Dábîtâ, Prádád, Lucknow 1874. There are also several partial translations into English and one Persian abridgement: Mulakkhásat al-tawâirîkh (ed. Calcutta 1243/1827, Agra 1247/1831). His other works include (i) Bigdrât al-imâlma, a muñâwâni on the lives of his ancestors, especially the miracles of his grandfather S. 'Alîm Allâh Tâbâbâ't (d. 1156/1743) and his great-grandfather S. Tâyî Allâh (MS. Bankipur Suppt., i, no. 1901); (ii) a theological work on the prerogatives of Allâ and his descendants, being a commentary of certain hadîthi quoted in the Fâwa'dî of Mir Huzâyin al-Maybûddî (defective MS. of unknown title, Bankipur, xiv, no. 1319); (iii) a tafsîr of the Kur'ân in 'idomatic' Arabic (tafsîr dar tâzî-i bâ-ma'âwara); (iv) a commentary on the Mu'ániwi of Dájjâl dîn Rûmî; (v) a dawân of poems; and (vi) various other theological works. MSS. of nos. (i) to (vi) are known to exist. A historical work of doubtful authenticity entitled Sharâf-nâma, written in 1221/1806-7 (MS. Ásâfîya, iii, no. 1314) is also attributed to him.

Biography: Siyar al-muta'ahkhârin, Lucknow 1866, li (iii), 945-52; an abridged Eng. transl. of the above appeared in The Asiatic Annual Register ... for the year 1802, London 1802, Characters, 28-32; Dhu'l Fakhr 'All Khán "Mast", Riyâd al-wifâk (MS.); Elliott and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians, vii, 194-7; Buckland, Dictionary of Indian biography, 164; Storey, ii, 652-640 (the most detailed account), 1207; 'Abd al-Hâyy Lahhânwi, Nuzhât al-khidwâtî, Haydarâbâd 1378/1957, vii, 199-200.

GHULAM KADIR ROHILLA

This work is divided into a muhadâdima and four rawâds (i) the viceroys of the Sultans of Delhi, (ii) the independent kings, (iii) the Nâzîms (governors) under the Timúrs and (iv) the British. Edition: The Riyâd-s-Salatin ... ed. by Maulavi Abdul Hak Abîd, Calcutta 1890-1; Eng. transl., The Riyâd-s-Salatin ... translated ... with notes by Maulavi Abdus Salam, Calcutta 1902-4.

A man of considerable learning, he devoted his spare time to teaching. One of the pupils of a pupil of his, S. 'Ilâhî Bahshî, 'All Bakhshî al-Huzâyini Afgârâzâbî wrote Râ'murâdî dî dâhân-nûmâ, a general history of the world, based on a brief account of Ghulâm Huzâyin, his teacher's student (cf. H. Beveridge, JASB, lviv/1915, 196, 198). Other references are to be found in Riyâd al-salâtîn, Engl. transl., 2-5; 'Abd al-Hâyy Lahhânwi, Nuzhât al-khidâwi, Haydarâbâd, 1378/1958, vii, 352. He died in 1233/1817. See also Storey, i, 178.

GHULAM KADIR ROHILLA b. DÂBITA KHÂN b. 'ÂMR AL-UMARÀ b. NADÎB AL-DÂWILA [q.v.], founder of the town of Nadli'hâbad, remembered chiefly for his cruel treatment of the Mughal emperor Shâh 'Alîm (reg. 1173-1221/1759-1806), and his family. While still young Ghulâm Kâdir Khán was left at the Imperial court as his father's representative, most probably as a hostage. He escaped from custody, however, in 1190/1776 on the defeat of the imperial forces by Dâbîtâ Khán, and joined his father at the fort of Ghawthgâh, the family headquarters near Thâna Bhowan, the birth place of Asfâr 'Âlî Thânâwî [q.v.]. The very next year Dâbitâ Khân was defeated by the Marâthás and Ghulâm Kâdir was taken prisoner and brought to Delhi. There he was lodged in the palace (Red Fort) and, to the amusement of the courtiers, was obliged to appear before the emperor clad in women's attire. All this seems to have been done to humiliate his father, the Robilla chief Dâbita Khân. A handsome lad, he attracted the attention of the ladies of the harem, but was punished by castration. On the death of his father in 1199/1785 Ghulâm Kâdir succeeded in defeating the Maratha collector of revenue and seized the Marâthâ leader, Sîndhîvây (Seindia), entered into a pact with Ghulâm Kâdir for controlling the Sikhs who were giving trouble in the Doâb. Instead of observing the pact Ghulâm Kâdir began to drive out the Marâthâ collectors of revenue and seize imperial territory, enjoying all the time the patronage of the eunuch Hâfîz Manzûr 'All Khán, who had a strong hold over the emperor and wanted to throw off Marâthâ control. In August of the same year Ghulâm Kâdir succeeded in defeating the Marâthâ forces at Shâhdâra, near Delhi. He laid claim to the post of Mir Bakhshî and the control of the imperial administration. The next month he occupied the capital and forced Shâh 'Alîm to appoint him Mir Bakhshî and Amir Al-Umârâ, offices once held by his father and grandfather. He then began his despotism in the Doâb and even usurped the crowns lands reserved for the privy purse of the emperor (sarî-i khâss mahdîl). In Shâhwâl 1202/July 1788 he again appeared before Delhi and through the treachery and intrigue of his friend, the eunuch Manzûr 'All, superintendent of the royal household, was able to have an audience with the unwilling but helpless emperor. This audience proved to be the beginning of a period of great troubles for the imperial family—the House of Timâr. Shâh 'Alîm was taken prisoner and deposed on 26 Shâhwâl 1307, and
ten days later he was blinded. In a moving Persian poem Shâh 'Alam laments the loss of his eyes (cf. Şâbû al-Dîn 'Abd al-Rahmân, Bazam-i Timûrisiya, among others, 275-8). Children and women of the harem were starved to death, princes flogged and the bezgams dishonoured. For days together every conceivable cruelty was perpetrated on the royal family in vengeance for the act of castration to which the Rohilla chief had been subjected during his boyhood. Retribution, however, soon overtook him. In Dîumâd-i 1203/February 1279 he was captured by the Maratha leader, Mahâddî Sîndhî, and after a short imprisonment was put to death; his body was dismembered and hung from a tree.


(A. S. BAZMEE ANSARI)

**GHULÂM AL-KHALÂLÎ**, usuat apppellative of Abû Bakr 'Abd al-'Azîz b. Djâ'far b. Ahmad, a highly-esteemed Hânlî traditionist and jurisconsult (d. 366/1007). He owes his by-name to the fact that he was the principal disciple of Abû Bakr al-Khalâlî (d. 311/923 [q.v.]). He transmitted his master's *Kitâb al-Dîmât*, the first great *corpus juris* of Hanbâlîm, and he is often to be accused of forgery and dishonesty, but, to judge from some anecdotes, his detractors seem to have been wasting their time; this was notably the case with Ibn Durayd [q.v.], who was one day shown up in public by Ghulâm Thâlî and until his death never spoke to him again. He had an answer for everything and was even able to find a meaning, from the old Bedouin vocabulary, for words which mischievous pupils invented as a joke.

Politically, it is particularly interesting to note that he became a supporter of the Umayyad caliph in it the beginnings of a veiled hostility to the life of luxury and pleasure which was led by the courtiers and tradition has it that he dictated from memory a page of exceptional interest on the way in which the Umayyad caliph, which he insisted on his pupils reading before he allowed them to attend his lectures; al-'Askâlahî himself (Liçîn al-mâzîn, v, 268) passes a rather severe judgement on this work because it contains apocryphal data, but he places the responsibility for these on other transmitters. It is precisely because of his hostility towards 'Alî and the Shî'â that Ibn al-Nadîm is by no means favourable towards him; all the same he devotes to him a long notice (*Fihrist*, Cairo ed., 113-4), which includes a page of exceptional interest on the way in which at that time a dictated text gradually acquired the form of a finished work, thanks to the care of the listeners and the final intervention of the master.

Ibn al-Nadîm and the other biographers list a total of more than 25 works among which the *Kitâb al-Yâbût* (or al-Yawâkît) *fi 'l-nugha* seems to be the most important. In this list he draws particular attention to a commentary (*gâhar*) and a supplement (*jârî*) to the *Fihrist* of Thâlî and a "very good" *Gâhar* al-Khâdîj based on the *Musnad* of Ahmad b. Hanbâl, a supplement to the *Kitâb al-'Ayn* of al-Khâlîl b. Ahmad, a criticism of Abû Ubayda (ma 'ankarahu 'l-Abrâ 'lâl Abû Ubayda fimâ rawîhî) and a critical supplement to the *Dînâmara* of Ibn Durayd.


(CH. PELLAT)

**GHULÂM THÂLî** (singular, GHÂLÎ), "extremists", a term of disapproval for individuals accused of exaggeration (ghûţ) in religion. By heresiographers it was applied particularly to those Shî'îs [q.v.] whose doctrines Ijtâmâ'âshârî Imâmî orthodoxy has regarded as exaggerated in reverence for the *imâmî* or in other ways. In practice, the term has covered fairly numerous speculative Shî'îs except those later accepted by Ijtâmâ'âshârî tradition, as well as all later Shi'i
groups except Zaydis, orthodox Imāma'shāhīs, and sometimes Ismā'īlīs. During the early period, what are called the Ghulāt offered a distinctive speculative tendency within the general Shi'ī political orientation; their speculations continued to influence most later Shi'ī (and even some Sunni) thought, and formed a reservoir of ideas from which many later Shi'ī movements drew their main inspiration. Accordingly, the term Ghulāt, if understood as a proper name without parti pris, may be made to serve for a heterogeneous but interconnected group of Shi'ī religious leaders and for the later tradition which went back to them.

Traditionally, the first of the Ghulāt was 'Abd Allāh b. Siba? [q.v.], whose Ghulāt may have consisted in denying that 'Allāh had died, and predicting his return (radī'a), as the later Imāmins did that of the Twelfth Imām. In any case, the notion of the absence (ghayba) of an īmām who is due to return and establish justice as māzīl [q.v.] or ḥulūl means to have appeared first among the Ghulāt. Other positions which seem to have been labelled Ghulāt by early writers were the (public) condemnation (sabb) of Ābū Bākr and 'Umar as usurpers of 'Allī's right, and the notion that the true īmāms were divinely protected (maʿṣūm) against any sort of error. The Ghulāt were especially concerned to define the nature of the īmām, and to assert varying positions on this: that the īmām was the waṣī', executor, of the Prophet; that he possessed a prophetic authority (nubuwawwa) himself, though one secondary to Muḥammad's; that he (as well as Muḥammad) possessed a spark of the divine light (naʿīr iḍāḥī) inherited from Adam through a line of prophets; or that he represented divinity itself, perhaps as a lesser god in the earth, or by infusion (ḥulūl) of the divine spirit in him.

They were almost equally concerned to define the nature of the true believer. Some seem to have expected all the truly faithful to receive some expectation of continuing prophecy and the hope of the various Shi'ī ideas, finally seem to have affected certain Zoroastrian sectarian movements, especially through reverence for Abū Muslim (cf. Gholam Hossein Sadighi, Les Mouvements religieux iraniens, Paris 1938). By the 3rd/9th century, at latest, there developed, among the Ghulāt, bītīnī [q.v.] systems of symbolical Kūrān interpretation. These seem to have been influenced by philosophy, and the Ghulāt differed, according as they asserted the supremacy of one or another principle, among those agreed to be embodied in certain religious offices and persons. The Mīmīyā exalted the mim, or Muḥammad, embodying as prophet the principle of declared truth and outer reality; the 'Aynīyya exalted the 'ayn, or 'All, embodying as smām the principle of inward meaning; a third principle was represented by the sin, or Salīm Fārid, the Gate through whom men came to the truth. Several of these groups played something of a rôle in the declining years of the ʿAbbāsīd caliphate, when an enthusiast like Shalmaghanī held high political position.

Much of the Ghulāt heritage was absorbed into the Imāmī and Ismāʿīlī movements and disciplined by the exclusion especially of notions implying any compromise of the unity of God; thus the term ḥulūl seems to be rejected by surviving authors, along with the idea that the smām could be a god or a prophet. But even such ideas continued present within Imāmī and Ismāʿīlī circles and in sects like the Nuṣayrīyya [q.v.]; in later centuries, numerous apocalyptic movements developed in which various of the ideas of the Ghulāt were used, and which often resulted in more or less long-lasting sects, some of the Nizāris and Druzes from the Ismāʿīlī fold, and the 'Allī-Ḥāšī or Abī al-Ḥākī, who saw 'Allāt as God. The first Şafawīs likewise interpreted Shi'īsm in a
manner which orthodox Imamism must term ghulu. Transformed into complex symbolic lore, as at the hands of the Hurufis, much entered the broad sweep of Shi'ite writings, both ImamI and especially texts of the 2nd/8th century adopted Kharidji doctrines and took part in the revolt of Maysara. Even after the defeat of the Khurdis they showed an inclination towards heresy: "Their countrified customs and rustic habits", says Ibn Khalbūn, "prevented them from recognizing the true principles of religion". Thus they gathered in multitudes around the false prophet Ha-Mīm [q.v.]. Later another prophet appeared, by name ʿAṣīm b. Djamīl al-Yazadijumī, who rebelled and expressed his claims by his adept lama, among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them as ancestor Ghumār son of Masūm or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāf, son of Masūm. The Ghumār were divided into a large number of clans—B. Humayd, Mattalwa, Ighsawa (= Ghawār), Madikasā, etc.—whose names are still borne by certain tribes of the Rif. It is rather difficult to determine precisely the territory occupied by the Ghumār. According to Ibn Khalādūn it was five days long, from the region of the plains of the Maghrib to Tangier, by as many broad, from Qaṣr Kutamā to the river Wanghā. It was bounded by the Atlantic between Ašlā and Anfā and was adjacent on this side to the territory of the Barghūšī. Al-Bakrī excludes the regions of Tangier and Ceuta from it and gives as its limits Nakūr on the east and Karshāt on the west.

The Ghumār had been long established in this part of the Maghrib when Islam was introduced. When conquered by Muṣār b. Nuṣayr they became converted to the new religion but in the 2nd/8th century adopted Khurdisī doctrines and took part in the revolt of Maysara. Even after the defeat of the Khurdis they showed an inclination towards heresy: "Their countrified customs and rustic habits", says Ibn Khalīdūn, "prevented them from recognizing the true principles of religion". Thus they gathered in multitudes around the false prophet Ha-Mīm [q.v.]. Later another prophet appeared, by name ʿAṣīm b. Djamīl al-Yazadijumī, who rebelled and expressed his claims by his adept lama, among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them as ancestor Ghumār son of Masūm or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāf, son of Masūm. The Ghumār were divided into a large number of clans—B. Humayd, Mattalwa, Ighsawa (= Ghawār), Madikasā, etc.—whose names are still borne by certain tribes of the Rif. It is rather difficult to determine precisely the territory occupied by the Ghumār. According to Ibn Khalādūn it was five days long, from the region of the plains of the Maghrib to Tangier, by as many broad, from Qaṣr Kutamā to the river Wanghā. It was bounded by the Atlantic between Ašlā and Anfā and was adjacent on this side to the territory of the Barghūšī. Al-Bakrī excludes the regions of Tangier and Ceuta from it and gives as its limits Nakūr on the east and Karshāt on the west.

The Ghumār had been long established in this part of the Maghrib when Islam was introduced. When conquered by Muṣār b. Nuṣayr they became converted to the new religion but in the 2nd/8th century adopted Khurdisī doctrines and took part in the revolt of Maysara. Even after the defeat of the Khurdis they showed an inclination towards heresy: "Their countrified customs and rustic habits", says Ibn Khalīdūn, "prevented them from recognizing the true principles of religion". Thus they gathered in multitudes around the false prophet Ha-Mīm [q.v.]. Later another prophet appeared, by name ʿAṣīm b. Djamīl al-Yazadijumī, who rebelled and expressed his claims by his adept lama, among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them as ancestor Ghumār son of Masūm or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāf, son of Masūm. The Ghumār were divided into a large number of clans—B. Humayd, Mattalwa, Ighsawa (= Ghawār), Madikasā, etc.—whose names are still borne by certain tribes of the Rif. It is rather difficult to determine precisely the territory occupied by the Ghumār. According to Ibn Khalādūn it was five days long, from the region of the plains of the Maghrib to Tangier, by as many broad, from Qaṣr Kutamā to the river Wanghā. It was bounded by the Atlantic between Ašlā and Anfā and was adjacent on this side to the territory of the Barghūšī. Al-Bakrī excludes the regions of Tangier and Ceuta from it and gives as its limits Nakūr on the east and Karshāt on the west.

The Ghumār had been long established in this part of the Maghrib when Islam was introduced. When conquered by Muṣār b. Nuṣayr they became converted to the new religion but in the 2nd/8th century adopted Khurdisī doctrines and took part in the revolt of Maysara. Even after the defeat of the Khurdis they showed an inclination towards heresy: "Their countrified customs and rustic habits", says Ibn Khalīdūn, "prevented them from recognizing the true principles of religion". Thus they gathered in multitudes around the false prophet Ha-Mīm [q.v.]. Later another prophet appeared, by name ʿAṣīm b. Djamīl al-Yazadijumī, who rebelled and expressed his claims by his adept lama, among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them as ancestor Ghumār son of Masūm or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāf, son of Masūm. The Ghumār were divided into a large number of clans—B. Humayd, Mattalwa, Ighsawa (= Ghawār), Madikasā, etc.—whose names are still borne by certain tribes of the Rif. It is rather difficult to determine precisely the territory occupied by the Ghumār. According to Ibn Khalādūn it was five days long, from the region of the plains of the Maghrib to Tangier, by as many broad, from Qaṣr Kutamā to the river Wanghā. It was bounded by the Atlantic between Ašlā and Anfā and was adjacent on this side to the territory of the Barghūšī. Al-Bakrī excludes the regions of Tangier and Ceuta from it and gives as its limits Nakūr on the east and Karshāt on the west.

The Ghumār had been long established in this part of the Maghrib when Islam was introduced. When conquered by Muṣār b. Nuṣayr they became converted to the new religion but in the 2nd/8th century adopted Khurdisī doctrines and took part in the revolt of Maysara. Even after the defeat of the Khurdis they showed an inclination towards heresy: "Their countrified customs and rustic habits", says Ibn Khalīdūn, "prevented them from recognizing the true principles of religion". Thus they gathered in multitudes around the false prophet Ha-Mīm [q.v.]. Later another prophet appeared, by name ʿAṣīm b. Djamīl al-Yazadijumī, who rebelled and expressed his claims by his adept lama, among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them as ancestor Ghumār son of Masūm or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāf, son of Masūm. The Ghumār were divided into a large number of clans—B. Humayd, Mattalwa, Ighsawa (= Ghawār), Madikasā, etc.—whose names are still borne by certain tribes of the Rif. It is rather difficult to determine precisely the territory occupied by the Ghumār. According to Ibn Khalādūn it was five days long, from the region of the plains of the Maghrib to Tangier, by as many broad, from Qaṣr Kutamā to the river Wanghā. It was bounded by the Atlantic between Ašlā and Anfā and was adjacent on this side to the territory of the Barghūšī. Al-Bakrī excludes the regions of Tangier and Ceuta from it and gives as its limits Nakūr on the east and Karshāt on the west.

The Ghumār had been long established in this part of the Maghrib when Islam was introduced. When conquered by Muṣār b. Nuṣayr they became converted to the new religion but in the 2nd/8th century adopted Khurdisī doctrines and took part in the revolt of Maysara. Even after the defeat of the Khurdis they showed an inclination towards heresy: "Their countrified customs and rustic habits", says Ibn Khalīdūn, "prevented them from recognizing the true principles of religion". Thus they gathered in multitudes around the false prophet Ha-Mīm [q.v.]. Later another prophet appeared, by name ʿAṣīm b. Djamīl al-Yazadijumī, who rebelled and expressed his claims by his adept lama, among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them as ancestor Ghumār son of Masūm or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāf, son of Masūm. The Ghumār were divided into a large number of clans—B. Humayd, Mattalwa, Ighsawa (= Ghawār), Madikasā, etc.—whose names are still borne by certain tribes of the Rif. It is rather difficult to determine precisely the territory occupied by the Ghumār. According to Ibn Khalādūn it was five days long, from the region of the plains of the Maghrib to Tangier, by as many broad, from Qaṣr Kutamā to the river Wanghā. It was bounded by the Atlantic between Ašlā and Anfā and was adjacent on this side to the territory of the Barghūšī. Al-Bakrī excludes the regions of Tangier and Ceuta from it and gives as its limits Nakūr on the east and Karshāt on the west.

The Ghumār had been long established in this part of the Maghrib when Islam was introduced. When conquered by Muṣār b. Nuṣayr they became converted to the new religion but in the 2nd/8th century adopted Khurdisī doctrines and took part in the revolt of Maysara. Even after the defeat of the Khurdis they showed an inclination towards heresy: "Their countrified customs and rustic habits", says Ibn Khalīdūn, "prevented them from recognizing the true principles of religion". Thus they gathered in multitudes around the false prophet Ha-Mīm [q.v.]. Later another prophet appeared, by name ʿAṣīm b. Djamīl al-Yazadijumī, who rebelled and expressed his claims by his adept lama, among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them among the Maslama tribes and attributes to them as ancestor Ghumār son of Masūm or, according to another tradition, son of Meṣṭāf, son of Masūm. The Ghumār were divided into a large number of clans—B. Humayd, Mattalwa, Ighsawa (= Ghawār), Madikasā, etc.—whose names are still borne by certain tribes of the Rif. It is rather difficult to determine precisely the territory occupied by the Ghumār. According to Ibn Khalādūn it was five days long, from the region of the plains of the Maghrib to Tangier, by as many broad, from Qaṣr Kutamā to the river Wanghā. It was bounded by the Atlantic between Ašlā and Anfā and was adjacent on this side to the territory of the Barghūšī. Al-Bakrī excludes the regions of Tangier and Ceuta from it and gives as its limits Nakūr on the east and Karshāt on the west.
rebels who ask for their protection". From the 9th/15th century onwards we lack exact information about the Ghumara. Their name, mentioned by Leo Africanus in the 10th/13th century, is borne today by a powerful tribe of the Dižabäa.


---

**Ghûmdân** (epigr. GHNDN, CIIH 429), the castle of Sanâ' (Asâl) in the Yaman, famous for its antiquity, its size, and its splendour. Arabian geographers give detailed descriptions of it (v. infra), esp. Hamdânî (in Iklîl, viii), who attributes its building to the king Dhuqarâa Dhuqîbd (about 25 B.C.), probably correctly (cf. CIIH 429). The castle was situated between the twin mountains Nukûm and 'Abydân. It is said to have been destroyed by the Abyssinian conquerors in 525 A.D., but was rebuilt and served as the residence of Sayl b. Dhu Yazan after the Persian occupation in 570. It was finally demolished in connexion with the Muslim conquest of the Yaman, alleged either by a certain Muhammad b. Ughmân or by Alkama b. Dhu Dzadan, celebrate Ghumdân of the name.

Legend attributes the foundation of 'Ghumdan to 'Sâm b. Nuh, more seldom to Solomon or al-'Zabba b. al-Dîn Sam, established as the residence of Sayf b. Dhu Yazan after the Muslim occupation in 570. It was finally demolished in connexion with the Muslim conquest of the Yaman, alleged either by a certain Muhammad b. Ughmân or by Alkama b. Dhu Dzadan, celebrate Ghumdân of the name.

The nickname was transferred to a later scholar, the homograph Alkama b. Dhu Dzadan, celebrate Ghumdân of the name.

**Ghur (epigr. GHURAB, GHMBR).** The Arabo-Persian word does mean "rouged", but its single root, and it is probable that in the course of time it came to be used in connexion with the Muslim conquest of the Yaman, alleged either by a certain Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Sulaymân al-Bukhârî said to have died a hundred years earlier, in 312/924 (Hadîdî Khalifa, ii, 116 f.), and to have been the author of a *History of Bukhârâ* which is, in fact, identical with this Ghumdân.


**Ghur (epigr. GHURAB, GHMBR).** The mountainous territory in Afghanistan about the headwaters of the Farah Rud, Hari Rud, and Murghab, from which is named the mediaeval dynasty of the Ghûrîds [q.v.]. The establishment of Islam came late in Ghur, and raids by Arab generals continued until the 4th/10th century. A tradition of the existence of Jewish settlements finds confirmation in the discovery of a Judeo-Persian inscription of A.D. 752-3 at Tang-i Aza, near Cîght. In 372/982 the *Hudud al-'alam* claims that most of the inhabitants had accepted Islam. Originally the chief place was Mandaysh, in a district called Sanga, the chief place was in a district called Sanga near the mountain Zâr-i Margh. These localities were placed by Maricq near Ahangaran—the name, still mentioned by the earlier historian of Bukhara, cf. Wüstfenfel, *History of Bukhara*, iii/2, 394; Dimishki, tr. Mehren, 31. For the alleged earlier historian of Bukhara, cf. Wüstfenfel, *History of Bukhara*, iii/2, 394; Dimishki, tr. Mehren, 31.


---

**Ghurâb**, (a.) "crow." In view of the diversity of their meanings the Arabic words formed from the three consonants gh, r, and b cannot be traced to a single root, and it is probable that in the course of the history of the language there came about a convergence of terms with different origins; thus, *ghurâb* is too reminiscent of the Latin corvus for us to consider it a mere coincidence; moreover, early Arab philologists considered *ghurâb* to be independ-
ent, since they made to derive from it such words as ghurba, ightirdb, etc. which imply an idea of estrangement, of separation; later authors go so far as to regard the root gh. r. b. as being made up from the consonants gh, r, b which appear initially in words meaning a misfortune or something unpleasant.

Such theories are explained firstly by the place which the crow occupies in the literary tradition of the Arabs, secondly by its place in ornithomancy, where it is pre-eminently the bird of ill omen.

In poetry, although its black colour may symbolize the night (ghurdb al-layl) and be the object of favourable judgements, the crow is fundamentally synonymous with separation, with an unhappy event, and the poets make sometimes an immediate use of the stereotyped expression ghurab al-bayn, which strictly means the carrion crow, but which owes its origin to the fact that crows are led by instinct to encampments which their occupants are preparing to leave, and announce by their croaking the imminent departure (basyan) of the tribe—more particularly of the beloved—before swooping down on the deserted places, where the poet, arriving too late, is struck with grief on seeing them.

The mere sight of a crow is in itself unpleasant, and one can readily understand, without feeling the need to postulate a borrowing, that the early Arabs should have made it into a bird of ill omen and in addition applied themselves to observing and interpreting its flight and its croaking, in the context of what is called hra [q.v.]. Examples from literature of these predictions, which were deduced more or less spontaneously, cannot be quoted here; but it is worth mentioning that they are the sign of a fairly rudimentary ornithomancy which only at a relatively late date was perfected and systematized, although the Fihrist (Cairo ed., 436) already refers to Arabic treatises of ornithomancy, one of which is the work of al-Madâ'innî. T. Fahd has studied a treatise attributed to al-Dîhîz, comparing it in a very illuminating fashion with two Assyro-Babylonian texts; in spite of differences of detail, it does not seem that the Arabic text is the result of an enquiry carried out among the Bedouins: rather one has the impression that it is an attempt, made probably at a late date, to give some order to elements of diverse provenance. Nevertheless, it is strange that al-Dîhîz, who is one of the few authors to have considered that the belief in the malicious influence of the crow and in the possibility of drawing omens from its flight and its cry is only a superstition based on verbal similarities (Hayawdn, iii, 444), should have been later credited with two treaties of divination: the text studied by T. Fahd (found in al-Nuwayri, Nihâya, iii, 130-2) and the Bûb al-Ilrîfa wa l-sâqîr wa l-farsâ sa-lâ madhbâb al-Furs (published and translated in Russian by K. A. Inostroatgev, in Materials from Arabic sources for the history of the culture of Sassanian Persia, St. Petersburg 1907, text, 3-27, tr. and comm., 28-120).

In the context of Islam the word ghurab is used in the Qur'ân (v, 34/37) with reference to the crow sent by God to show Cain how to bury his brother Abel whom he had just killed; although rationalists see in this a manifestation of divine favour towards the bird considered to be of ill omen, they do not succeed in stifling the prejudices made still stronger by the legend of the crow (ghurab Nâh) which Noah sent out to reconnoitre, but which, having found a carcass, did not return.

The malevolent character of this bird explains the considerable number of nicknames which it has in Arabic; but it is proverbial also for sharpness of vision, its suspicion, its pride and the blackness of its plumage, and the word ghurab appears in a number of expressions such as "that will only happen when the crow turns white" (hâdît yâqîb al-ghurab).

The Arabs knew several varieties of crow, including one which can learn to speak, and had observed their hostile relations with cattle, donkeys and owls; their habit of perching on tombs and parting the beaks into the pustules which form on their backs tended to increase the Bedouins' dislike for this bird, about which in any case they knew little, since some maintained that it reproduced itself by pecking the female with its beak.

The crow is among the animals that must be killed, and its flesh is forbidden; it possesses however certain medicinal properties, the dried blood in particular being a specific for haemorrhoids. A crow's beak carried on the person gives protection against the evil eye, but to see the bird in a dream is of course a sinister portent.

Bibliography: Dîhîz, Hayawdn, ii, iii, 409-64; Ibn Kutayba, ʿUyân, passim; Damîrî, s.v.; Kazwînî, s.v.; Bayhaqî, Mabadsîn, passim; H. Pècs, Poésie et raison, index; H. Massâ, Crovaneys et coutumes persanes, Paris 1938, i, 195; T. Fahd, Les présages par le corbeau. Étude d'un texte attribué à Gâhîz, in Arabica, viiii (1961), 30-58.

(Ch. Pellat)
laṭa-sarayi, the Palace of Ibrāhīm Pāša, or the palace at Edirne [see ghulām]; (2) from suitable sons of members of the Ālī Būlūk; (3) from young Muslims from other Muslim lands who had come to fight the ghāsh in the Ottoman army and distinguished themselves (according to Idrīs Bīlīsī, Ḥaṣāt bīḥīqīṭ, MS Nuriosmaniye 300, they were "Arab, ʿAḡjem and Kurd"; according to Angiolello they came from Persia, the land of the Tatars, Cappadocia, the land of the Turcomans and Egypt). The name shows that the original source of recruits for these bōluḵs was the last (the only case where Muslims were taken into the ranks of the Kāḥṭ būlūḵ [see ghulām].

In about 860/1455 (I. de Promontorio, 30) the two bōluḵs numbered 1000 men (but Ordo Portae, of about the same date, mentions only 400; Angiolello speaks of 500-1000). In the 10th/16th century they numbered 1000 each, 2000 together (Ḥaṣāt bīḥīqīṭ; Ramberti, apud A. H. Lybyer, The government of the Ottoman Empire . . ., Cambridge 1913, 251: about 2000 together; in a document of 970/1568, see Uzuncarsılı, op. cit., 196, the Ṣagh Gharibler are recorded as 1000 men, 2000 together). By the beginning of the 11th/17th century (ʿAyn-i ʿAll, Kauṇānīn, Istanbul 1280, 9), the Diṃḍaʿat-i Gharibd-i yemin numbered 928, the Diṃḍaʿat-i Gharbēd-i yemin numbered 975.

Their organization was the same as that of the other bōluḵs of Ḳāḥṭ būlūḵ. In each bōluḵ there was an aḡha in command, a kēthūḏu (kākya; according to Angiolello and Ramberti he was paid 30 akṣes a day), a kāḥṭ or kāḥīsī to attend to the paper work (with 20 akṣes, according to Angiolello; according to Ramberti, half a century later, he received 25), and a tuwush or baẓḥ-tuwush responsible for discipline (for the organization see Sadra’un Kemankeš Kura Mūṣṭafā Paşa Lāyḥās, ed. F. R. Naṭ, in Taʾrīḫ Veskileri, v/6 [1942], 457). In the 10th/16th century the aḡha of the Ṣagh Gharibler was appointed from among the ṭāḥṣeṅlis. At a ʿṭāma, the aḡha of the Sol Ṣagh Gharibler was promoted aḡha of the Sol Ṣagh Gharibler, and the latter aḡha of the Sol ʿUlufedżiler. Sometimes by exception, and contrary to the kānūn, towards the end of this century the aḡha of the Ṣagh Gharibler was promoted directly aḡha of the Silāḥdārār, or sandğaŋ-begi, and even begerbegi (see documents apud Uzuncarsılı, 172). Whereas each of the aḡhas had in the times of Muḥammad II and Sulaymān I received an ʿuluf of 80 akṣes (see Angiolello and Ramberti), at the end of the 10th/16th century they received 100; in addition they held zeḵdjets.

The two divisions were sub-divided into 260 bōluḵs, each with its bōluḵ-bāṣḥ (Kemankeš Lāyḥās, 457).

Since their horses needed grazing land, the majority of them were scattered in the outskirts of Istanbul, Edirne, Bursa, Kütahya and Konya; an officer appointed jointly by the aḡhas of the six regiments, with the title kēthūḏu-yeīrī, was in command of each of these scattered groups of members of the six regiments and maintained discipline. The ʿulufes of the men varied between 6 and 20 akṣes (Ordo Portae, p. 9; Angiolello: 10-20 akṣes; I. de Promontorio: 12 akṣes; Ramberti: 7-14 akṣes). At each promotion the Sol Ṣagh Gharibr (sandğaŋ) at the beginning or their sons, if they showed themselves fit, could be appointed to the Gherbed régiments. Their weapons were bow and arrow, shield, scimitar (pala), dagger, lance and axe. Though some carried muskets, fire-arms were not popular with them. They had assistants known as ʾṣqrān (Ramberti, 251). Each of the two bōluḵs had a flag (bāyraḵ) and a tuqâ; the flag of the Ṣagh Gharibler was white and that of the Sol Ṣagh Gharibler of two colours, white and red or white and green. Duties. Like all the Ḳāḥṭ būlūḵ, at first they served in the field only when the Sultan himself went on campaign, but in the 10th/16th century it became the practice for them to serve also under a sāṭrār-e chem, i.e., a commander with the rank of vizier. The Gherbōvjetiler had a reputation for valour, and so in the course of the fighting were sometimes entrusted with difficult tasks like penetrating the ranks of the enemy (Ḥaṣāt bīḥīqīṭ). Their principal duty on campaign was to guard the Sultan’s standards (Ḥaṣāt bīḥīqīṭ and later the sandğaŋ-begi ʿṣqrān); they took their station as the rearmost of the cavalry regiments guarding the Sultan’s tent and protected the rear (Ordo Portae, 9). These two bōluḵs formed the rearguard of the Ḳāḥṭ būlūḵ, stationed in the centre, and guarded the tents and baggage. From the end of the 10th/16th century onwards, when, during a siege, a battle developed it was their dangerous duty to guard the entrenchments.

With the general decay of the akṭūm system, the order and discipline of these bōluḵs too began to break up. Already in the 10th/16th century, the places of Ḳāḥṭ būlūḵ in their ranks were in time of war increasingly filled by ‘outsiders’ known as serdengedā; at the same time the principle was abandoned of enregistering mūḏaḏm candidates for future vacancies in the bōluḵs.

When in the 11th/17th century these bōluḵs began to partake in the mutinies and revolts, steps were taken to reduce the importance of the bōluḵat-i erbaʿa. In 1071/1660, under Kōprülü Muḥammad Pāša the numbers of the Ṣagh Gharibler were reduced to 410, those of the Sol Ṣagh Gharibler to 312. Later still, the Ṣagh Gharibler ʿAquṣ was made subordinate to the Sipaṭi ʿoğluṅlār Aḵāṣ, and the Sol Ṣagh Gharibler ʿAquṣ to the Silāḥdārār ʿAquṣ. In a list of 1123/1711, the Ṣagh Gharibler are shown as numbering only 180 men and the Sol Ṣagh Gharibler 162. On campaigns, however, these two bōluḵs maintained their entity as guardsians of the sandğaŋ-begi ʿṣqrān. In Ṣafar 1242/ September 1826, very shortly after the abolition of the Janissaries, all six of the Ālī Būlūk were disbanded (for the text of the firman, see Uzuncarsılı, 210-2).

The so-called ḡworat tāfsezi, groups of men who, from the 10th/16th century onwards, left their homes and sometime roamed the country as brigands, are quite unconnected with the Gherbed.

Bibliography: in the article.

GHURABĪYÁ, a branch of the Shiʿī "aggregators" (gūlāt [q.t.]). Its adherents believed that ʿAll and Muḥammad were so like in physical features as to be confused, as like “as one crow (gūlāt) is to another” (a proverbial expression for great similarity, cf. Zeitschr. f. Assyr., xvii, 53), so that the Angel Gabriel when commissioned by God to bring the revelation to ʿAll gave it in mistake to Muḥammad. ʿAll was, they say, appointed by God to be a Prophet and Muḥammad only became one through a mistake. According to Ibn Hāza ne, ʿAll is the one that ʿAquṣ Gabriel erred in good faith; others held he went astray deliberately, and cursed him as an apostate. According to al-Baghdādī, the sectaries greeted one another by cursing Gabriel. According to the Bayān al-adīyān, the Ghurabīyya were so called because they believed that ʿAll was in heaven in the form of a crow. Ibn Kūyayba (Maḏārif, ed. Wüstenfeld, 300) remarks that this
GHURABIYYA — GHURIDS

is one of the few sects the origin of which is not attributed to an individual.

It is related that in the 4th/10th century the followers of this sect in Kunn raised a serious revolt against the decision of the judge Abû Sa'îd al-I斯塔khîrî (died 336/949) when he divided an inheritance equally between two claimants, one of whom was the daughter and the other the uncle of the deceased. The Ghurabiyya demanded that the whole estate should go to the daughter and the uncle be quite excluded; as our source rightly observes, this was the result of their political creed, according to which the succession to Muhammad was legitimate only in the line of his only daughter Fâtimah and not in that of his uncle (Abbasî) (Subkî, Tabâbî al-Shîfiyya, ii, 194). Cf. the regulations made by the Caliph al-Mu'izz according to a report of Ibn Hîdar, Raif al-Iṣrâîlî, ed. Guest (in the appendix to al-Kindi, Governors and Judges of Egypt, Gibb-Memorial, xi), 567, l. 3 from end. Ibn Diubayr, who visited Damascus in 580/1184, mentions the Ghurabiyya among the minor sects to be found in Syria.


GHUR [see DILAWAR KHAN and MAWLAWI].

GHURIDS, the name of an eastern Iranian dynasty which flourished as an independent power in the 7th/13th and the early years of the 7th/14th century and which was based on the region of Ghur (q.v.) in what is now central Afghanistan with its capital at Firuzkuh (q.v.).

1. Origins and early history. The family name of the Ghurid Sultans was Shansab/Shansab (< MP Gushnasn; cf. Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, 282, and Marquart, Das Reich Zulfin, in Festschrift E. Sachau, 289, n. 3), and in the time of their florescence, attempts were made to attach their genealogy to the ancient Iranian epic past. The 7th/11th century historian of the Ghurids, Dîjâzânî, quotes a metrical version of the genealogy of the family composed by Fakhr al-Dîn Mubârâkshâh Marâvardî and completed in the reign of Sultan Ghiyâth al-Dîn Muham- mad (âxîl. in the last third of the 6th/12th century). In this, the family is traced back to the tyrant-of-Iranian mythology, Azhd Dahak, whose descendants were supposed to have settled in Ghur after Farîdîn’s overthrowing of Dahak’s thousand-year dominion. Within this genealogy, Shansab himself is placed in the first century of Islam, and the family now brought within the ambit of the new faith. Shansab is said to have been converted by the Caliph âAllî, who formally invested him with the rulership of Ghur; his son Fâlîk later espoused the cause of Abî Muslim in Khurâsân and in this way obtained the support of the Ghurids. A further alleged episode can be directly connected with the political position in Ghur in later times.

According to this, the Caliph Hârûn ar-Rashîd received at his court the Amir Bandî b. Nahârân Shansabânî and a rival chieftain from Ghur, Shîh b. Bahrâm. But it was awarded the insignia of political sovereignty (imdrâîl) over Ghur, together with the title Kasim Amir al-Muwî’îmûn, whilst Shîh was awarded the military command (pâhâlânî) of the forces of Ghur, “an arrangement”, says Dîjâzânî, “which has continued thus till the present time” (see further, below).

All these fabrications clearly aim at giving some lustre to a dynasty which had arisen from very obscure and localized origins, or as in the latter episode, they attempt to project into the past an explanation for the political situation of later times (cf. C. E. Bosworth, The early Islamic history of Ghur, in Central Asiatic Journal, vi [1961], 125-7). Ethnically, we can only assume that the Shansabanis were, like the rest of the Ghûrs, of eastern Iranian stock. We are equally in the dark about the language which they spoke, except that in the early 5th/11th century it differed considerably from the Persian of the Ghaznavid court. It is possible that the earliest Ghurids spoke some south-east Iranian language, one of the group which has been all but eliminated in modern times by the spread of Persian and Pashto (communication from G. Morgenstierne).

We know nothing really definite about the Shansabanis until Ghaznavid times, i.e., the 5th/11th century; it was only in the early part of this century that Ghur, and presumably the Shansabanis, began to adopt Islam. The Hûdâ al-Islâm (372/982-3) mentions a Ghur-Shâh who was tributary to the Farîghûnî Amir of Ghaznâw. It is notable that the north of Ghur (q.v.), but there is nothing to show that this ruler was necessarily a Shansabânî. Within the empire of Sultan Mahmûd of Ghaznâ (338-421/948-1030), Ghur remained an unabsorbed enclave; hence during his reign, at least three expeditions were sent by him to Ghur. In 401/1011 a force attacked the Shansaban chief Muhammâd b. Sûrî, capturing him at his stronghold of Ahangaran. He was now deposed, his pro-Ghaznavid son Abû ‘Allî set up as the Sultan’s vassal and teachers left to instruct the people in the precepts of Islam (cf. Utbi and Dijâzânî in M. Nâzîm, The life and times of Sultan Mahmûd of Ghaznâ, Cambridge 1931, 70-2, and Bosworth, op. cit., 123-2, 127-8). From this, and from other information in Dijâzânî, we can firmly identify the Shansabanis as petty rulers of the region of Mandeh on the south bank of the upper Herî Rûd, with its centre at Ahangaran, the place still known today by that name. According to Dijâzânî, the stronghold of the Shansabanîs of Mandeh lay at the foot of the Zar-i Marsh, one of the five great mountain massifs of Ghur, and believed by the Ghuris to be the mountain where the Simurgh nurtured Rustam’s father Zal. At this time, the term “Ghur” seems to have had a restricted meaning and to have been synonymous with Mandeh, i.e., the north-eastern corner of the Ghur of the early Islamic geographers.

The existence of several other chieftains of Ghur (in the larger sense of the term) is known in the 5th/11th century. Of at least equal importance with the Shansabanis were the lords of the region further down the Herî Rûd, around the later Ghurî capital of Firuzkuh and the modern Khâlîq or Khâlîq-i-Ghur (in the narrow sense) and called Bidâd al-Dîjalî. Bayhaki, ed. Ghanî and Fayyâd, 74-20, gives a detailed
account of the Ghaznavid expedition of 411/1020 under Mas'ud b. Ma'mūd, which marched up the Heri Rud from Herāt, captured the fortress of Dūrāw and made the local chieftain Wārmesh-Pat submit. The occurrence at a later date of this name in the Shāhānūš family (see above) points to the fact that this district of Dūrāw was in the north-western corner of Ghūr was the centre of the Shansabanīs’ rivals, the Shāhānūsh. Bayhaḵī mentions the names of other chieftains in Ghūr, and it is clear that, despite Dūrāw’s attempts to inflame the early Shansabanīs’ sphere of authority, these last were only one lot of petty chiefs amongst several in this inaccessible region. Moreover, it seems that the primacy of the Shansabanīs at a later date was only achieved after much jostling for power and local warfare, although explicit information on this process is meagre.

2. The period of vassalage to the Ghaznavids and Saldjūqs. Ma’mūd of Ghazna’s nominee Abū ʿAli b. Ma’mūd is praised for his beneficent rule and his encouragement of the newly-introduced Islamic religion; he built mosques and madrasas and endowed them with awkāf. But during the reign of Mas’ud of Ghazna (421-32/1030-41) an internal revolution took place in Māndehš and, Abū ʿAli was deposed by his nephew ʿAbbas b. Shih. ʿAbbas devoted his efforts to fortifying and rebuilding the castles and strongholds which were such a feature of the landscape of Ghūr, but his tyranny provoked an appeal of discontent Ghūrī chiefs to Sultan Ibrāhīm b. Ma’mūd. Ibrāhīm therefore marched into Ghūr, deposed ‘Abbas and set up the latter’s son Muḥammad. Muḥammad was succeeded by his own son ʿUṣūl al-Dīn Hasan (the first Shansabanī known to have a lakab or honorific). Within this period, c. the second half of the 5th/11th century, the Shansabanīs were trying to extend their authority beyond Māndehš and over the lands of rival chieftains. Dūrāwī speaks of the feuding and turbulence which went on within Ghūr both at this time and until much later; and it was during the suppression of a rebellion in Waḏlristān, the district to the west of Ghazna, that ʿUṣūl al-Dīn Hasan was killed.

With the accession of his son, ʿĪz al-Dīn Husayn (458/1066-9) the Shansabanī dynasty becomes fuller. Since four of his many sons eventually became rulers, Dūrāwī calls him ʿAbu ʿUzz-ʾal-Salādīn, “Father of Sultans”. By now, Ghūr had become a buffer region between the truncated Ghaznavid empire, reduced after the middle years of the 5th/11th century to southern and eastern Afghanistan and northern India, and the powerful empire of the Saldjūqs. In particular, Salādīn Kūrāḏānī was after 490/1097 under the rule of the forceful Sandjar b. Malik Shāh. With the relative decline of the Ghaznavids after Ibrāhīm’s death in 492/1099, Ghūr was drawn towards the Saldjūq sphere of influence. ʿĪz al-Dīn Husayn was initially confirmed in power by Mas’ud III b. Ibrāhīm of Ghazna, but in 501/1107-8 Sandjar led a raid into Ghūr and captured ʿĪz al-Dīn, and there after the Ghūrid maintained close relations with the Saldjūq, sending him as tribute the specialties of Ghūr, including armor, coats of mail and the local breed of fierce dogs.

On ʿĪz al-Dīn’s death, his son Sayf al-Dīn Sūrī succeeded as chief in Ghūr and overlord of the Shansabanī family. He now made a general division of territories amongst his brothers, an indication that political feeling amongst the Ghūrids was still tribal and patrimonial in nature, and unaffected by the administrative sophistication of their Ghaznavid neighbours, with their unitary state under one Sultan. Sayf al-Dīn retained the fortress of Istīy as his capital; ʿUṣūl al-Dīn Muḥammad was allotted Warshār or Wārshār, where he reigned with authority and fortress of Fīrūzkūh and assumed the title of Malīk al-Dībāḥ; ʿUṣūl al-Dīn Muḥammad took Mādīn; ʿAlī al-Dīn ʿUsayn took Waḏlristān; Bahāʾ al-Dīn Šāh took Sanga, the chief place of Māndehš; and Fakhr al-Dīn Mas’ud took Kātī on the headwaters of the Herī Rud. It was soon apparent that the Shansabanīs’ sense of family solidarity was not developed enough for this division to work, and fratricidal strife broke out. ʿUṣūl al-Dīn quarreled with his brothers, fled to Bahāʾr Shāh’s court at Ghazna, but was there poisoned. From this deed there arose, says Dūrāwī, the deep hatred and enmity between the Ghūrid and Ghaznavid families. In retaliation, Sayf al-Dīn Sūrī marched on Ghazna and temporarily expelled the Sultan, but in the face of popular sympathy for the Ghaznavids was unable to hold the city; and in a battle which took place when Bahāʾr Shāh returned, Sayf al-Dīn was captured and ignominiously executed.

Bahāʾ al-Dīn succeeded in Ghūr in 544/1149, and after finishing the fortifying of Fīrūzkūh, set out with an army for Ghazna, but died en route in that same year. ʿAlī al-Dīn Husayn had been left behind by his brother to rule Ghūr, and he now took over supreme power and tried to averge his dead brothers and, if possible, to reduce Ghaznavid power in Afghanistan, for the hold which they had on the routes through eastern Afghanistan from Kābul to Ghazna and Bust blocked any potential Ghūrid expansion there. Bahāʾr Shāh massed his troops in the region of Tīghābād (i.e., the modern region of Ḥandārā). ʿAlī al-Dīn moved into Zamīn-Dāwar and a great battle took place, in which the tactics of the Ghūrid infantry, with their walls of protective shields, overcame the Ghaznavids’ elephants. Bahāʾr Shāh was pursued to Ghazna and again defeated, retiring now to India. ʿAlī al-Dīn entered the city, and a frightful orgy of devastation and plundering followed, earning the Ghūrid his title of Dījān-Sūr “World Incendiary” (545/1149-50). He now moved into Zamīn-Dāwar and a great battle took place, in which the Ghaznavid Sultans were exhumed and burnt, and on the way back to Ghūr, the other great Ghaznavid centre of Bust was sacked in an equally savage manner. ʿAlī al-Dīn thus made no attempt at this moment permanently to annex the Ghaznavid territories in eastern Afghanistan, but he does seem to have aspired to a more ambitious position than that of a mere chieftain of Ghūr. According to Ibn al-ʿAthīr, he now copied Salādīn and Ghaznavid practice, calling himself al-Sultān al-Muʿāazzam and adopting the ʿādr or ceremonial parasol; previously, the Ghūrids had been content to style themselves Malīk or Amīr. It was natural that his success at Ghazna should embolden ʿAlī al-Dīn to throw off Saldjūq control. In 547/1152 he stopped paying tribute to Sandjar and endeavoured to support an anti-Saldjūq rising in Herāt. His army advanced from Fīrūzkūh down the Herī Rud, but was met at Nāb by Sandjar’s forces and crushingly defeated after the Turkish, Oghuz and Khaḷaḏī troops in the Ghūrid army had gone over to their co-nationals in Sandjar’s army. ʿAlī al-Dīn was personally captured and spent some time as a prisoner in Kūrāsān. The last years of his life, until his death in 556/1161, were spent firstly in consolidating his position in Ghūr against rival members of his family, and secondly in making conquests in Waḏlristān and the upper
3. The Ghurids as an imperial power. The expansionary policy of 'Ala al-Din's last years meant that the Ghurids were now breaking out beyond their mountain fastnesses in Ghur and would soon become a major power in the eastern Islamic world. There was, indeed, something of a vacuum of power there at this time: the Ghaznavid empire was in decay, and Sandjai's capture by the Ghurids and the consequent anarchy in Persia facilitated Ghurid expansion in the west. 'Ala al-Din's annexations gave the impetus towards a tripartite division of the Ghurid empire, each under a separate branch of the Shansabaní family, and this division remained characteristic until the final fall of the Ghurids.

The senior branch ruled over Ghur from Firuzkoh and was concerned with expansion westwards into Khurásan. When Ghazna was finally taken in 569/1173-4, another branch was established there and used Ghazna as a base for expansion into India. Finally, 'Ala al-Din installed in the newly-conquered town of Bamiyan his brother Fakhr al-Din Mas'ud, and the latter ruled over Tukharistán, Badakhshan and Shughnan, up to the Oxus bank. After Fakhr al-Din's death in 558/1163, he was followed by his son Shams al-Din Muhammad. The latter is said to have had a rival over Oxus to Caghāniyān and Wakhsh; he also received from Ghiyath al-Din Muhammad in Firuzkoh the title of "Sultan" and the privilege of having a "Fatr".

'Ala al-Din Husayn was succeeded at Firuzkoh by his son Sayf al-Din Muhammad, who took repressive measures against the Isma'ilis who had infiltrated into Ghur, and who also held a feud with the Shansabanís and their rivals in Ghur, the Shīhān. The Sultan treacherously murdered his Commander-in-Chief Warmem b. Shīth, and in revenge, Warmem's brother, now succeeded to the office of Shīhān. The Sultan treacherously murdered his Commander-in-Chief Warmem b. Shīth, and in revenge, Warmem's brother, now succeeded to the office of Shīhān. The Sultan treacherously murdered his Commander-in-Chief Warmem b. Shīth, and in revenge, Warmem's brother, now succeeded to the office of Shīhān. The Sultan treacherously murdered his Commander-in-Chief Warmem b. Shīth, and in revenge, Warmem's brother, now succeeded to the office of Shīhān.

Under Shams al-Din (later Ghiyath al-Din) Muhammād of Ghur (558-99/1163-1203) and Shihāb al-Din (later Mu'izz al-Dīn) Mu'izzād al-Dīn of Ghazna (559-602/1163-1206), the Ghurid empire reached its apogee. These two brothers maintained a partnership and amity rare for their age. Broadly speaking, the first was concerned with expansion westwards and the checking of the Khorāzmi-Shāhs' ambitions in Khurāsān, whilst the second carried on the ghāzist-tradition of the Ghaznavids in northern India. The Ghurids thus challenged the Khorāzmi-Shāhs for supremacy in the eastern Islamic world, and initially seemed to have an advantage in that they were completely free agents, whereas the Shāhs were vassals of the Kāra Khiṭay. Moreover, the Ghurids skilfully utilized the fears roused in the west by the Shāhs' imperialist ambitions. Ghiyath al-Dīn kept up cordial relations with the 'Abbāsid Caliphs, and embassies were frequently exchanged between Firuzkoh and Baghārd; Dīvānī's father took part in one of these. The Sultan was received into the Najda Fatwah under a condition, that the Caliph more than once urged the Ghurids to stem the advance of the Khorāzmi-Shāhs in Persia.

Ghiyath al-Dīn was joined at Firuzkoh by Mu'izz al-Dīn, who had been at Bamiyan. The two of them then fought over a coalition of Fakhr al-Dīn's last years meant that the Ghurids were now breaking out beyond their mountain fastnesses in Ghur and would soon become a major power in the eastern Islamic world. There was, indeed, something of a vacuum of power there at this time: the Ghaznavid empire was in decay, and Sandjai's capture by the Ghurids and the consequent anarchy in Persia facilitated Ghurid expansion in the west. 'Ala al-Din's annexations gave the impetus towards a tripartite division of the Ghurid empire, each under a separate branch of the Shansabaní family, and this division remained characteristic until the final fall of the Ghurids.

The senior branch ruled over Ghur from Firuzkoh and was concerned with expansion westwards into Khurāsān. When Ghazna was finally taken in 569/1173-4, another branch was established there and used Ghazna as a base for expansion into India. Finally, 'Ala al-Din installed in the newly-conquered town of Bamiyan his brother Fakhr al-Din Mas'ud, and the latter ruled over Tukharistán, Badakhshan and Shughnan, up to the Oxus bank. After Fakhr al-Din's death in 558/1163, he was followed by his son Shams al-Din Muhammad. The latter is said to have had a rival over Oxus to Caghāniyān and Wakhsh; he also received from Ghiyath al-Din Muhammad in Firuzkoh the title of "Sultan" and the privilege of having a "Fatr".
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Under Shams al-Din (later Ghiyath al-Din) Muhammād of Ghur (558-99/1163-1203) and Shihāb al-Din (later Mu'izz al-Dīn) Mu'izzād al-Dīn of Ghazna (559-602/1163-1206), the Ghurid empire reached its apogee. These two brothers maintained a partnership and amity rare for their age. Broadly speaking, the first was concerned with expansion westwards and the checking of the Khorāzmi-Shāhs' ambitions in Khurāsān, whilst the second carried on the ghāzist-tradition of the Ghaznavids in northern India. The Ghurids thus challenged the Khorāzmi-Shāhs for supremacy in the eastern Islamic world, and initially seemed to have an advantage in that they were completely free agents, whereas the Shāhs were vassals of the Kāra Khiṭay. Moreover, the Ghurids skilfully utilized the fears roused in the west by the Shāhs' imperialist ambitions. Ghiyath al-Dīn kept up cordial relations with the 'Abbāsid Caliphs, and embassies were frequently exchanged between Firuzkoh and Baghārd; Dīvānī's father took part in one of these. The Sultan was received into the Najda Fatwah under a condition, that the Caliph more than once urged the Ghurids to stem the advance of the Khorāzmi-Shāhs in Persia.

Ghiyath al-Dīn was joined at Firuzkoh by Mu'izz al-Dīn, who had been at Bamiyan. The two of them then fought over a coalition of Fakhr al-Dīn's last years meant that the Ghurids were now breaking out beyond their mountain fastnesses in Ghur and would soon become a major power in the eastern Islamic world. There was, indeed, something of a vacuum of power there at this time: the Ghaznavid empire was in decay, and Sandjai's capture by the Ghurids and the consequent anarchy in Persia facilitated Ghurid expansion in the west. 'Ala al-Din's annexations gave the impetus towards a tripartite division of the Ghurid empire, each under a separate branch of the Shansabaní family, and this division remained characteristic until the final fall of the Ghurids.
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Mu'izz al-Din's death, the Ghurid empire fell apart, passing for a brief while into the hands of the Khwarizm-Shahs before the coming of the Mongols enveloped the eastern Islamic world in a common catastrophe. The Ghurid armies comprised both native Ghur and Afghan troops, primarily infantrymen, and also Turkish ghulams, who supplied the cavalry element. Mu'izz al-Din's skill had kept these groups together, but dissensions occurred after his death. The Ghurid troops supported for the succession to the Sultanate the Bamiyan line, first Bahá' al-Din Sámi and then after his death in 602/1205, his two sons 'Ala' al-Din and Djála'l al-Din. The Turks, however, favoured Mu'izz al-Din's nephew Ghiyáth al-Din Mahmúd, who in the end prevailed over the governor of Ghur, Díyá' al-Din, candidate of the local adherents of the Karrámíyya sect. In contrast to the Ghurids, so far as we can ascertain from the paucity of surviving material, Ghazna rose again after the Ghurid sacked and flourished under Mu'izz al-Din, benefiting from the influx of Indian plunder; it is to the period of his rule there that U. Scevareto ascribes a unique type of glazed tile found at Ghazna (backed by Islamic glazed tiles with moulded decoration from Ghazni, in East and West, N.S. viii/4 (1962), 263-87). Ghiyáth al-Din Mahmúd was a great builder and patron of the arts, constructing mosques, madrasas and caravanserais in Khurásán. Above all, we now have the minaret of Djam/Firúzkuh as a museum of a backward mountain region. With the aid of his local Ghurí troops combined with Turkish ghulams, the Ghurids made Ghur for the first time and in its history the centre of a great empire. That this was not more durable may perhaps be explained by the over-straining of Ghurid military resources on the two fronts of Khurásán and India, and by the transitory achievement of their Ghurí rivals, the Khwarizm-Shahs, in taking advantage of conditions in Persia after the fall of the Sálimids. There was, nevertheless, a durable Ghurid legacy in India through Mu'izz al-Din's campaigns there, which formed a basis for later consolidation by such of his Turkish commanders as Kútb al-Din Abyákb, Yúqíyár al-Din Muhammad Kháldí and Náṣir al-Din Kábdá (for the Ghurid campaigns in northern India see DÍLMÍ SULTANÁTE). Ghiyáth al-Din Mahmúd sent Kútb al-Din a tár and the title of 'Sultán', and Kútb al-Din was accordingly installed in Lahore with this title. These ghuláms generally continued in India the Ghurid court and military traditions and added the word Mu'izz to their own titles, keeping Mu'izz al-Din's name on their own coins for many years after his death.

5. Ghurid culture. The ethos of the Ghurid empire was strongly Sunní. Sayf al-Din Muhammad persecuted Ismá'ílí adherents in Ghur. Ghiyáth al-Din Muhammad cultivated the moral support of the 'Abbásí Caliphs, as did the Ghuríd's epigoní in northern India. They thus secured an advantage over the Khwarizm-Sháhs, who suffered in the eyes of Sunní orthodoxies for their loose Caliphal policy and in the case of 'Alá' al-Din Muhammad at least, in their pro-Shí'í sympathies. In the earlier Ghuríd period, the doctrines of the last Karámiyya sect were dominant in Ghur, but Ghiyáth al-Din Muhammad and Mu'izz al-Din Muhammad adhered latterly to the Shí'í law school (see Bosworth, The early Islamic history of Ghur, 129-53).

The Ghurids followed the example of the Ghaznavids in being generous patrons of art and literature. In his section of the Lábáb al-álbáb on royal poets, 'Awfí cites 'Álá' al-Din Husayn, and states that after the Sultan's death, his dawrān circulated widely in northern India and Zábulistán; it is well-known that during the sack of Ghazna, 'Alá' al-Din was careful to preserve for his own library the works of the great Ghaznavid poets. The tábhirás of 'Awfí and Dawlat-Sháh preserve the names of a large number of Ghuríd poets, and Nízámí 'Arúdí cites them as immortalizers of the Sultans Abu'l-Kásim Ráfí', Abú Bakr Díawahrí, 'Álí Súfí and himself. In the case of the Ghaznavid period, from which we have several fairly complete Quáns, the great bulk of Ghuríd poetry has regrettably been lost. Fortunately, some of the work of Fákhúr al-Dín Múbaráksháh or Fákhúr-i Mudábbir has survived, cf. Storey, i, 116-47. All this literature was in Persian; the recently-discovered Fásho anthology, the Fajr khazáná "Treasury of secrets", claims to include Fásho poetry from the Ghurid period, but the significance of this work has not yet been evaluated (see arşan (iii) Fásho literature).

As in literature, the Ghurí architectural traditions of the Ghaznavid period were kept up by the Ghurids, so far as we can ascertain from the paucity of surviving material. Ghazna rose again after the Ghurí sacked and flourished under Mu'izz al-Din, benefiting from the influx of Indian plunder; it is to the period of his rule there that U. Scevareto ascribes a unique type of glazed tile found at Ghazna (backed by Islamic glazed tiles with moulded decoration from Ghazni, in East and West, N.S. viii/4 (1962), 263-87). Ghiyáth al-Din Mahmúd was a great builder and patron of the arts, constructing mosques, madrasas and caravanserais in Khurásán. Above all, we now have the minaret of Djam/Firúzkuh as a monument of Ghurid architecture, to add to the other surviving examples at Heráz, Çíšt and Láshqar-i Bázár (see the Ghurí ministrel and Persian theologian Hevád al-dín, who supposes that it is possible to speak of a distinctive Ghurid architecture (L'art ghirid d'Afghanistan à propos d'un livre récent, in Arabica, vii (1960), 273-80).
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GHURUSH [see sīkka].

GHUSL, general ablution, uninterrupted
washing, in ritually pure water, of the whole of the
human body, including the hair, performed after
declaring the intention (niyya) so to do. For the
living it is a fairly simple process, though it applies
also to the washing of the corpse of a Muslim (see
below). For the living, the essential ghusl is that
which is obligatory before performing the ritual
daily prayers; this ghusl becomes necessary as a
purification following acts of a sexual nature which
produce ghanība (q.v.); intimate relations, normal or
not, emission of sperm and of feminine menses (except
in cases of unilateral marriage; this ordinary ablution,
wudu? is required). Ghusl is also required after
menstruation and lochia (other losses of blood do not
demand the ghusl for purification). Whoever is thus
in a state of major impurity is subject to the same
taboos as those incurred by minor impurity (hadath
(q.v.)); in addition, he may not recite the Kur
except in the presence of the ordinary ablution.

The rules for the washing of the dead are of course
important, the four orthodox schools agree in the
principles of the devolution of this duty on the
spouse of the deceased, then on his or her relatives;
in all cases, the legal nakedness of the dead person
('awwa) must be covered during the operation; if the
corpse of a man is washed by a woman who, being
his wife, is not forbidden to see him, the point is
disputed as to whether the corpse need be completely
covered (and vice versa for the body of a woman).
In the absence of water, here also recourse may be
had to tayammum, as in some other hypothetical
situations. The corpse of a martyr (ghālid [q.v.])
who has fallen in the Holy War is not washed.

As well as these legal dispositions, it is necessary,
with this as with all other institutions, to examine
what happens in practice in the Muslim world. In
our view, the ghusl of the dead is generally practised,
and the ghūsls which are only sunna are practised
rather seldom. Concerning the ghusl for ghanība,
it has not until now been sufficiently noticed that the
existence of the hamām is connected with the
purification from ghanība. As in other matters, the
effective practice is sometimes much more lax than
the theory: where the ritual prayer is neglected (this
is very often the case for example in North Africa,
particularly among women), the ghūsl will naturally
also be neglected; but sometimes the demands of
practice are much more rigorous than the law. In
Morocco, for example, in certain regions of
Morocco, whoever has relations with a Jewess must wash seven
times with water coming from seven different
streams. Throughout Islam, however, for every
minority very much preoccupied with observing the
prescriptions of the law, we find a majority who
often neglect them, although, in particular cases,
they have a curiously inadequate idea of what they
are: detailed systematic studies would thus show a
discrepancy between the regulations of the ghusl and
the practice.
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GHŪTA, name given in Syria to abundantly irrigated
areas of intense cultivation surrounded by arid land. A ghūta is produced by the co-operative
activity of a rural community settled near to one
or several perennial springs, whose water is used in a
system of canalization to irrigate several dozens or
several hundred acres. Each ghūta has its own
particular system of irrigation based on cycles of
varying length. The soil in a ghūta is usually laid out
in platforms which form terraces of watered zones,
the levels sections of which are supported by stone
walls two to six feet high. In them is carried out a
closed agricultural economy, which provides an
assured subsistence for men and animals. Near
the source of the water there is an area in which
vegetables and fruit are intensively grown, then the
to which the land is exploited decreases in
proportion to the time it takes for the water to reach
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who has fallen in the Holy War is not washed.

As well as these legal dispositions, it is necessary,
with this as with all other institutions, to examine
what happens in practice in the Muslim world. In
our view, the ghusl of the dead is generally practised,
and the ghūsls which are only sunna are practised
rather seldom. Concerning the ghusl for ghanība,
it has not until now been sufficiently noticed that the
existence of the hamām is connected with the
purification from ghanība. As in other matters, the
effective practice is sometimes much more lax than
the theory: where the ritual prayer is neglected (this
is very often the case for example in North Africa,
particularly among women), the ghūsl will naturally
also be neglected; but sometimes the demands of
practice are much more rigorous than the law. In
Morocco, for example, in certain regions of
Morocco, whoever has relations with a Jewess must wash seven
times with water coming from seven different
streams. Throughout Islam, however, for every
minority very much preoccupied with observing the
prescriptions of the law, we find a majority who
often neglect them, although, in particular cases,
they have a curiously inadequate idea of what they
are: detailed systematic studies would thus show a
discrepancy between the regulations of the ghusl and
the practice.

Bibliography: For the sociological theory of
the whole subject of purifications etc. in human
societies, V. Pareto, Trattato di sociologia generale,
i; Fr. tr., Traité ..., i, 649 ff.; Eng. tr. The
mind and society, 1935, ii, 736 ff.; C. H. Bouquet,
La pureté rituelle dans l'Islam, in RHR, cxxxviii (1950),
53-71 (with detailed references for what has been
said above). The books of fīhō begin with a chapter
on ritual purity, where ghūsl is dealt with, e.g.,
Khāli, Mukhtasar, excellent Italian tr. by Guidi,
i, 28 ff., 141 ff., and Fr. tr. by Bouquet, i, 32 ff.,
95 ff.; similarly the books of ṣīkṣa (e.g., the
modern work of Muhammad al-Djazīri, K. al-
Fīhī 'aša'ī, Delhi, 1935: much detail and very lucid).
(G. H. BOUSQUET)
1. The minaret of Djām or Firūzkūh (reign of Sultan Ǧihāyāʾ al-Dīn Muḥammad, 558-99/1163-1203).
2. Detail of the minaret.

3. Surviving remains of the madrasa and mosque at Čisht in the Hari-Rud valley, also from the reign of Ghiyāth al-Din Muḥammad.
it. While birch-trees and poplars grow in the damp of the central area, as the distance from the spring increases, trees become sparser, unsheltered fields spider-are planted in rows and corks are reached; beyond this there will be the region which is flooded in winter, and further still some temporary fields. This is a schematic picture of the Ghūṭa of Dimashq, Nabak, Yabrud and Dimashq (see R. Thoumin, *Geographie humaine de la Syrie Centrale*, Tours 1936, 115-120; J. Weulersse, *Paysans de Syrie et du Proche Orient*, Paris 1946, 283-91).

The Ghūṭa of Dimashq (q.v.) is the area of gardens and orchards which surrounds the former Umayyad capital below the gorges of Rabwa and which is made fertile by a close network of irrigation trenches fed by the Baradā (q.v.). The Ghūṭa extends from the eastern slopes of Mount Kāsīyūn (q.v.) as far as the streams and the water brought in from the Baradā allow bushes to be grown. Beyond this to the east, is the Marḍi, a region of pasture and wide stretches of arable land. These grass-lands, which are green from December to June and dried up from July onwards, end at the lagoon of ʿUṭayba (q.v.), or “Lake of Damascus”. Still further to the east is the scorched land of the steppe, which man’s strenuous labour has pushed back to about 20 km/12 miles from Mount Kāsīyūn.

The Ghūṭa of Damascus, of which mention is made in the Qurʿān, which is considered by Muslim tradition to be one of the four earthly paradises, has been celebrated by many Arab poets (see Kūr ʿAḥī, *Ghūṭa*, 68-107) and described by more than one western traveller.

Consisting of a half of a basaltic basin filled with fertile limestone alluvions and facing eastwards, the Ghūṭa is intersected by the Baradā, which flows down from Mount Kalamūn, comes in below Birza and from that time onwards, end at the lagoon of ʿUṭayba (q.v.), or “Lake of Damascus”. Still further to the east is the scorched land of the steppe, which man’s strenuous labour has pushed back to about 20 km/12 miles from Mount Kāsīyūn.
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writer gives a different list of them, and that of Ibn Tulun al-Salihi (10th/16th century) has only a certain number of names and sites in common with that of the present-day writer Kurd ‘Ali (Ghuta, 218 ff.). To the names already given can be added those of some villages which have become places of pilgrimage by reason of legends connected with them, such as Birza in the north-east where, according to a legend which stems from the Samaritans, the birthplace of Abraham (the Mahkâm Tor hakım) is to be found; Bayt Lahyâ in the north, also connected with the legend of Abraham; the hill of Rabwa in the west, a legendary stopping place of Isâ and his mother; and finally the village of al-Râwiya, in the south-south-east, where is the tomb of one Zaynab Umm Kulthûm (who has nothing in common with either the daughter of the Prophet or the daughter of ‘Ali and Fâtimah). There are also villages where the tomb of a Companion of the Prophet is revered; among these are Ḥâjlîqa, where Mudhrîk b. Ziyad is buried, al-Manâhî, where Sa’d b. Ubâd is buried, and Mizza where Dihya al-Kalbi is buried.

The history of the Ghûta is bound up with that of Dimashq [q.v.]. The excavations of Tell al-Sâlihiyya provide evidence that the first human settlements in this oasis go back to the fourth millennium B.C. Greek and Roman remains are found at various places. In the Byzantine period there existed a great number of churches and monasteries such as Dayr Murrân, Dayr Bâwâna and Dayr Buṭrus of which the combined effects of time and man have removed every trace; others are perpetuated in present place-names, such as Dayr Sa’dîb (now Dayr Khûlid) and Dayr al-Asâfîr. It was in the Ghûta, at Mardij Râhî [q.v.], that Marwîn, with his Yemenis, gave battle to theRAYâs in 64/683. Under the Umayyads, the Ghûta formed one of the districts of the province of Dimashq, and had an autonomous administration with a separate ‘ibâd whose chief activity was the collecting of the ḥadîd. Many of the attacks on Dimashq were made less effective by having to get past the orchards with their network of paths edged by low walls on either side, and Crusaders and Zangids were able to appreciate their defensive value at the end of the 12th/13th century, and even more in the 17th/18th century, under the Ayyûbîd [q.v.] princes. Many monuments were built; madrasas and mausolea arose in peaceful surroundings among the orchards between the Nahr Thawrâ and the Nahr Yazid. From west to east could be seen the double cupola of the mausoleum of Kitbuhgâ (9th/14th century), the Mâridâniyya madrasa (7th/13th century) at Dijl-Abayd, the Shîbiyya madrasa which formed part of a complex of buildings including the mausoleum of Shibli al-Dawla Kafîr, a khânqâh and a public fountain; the ribbed cupola of the Turbat al-Badîrî, built in the time of Nûr al-Dîn [q.v.], rises not far from the madrasa of Sitti Ḥâfîza (7th/13th century). Finally, below al-Sâlihiyya, the Ruknîyya madrasa (7th/13th century) overlooked the gardens. Vegetable gardens and orchards survived to the north of Dimashq until about 1950, since when they have been gradually supplanted by new housing estates.


AL-GHUZZ, ‘Allâ’ al-Dîn ‘Allâ b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Bahâ’î al-Dimashqî, an Arabic writer of Berber origin (d. 815/1412) who composed, under the title Matâli’s al-budûr fi manâsîl al-sûrûr, an anthology on the model of the adab books but which, as the author justly boasts in the preface, is in its content favourably distinguished from the great mass of these writings. He deals with the house and its different sections, all the pleasures of life and sport and the accessories required for their utilization; he illustrates these subjects with anecdotes and verses taken from later poetry but, at the same time he presents a very great wealth of material—still far from being exhausted—relating to the history of the civilization of the Muslim peoples. The book was printed in Cairo, in two volumes, in 1599-1600 (N. ELISSEFF).

GHUZZ, form generally used by Arabic authors for the name of the Turkish Oghuz people. The origin of the Oghuz, which for long was obscure because of the diversity of the transcriptions of the names of peoples in the Chinese, Arabic, Byzantine and other sources, seems to have been clarified by J. Hamilton, Oghuz and On-Uyghur, in JA, colt/ (1962), 23-64. At the beginning of the 7th century A.D. there was formed, among the eastern Turkish T’ie-lo tribes, a confederation of Nine Clans = To’ozh Oghuz (a form known to the Arabic authors), who revolted against the empire of the eastern Turks and helped to form the empire of the most important tribe among them, whose name is the earliest attested, namely the Uyghurs. During the period of the extension of this empire (9th/10th century) some groups of these peoples spread towards the west, losing their links with the structure of the Nine Clans and acquiring, in new countries and in their contacts with new peoples, distinctive characteristics: these are the people called by the western Turks and the author justly boasts in the preface, is in its content favourably distinguished from the great mass of these writings. He deals with the house and its different sections, all the pleasures of life and sport and the accessories required for their utilization; he illustrates these subjects with anecdotes and verses taken from later poetry but, at the same time he presents a very great wealth of material—still far from being exhausted—relating to the history of the civilization of the Muslim peoples. The book was printed in Cairo, in two volumes, in 1599-1600 (N. ELISSEFF).
We shall not deal at length here with the period of the history of the Oghuz/Ghuzz before they came in contact with Islam. It should however be mentioned briefly because, owing to their new habitat and the period during which they moved there, all that we know of them, admittedly very elementary and uncertain, is now based mainly on the Arabic (or Persian) authors. We shall ignore what these authors have said on the eastern Toçuz-Oguz (see V. Minorsky in his commentary and his translation of the Hudiid al-Islam, 1937, 268 f.) in order to concern ourselves here only with the western Oghuz/Ghuzz.

The earliest reference to the presence of Oghuz/Ghuzz (without the Toçuz) in Central Asia is found in al-Balâdhuri (432), writing of events belonging to the end of the reign of al-Ma’mûn, although Ibn al-Âthîr, writing much later, reports the opinions of authors who consider those Turks who, under the caliphate of al-Mahdi, had supported the movement of al-Mu’qanâ’i, as already then belonging to the Oghuz. In contrast to this, from the middle of the 3rd/9th century, nearly all the Arab geographers mention the Oghuz as occupying a territory roughly bounded to the south by the Aral Sea and the lower course of the Sr-Daryâ, to the west by the River Ural or the lower Volga and the Caspian Sea, to the north-east by the upper course of the Irtysh. They then had other Turkish peoples as neighbours: to the north the Kimâk, a branch of the Klîps, to the east the Karulîk (Karulî), to the west the Persîeg and above all the semi-Turkish state of the Khazar, and they were in constant communication with the Bulgars of the middle Volga who were also for the most part Turks; finally, to the south, and particularly along the Sr-Daryâ, they bordered on the Muslim world. For the most part they were nomads, herding camels (with one hump and resistant to cold though not to excessive heat), sheep, horses etc., and each tribe branded its animals with a special sign—a ṭughra, ṭamga (qq.v.). All the same, it should not be thought that they were exclusively nomadic, for both among the remains of the former populations and among the Oghuz themselves there were settled groups occupied with agriculture in the oases, and also, particularly on the boundaries of the Muslim world and along the routes leading to the Bulgars or the Khazars, markets which had often become small fortified towns where their chiefs and leading men came to barter, against the products of the civilized world to the south, animals, prisoners sold as slaves, and furs brought from the northern forests; and in the principal one of these little towns, Yânîkânt, probably the ancient Nau-Kârda of the pre-Turkish Indo-European inhabitants, the chief of the Oghuz/Ghuzz chose to live in the winter, though he may have stayed further upstream, at Dînd (near to the modern Perovsk): the recent archaeological investigations which have located the sites and the ruins of these towns along the former course of the lower Sr-Daryâ confirm that they were certainly urban settlements and not the camps of nomads. It is difficult to state precisely what the Oghuz were ethnically, but, however important the Turkish element was (and the Russian chroniclers know the Oghuz only by the name of Turks/Torkî), there is little doubt that there had been on the one hand inter-marriage with the remains of the earlier populations, and on the other hand an integration into the Oghuz/Ghuzz of non-Turkish groups, incorporated just as they were and later Turkified: it has even been suggested that the name of the Oghuz/Ghuzz tribe of the Dînd (q.v.) preserves the ancient name of the Toghrâians; the result being that the Oghuz/Ghuzz of the west were no longer ethnically the same as the other Turks and particularly those of the east.

So far, then, as we can speak at all of a geopolitical configuration of Central Asia, it would seem possible to postulate, in the 4th/10th century, certain political and other interests in common between Khârizm, the semi-autonomous outpost of Muslim civilization to the south of the Caspian Sea, and the state of the Khazars, to the west of the Caspian Sea and the lower Volga, and that there was, in opposition to them, some form of alliance of the Oghuz/Ghuzz with the Bulgars (and at one time, with the "Russians" of Kiev). This is particularly the impression given by the account which has been preserved of the embassy to the Bulgars at the beginning of the century of the caliph’s envoy, Ibn Faḏlân, who passed through Khârizm. Moreover, although the Oghuz/Ghuzz formed only a very loosely-jointed federation of tribes, they nevertheless recognized, within the framework of a western Turkish world which maintained a certain feeling of uniformity, the supremacy of the Oghuz (q.v.) of Yabghu, who corresponded the Karluk Yabghu of the right: a title and idea inherited from the ancient Turkish empire of the 6th century A.D. and from the early Central Asiatic states. The Yabghu of the Oghuz/Ghuzz normally lived at Yânîkânt; he had a lieutenant (Kûhârdîkîn) and a head of the tribal army (subaštâfî).

Even if, as Ibn al-Âthîr believes, the Turks (whoever they may have been) who had helped al-Mu’qanâ’i had already embraced Islam, according to him Islam did not reach the western Turks, and in particular the Oghuz/Ghuzz, until the 4th/10th century and it was not until the end of that century that it became general among them. Before this the Oghuz/Ghuzz, like all the inhabitants of Central Asia, must have been influenced to some extent by Buddhism, Manichaeism, Nestorian Christianity and Khazar-Judaism, and the influence of the latter perhaps explains the later presence among the Saldûks of characteristically Biblical names; but there are no grounds for believing that they abandoned completely their vague ancestral Shamanism. The Oghuz/Ghuzz came in contact with Islam in various ways: first through the raids and counter-raids which they exchanged on the southern frontier of their territory with the Muslim ghâalis of the state of the Sâmânîds (q.v.), and the prisoners which were taken by both sides; then through some of the activities of the Șîifs of the frontiers; and finally, and probably most of all, through the merchants whom they met in the markets, or "protected" as they travelled along the roads leading across Oghuz territory towards that of the Bulgars, the Khazars and the Chinese. Political or other reasons had caused Islam to spread among the Bulgars, and probably among the lower classes of the Khazar population, from the first half of the 4th/10th century. The Karluk and the Oghuz/Ghuzz were not converted until the second half of the century, the former shortly after the middle and the latter at the end of the century, though it has of course still to be ascertained what form of Islam had been taught to them and how much of it did in fact absorb at first. Moreover Islam did not reach all the Oghuz/Ghuzz, and those in the extreme west escaped the Muslim propaganda: the remnants of
them were later, when incorporated in the Byzantine army, to receive Christian baptism.

The conversion to Islam, whatever form it may have taken, did not prevent the south of those of the Oghuz/Ghuzz who were not already too much engaged in the west are related phenomena. The drive towards the territories of the Muslim Mā warā al-Nahr, although these lands themselves were an attraction, may have been due also to pressure behind the Oghuz/Ghuzz from their other Turkish neighbours, for it is known that later the Kıpşak were to occupy the territories left vacant by the migration of the Oghuz/Ghuzz. But another result of their conversion to Islam was that it prevented the ghāzis from fighting against them as pagans and allowed the Muslim princes to enthrone them under their banners; it could even make them into ghāzis themselves to fight against the other Turks who were still pagan, and the part which the ghāzī formations were to play in the pattern of later Turkish history is indisputable even when, transferred to other fronts, they were directed against other adversaries. It is possible that there took place, between the supporters and the enemies of Islam, battles memories of which may be preserved in the (admittedly highly embellished) accounts concerning the origin of the Saldjuks; but Şah-Malik, the Yabghu against whom the Saldjuks fought, was nevertheless himself a Muslim, and we shall not exclude, merely for lack of evidence, the idea that the Oghuz/Ghuzz chiefs were attracted to Islam, as were those of the Karluq (the Karakhanids) and as has so often happened with peoples in a tribal stage of development, by the principle of authority which Islam conferred on them over the organization of the tribes, apart from the fact that they would soon be able to intervene in the conflicts of the traditional Muslim world itself.

As has just been said, the Oghuz/Ghuzz expansion towards the south took place mainly from the last years of the 4th/10th century, then especially in the fourth decade of the 5th/11th century, under the leadership of a family, the Saldjuks, which was to found a vast empire. This is discussed in other articles, so that we are not concerned to relate here the history of this expansion—contemporary with that of the Seljuks in the Near and Central East, and the Khwarizmians in the south—though it is impossible to state precisely in which contexts the term Oghuz/Ghuzz continued in use and in which Türkmen/Turcoman was preferred. Certainly it seems that at first the latter name was used exclusively of the Muslim Oghuz/Ghuzz in contrast to those who had not become Muslim and who continued to be called by their earlier name. But we find the name Oghuz/Ghuzz used later of those who had become Muslim. Broadly speaking it can be said that the name Türkmen/Turcoman is used by writers of the territories comprising the Saldjı̄ık empire and its successor states to indicate those of the Oghuz/Ghuzz who were the descendants of the groups which followed the Saldjuks (even although they later abandoned them to go, for example, into Byzantine Asia Minor); these writers applied the name Oghuz/Ghuzz to all the others, even later, when some of them in their turn were to come and settle in the Saldjı̄ık territory (but without really being incorporated in the state). Foreign writers, on the other hand, or those who were hostile to the Saldjuks and their successors, used the name Ghuzz universally, with pejorative intent, of all the Turks on whose military strength these regimes depended; this was the case with the writers of Fātimīd Egypt,
and even with those who, in the Yemen, wrote of the conquest (albeit half Kurdish) of the country by the Ayyubids, or with those in the Maghrib who related it for educated Turks, writers such as Yazdji-oghlu, the 9th/15th century adapter of Ibn Bibi in Asia Minor, or the famous prince Abu '1-Ghazi in Central Asia in the following century. But although the legend reflects after its fashion the regions in which it grew up, there would seem to be no justification for using it as a basis for a reconstruction of the authentic history of the early Oghuz/Ghuzz, though a future scholar may find a way of making some use of it in this respect.

Bibliography: The Oghuz/Ghuzz are known in varying degree to nearly all the geographers from Ibn Khurra'dibib. The main information, much of which is collected in Russian translation in V. I. Belayev, Arbatskie istoricheskie po istorii Turkmen i Turkmeni, i, Moscow-Leningrad 1939, is found in the following: Ištakhrī, 9 and 217-22, completed by Ibn Hawkal, ed. Kramers, 389, 512 and Mukaddasi, 274; works based on Diyāhān: Ḥudūd al-'ilm, 100-1 and 122, Marwazī 29 (both ed. Minorsky), and Gardizī; Ibn al-Athīr again; Diuwaynī, 548/1153). But whereas the Turcomans, led by the Saldūkīds, had founded an empire, the Oghuz/Ghuzz of this period merely helped to spread anarchy throughout Khūrāsān. Finally they were decimated and subdued by the Khārismshāhs, although one of them, Malik Dinār [q.v.], ousted other Saldūkīds, proceeded to make himself master for several years of their principality of Kirmān. The difference arises in part certainly from the fact that the Saldūkīds had been able to lead their Turcomans on to other conquests, while the absence of a great leader and the general political conditions of the 6th/12th century allowed the Oghuz/Ghuzz of Khūrāsān no prospect beyond that of converting Khūrāsān into a region of grazing lands for their convenience.

The above episode is the last in which we find the Oghuz/Ghuzz in action under this name; beyond the frontiers of Islam their place had been taken by the Ayyubids, a century earlier, was himself heavily defeated by them (548/1153). But whereas the Turcomans, led by the Saldūkīds, had founded an empire, the Oghuz/Ghuzz of this period merely helped to spread anarchy throughout Khūrāsān. Finally they were decimated and subdued by the Khārismshāhs, although one of them, Malik Dinār [q.v.], ousted other Saldūkīds, proceeded to make himself master for several years of their principality of Kirmān. The difference arises in part certainly from the fact that the Saldūkīds had been able to lead their Turcomans on to other conquests, while the absence of a great leader and the general political conditions of the 6th/12th century allowed the Oghuz/Ghuzz of Khūrāsān no prospect beyond that of converting Khūrāsān into a region of grazing lands for their convenience.

The above episode is the last in which we find the Oghuz/Ghuzz in action under this name; beyond the frontiers of Islam their place had been taken by the Ayyubids, a century earlier, was himself heavily defeated by them (548/1153). But whereas the Turcomans, led by the Saldūkīds, had founded an empire, the Oghuz/Ghuzz of this period merely helped to spread anarchy throughout Khūrāsān. Finally they were decimated and subdued by the Khārismshāhs, although one of them, Malik Dinār [q.v.], ousted other Saldūkīds, proceeded to make himself master for several years of their principality of Kirmān. The difference arises in part certainly from the fact that the Saldūkīds had been able to lead their Turcomans on to other conquests, while the absence of a great leader and the general political conditions of the 6th/12th century allowed the Oghuz/Ghuzz of Khūrāsān no prospect beyond that of converting Khūrāsān into a region of grazing lands for their convenience.

The above episode is the last in which we find the Oghuz/Ghuzz in action under this name; beyond the frontiers of Islam their place had been taken by the Ayyubids, a century earlier, was himself heavily defeated by them (548/1153). But whereas the Turcomans, led by the Saldūkīds, had founded an empire, the Oghuz/Ghuzz of this period merely helped to spread anarchy throughout Khūrāsān. Finally they were decimated and subdued by the Khārismshāhs, although one of them, Malik Dinār [q.v.], ousted other Saldūkīds, proceeded to make himself master for several years of their principality of Kirmān. The difference arises in part certainly from the fact that the Saldūkīds had been able to lead their Turcomans on to other conquests, while the absence of a great leader and the general political conditions of the 6th/12th century allowed the Oghuz/Ghuzz of Khūrāsān no prospect beyond that of converting Khūrāsān into a region of grazing lands for their convenience.

It was at this time, however, that among these descendants of the Oghuz/Ghuzz, confronted with the Mongols, there developed, in an atmosphere of veneration of the past and of their ancestors, the legend known as that of Oghuz/Khan, the vast spread and possibly also the relative antiquity of which are attested by versions extending from Central Asia (in Uyyghur) to Asia Minor (in particular the popular Turkish story of Dede Korkut [q.v.] composed under the Ḥak-Ḵoyunlu in the 9th/15th century). It represents the descendants of Oghuz Khan as being divided into 24 tribes, and of these it is certain that 22 were already known, by name and by their ṭamghās, to Mahmūd Kāshghārī, the Muslim Turk of the second half of the 5th/11th century whose dictionary provides such noteworthy information about his fellow-Turks; a certain number of the ṭamghās, with only the Ḥindī (and then solely as the tribe of the Saldūkīds), the Ṭylva, Salghur, Avšār and the Döger appear before the Mongol period. The Saldūkīds conquest had taken place over their heads and broken them up. It was Rashīd al-Dīn, the great historian of the Mongols, who related it for educated Turks, writers such as Yazdji-oghlu, the 9th/15th century adapter of Ibn Bibi in Asia Minor, or the famous prince Abu '1-Ghazi in Central Asia in the following century. But although the legend reflects after its fashion the regions in which it grew up, there would seem to be no justification for using it as a basis for a reconstruction of the authentic history of the early Oghuz/Ghuzz, though a future scholar may find a way of making some use of it in this respect.
Zwölf Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Türken Mittelasiens, lectures delivered in 1926, and his developments... the columnaries of V. Minorsky in his editions of the Ḥudud al-ʾilām and of Marwazi cited above, and the anonymous Istoriya Turkmenii, Tashkent 1940.

Among the special works, for the origins we limit ourselves to referring to Hamilton cited above; for the history of the Oghuz/Ghuzz in Central Asia in the 4th/10th and the 5th/11th centuries, Houtsma, Die Ghuzzenvölker, in WZKM, ii (1888); J. Marquart, Uber das Volkstum der Komanen, Abh. d. K. Ges. d. Wiss. Göttingen, N.F. xii (1914); M. F. Köprüülü[çade], Oghuz etnoloshisine dair taʾrîhîk nollar, in Türkçiyâ Meşârîsî, i (1925), 185-211; A. J. Yakubovskiy, Seldjukskoe dovnïenie i Türkmeni v XI v. voo, in Izv. Ak. Nauk SSSR, 1936; S. P. Tolstov, Goroda Guizzov, in Sovetskaya Etnografija, 1937, and especially Po sledom drevnekhazarskoy tsvitolizatsii (German trans. Auf den Spuren der alchazarsischen Kultur), 1953, a basic synthesis of the results of the archaeological investigations carried out by the author and others up to that date, with significant historical implications; O. Pritsak, Der Untergang des Osogischen Jägues (see above in the art.); Cl. Cahen, Les tribus turques d’Asie occidentale pendant la paix byzantine (see above in the art., ii, 1956-57), and Le Malîkmâneh et l’histoire des origines seldjoukides, in Orients, ii (1949); Ibr. Kafesoglu, Türkmen ads. manass ve mahiyet, in Jean Deny Armağanı, 1958; Tahir Binçoglu, Oguuzlar ve Oğuzlular üÂerine, in Türk dili ara$aralistar yâlili belleten, 1959 (based on Mahmûd Kâşghârî). For the events of the 6th/12th century, Barthold, Sultan Sindjar i Gways, in Zap. VO, xx (1912); M. Köynmen, Seldjuk Seçiklerinin İmparatorlukla İlişkisi (see above in the art., ii, 1956-57), and Çoğunlar ve aletler, in Jean Deny Armağanı, 1958. This article was prepared before the publication of the art. Oğuz in IA.

(CL. CAHEN)

ii.—MUSLIM WEST

In the Middle Ages al-Ghuzz (or al-Aghzâs, or al-Ghuzziyûn) indicated the Turkish or Turkoman mercenaries who twice penetrated North Africa by way of Egypt. The first Aghzâs appeared, in the middle of the 6th/12th century, in the army which the Almohad ʿAbd al-Muʾmin sent to conquer Irîkîya (553/1158). A group of them was introduced into Irîkîya by Karâkîsh al-Ghuzzî [q.v.], an adventurer of Armenian descent, the freedman of a brother of Saladin, and Ibrâhîm b. Karâkîsh, who were sent by the ruler of Egypt and Syria, Kâthîr b. Senûr, and were eastern Maghrib. Karâkîsh had appeared in 568/1172-3 in Tripoli. After several adventures, including imprisonment in Cairo, he was again in Tripolitania in 573/1177-8 to fight beside the Banû Chârîya [q.v.]. But Ibn Karâkîsh was killed and the family of Karâkîsh, his sons, his possessions and some of his mercenaries fell into the power of the Almohad caliph ʿAbd Yûsuf Yaʾkîb al-Manṣûr, after the (fall of Gàsba [i.e. Gafsà in 568, 1172-3], October 1172) and of Gàsba, three months later. These Ghuzz, by proved courage, having given proofs also of their submission, were then transferred to Marrâkûsh and formed into a corps d’élite, regularly paid, which the caliph put at the service of the régime. Armed with a bow which was named after them (al-ghuzz), they fought in all the battles and were very much in favour, but without being absorbed into the population (they had their own cemetery).

About 660/1261, there appeared in North Africa a new wave of Ghuzz, but the name this time refers to Kurds, fleeing before the conquests of Hûlûddî [q.v.]. When the Almohad dynasty fell, some took service with the ʿAbd al-Wâlids of Tlemçen, others with the Hafsids of Tunis, others finally settled at Marrâkûsh where they passed into the service of the Marînid dynasty who made much use of them in their expeditions of the Holy War in Spain where, with the archers of Ceuta, they formed the front line; they constituted also the personal bodyguard of the sultan. With time and with the appearance of portable fire-arms the Moroccan Ghuzz lost some of their importance. In the middle of the 16th century they are no longer referred to as Ghuzz but as Turks, whether they were mercenaries or not; in the 17th century their name, retained in Portuguese (algot) with the meaning of hangman, is applied only to public executioners.

The Ghuzz used by the Almohads in their expeditions of the Holy War are mentioned by many of the mediaeval European historians.


(G. DEVERDUN)

iii.—SUDAN

In the Sudan the term Ghuzz was used of the hereditary kâfisfik of Lower Nubia (between the First and Third Cataracts of the Nile) during the Ottoman period; more generally, the tribe formed by their kin. The name, as in Egyptian usage, was equivalent to Mamiâk, and the Ghuzz should therefore be distinguished from the hereditary garrison-troops (kāfîsdis) of Bosnian origin in Aswân, Ibrîm and Sây, who were called Oṭmānymâls. The founder of the tribe is called by Buckhardt, Hasan “Coosy” (probably Kûsîr for Ghuzzî), and his coming, as commander of the Bosnians, is placed in the reign of Sultan Selîm I: this may be too early. The hereditary kâfisfik, which had its headquarters at al-Dirr, and was virtually autonomous, survived until the time of Muhammad ʿAll Pâša (1736-1803) and of the Turco-Egyptian invasion of the Sudan (1820-1), Ismâʿîl Kâmil Pâša
appointed a member of the tribe, Hasan, to administer the territory between Aswan and Wadi Halfa. The vestiges of the traditional authority of the Ghuzz tribal chiefs vanished some sixty years later, when the area was placed under military government at the time of the Mahdia.


**GIAOUR** [see GABB and KĀFI].

**GIBRALTAR** [see DJABAL TARIK].

**GILĀN, a historic region around the delta of the river Safid-rud [g.v.], was the homeland of the Gel people (Gelae, ḳalāṣ; = ḳalūdū) in antiquity. The present Persian inhabitants, who speak a special dialect (cf. G. Melgunoff, *Essai sur les dialectes... du Gilânl*, in *ZDMG*, xvii (1868), 195-224, and the article IRAN: Languages) bear the name Gilân (at an earlier period also Gill). The derivation of the name from *gil* "clay", in allusion to the marshes of the region, is a piece of folk etymology.

In the middle ages Gilân first extended as far as the Calîūs in the south east; later it ran parallel on its eastern side with the Pulû-rud and included Câbûksâr. In the north east Gilân verged on the region of Fūmân (cf. the title inscription of the Jamshidkâh from part of it). After Tâlâsh was ceded to Russia by the Peace of Gulistan of 1813, this frontier was replaced by the river Astârâ. For some 225 km. Gilân is bounded by the Caspian Sea; towards the interior the frontier is the mountain-chain forming the northern limit of the high plateau of Iran, and in this direction Gilân is between 25 and 105 km. wide. In the 10th-11th centuries the mountainous areas in the south of the region bore the name of Daylâm [g.v.]; their inhabitants were often the enemies of the real natives of Gilân. As the inhabitants see it, the area is divided by the Safid-rud into two regions; "beyond the river and before the river"—Bīya Pāsh in the east (land of the early Amardoi) and Biya Pas in the west (land of the Gelae). In the 19th century the area was divided into four and then five regions. In 1938 the population was estimated at 450,000, mostly Shîf璞 Persians (Gilân and Tâlâsh, particularly in the mountains) but also Jews, Armenians, and gypsies, who occupied an area of some 14,000 square km. In the middle ages the first capital was Dûlâb (= Gaskar? [q.v.] according to Muṣâaddâs), then Fūman [g.v.] and Lâhîdîān [g.v.] according to Mustawfî Kāwûnî, and finally, after Gilân was incorporated in the Ṣafīwî empire, Raqsî [g.v.], which remained the capital under Nâdîr [g.v.] and to the present day. Since 1938 Gilân has formed the administrative district of Raqsî in the first canton (Ostan) of the empire of Iran, linking the country with areas further south (see IRAN, with statistics and map).

Gilân has a warm, damp, often tiring climate. Even in the middle ages, accordingly, its people were often to be seen dressed in only short trousers or "almost naked" (Ibn al-Athîr, *Bulāfî ed.*, viii, 77). The luxuriant forest provided (and still provides) the materials for the wooden houses with verandas (*īṣṭaḡîr, 205, 211; Yâḵūt, i, 183) characteristic of Gilân and Māzandarân [g.v.]. In the middle ages agriculture (which was a profitable pursuit) was left mainly to the women (*ḥudūd, 136 f.) and consisted chiefly of rice-growing and silkworm-breeding, which has been introduced by Armenians; its products were exported to the Mediterranean area via Tâna on the northern shores of the Black Sea as early as the 14th century (W. Heyd in *Zeitschrift für Staatswissenschaften*, xviii (1864), 692). In modern times tobacco has come to be grown. Fishing made an important contribution to the inhabitants' food supplies; admittedly in the middle ages most journeys across the Caspian Sea began from Abâskûn [g.v.] and not from Gilân as in modern times (cf. B. N. Zakhodner, *Povestî i Yu. V. Kaspîya [The Volga Basin and the south-eastern part of the Caspian Sea]*, in *Folia Orientalia*, i/2, Warsaw 1955, 231-50). As for mineral resources, Gilân possesses a certain amount of copper and lead.

As with all the area along the southern shore of the Caspian Sea, the northern mountain-chain of the Iranian plateau and its climate have protected Gilân from inland invaders (Arabs as well as Turks and Mongols) throughout the whole of its history. However, in 301/913 the Vikings (Rûns) made a successful attack from the sea (Masʾîdd, ii, 20-4; B. Dorn, *Caspia*, St. Petersburg 1875 [Mem. Imp. Ac. of Sciences, 7th Series, xxii/1, idem, in *Quellen*, iv, p. IV I, 18) and in 1638 and 1667 the Cossacks followed their example in Raqsî. The inhabitants of the country, particularly the Daylamis [see DAYLAM], had a great influence (above all in the 10th century) on the history of their neighbours and even on that of the Caspian countries as part of it. After Gilân with her clans and her local rulers was nearly always independent, from the period of the Achaemenids and the Sasanians, the Zoroastrian faith and some Nestorian colonies could survive there for a long time (Thomas of Marga, *Book of the governors*, ed. E. A. W. Budge, London 1893, ii, 450; Jean Davelvlier, in *Mêlanges Cavallera*, Toulouse 1948, 279, with bibliography). The doctrines of the Shi′i Yazdis penetrated into Gilân from the neighbouring countries of Tabaristân [g.v.] and Mâzandarân [g.v.] and brought the Nâširwând dynasty into the country (on the literary productions of the Yazdis there see R. Strothmann, in *Isla*, ii (1911), 60-3). Little more is known as to the details of the history of Gilân in these centuries. The country came under the nominal rule of the states of the Ziyârids [g.v.], the Buysâds and the Kakûns [g.v.] as well as the Great Salûks [g.v.]; on this see Ann K. S. Lambton, *Landlord and peasant in Persia*, London 1953, 60. Hence Gilân paid tribute, at least for a time (for details see Spuler, *iran*, 469). In connexion with this development Sunni Islam found general favour and even occasional helpers in some of the many dynasties which shared the country until the end of the 16th century. Christianity and Zoroastrianism faded away. (L. Rabino di Borgomale, *Les dynasties locales du Gilân et du Daylam en JA*, ccxxviii (1949), 301-50, gives a full account of these dynasties, which is too detailed to be reproduced here). In 762/1361 the Hâšân Qâdjîyût [g.v.] succeeded in forcing the country to acknowledge his overlordship, but its native dynasty remained. In the western part of the country at that time the madhhab of the Ḥanâfîs and the less numerous Shiʿîs preponderated as did the now extinct madhhab of the historian and Kurʿân commentator al-Ṭabarî (who indeed came from this region). In the east the Zayâdîs had remained (cf. Kâshânî, *Taʾrîkh*, Paris, Bibl. Nat., supp. persan, ms. 1419, fol. 38r to 49v; this manuscript is to be published by Professor Horký of Prague). From 762/1361 the Kâ-Ṭîyâ dynasty managed to hold its own, and lost it only when Shāh ʿAbbâs I incorporated Gilân in the ʿAfastawí state in 1000/1592. In 160/1650
It was put under the direct rule of the central power (cf. Lambton, op. cit., 108). Since then Gilan has belonged to Persia, apart from the years between 1316/1724 and 1410/1734 when it was occupied by the Russians who, however, finally left it on account of its climate. From 1917 to 1921 the Bolshevists tried to impose their rule on it; in the end they succeeded with the help of intermediaries in founding a Soviet republic of Gilan (cf. Kurt Geyer, Die Sowjetunion und Iran, Tubingen 1955, 13-8, especially 14, note, sources and bibliography). All these attempts were finally brought to an end when Riḍa Shāh [q.v.] took over the government and, later on, the throne.

Bibliography: Apart from works named in the article: L. Rabino di Borgomale, Les provinces caspiennes de la Perse: Le Gǔllān, Paris 1917 (condensed version of a special number of RMM, ix-x (1915-6); a detailed historical and geographical account with a list of the older and specialized literature on the subject, including descriptions of travels and consular accounts, and special maps). Geography: Ḥudād al-ʿalām, 136 f., 388-91; Le Strange, 172-5 and Map V; Rabino, Deux descriptions du Gilan du temps des Mongols, in JA, cccxxvii, 325-34 (after Kāshānī and ʿUmarī); Brockhaus-Efron, Encyclopediya, viii A (10), 1893, 608 f.; BSE, ii, 1952, 375 f. History: ʿAbd al-Karim Tāvirkī Gilān, Tehran 1940 (inaccessible to me); Spuler, Iran, 545 and index; idem, Mongolen*, 108 f., 265 f., index. Sources: Storey, i/2, 361-3 and 1298, no. 479, 482-3 (cf. with this no. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Fūmānī in i, 60). Maps (apart from those already named): Rabino, Carte de la province du Gǔllān, Lyon 1914; Ḥudād, 389. See also the Bibliographies of the articles on towns mentioned above and of DAVLĀN, MĀNĀRDĀN and TĀBĀRISTĀN, (B. SPULER)

AL-GILDĀKĪ [see Supplement, s.v. AL-GILDĀKĪ].

GILGIT [see Supplement; for the languages of the region, see DARDIC AND KĀFĪR LANGUAGES, VI].

GİMטרי [see KONBUR].

GİNLİ [see DİO].

GİMŞİFE [see KİŞİ].

GIPEFE [see ZARAČAP].

GİRĀY, cognomen borne by the members of the dynasty which ruled in the Crimea from the beginning of the 9th/10th century until 1197/1253. The family was descended from Ţogha Temür, a younger son of Cingiz Khān’s son Diocl. Môngk Teimūr, the Khān of the Golden Horde (665/1267-670/1280), had granted the Crimea and Kafa as nantūlfah (appanage) to his son Uorang Temūr (Orēng Timūr) (Abu ‘l-Ġhumāt Bahādur Khān, Shehdīr-i Tūrk, St. Petersburg 1871, 173). During the civil wars which from 760/1359 onwards convulsed the domains of the Golden Horde, the descendants of Ţogha Temūr joined in the struggle and laid claim to the Khānate; they finally succeeded in establishing a state in the Crimea, independent of the other Khāns, ruled by its capital Uluğ Yurt, the centre of the Golden Horde. The Khānate’s capital was placed on the throne as a client of the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II in 858/1454 (see HĀDĪJĪ GĪRĀY), and this alliance was maintained by his successors. In 880/1475, called in by Eminēk Mīrzā to assist him against the Genoese, who were stirring up internal troubles, the Ottomans responded immediately and, when opportunity offered, on seizing Sarāya and thus acquiring the Khānate of the Golden Horde.

According to a local tradition in the Crimea (al-Sağī al-sayyūd [see Bibl.], 72), Gīrāy Khān, in accordance with the customs of the Golden Horde (see ‘Umādat al-tawārīkh, 204), was brought up by his atālīkh [q.v.], who belonged to the Kĕreb Khans, and, later on, out of respect for his atālīkh, gave his first son the name Ḥādījī Kĕrey; thereafter the members of this family bore the cognomen (lākāb) Kĕrey Gīrāy. According to G. Nēmeth (A Honfoglaló Magyarság Kalabahida, Budapest 1930, 265-8), the name is composed of ker, ‘giant’, with the diminutive suffix -ēy. As a name borne by various sections of the tribe, it is found among the Kazaks, the Turkmen, the Bashdjirt, the Buriats and the Mongols, with various pronunciations: Kĕrey, Kīrey, Kīray, plural: Këret. When Cingīz Khān defeated the powerful Kĕrēt ruler Oŋg Kĕn, some of the Kĕret fled to the West, the rest being scattered among the Mongol tribes (Secret history, § 186; Turkish tr. by Ahmed Temīr, Ankara 1948, 109; German tr. by J. Haensch, Leipzig 1948, 74). Thus the Kĕret, either fleeing before the Mongols or coming with them, were spread over a very wide area, as far west as the Crimea. Until recent times the Tarāḵī branch of the Uvak-Kīrey led a nomad existence among the Kăzaḳs in the valleys of the Irtish, the Sari Su and the Chu (H. H. Howorth, Hist. of the Mongols, ii, London 1876, 6, 21). The tāmgha of the Khāns of the Crimea (for its shape see the coins of Mengī Gīrāy in Mūzē-i Huymān, mēshkāt katalaghu, 3rd section, Istanbul 1318/1900, 211, and IA, iv, 774b) was called tarkā tāmgha.

The Kĕrey were one of the four main tribes (kēshī) upon which the Khānate of the Golden Horde depended. The Kĕrey, dwelling east of the Don and in the northern Caucasus, gave their support to Ḥādījī Gīrāy. Only one of his sons, Mengī, used the cognomen Gīrāy, but it was borne by all Mengī’s sons and descendants, and was assumed also by some of the begs of the Shirin who married into the ruling family (‘Umādat al-tawārīkh, 200). Ḥādījī Gīrāy made an alliance with the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II in 858/1454 (see HĀDĪJĪ GĪRĀY), and this alliance was maintained by his successors. In 880/1475, called in by Eminēk Mīrzā to assist him against the Genoese, who were stirring up internal troubles, the Ottomans responded immediately and occupied the Genoese fortresses in the southern Crimea; Mengī Gīrāy [q.v.], released from prison, was placed on the throne as a client of the Ottoman Sultan (H. Inalcik, Yeni vekshaları göre Kırım Hanlığı’nın Osmanlı İlişkilişine girmesi, in Belleten, viii/30 (1944), 185-239).

At first, the Gīrāy Khāns were in alliance with the Grand Dukes of Moscow, against the Khāns of the
Golden Horde (ruling at Saray and hoping to recover control of the Crimea), and against the Jagiellons of Poland. But after 926/1520, the khans of the Crimea, led by his descendants as the rightful heirs, to the patri-mony of the Golden Horde, and when the Russians began to threaten Kazan embarked on an unrelenting struggle against them, which bore the character of a religious enterprise (ghazdi). In 927/1521 Sahib Giray [q.v.] became Khan of Kazan; three years later he went to Istanbul, being succeeded, until spring 938/1532, by Safa Giray (HadidjI, Kazan ibn Meheeddin, Kazan 1913, 125-35). When in Rabl I 939/October 1532 Sahib Giray returned as Khan of the Crimea, he attacked the Russians, and after a long struggle the Giray house were obliged to cede the Volga basin and the old capital of the Golden Horde, Takhti-Ili (Ulugh Yurt); Kazan was lost in 939/1532, Astrakhgan in 961/1554. It is from this period onwards that the Giray house, who had heretofore claimed to follow an independent policy, adopted Ottoman protection against the Russian threat, acting in ever closer cooperation with the Ottomans in the wars in Central Europe and against Persia [see sikhis].

The first joint military enterprise had been the Moldavian campaign of 881/1476, the second Suleymän I's Moldavian campaign of 945/1538.

Ottoman recognition of the Giray house as their intermediaries in their political relations with northern powers: ambassadors of Poland and Russia would first present themselves at the court of the Khan and then proceed to the Porte.

Domains. The capital is referred to in Hâddîjî Giray's yazilik of 857/1453 as "Orda-i mu'azzam Kırk-yırde Saray" (see A. N. Kurat, Altnordur, Kırım ve Türkistan Hâmiyata asl yariil ve bitikler, Istanbul 1940, 60-80, plate 173-84). His coin of 845/1441 was struck at "Bedelt-i Kârîm", that of 847/1443 at "Kırk-yîr" (for these towns see V. D. Smirnov, Krismskoye khansstvo pod vevkhozvostom ottomanskoy Porti do naçtla XVIII. veka, Odessa 1887, 102-22).

Under Mengli Giray the palace was moved from the strong citadel at Kırk-yîr into the valley, to the site now called Baghcesaray (Simferopol). In the strong citadel at Kirk-yir into the valley, to the right of the Kipcak and Kabartay. In their struggle against them, which bore the character of a jihad (ghazd), the attempt to establish their sovereignty over Taman, the Kipcak and Kabartay. In their yazilik the Giray rulers give themselves the title "Ulugh orda see Ulugh yarilil ve Dehst-i Klîplâcîi ve Tahtî-i Kirmîhî ..... Cerkesnîi ve Tal bîle Tavâghnîi Ulugh Fâdîkhanîh we kem Ulugh Kâhîn". In the attempt to establish their sovereignty over the Desert Klîplâcî (the steppe land to the north of the Black Sea) and Circassia the Khâns had to engage in long struggles, achieving partial success particularly under Sahib Giray I [q.v.]. Sultans of the Giray family, with the title Ser-asker Sultân, were sent to govern the Khânts' territories in Kuban, Budâjak and Yedisan. Like the Khâns of the Golden Horde before them, the Khâns exacted an annual tribute of money and furs (known as i lyâgh and âltî from the rulers of Russia and Poland. Since the Khâns always claimed sovereignty over the ports on the southern coast of the Crimea (Tat-îli), from 889/1484 onwards the Ottomans made them a yearly grant (sâlîyân) from the customs revenues of Kefe [q.v.] (a million and a half akçe annually). Meheeddin Giray I, and some later Khâns, attempted to establish direct control over these ports.

The dynasty first openly acknowledged the sovereignty of the Ottoman Sultan in Mengli Giray's letter of Rabl I 880 [July 1475 (see H. İnalçîk, op. cit.). Although the new relationship resulting from the strengthening of this sovereignty was later presented as arising from a special agreement, the terms adduced are clearly fabrications.

From Mengli Giray onwards, the Khâns each had a bağlay [q.v.] (also bağhalay) as wali 'sad, 'heir apparent', and from 992/1584 also a second wali 'sad known as Nûr al-Dîn (Nuraddin). According to the Khâns-i Dîngilî (târe, yasa), the bağlay should be the Khan's brother; when the throne fell vacant, the bağlay became Khan and the Nûr al-Dîn became bağlay. The attempts of some Khâns to appoint their sons to these posts caused disturbances and civil war. When the tribal aristocracy of the Crimea [see sikhis], following the târe and without reference to the Porte, appointed a bağlay as the new Khan (as in the cases of Ghazî Giray I and Toştamûşî Giray), the Ottoman Sultan withheld his recognition and fierce conflicts resulted, but in general the Porte was influenced in its choice by the claims of the existing bağlay. Of the forty Khâns, 24 had been the bağlay, and five the Nûr al-Dîn.

From the time of Saâdet Giray (930/1524-938/1532) onwards, it became customary that one of the Khâns' brothers should be sent to Istanbul as a hostage (Ferîdûn Beg, Munşu'dât al-sa'lânîn, i, 167; Müneneddin-bâgî, Sahîh al-akhbâr, ii, 69). Two of these hostages (Islam Giray II and Bahâdîr Giray I) were sent to the Crimea as Khâns. The Khâns chosen received his diploma direct from the hand of the Ottoman Sultan and was presented with the khânîk tehrîfî (a sword, a banner, a bağpash with a jewelled sârgulî and a sable robe) (see Sîldâhâr târîkhî, i, 131, 683). When there was a campaign, the Sultan sent the Khâns a gift of 40,000 gold pieces, known as ême-bahâ, which was distributed to the Khâns' household troops and to the men. The Sultan could depose, imprison or exile the Khâns; occasionally the Khâns was executed. When a Khâns had to be appointed, the Porte usually came to an agreement with the Shîrin Begi, the leader of the Crimean tribal aristocracy. When a Khâns succeeded to the throne, the hostage, together with other members of the dynasty who found themselves in danger, entered the Ottoman domains and were installed in various parts of Rumeli (İslîmîye, Yanbolu, Tekirdâgî, Çataldâg). When the succession to the Ottoman throne was threatened, the Giray family was regarded as having a claim to it (e.g., in the revolution of 1908/1687, see Sîldâhâr târîkhî, ii, 630).

The branch of the family known as Çoban Girâylar arose at the end of the 10th/16th century. The bağlay Feth Giray, in return for ransom, sent back to her country the daughter of a Polish boyar who had been captured; on the way, the girl gave birth to a son, but Feth Giray refused to acknowledge the child as his and tried to have it killed. A certain Hâddîjî Ahmed, who was travelling with the girl, hid the child in Moldavia and, when Feth Giray was killed in 1004/1596, brought him to the Crimean. He was appointed Nûr al-Dîn, with the name Dewlet Giray; his descendants were called (pejoratively) 'Çoban Girâylar'. Although one of this line, Adîl Giray, was appointed Khâns (1075/1665-1681/1670), the later Khâns denied that this branch was of royal blood and gave no further offices to its members.

By article 3 of the Ottoman-Russian treaty of Küçük Kaynarca (2 Dümâdâ 1188/17 July 1774), the signatories recognized the independence of the Giray house but in 1197/1783 the Russians occupied and annexed the Crimea. In 1199/1785 the Ottomans considered appointing a member of the house as Khan over the Tatar
tribes in Budjak (Dzewdet, Ta‘rikh, iii, 142); in 1201/1787, when war was declared on Russia, this plan was put into effect and Girgā Darāz, with the title of Kāhān, and later Bakht Girgā fought in the Ottoman ranks at the head of the Tatars of Budjak. By article 6 of the treaty of Jassy (Yash), in 1206/1792, the Ottomans recognized the Russian annexation of the Crimea.


GIRESUN, a town on the Black Sea coast of Anatolia about 110 miles west of Trabzon, the principal town of a vilayet, with a population (1960) of 19,902. It is the Kerasos of antiquity (for the classical names and their possible permutations see A. D. Mordtmann, Hanover 1923, 405); threatened by the Turks from the 8th/14th century onwards, it was exposed in the 17th century to the raids of the Cossacks (Ewliya telebi, Seyyidrafînd me, Nouvelle relation . . . d’un voyage fait en Egypte, Paris 1677, 21-5; ‘Abî Mubârâk, al-Khâtâf al-djdidâl, x, Cairo 1905, 53-5; H. A. B. Rivlin, The agricultural policy of Muhammad ‘Ali in Egypt, Cambridge, Mass. 1961, 87-8, 223-4. (P. M. Holt)

GIRGENTI [see GIGLIENTI]

GIRISHK, a town of ca. 10,000 inhabitants, altitude 865 metres/2830 ft, on the Helmand River in present Afghanistan.

Girishk is not mentioned in sources before the time of Nâdir Shâh, when he captured the citadel in 1737, but a fort probably had guarded the passage of the river at this site for a long time before this date. In the 19th century Girigâsh was the centre of the Barakzai Afghans, and as such assumed a new importance. The site was of strategic importance and Girigâsha played a role several times during the troubles of the 19th century. At present the town is an important centre for the irrigation of the Helmand basin.

Bibliography: Le Strange, 346; S. K. Rishiyita, Afghanistan v XIX xeke, trans. into Russian, Moscow 1958, index; D. Wilber, Afghanistan, New Haven, Conn. 1934. index. (R. N. Frye)

GIRIT [see IKRITISH]

GIŠÇ DARAZH, SAYYID MUHAMMAD GIŠÇ DARAZH, a celebrated Ghâzal of the Deccan, was born at Delhi on a Radjab 727/31 July 1321. He was originally from Harat, from where they migrated to India and settled at Delhi. His father, Sayyid Yusuf Ḥusaynī alis Sayyid Râdžâ, was a disciple of Shâykh Nîzâm al-Dîn Awlîyâ [q.v.]. Gîśç Daraž was a small child when Sultan Muhammad b. Tughlugh (725/1325-754/1353) embarked upon his Deccan experiment and forced the ‘ulamâ‘ and maqādhîkh of Delhi to migrate to Daulatbâd. Sayyid Râdzâ left Delhi under duress and settled at Daulatbâd, where he died in 731/1330. In 735/1335-6 Gîśç Darâz left Daulatbâd with his widowed mother and returned to Delhi. He completed his study of the external sciences (‘ulamâ‘-zi’hir) under Sayyid Shâraf al-Dîn Kaythall, Mâwûlânî Tâdqî al-Dîn Bahûdûr and Kâdî ‘Abî al-Mâkthadr. His search for a spiritual master brought him to Shâykh Nîzâr al-Dîn Cirîgî [q.v.], whom he served for years with single-minded devotion, and from whom he received the šî‘âfah and the title of Gîśç Darâz (‘one possessing long locks of hair’).

When Timur turned towards India (800/1398), Gîśç Darâz hastened to quit Delhi. He stayed for some time in Gwâlînr and then left for Gudjârât where he was the guest of Khâqa Rukna al-Dîn Kân-i Shâhu. Later he migrated to Gulbârg and finally settled there. Flrûz Shâh Bahmanî (800/1397-
Gisu Daraz was a profound scholar and a prolific writer. He was well-versed in the studies of the Kur'an, hadith, fikih and tasawwuf, and knew several languages, including Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit and Hindi. He was fully conversant with Hindustani folklore and mythology and used to discuss religious problems with the Hindu yogis and scholars (Dijâwâmî al-kalâm, 118-9). He had correspondence and contact with eminent contemporary saints, such as Suyyid Nîdin son of Shâh Allâh Dihlawl in Mâhrâb and Bâkâ. He explained the Cîshît mystic principles in the Deccan and produced a large number of works on different branches of the religious sciences. It is said that the number of his writings corresponds with the number of years he lived (i.e., 109). No Indo-Muslim Cîshît saint has so many literary works to his credit.

Of the works produced by Gisu Daraz, the following are particularly noteworthy: (A) E'lâq: (i) a mystical commentary on the Kur'an (MS with Suyyid Muhammad Hîsawyn, sadgîjî dañâghî naqîsh, Gulbarga); (ii) another incomplete commentary on the lines of the Kâshîbah. (B) Hadîth: (iii) a commentary on the Ma'âshîr al-anwâr; (iv) Persian translation of the Ma'âshîrîk. (C) Fikih: (v) Sharh al-Fikih al-islahî, edited by 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1367. (D) Ta'sawwuf: (vi) Mu'âshîrîf, an Arabic commentary on the Mu'âshîrîf al-ma'âshîrîf fikih of Shâh Suyyid Shâhîb al-Dîn Shurwardî in MS in three volumes with the sadgîjî dañâghî naqîsh, Gulbarga; (vii) Commentary on 'Awrifîr al-ma'âshîrîf in Persian (MS in two volumes with the sadgîjî dañâghî naqîsh, Gulbarga); (viii) Sharh Ta'arruf, commentary on the Ta'arruf of Shâhîb Abd Bâkî Muhammad b. Ibrâhîm Bâkârî; (ix) Sharh Aâdîl al-muridîn, Arabic commentary on the Aâdîl al-muridîn of Shâhîb Dîwâ'î al-Dîn Abu 'l-Nâjîb 'Abd al-Kâhir Shurwardî; (x) Persian translation of Aâdîl al-muridîn; (xi) Commentary on the Fusûs al-bikam (this work is not extant, but from references to Ibn al-'Arâbî found in Maktûbdt (p. 22), Khîdima (pp. 18-9) and Dijâwâmî al-kalâm (p. 99) it appears that he did not agree with his views); (xii) Sharh Tâmîbhîdî, a Persian commentary on the Tâmîbhîdî of Ayn al-Ku'dâm Hâmadânî, edited by S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1364; (xiii) Sharh Risâla-i Kugâyryyisîa, Persian commentary on the Risâla of Kugâyryyisîa, ed. S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1361; (xiv) Sharh Risâla-i Kugâyryyisîa, in Arabic; (xv) Fisîkh al-kuds or Fisîkhî-nâmâ, edited by S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1356; (xvi) Aşmâr al-Ashârî, edited by S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1350 (commentary on a section of this work by Shâh Râfî al-Dîn Shâhîb Dîwâ'î al-Dîn Shurwardî, Maktûbdt Tis' Ra'sâbî, Delhi 1314); (xvii) Khîdima, edited by S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1356; (xviii) Mahbûbî, edited by 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1362 (contains 66 letters; the As. Soc. of Bengal MS 1232 contains 61 only); (xix) Mâ'dâmî's-i Yâsâda Rasâ'îî, edited by S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1360 (ru'âyat in this collection has been wrongly attributed to Gisu Daraz; it was written by Imâm Muâafar Bâkî); (xx) Dijâwâmî ‘Iwâshâbî, commentary on a ri'âdâh of Shâhykh 'Abî al-Kâdir Gîlânî, edited by S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1362; (xxi) Anîs al-wâshâbî, collection of poems, ed. S. 'Ata Hîsawyn, Haydarâbâd 1360.

Two early works—(I) Mîrâdî al-asghîhîn, (editions prepared by (i) Dr. M. 'Abî al-Hâkîk, Delhi, (ii) Dr. Qâ'id Nârân, Delhi, (iii) Khîlîk Anqûm, Delhi, (iv) Ta'sîmînârâ, (v) Dr. Nâdhîr Abîmâd, 'Allâghâr (typescr ipt)) and (II) Shîbâr nâmâ (editions) (i) Mûbârîz al-Dîn Râfî, Haydarâbâd, (ii) Thâmûlînaw Shawkat, Haydarâbâd—are also attributed to Gisu Daraz but no convincing internal or external evidence has so far been put forward to establish the attribution.

Though these works are mostly in the nature of commentaries and summaries of earlier mystic classics, they are not wholly devoid of originality. Gisu Daraz did not always conform to the traditional approach; in fact he had, as Shâhykh 'Abî al-Hâkîk Muâdîdî of Delhi has remarked, a peculiar ma'âshîrîf of his own. He went, to the extent of both Ibn al-'Aâmîr and 'Ayn al-Ku'dâm Hâmadânî. He did not agree with the author of the Ta'arruf that a mystic cannot have the vision of God (ru'âyat) here in this world. He did not permit his disciples to adopt indiscriminately the practices of the yogis. He was particularly fond of the Aâdîl al-muridîn and the Aâdîlîr al-ma'âshîrîf, since they were of great value for one who wanted to organize ðânâshîkî life in lands without any deep mystic tradition. There is a desire in his works to bridge the gulf between shîrî's and tarîkâ, which he considered complementary rather than contradictory to each other. He explained some of the much-criticized practices of the Cîshîtîs (e.g., prostration before the fir and audition parties) in such a way that orthodox opposition to them was toned down. Great as an organizer, erudite as a scholar, Gisu Daraz did not, however, succeed in maintaining the Pan-Indian character of the Cîshîtî sadgîjî dañâghî which he occupied. The era of the great Cîshîtî Shâhykhâ of the first cycle ended with his master, Shâhykh Naşîr al-Dîn Cîraîghî of Delhi.

Bibliography: 'Abî al-Azîz b. Şîrî Malik Wâîzi, Ta'ârîkh Habâbî wa-Σhâhîkârâ Mûrîâdhî, a biography of Gisu Daraz, completed in 849/1445-6 (MS As. Soc. of Bengal 246); Urdu translation of the above published from Rawdatayn, Gulbarga; Suyyid Muhammad Hîsawyn, Dijâwâmî al-kalâm, Kânpur 1356; Muhammad 'Allînî, Semi'îyyî Muhammadi, Allahabad; Niżâm Yamanî, Lâyîfî-i Aghrafî, Delhi 1295; Shâhykh 'Abî al-Hâkîk, Aâbârâh al-akhyarî, Delhi 1309, 139-134; 'Abî al-Râhîm Cîshîtî, Mûrî'îr al-âsîrîr, MS in personal collection, 73-4-42; Suyyid 'Allî Tahâbârâî, Bâkînî ma'âshîrîf, Haydarâbâd 1355/1396, 43-44; Firishta, Ta'ârîkhî Fîrishta, Nawal Kishore, i, 316, ii, 399; Ghulâm Muînî al-Dîn 'Abî Allâh, Ma'âshîrî âl-âsîrîr, MS in personal collection, i, 366-438; Aýzâd Bilgramî, Rawdat al-awlîyâî, Awrangâbâd 1892, 18-25; Muhammad Ghawthi Šhâshâîtî, Gulbarisi abrîr, MS As. Soc. of Bengal, i, 45v; Nîn Allâh Hîsawyn, Khwâshîrâh, an account of the life and spiritual attainments of both Gisu Daraz and his descendants, MSS: see Storey, 976; Gul Muhammad Ahmadpûrî, Takmîlît Siyar al-awlîyâî, Delhi

**GIZA, GIZEH** [see al-Sa’hirah].

**GLASS** [see zvdj].

**GLAWA** [Arabicized form of the Berber Iglwa (sing. glawa).] Berber tribe of Morocco, belonging to the linguistic group of the askalikh. Population (1940) about 25,000 including 1,600 Jews. Their territory, which straddles the centre of the High Atlas chain, is crossed by the ancient road which, at an altitude of 2,300 metres/7,500 feet, passes over the Tishka col, which straddles the centre of the High Atlas chain, and which, from earliest antiquity, has provided communication between southern Morocco and the great palm-groves of the Wad Di Dar. Although the tribe considers itself to be of Munidh origin, its native chiefs trace their origin to the marabout Abd Muhammd Sldib, the patron saint of the Moroccan town of Safi. With heads uncovered but with a black band round their foreheads, the Glawa formerly wore the akhnif, a short burnous of black wool, woven in one piece, with a large red or orange medallion on the back. The Glawa do not weave carpets; it is thus in error that their name has been given to the greatly internationally known.

**GOA** [see Hnd-iv and Sindhrka].

**GOD** [see allh].

**GODOBERI** [see ANDI].

**GOA** [see Hnd-iv and Sindhrka].

**GODDODERI** [see andi].

**GOG AND MAGOG** [see Vqjg W-Mhdg].

**GOG** [see gag].

**GÖK TEPE** (Turkish “blue hill”), transliterated in Russian “Geok Tepe,” a fort in the oasis of the Akhal-Teke [q.v.] Turkmen, on the Saslk su (Saslk Ab), situated about 45 km. west of Aghkabbd, today in the Soviet Republic of Turkmenistán. It consists to join the French. In 1913, with the accession of Mawlay Ysuf, he was restored to his high office and built an imposing palace at Marrakush where he died suddenly on 13 August 1918.

Ma-ikhdz-ahmad, the younger brother of Gldw Madnli, who appointed him pasha of the town of Marrakush by a zhhr of 8 July 1909. He shared in his brother’s disgrace in 1911 but was restored to office at the time of the French occupation of Morocco, in September 1912. When his brother died he succeeded him in his high office and, with the help of his son, held the double appointment until his death. A courageous and experienced warrior and a devout Muslim (he twice performed the Pilgrimage), this harsh ruler kept the tribes and the town which he governed in fear and in poverty, but also in peace. Settled at Marrakush, in the triple palace which he had built for himself, he loved to offer extravagant hospitality to illustrious guests from all parts of the world, who would then proclaim afar his power, his generosity and his political acumen, thus contributing to the rise of tourism in Morocco. During the war of 1939-45 he was unspeakably faithful to the Allied cause and one of his sons, an officer in the French army, was killed in Italy. In 1953 he led a conspiracy of Berbers and Marabouts which resulted in the expulsion of the sultan Sayyidh Muhammd. When the latter returned, in November 1956, he obtained amdn, and died in his palace on Monday 23 January 1957.


(G. Deverdun)
of a series of isolated places, one of which, Dengil Tepe (4½ km. in circumference), was defended from its isolation, near Dengil Tepe; since 1893 the Trans-Caspian Railway has also reached this place in which a museum commemorates the battle.


**GÖKALP, ZIYA**, Turkish thinker, born Mehmed Diya? (Ziya) at Diyarbakr in 1875 or 1876 and known by his pen name after 1912. Ziya became acquainted with the Young Ottoman ideas of patriotism and constitutionalism through his father, who died having entered him in the modern high school to learn modern sciences and French. From his uncle he learned Arabic, Persian, and the traditional Muslim sciences and became acquainted with the works of the Muslim theologians, philosophers, and mystics. The clash of orthodoxy, mysticism and modern science in his mind, heighted by the uncle’s opposition to his aspirations for a higher education in Istanbul, led Ziya to attempt suicide from which he was saved by his elder fellow-townsmen Dr. ‘Abd Allah Djewdet [q.v.]. His subsequent career was an intellectual sublimation of his struggles between the three influences, and may be separated into three phases.

His liberal and revolutionary phase began with his coming to Istanbul to attend the school of veterinary medicine, and entrance into the secret Society of Union and Progress. He was arrested in 1897, sentenced to one year of imprisonment, and exiled back to Diyarbakr.

Following the Revolution of 1908, Ziya became the leading Ottomanist liberal writer and lecturer in Diyarbakr. His change into an idealist populist and nationalist, marking the second phase of his career, occurred in Salonika where he went in 1909 as a delegate to the convention of the Union and Progress and remained, having been elected to its central committee. He became associated with a group of young writers connected with the periodicals *Geni Kalem* (Young Pens) and *Yeni Felâse Medîme* (New Philosophical Review) who were interested in the democratization of the language and literature, and in the development of a new ideology to serve as a guide in the social transformation believed to have been begun by the Revolution of 1908. The group crystallized two tendencies, one materialistic and socialistic and the other idealistic and nationalistic.

Gökalp became the leader of the second while the first soon disappeared.

From 1912 to 1919, Gökalp lived in Istanbul, this being the most influential phase of his career. His acquaintance with émigré intellectuals from Kazan, the Crimea, and Azerbaijan gave a more pan-Turkist colouring to his nationalism, though he did not subscribe to their racist tendencies. He remained primarily the nationalist ideologist of the Turks of the Ottoman Empire, who he believed had to cultivate national consciousness in face of the chal-

GÖKÇAY [see GÖKÇE].

GÖKÇE-TENGIZ, Gökçe-Göl or Gökçe-Deniz; otherwise Sevan, from Armenian Sevanak, ‘Black monastery’; a great lake in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, approx. 40° 20' 32" and 45° 30' E. Triangular in shape, Lake Gökçe lies 6,000 feet/1830 metres above sea level and is surrounded by barren mountains; its area was formerly reckoned at 540 sq. miles and maximum depth 67 fathoms, but the level of the lake is being systematically lowered in connexion with the important system of hydro-electric stations on the river Zanga, which flows from the lake into the river Aras, and supplies a large part of the energy requirements of Soviet Armenia. A lava island (now peninsula) at the north-west corner is surmounted by two ancient Armenian monasteries, the monks of which were much persecuted following the Arab conquest in the 1st/7th century (cf. J. Muyldermans, La domination arabe en Arménie, Louvain 1927, 95). Lake Gökçe is scarcely mentioned in Islamic sources prior to Ḥamd Allah Mustawfi Kaşmâl [g.v.], but subsequently features in the accounts of Ottoman-Persian conflicts in this area, as well as during the Russian conquest of Transcaucasia early in the 19th century. The lake is famous for its succulent fish, particularly a trout called sîbahan, which form the basis of an important industry. Lake Gökçe is not to be confused with several rivers called Gökçay (‘Blue stream’), e.g., one in Shahl [q.v.], another in Anatolia between Sivas and Edirne, a third in the eastern part of Transcaucasia early in the 19th century. These rivers are nominally Muslim by religion.


(G. W. BARTHOLOM.-[D. M. LANG])

GÖKLÂN, a Turkmen tribe mainly inhabiting the country between Bokhara and Khiva in northern Persia, but with some elements in the Turkmen SSR and the Kara-Kalpak ASSR of the Soviet Union. The number in Persia is difficult to determine but is probably about 60,000. Soviet sources now tend to avoid tribal distinctions, but according to the 1926 census there were 17,000 Göklân in the Kara-Kala district of the Turkmen SSR (South of Kizyl-Arvat) and some 35,000 in the area lying between İlyâly (S. of Khodzheyli) and Turtkul' in the Kara-Kalpak SSR. They have ten ‘barghans’ or ‘barangs’ of clans (Čakur, Kırık, Bayandır, Kavi, Yangak, Saghl, Kara-Balkan, Ay-Derviş, Erkeklî, Sheykh Khodâ) only traces of which now remain. The Göklân appear never to have been nomads, being occupied mainly with silk and more recently with cotton growing. Those in the Kara-Kala district are mostly market gardeners. They were in the past traditional enemies of the large Yomud and Tekke tribes and were wont to side with the Russians during the latter’s campaigns in the Turkmen country in the last quarter of the 19th century. They are nominally Muslim by religion.

Bibliography: R. Rahmeti Arat, article ‘Gökliyan’ in (IVANŽI BERKES)

GÖKŞUN, also Göksun, a small town in south-eastern Turkey, the ancient Kokussos, W. Armenian Gogson, now the chief-lieu of an ilçe of the vilâyet of Maraş, pop. (1960) 3697. It is the ‘Cocson’, ‘Coxon’, where the army of the First Crusade rested for three days in the autumn of 1097 (see A History of the Crusades, ed. K. M. Setton, i, Philadelphia 1925, 297-8).

Bibliography: IA, s.v. Göksun (by Besim Darkot), with full bibliography.

(G. W. BARTHOLOM.-[D. M. LANG])

GOLD [see GHAHAR].

GOLD COAST [see GHANA].

GOLDEN HORDE [see BATÔYIDS, KIPÇAK, SARAY].

AL-GOLEA [see AL-KULAYYA’].

GOLETTA [see MALK AL-WADI].

GOLUMBA [see PLÀDER].

GÖLKONDÀ, renamed Muhammednagar by Sultan Kull Kuth Mal-Mulk, the founder of the Kuth Shâhî [g.v.] dynasty, a hill fort about five miles west of Ḥaydarābād (Deccan) [g.v.], is situated in 17° 25' N., 79° 14' E. The hill rises majestically in a vast boulder-strewn plain. The site is a natural one for the construction of fortifications, as the summit,
called Bālā Ḥiṣār or acropolis, is about four hundred feet above ground level and commands the whole countryside. The name, Golkonda, is derived from two Telugu words, golla (shepherd) and konna (hill). There is no doubt that part of the fortifications go back to pre-Muslim times, for certain constructions, such as a wall by the side of the Faṭḥ Darwāza, are built of huge granite blocks piled one upon the other, which is characteristic of pre-Muslim citadels of Andhra Pradeś such as parts of the historic fort of Kondāpalli. Golkonda was ceded to Muhammad Shāh Bahmani by the Rādīq of Warangal in 764/1363, but did not become the capital of the taraf or province (later, kingdom) of Tilang-Andhra till the governorship of Sultan Kull Kūṭb al-Mulk in 900/1494-5. Golkonda’s glories were rivalled by the foundation of Ḥaydārabād [q.v.] in 1000/1592-3. In the heyday of its history Golkonda was the centre of trade and commerce where travellers, architects, calligraphers, learned men and men of the world thronged, and this inevitably resulted in a vast increase in the population of the walled city which led to the foundation of the new “City of Ḥaydār”. Golkonda, however, remained the emporium and centre of the diamond trade of the Orient.

The fortifications of the city and the Bālā Ḥiṣār are a unifying whole. The outermost circumvallation, which protects the whole city, is about 8,000 yards in circumference, enclosing a vast area, more or less oval in shape, with the rectangular nayā-kiśār, “new fort”, constructed in 1624, jutting out rather abruptly to the north-east. This wall, which is crenellated throughout, rises to an average of 55 feet, with 8 strong gates and 87 bastions, each with its own name. Four gates are still open: the Faṭḥ Darwāza or “Victory gate” (through which the conquering army of Awrangzib entered the city), the Makki Darwāza, “Mecca gate”, completed 967/1559, the Banjāra Darwāza leading to the Kūṭb Shāhī tombs (which form a majestic sky-line in the neighbourhood), and the Mōṭī Darwāza, “pearl gate”. A very interesting bastion is the Naw Darwāza, which juts out from the wall of the nayā-kiśār in a corrugated form, perhaps intended to provide a greater field for defence in all directions (but see Burton-Page in BSOAS, xxiii/3 (1960), 520). For other bastions see BURG, iii.

About 900 yds. above the Faṭḥ Darwāza is the Bālā Ḥiṣār Darwāza, “acropolis gate”, the entrance to the second line of defensive walls. A short distance to the north of this gate is the Dīlamī Masjīd, erected by Sultan Kull Kūṭb al-Mulk in 924/1518, in which he was assassinated some 25 years later. From this gate the road upwards is very steep, with hundreds of steps with recesses for resting. Half-way up the hill run the double walls which constitute the third line of defence. On the left are palaces, women’s apartments, mosques, arsenals, offices, granaries, magazines, and on the right, open ground, parks and groves, wherever a space could be found for them. Before the Bālā Ḥiṣār proper is a well-preserved mosque reputedly erected by Irāhbīl Kūṭb Shāh, and within a few yards of the Throne Room and the acropolis proper is an ancient Hindu temple which was renovated by the Brāhmīn ministers of the last Kūṭb Shāhī king. There is another very steep path, also served by a number of irregular steps, connecting the lower palaces with the Bālā Ḥiṣār, and by the side of this can be seen the system of raising water from the ground level to the topmost citadel. There is a series of tanks, at different levels; the water was raised by teams of oxen at each level pulling huge leather buckets by rope and pulley and pouring it into the higher cisterns. The waste water was brought down through earthen pipes which still exist.

The Bālā Ḥiṣār Darwāza is remarkable not merely for its mantlet but also for the figures and emblems of Hindu mythology which are worked in stucco between the arch and the lintel. Perhaps an even more remarkable structure is a small gateway piercing the penultimate fortification. It is a pillar and lintel gate surrounded by a fairly flat arch. In the centre of the broad stone lintel is a beautiful circular medallion with the lotus motif flanked by mythical figures of Yāli, half dog and half lion, and swans with snake-like worms in their beaks. Above the lintel is a simple pointed alcove surrounded by representations of lion-cubs, peacocks and parrots. The whole composition symbolizes the synthesized Indo-Muslim culture of the Kūṭb Shāhī period.

The Golkonda tombs, standing outside the fort to the north-west, are a group of some twenty buildings seven of which are tombs of the kings. Their appearance is uniform: typically a square building with an arced lower storey, supported on a massive plinth which may itself be arced; the lower storey bears a crenellated parapet with a small window at each corner, and centrally a tall drum, which may be arced and balustraded, supporting a single dome arising from a band of petal-like foliations as in the Bīḍāpur [q.v.] domes. The grey granite is usually covered with stucco and with encaustic tiles. The projecting cornices are elaborately worked with plaster designs; this, and the addition of miniature decorative arced galleries encircling the minars, are characteristic of the Kūṭb Shāhī buildings here and at Ḥaydārabād. An important early building in the group is the mortuary where the bodies were washed, the arches of which continue the Bahmani [q.v.] style. For illustrations of these buildings see HIND, Architecture.

The city of Golkonda was the most important mart for emeralds in Asia, as described by, e.g., Marco Polo in 1292, Nicolo Conti in 1420, Tavernier in 1651, and it was here that diamonds were cut, polished and shaped and then exported to all parts of the world.


GONDAR [see HABASHA].

GONDHEPBUR (Arabic form Ḫundaysbūb) a town in Khūṭistan founded by the Sāsānīd Shāpūr I (whence the name Ḫundaysbūb “acquired by Shāpūr”), cf. Nöldeke, Geschichte der
It is the town known as Beth-Lapat in Syriac, or Umur’s story in Tabari, i, 2557, and Ibn al-Athir, ii, 432, according to which the fall of the town was the result of a forgery made by the slave Mukhif, to be a romantic fiction. The skin of Mani [q.v.] was hung on a gate of the city. Gondeshapur was the capital of Ya’kub b. Layl al-‘Affar (262-3; see M. F. Koprulü, Les origines de l’Empire Ottoman, Teheran 1963, 366-74. (AYDIN SAYILI)

GONDESHAPOR — GONULLU
Perser, 41, n. 2), who settled it with Greek prisoners.

In the main fortresses they formed two diemdcats, suwdri (cavalry) and piydde (infantry). Each diemcat

There was a hospital at Gondeshapur where, unlike the Greek asclepieia and the Byzantine nosocomia, treatment seems to have been based solely on scientific medicine. At any rate, this was a characteristic of the hospitals of Islam, for which the hospital at Gondeshapur may have served as a model. The fourth Islamic hospital founded in Islam (by Hārūn al-Rashīd) was in fact built and run by Gondeshapur physicians. There was a medical school at Gondeshapur which was probably in close association with the hospital there. There is also evidence that the town was the Gondeshapur school for religious instruction. Systematic Gondeshapur influence on Islamic medicine seems to have started during the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, when Gondeshapur physicians began to take up their residence in Baghdad. Hārūn b. Kalada, the Arab doctor contemporary with the Prophet, is said to have studied medicine at Gondeshapur. This story presents certain chronological difficulties in its details, however, and is, very likely, of a legendary character.

Arabic sources contain stories which trace back the medical interest of the district of Gondeshapur to a physician who had come from India. These stories imply that this initial Indian influence found a fertile ground for development in the Byzantine settlers of Gondeshapur which included a group of doctors and that this medical knowledge was further enriched in time through cumulative experience in treatment and through contact with local medical traditions. It is difficult to determine the factual value of such reports. The transformation of Gondeshapur into an important medical centre was undoubtedly the work of the Nestorians. But this may not have effectively taken place before the reign of Khosrow I Anšahrāwan (531-579 A.D.).

In the 11th/12th century we find an organized body known as gōnūllūyān in most of the fortresses of the Empire, in Europe, Asia and Egypt. It resembled the bodies of muslimālīs and bešshīyāns; its characteristic features were that its members performed garrison duties, served for pay (‘ulāfe), and had for the most part begun as volunteers. It was organized, like the Kapt-kullārī, into djemāʿāt and bōlsāk. Reference is found to two main groups, the Sāf Gōnūllūlar (or Gōnūllūyāni-i yemin, ‘of the right’) and the Sār Gōnūllūlar (or Gōnūllūyāni-i yarash, ‘of the left’). In the main fortresses they formed two djemāʿāt, siwālī (cavalry) and piyāde (infantry). Each djemāʿāt


GONULLU, Turkish word meaning ‘volunteer’, in the Ottoman Empire used as a term (sometimes with the pseudo-Persian plural gōnūllūyān, in Arabic sources usually rendered djemāʿāt or hamāyūn) for three related institutions:

1. From the earliest times of the Ottoman state, volunteers coming to take part in the fighting were known as gōnūllūs; their connexion with the mutasawwir-‘a, ‘ghāzis (q.v.), of earlier Muslim states is evident (see M. F. Köprülü, Les origines de l’Empire Ottoman, Paris 1936, 102-3; I. H. Uzuncarşı, Osmanlı devleti teşkilatına medhal, Istanbul 1942, 59). A high proportion of the ‘ghāzis and ‘ašhāfs (q.v.) on the adf (the march-lands) of the Ottoman state were such gōnūllūs. With the promise of the grant of timars and ‘ulāfes (q.v.) the State encouraged men to join the army, especially when a major campaign was in prospect; the text of a firman, issued before the Moldavia campaign of 899/1494, by which the Sultan ordered such a proclamation to be cried in public, survives (in the registers of the bakīs of Bursa, A. 4/4), and it is recorded that a group of gōnūllū was taken by the Sultan. Such volunteers are found throughout Ottoman history, and this was the principal means by which native Muslims could become timarlıs or enter the ranks of the Kapt-kullar [see GHULAM], for volunteers who distinguished themselves were granted timars or ‘ašhāfs (q.v.) or admitted to the ‘gharabā’ (q.v.) regiments; the rest were appointed to the bodies of gōnūllūyān who performed garrison duties in the fortresses of the Empire, being supported by ‘ulāfe. In the 11th/12th and 12th/13th centuries, with the ever-increasing need for men, the gōnūllū bayraklı was unfurled and gōnūllū troops, serving for pay, were recruited; this must have been a continuation of the old tradition.

2. In the 10th/11th century we find an organized body known as gōnūllūyān in most of the fortresses of the Empire, in Europe, Asia and Egypt. It resembled the bodies of muslimālīs and bešshīyāns; its characteristic features were that its members performed garrison duties, served for pay (‘ulāfe), and had for the most part begun as volunteers. It was organized, like the Kapt-kullar, into djemāʿāt and bōlsāk. Reference is found to two main groups, the Sāf Gōnūllūlar (or Gōnūllūyāni-i yemin, ‘of the right’) and the Sār Gōnūllūlar (or Gōnūllūyāni-i yarash, ‘of the left’). In the main fortresses they formed two djemāʿāt, siwālī (cavalry) and piyāde (infantry). Each djemāʿāt

GONDÂSHĀPUR — GONDÂSHĀPUR
was commanded by an agha, and each was divided into bólikhs of 10-30 men each. The first bólikh of the cavalry was called Ağa bólikh, and the second Ketkhuđa (Kahya) bólikh; the first bólikh of the infantry was the Ketkhuđa bólikh. Every bólikh had a Boľük-bağlı (or Ser-bólikh). In 1025/1616 the daily pay of the Ağa was 50 akçe, of the Clerk (Kātib) 20-25, and of the Ketkhuđa 20-25; each Ser-bólikh received 10-20 (for details see Defter-i esaml-i gdnülüssün-i siiwdri we piydde-gdn饼干-i ^al^a-i eydlet, Istanbul, Basvekalet Arşivi, maliye 2/646). In 961/1556 the gdnulüss of Cairo received between 10 and 16 akçe, in 1310/1758 those of the fortress of Nīsh received 14 akçe a day. A establishment (known as gdnulüss or gedik) of each djemis'at was fixed. In the 10th/16th century, when there were vacancies, in response to a teşkidere [q.v. from the beg or the defterdar of the eydlet, a berat [q.v.] of the Sultan would be issued granting these vacancies to volunteers who had distinguished themselves on the frontiers, so-called varar yığitler and yoldaşlar, the sons of gdnulüss, and Janissaries. There were in the fortresses separate djemis'atı of pensioners (mutelhād) and bul-oghulları [see veçiçeri] connected with the gdnulüssün.

The gdnulüss in the fortresses might be called out to serve on a campaign or take part in frontier fighting. Those that distinguished themselves might be granted titmärs; in the 11th/17th century it could happen that distinguished aghas of the gdnulüss were appointed sandjak-begi.

3. In the 11th/17th century a body known as the gdnulüssün is mentioned also among the paid auxiliaries who, under various names, were recruited in the provinces to serve on a campaign. In 1130/1718 those of the fortress of Ser-bólikh, Ketkhuđ (Kahya) bólikh; in 1131/1718 those of the fortress of Snelige were abolished, and it was ordered that their place should be taken by the raising of divawegân (děltler), føríanülün, ûcbün and gdnulüssün; but the dismissed sëkbiins re-enlisted in the new formations and continued their misdeeds. These groups, the gdnulüssün included, frequently cast off all obedience and discipline and proclaimed the provinces with their depredations.

Bibliography: in the article.

GÖRAN [see görân].
GÖRDÈS, a small town in eastern Anatolia (38° 55' N., 28° 17' E.) at an altitude of about 1,500 ft on the banks of the Rum Çay. The town, with a small local market, has now lost all importance but it was famous until the beginning of the 19th century as an important centre for the making of prayer rugs. The population in 1960 was 5,071.

Bibliography: Ewiljä Çelebi, Seyhânârêwe, ix, 55; IA, s.v. (B. Darkot); for the carpets of Gördes, see IA, s.v. Halis (M. A. Mehmedoğlu) and pl. 2 and 3. (X. DE PLANHOL)

GÖRJİDE [see manastır].
GÖRJİDE KOÇI BEG [see köçi beg].
GÖSPEL(S) [see inşepend].
GOUM [see gum].
GOVERNMENT [see dawla, hurkuna, siyâsa, sultân, etc.].
GOVERNOR [see amîr, wâli].
GRAMMAR [see fi'î, nûw, taşrîf].
GRÂN [see âmîd-grân].
GRANADA [see sârhâna].
GREECE [see GREEKS].
GREEK FIRE, GREGORIAN FIRE [see barûd, nafr].
Encyclopaedia of Islam, II

GROCER [see bâékâl].
GUADALAJARA [see wâdi 'l-hiçâra].
GUADAULAPA [see wâdi 'l-kâbîr].
GUADARRAMA [see al-sharâfât].
GUADIANA [see wâdi yana].
GUADIX [see wâdi âgg].
GUARANTEED [see amân, dâman, kafala].
GUARDAFUI, the cape at the north-east tip of the Horn of Africa, in Somalia, known also as Ra's 'Ashr, and, according to 'Ali Celebi, as Ra's al-abmar. It was the 'Ahoumdîn depot, source of the Periplus and Ptolemy and the vòtovn xêpoc of Strabo. The origin of the name is uncertain; the present form is one of several variants occurring in the Portuguese writers. It may be connected with Mas'ûdîn's Dijafânû and it appears as Djîrfdûn in the rutters of Ibn Mağjîd and in 'Ali Celebi. Many absurd etymologies have been proposed. It may include the name Hafûn, given to a prominent cape further to the south. Guilian states that the local inhabitants gave the name Djurdafûn not to Guardafui but to a small promontory a few miles away. It belongs to the area in which the Somali are first found and was once populated by Dir, later expelled by Dârod (Mađîrên). There is a small group of Maĥr descent who have intermarried and speak Somali.


GUĐALA, a small Berber tribe belonging to the great ethnic group of the desert Sanhadja (the Berber phoneme g is usually rendered in Arabic script by a jîm but Ibn Khaldûn, in his system of transcription, writes it as a kaf which, in the original manuscript, presumably had a diacritical point placed above or below). They lived in the southern part of what is now Mauritania, to the north of the Senegal and in contact with the ocean. To the south their territory bordered the land of the Negroes; to the north, in the present Adrar of Mauritania, lived their Şanhadja "brothers", the Lamtûna and the Massûfa.

Like the other desert Şanhadja, the Gudula were essentially nomadic camel-drivers, and possessed fast dromedaries (nadjib, pl. nudjûb). Nevertheless they possessed a town, Naghîbar (reading uncertain), at a distance of about six stages from the river Senegal, and so probably in what is now Tâgánt.

Along the shores of the Atlantic they collected quantities of ambergris and caught enormous sea turtles the flesh of which they ate. There too they possessed, on the island of Awîlî, not far from the mainland, a famous salt-pan. As al-Idrîsî places this island at about one day's journey (at most 150 kilometres/100 miles) from the mouth of the Senegal, it cannot have been, as was suggested, either Arguin or Tidra. It may be connected with Mas'ûdîn's Djafânû and it appears as Djîrfdûn in the rutters of Ibn Mağjîd and in 'Ali Celebi. Many absurd etymologies have been proposed. It may include the name Hafûn, given to a prominent cape further to the south. Guilian states that the local inhabitants gave the name Djurdafûn not to Guardafui but to a small promontory a few miles away. It belongs to the area in which the Somali are first found and was once populated by Dir, later expelled by Dârod (Mađîrên). There is a small group of Maĥr descent who have intermarried and speak Somali.

who was to launch the Almoravid movement. After the death of Yahya b. Ibrahim the supremacy returned to the Almoravids in the person of Yahya b. Umar, and then of his brother Abu Bakr, who was to launch the Almoravid movement. After the death of Yahya b. Ibrahim the supremacy returned to the Almoravids in the person of Yahya b. Umar, and then of his brother Abu Bakr.

The Gudjals no longer made common cause with the Almoravid movement, in which mainly the Lamtuna and the Massufa took part. After the expedition against Siddiimmaa they retired to their territory in the Sahara, where they fought sometimes with the Negroes, sometimes with those of the Lamtuna who had remained on the spot. They undoubtedly ended by wiping out the latter. In the second half of the 8th/14th century Ibn Khaal'doon places them immediately to the south of al-Sâkîya al-Ḥamrâ', in contact with the Dhwâ-Ḥassân, nomadic Arabs of the Maʾšî group. Later on the latter were to advance towards the south and occupy present-day Mauritania. At this point the Gudjâla disappear from history.

Their name is now attested only by two very small fractions of Gudgâla, one in the north, in Thir, the other in the south, among the Brâkna.

Bibliography:

Besides the classical historians and geographers, see: A. Huici Miranda, "Un fragmento indéctio de Ibn 'Iadari sobre los Almorávides, in Hesperís-Tamuda, ii (1961), 43; P. Marty, L’émirat des Trarzas. [G. S. Colin] Gudjarat. [E. G. G. de P. Marty], Javân, Ghazar, Gudjjarat, which is obviously the Arabicized form of the Dájjal [q.v.], and the Ahirs, who are claimed by Gudjdjar historians as off-shoots of the main stock. Both Western and native writers agree that the tribe migrated to the plains of Hindustan from Central Asia sometime in the middle of the 5th century A.D. Tal, handsome, wirily-built, and of a fair complexion, they are believed to be descendants of either the Scythians or the White Huns. The view of a minority of Gudjdjar historians, that they are of indigenous origin, finds little support. Largely agriculturalists, they also herd cattle and sell milk and other dairy products, but with the spread of education and a desire for bettering their economic condition they have taken to other occupations, mainly in the un-divided Punjab, and in present-day Pratihar Pradesh (India), and adopted a settled way of life.

The word Gurdjdjar first occurs in Bâna's Haralšâtra where Harsha Vardhana's father Prabhâkara-vardhâna is described as "the one who kept Gurdjdjar awake" (cf. K. M. Munshi, Glory that was Gurdjara-Deśa, Bombay 1955, i, 3). Here Gurdjdjara stands for the "king of Gudgjars", the malîh al-djuzar of the Arab historians (cf. al-Sîrâfî, Silsilat al-tawdrikh, Paris 1881, 126-7; al-Balâdhurî, Futûh, 446; Ibn Rusta, al-Aʿdâb al-mafîsa, Leiden 1892, vii, 137; Ibn Khurradadhbih, 16, 66; al-Masûdî, Murûdî, i, 383-4), who ruled over Gudjâarâta, whose boundaries is it difficult to fix precisely but which extended not only to the Narmda but also included parts of modern Saurashtra and Râdjasânth, with its capital at Bhilamâla or Bihamâla (Bilamân during the Arab historians, perhaps representing the colloquial pronunciation) near the present Mount Abu. This was a famous centre of swordmaking. Swords made here were highly prized, and there are several references in Arabic literature to the sword of Bilamân (cf., e.g., al-Kindî, al-Suwâf wa adînîsâhû, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmân Žâld, Cairo 1932, 9-10, where it has been corrupted into Sulaymânîyya). In all probability this was the sword of pure Hindu origin, for many of the Muslim Gudjârs took pride in being converts from Hinduisim. They regard as their national origin, for many of the Muslim Gudjârs take pride in being converts from Hinduism. They regard as their national identity, for many of the Muslim Gudjârs take pride in being converts from Hinduism. They regard as their national identity.
heroes Djaypāl, the Hindu-Shahiyya ruler of Lahore, whom Mahmud Ghażnawi defeated, Mihir Bhodja Prathāra, whose grandfather Nāga Bhṭā (792-825 A.D.) has been described as the inveterate enemy of the Arabs, Rādja Dāhir of Alor, defeated and killed by Muhammad b. Sa‘īd, Rāna Sa‘īd, and Rāna Pratap of Mewār, and look upon their Muslim conquerors as despoilers and enemies of the Gūḍjārās, because they destroyed their kingdoms, raised and looted their territories and subjected them to all sorts of indignities (cf. ‘Abbās Cāwnān Gūḍjār, Tātirī Gūḍjār, Karachi 1960, iii, especially ch. iii and iv, which are full of the bitterest invective against the Muslim conquerors and invaders).

Bibliography: H. Abd al-Ḥakīm, Tawārīkh-i Gūḍjārā n ma‘a ansāb-i Gūḍjārāh, Lahore 1931, wherein he refers to two Persian MSS on the history of the Gūḍjārās—(1) Mir‘ād-i Gūḍjārān by Sayyid Djamāl Gūḍjār and (2) Murshid-i Gūḍjārān by Cawdhari Fāyḍ Muhammad, but no copies of these works seem to be extant; Abū l-Barakāt Muhammad ‘Abbād al-Mālik, Sāḥīh-i Gūḍjār, Aʿẓamgāh 1333/1934; Rāna Muhammad Akbar Ḵān, Gūḍjārī-Gūḍjāī, Lahore 1955; K. M. Munshi, Glories that was Gūḍjārā Desa, 2 vols., Bombay 1955; Rāna ‘Abbās Cāwnān, Tātirī Gūḍjār, Karachi 1960, the midly most uncritical account of the Gūḍjārās [full of historical untruths, halftruths and legends], to be used with care; JASB, iv/i (1886), 181 ff.; D. Ibbetson, Outlines of Panjab ethnography, Calcutta 1883, 182-8; A. H. Bangley, Gujar, Jat, Ahir; D. R. Bhandarkar, Epigraphic notes and questions, ii, Urdu transl. in Ṣahīh-i-Gūḍjārī, op. cit., 473-85; A. M. T. Jackson, Bombay Gazetteer, i/1 (1896), 526 ff.; Imperial Gazetteer of India, Oxford 1908, vol. I (Bombay Presidency); W. Crooke, Tribes and castes of N.W. Provinces and Oudh, Calcutta 1896, ii, 430 ff.; A. V. Smith, Early history of India, London 1913, 22, 303; idem, The Gūḍjārās of Rajputana and Kānaūj, in JRAS, 1903; Gazetteer of Gūḍjārā Darshān, Lahore 1893; Mirzā Muhammad ‘Āshār Bēg, Tātirī Gūḍjār (in Urdu), Lahore 1867; D. C. Ganguly, History of the Paramar dynasty; C. V. Vaidya, History of medieval India, 222-3, 236, 356; Census Report of India, 1901, 498; M. R. Neville, Gazetteer of the Saurashtra coast, ii, 195-205; see also the Gazetteers of Agra and Mathura districts; M. L. Nigam, Some literary references to the history of the Gūḍjārā-Prākhārīs Mahendrapāla and Māhiḍaṇa, in JRAS, 1964, 147.

GUDJARAT, a province of India on the north-west of its coastline, lying east of the Ran of Kačh [q.v.] and broadly divided into Mainland Gudjarat and Peninsular Gudjarat (Kaṭhāvān, the ancient Sawrashtra, modern Sōrāṭ). Mainland Gudjarat is approximately the area of the plains in the lower reaches of the rivers Sābarmatī, Mahī, Narbārā and Tāptī, bounded north by the Mārwār desert, east by the line of hills running south-east from Aḥbū to the Vindhayas. It takes its name (Sanskrit Gūḍjārāṭa) from the widespread Gūḍjār (Skt. Gūḍjāra) tribe, who, it has been suggested, entered India with the White Huns at the end of the 5th century A.D., and who in many ways closely resemble the Čālīks [q.v.]; the name was even applied to the coast north of Adīmēr in the 9th century A.D., but by the 12th-13th centuries, just before the coming of Islam, Gudjarat referred particularly to the domains of the Solanki kings of Aḥāhilvādā whose boundaries were much as described above.

(a) The ancient history of Gudjarat covers a period of some 15 centuries before the advent of Islam at the end of the 7th/8th century: the Māwrya dominions extended to Sawrāṭhāra in the 4th century B.C. (inscription of Atoka at Dūnāgār [q.v.]); the region was under the Śāka states until the 4th century A.D. when it passed to the Guptas; after their overthrow by the Huns there followed the Valabha (perhaps overthrown by the Arabs from Kānṣhāra [q.v.] in Sūrāṭhāra, cf. the numismatic evidence adduced by G. P. Taylor in Gujarāt College Magazine, January 1919), Čāwdrās, and the Solankis or Cawlykuys. The last-named dynasty were worshippers of the Hindu divinity Śiva, whose splendid temple at Somnāth in Sawrāṭhāra was plundered by Mahmūd of Ghażnī in Dhu ’l-Ka’dā 416/January 1026, in the reign of Bīhām I the fourth Cawlykuq dynasty (Ibn al-Athlīr, ix, 242; so also the Bīrūns, ed. Sachau, ii, 9; Gardizi, ed. Nazim, 86-7; Haig in Cambridge history of India, iii, 23 ff., gives an incorrect date, presumably following Fīrūzā; gold and jewels worth two million dinārs, the sandalwood gates of the temple, and the stone phallic emblem of the god were transported to Ghażnī. The rebuilding soon commenced, this time in the fine stone for which the region is famous, and the temple continued in this genre which was to become very significant for the derivative architecture of the Gudjarat sultanate. The sixth dynasty, the great Siddhārājā, who ruled for over 50 years in the 12th and 13th centuries A.D., extended the dominions and built the famous temple at Siddhpur later converted into a mosque by Ahmad I; under his patronage the Dīyan [q.v.: religion] was firmly established in Gudjarat. The ninth ruler, Mūlārājā II, sent a large army which in 574/1178 vanquished the army of Mu‘izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām which was exhausted by its long march through Uchā, Mulān and the Mārwār desert (Muhammad historians show Bīhām II as the victorious ruler; but the Sanskrit Kirtikaumudi and Sahñassāk-kirīlana, and contemporary grants, leave no doubt that the invading army came from Mārwār); the short reign). The defeat was avenged in 593/1197 when Mu‘izz al-Dīn’s general Kūt b. Dīn Aybak [q.v.] plundered Anahīlvidā, the capital, forcing Bīhām II to take refuge in a remote part of Gudjarat, and returned to Dīhil laden with booty. Mūlārājā and his brother Bīhām both came to the throne as minors; the central authority thereby became weak, and the kingdom was virtually divided among the nobles and provincial chieftains. The most powerful of these, the Vāghelāls ruling at Dholkā, gradually usurped the royal power and transferred their capital to Anahīlvidā; this was the regnant dynasty at the time of the Muslim conquest, and it continued to hold pockets of territory in north Gudjarat for some time thereafter.

Pre-Muslim Gudjarat seems to have been well known to the Muslim, particularly the Arab world, for it is frequently referred to by travellers and geographers from the merchant Sulaymān onwards. Al-Baladhurī, 3rd/9th century, notices the pirates of the Sawrāṭhāra coast, and mentions the great ports of Bahr-Čī and Sānīn [q.v.]; al-Ma‘ṣīdī describes the strength of the kingdom and the power of its ruler, and mentions the gold and silver mines; Iṣṭākhrī, 4th/10th century, and Ibn Ḥawqāl, 4th/10th century, give itineraries and describe the topography; al-Bīrūnī, 5th/11th century, gives fuller details with greater exactness, as does Idīrīsī at the
end of that century; these two are the only geographers to describe the rivers of Gudiarat. Most of these authors are especially interested in the ports of the Zoroastrians.*

Most of us are now to be found all over the Indian sub-continent their concentrations has always been highest in Gudjarat and the Marachá country to its south, specially Bombay. For a general account of the Zoroastrians see MADJUS; for this Indian branch see PARS!, in addition to later references in this article.

(b) Gudjarat under the Dihli sultanate. Gudjarat fell to the Muslims in one decisive battle won by Muhammad b. Tughluk, which was defeated in 697/1298 (some textual confusion; cf. Hodivala, Studies in Indo-Muslim history, i, Bombay 1939, 248-9) by the armies of the Dihli sultan 'Ala' al-DIn Khâlid after the generals Ulugh Khân and Nuşrat Khân; Anahilwâda was sacked, the rebuilt Somnâth temple was despoiled, and local garrisons were established. Nuşrat Khân moved on to the sack of Khambâyât, where in addition to enormous booty he secured the slave Kâfrî, nicknamed Hazârâmârî, "bought for a thousand dinârs" [see KÄRÌ; DILH SULTANATE]. Asâwâl, Dholkâ, Randâr, Mahuwâl, Diwâ and Djuñâghâr were also overrun, and the invaders extended even to Kačchh. Karâna's queen Kawâldevî was sent to 'Alâ' al-Din, but Karâna escaped with his daughter the celebrated Devaldevi to Devagiri [see PARS!, in addition to later references in this article.

Some twenty years later bands of Afghan and New Muslim adventurers, under disaffected amîrs, rebelled against the Dihli authority and was replaced by Wahid al-DIn Kurayshi, under whom Gudjarat was subjugated and the Marachâ country to its south, specially Bombay. For a general account of the Zoroastrians see MADJUS; for this Indian branch see PARS!, in addition to later references in this article.

The imperial control of the provinces slackened during the struggles for the Tughluk succession, and by 793/1391 Farâb al-Mulk was known to be supporting Hindu practices to gain the confidence of the Râdîpûts before attempting to establish his independence; the 'ulamâ' protested to Dihli, and Muhammad II Tughluk sent Zafar Khân his son in law Malik al-Mulk abdicated in favour of another amîr-i sâda,旻an entitled Zafar Khân, who was shortly after divorced (748/1347) proclaimed as 'Alâ' al-Dîn Hasan Bahman Shah [see BAHMAN!S]. Taghi with drew to Sorath and thence to Thaffâh, but through Muhammad b. Tughluk's energetic pursuit of him the whole of Gudjarat was subdued as never before. The sultan pursued Taghi to Thaffâh where he had taken refuge with the Dîmân, but died in camp there in 752/1351, his nephew Fâriz Shâh Tughluk travelling to the camp for his enthroneinent. Fâriz made a difficult retreat to Dihli, and local events in Gudjarat did not concern the historians until some fifteen years later when he marched against the Dîmân in 767/1366 (for the date see Hodivala, op. cit., 322); the campaign was disastrous and he lost most of his army in the Ran of Kačchh. On finally gaining Gudjarat he dismissed the governor for failing to send him supplies and guides, and spent much time there in recruiting a new army, appointing as governor Zafar Khân the son-in-law of Fâhir al-Dîn Mubârâk [q.v.]. This efficient nâmâm was supplicated in 778/1376 by one Shâms al-Dîn Dâmghânî, who had promised a greatly increased revenue from the province; in spite of severe extortion Dâmghânî was unable to fulfill his promise, and the oppressed population rose against him. The sultan then appointed Malik Mufârâr Sultanî entitled Farâb al-Mulk, who remained governor for fifteen years. The imperial control of the provinces slackened during the struggles for the Tughluk succession, and by 793/1391 Farâb al-Mulk was known to be supporting Hindu practices to gain the confidence of the Râdîpûts before attempting to establish his independence; the 'ulamâ' protested to Dihli, and Muhammad II Tughluk sent Zafar Khân the son of Wadjîh al-Mulk as governor, with the title of Mużaffar Khân. Farâb al-Mulk defied the new governor, and the armies of both met in the decisive battle of Kambol, 30 km. west of Pâlan, on 7 Safar 794/January 1392, when Farâb al-Mulk was killed. Mużaffar Khân proceeded to Pâlan and diligently began restoring order and prosperity in the province, and quashed all tendencies to the toleration of Hindu idolatry. He several times besieged the fortress of the Râdjâ of Idar [q.v.] for withholding tribute, and destroyed the temple of
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Somnath in 797/1395 and 804/1402; on the latter occasion he followed the Somnath Hindus to Dwarka where he established Islam.

When Ahmad was in Kathiawar his appointed governor his son Tätār Khān had been retained in Dihilī by Mūhammad II Taghlīk as his ważīr. On the death of the sultan, Tätār Khān was prominent in the intrigues for power, and in 800/1398 he came to Gudjarāt to raise an army in order to march on Dihilī. The invasion of Tīmūr prevented this immediately, and indeed Māhmand Shāh, the last Tīgūlīk, took refuge for a time at Pāṭan with Muẓaffar Khān. In 805/1400 Tätār Khān endeavoured to persuade his father to march on Dihilī, but the latter, now aged over 60, refused and attempted to dissuade his son. Tätār Khān then imprisoned his father, proclaimed himself sultan of Gudjarāt in Rabī‘ II 806/November 1403 with the title of Mūhammad Shāh, and marched on Dihilī; but Muẓaffar Khān’s brother Shams Khān caused Tätār Khān to be poisoned and released his brother from prison. Muẓaffar returned to Pāṭan and carried on the administration for several years before finally assuming the royal title.

(c) The sultanate of Gudjarāt. Muẓaffar Khān was persuaded by the nobles to assume the insignia of royalty in 820/1416, as the Tughlūk dynasty was virtually extinguished, and no coin had been struck in his father’s name; he therefore acceded as Muẓaffar Shāh. Shortly after his accession he invaded Mālwa [q.v.] and imprisoned sultan Hūḏang at Dāhr on suspicion of his having murdered his father Dīlāwār Khān [q.v.]; however, he restored him soon afterwards. Muẓaffar died in 831/1429 and was succeeded by his grandson Ahmad the son of Tätār Khān—not without the suspicion of having been poisoned by his nobles.

The reign of Ahmad I, which did much to consolidate the new sultanate, lasted 33 years, much of which was occupied in warfare against neighbouring Rāḍīgūt princes and the contiguous Muslim rulers of Mālwa, Khandesh [q.v.] and the Deccan: in 817/1415–16 against Dīnārgār, compelling the payment of tribute; and from this time the power of the sultanate was extended into the central regions of Sūrath, beyond the coastal towns already in its control; in 819/1416 a confederacy of Rāḍīgūt in the north-west, with the partial support of Hūḏang of Mālwa, was defeated, and two years later Ahmad marched against Cāmpānār and levied tribute; in 820/1417 the army of Naṣr Khān of Khandesh, supported by the Mālwa army, invaded the eastern border of Gudjarāt and invested the fort of Sūltānpur, but was repulsed by Ahmad Shāh who followed up and besieged Naṣr Khān in his fort of Afsgrāh; Naṣr swore fealty to Ahmad Shāh and his claim to Khandesh was in turn recognized by Ahmad. The instigator of the Khandesh attack and his claim to Khandesh was in turn recognized by Ahmad. The instigator of the Khandesh attack against Ahmad I which was subsequently found to be Hūḏang of Mālwa, Ahmad next attacked that kingdom in 822/1420 and 823/1420, effecting little but the plunder of outlying districts; in 825/1429, during Hūḏang’s absence from Mālwa on his notorious expedition to Utištā [q.v.], Ahmad again attacked, besieging the capital Māndū [q.v.] for some months without effect; the Gudjarāt and Mālwa armies confronted each other later that year in Sārangpur without a major engagement, and Ahmad returned to Aḥmadābād and undertook no further military action for two years.

From 829–31/1425–8 there were continued hostilities against Pundjāb the ruler of Idar. Ahmad built the walled city of Ahmadnagar (renamed Himatnagar in the 20th century) some 30 km. from Idar as a base of operations. In 831/1428 Pundjāb was killed by a fall and his son sought peace and promised tribute; nevertheless he and his successors maintained intermittent warfare with the Gudjarāt sultānate for generations thereafter. In 832/1429 a Hindu prince of the house of Dīlāwār (some doubt; his name does not occur in the dynastic lists), objecting to Ahmad’s discriminatory measures against the Hindus, attacked Nandurbār with the help of a Bahmānī army, later reinforced by one from Khandesh also; the attackers were utterly defeated by Ahmad’s superior skill. Two years later the Bahmānī ruler Ahmad Shāh Wallī sent an army to capture the island of Mālim (now a part of Bombay), which was held under general Gudjarāt suzerainty by a semi-independent Muslim prince; but the generals of the Gudjarāt force first invested Thāna, the most important town of the northern Konkan coast and in Bahmānī territory, by land and sea, and after its capitulation drove the invader from Mālim.

Ahmad died in Rabī‘ II 846/August 1442 after a reign devoted to consolidating Islam in his dominions by relentless iconoclasm and oppression of the Hindus. His justice was strict but impartial, and he was known for his piety and as a disciple of the great religious teachers Shāykh Ahmad Khattū of Sankhod and Būrānī al-Dīn Kūṭb al-‘Alām of Baṭwā. In 831/1428 he had founded his capital city of Ahmadābād on the left bank of the Sābarmati, with a citadel and spacious streets (Ahmad Rādīj, Haft ḳīlām, Bibl. Ind., 86–7), and struck coin there and at Ahmadnagar. His soldiers were paid half in coin from the imperial treasury and half by grants of land (dāḥār); for the mana system of land revenue applicable to Hindus, originating in his reign, see TENURE OF LAND.

Ahmad’s eldest son succeeded him with the title Muhammad Shāh, a mild and generous ruler. He followed his father’s policy in a further attack on Idar in 850/1446, the ruler buying peace by giving Muhammad his daughter in marriage, and in 853/1449 against Cāmpānār, from which, however, he withdrew after the ráḏīq had invoked the aid of Mālimdūr I of Mālwa; on the return journey he fell ill and died at the capital in Mubārram 859/February 1451. His eldest son Djalāl Khān succeeded him with the title Kūṭb al-Dīn Ahmad Shāh II and reigned for less than nine years. He won an early victory in the battle of Kapadwand against a Mālwa invading force; and in 861/1457 formed a Muslim alliance with Māhmand I of Mālwa against the Hindus rādān of Citawr, who had earlier defeated his forces (Sanstrick inscription on kirtistambha of Citawr; the defeat is not recorded by the Muslim historians). Otherwise his reign was occupied in building, and in attempts to secure the person of his young half-brother Fath Khān who was under the protection of the Baṭwā shaykh Shāh ‘Alām. Kūṭb al-Dīn Ahmad died suddenly in Radjab 862/May 1458, and is said to have been poisoned by his Wāzīr in order that his father, Shams Khān of Nāgawār, might succeed to the Gudjarāt throne. The nobles first raised to the throne Dāwūd Khān, a younger son of Ahmad I, but he was deposed after a reign of seven days of moronic
incompetence, and Fath Khan, then thirteen years old, succeeded as Mahmud Shah. Within months he showed the courage and judgement that were to characterize the 54 years of his reign when he thwarted a conspiracy to remove him; and he was early involved in clashes with Mula when he intervened to prevent a Mula attempt on the dominions of the infant Bahmani king Nizam Shah.

In 865/1461 Mahmud supported Ughmán Khán of Daulatabad in his struggle for the succession there, secured the extension of his domains—important for Gudjarat as Islam was thereby securely established in south Rájpútañá—and conferred on him the title of Zubdat al-Mulk. The extension of Islam in the south of the Gudjarat dominion was furthered in 869/1465 when an army was sent to take the hill forts of Bahirí and Pánera and the port of Dáman from the hands of their Hindú rídíd; and at this time the old Pársí settlement of Sangánán was destroyed. The years 871-7/1467-70 saw Mahmud gradually overcoming the strong Rájpúta power at Dijnágarí and its citadel-fort of Gírnár. The defeated rídíd embraced Islam, and Mahmúd remained some time at Dijnágarí, improving its beauty and its defences to make it a centre from which Afghan Islam could be propagated throughout the Soráh peninsula. He accordingly renamed it Mústáfábádí and settled sáyyídís and other divines there, and set it up as a mint town and as the headquarters of the thándádir or local administrator. To combat the laxity of the administration reported from Ahmadábád while the sultan was on his Soráh campaign he appointed one Díamál-al-Dín as faqír with the title of Muháfíz Khán. From his new headquarters of Mústáfábádí Mahmúd undertook military expeditions in 875/1472 into Sindh and Káčchí, subduing the predatory tribes and sending their leaders to Mústáfábád for instruction in Islam; on his return he marched against the sacred Hindú town and temple of Dwárká (gáh) where pirates had been harassing Muslim pilgrims, and sacked the town and the neighbouring island of Bel (see J. Burton-Palmer, “The two forts of Dwarka...” in BSOAS, xx [1957], 145-57). He returned to Ahmadabad in 878/1473 and undertook no major military operations for the next nine years; in this time he built the new city of Mahmúdábád 30 km. south-east of Ahmadabad.

In Ramádán 885/November 1480, when Mahmúd was making his yearly visit to Mústáfábád, an attempt to dethrone him and place his eldest son Ahmad on the throne was frustrated by the wazir and Muháfíz Khán; Ahmad seems to have been involved in the conspiracy, as he was passed over for the succession and Mám próbár’s youngest son Khállí became heir-apparent. In Sháwwál 887/December 1482 Mahmúd started his second great war against the Hindús. His allies included the Mamluk sultan Kánsawí al-Ghawrí, under the command of Amir Húsayn, and that of Gudjarat which arose in Khandésh on the death of ‘Adil Khán II, finally resolved in 914/1509 with the acceptance of the Gudjarat candidate, a kinsman of Mahmúd’s, as ‘Adil Khán III (for a detailed account see FARUKIDS).

Since the arrival of Vasco da Gama in Calicut in 1498 the Portuguese had extended their maritime influence over much of the Indian ocean and the Red Sea, to the great detriment of the lucrative trade which passed through the Gudjarat ports, especially Khandésh, and depriving Egypt of the revenues of much of her Eastern trade. Their first opposition in these regions came from the joint force of the fleet despatched by the Egyptian Mamluk sultan Kánsawí al-Ghawrí, under the command of Amir Húsayn, and that of Gudjarat, who won the first victory in Ramádán 913/January 1537 and took Dom Lorenzo, son of Francisco d’Almeida the Portuguese viceroy, who was killed in a battle off Cawí; but the combined Muslim fleets were defeated by d’Almeida in a battle outside Díwí harbour in Sháwwál 914/February 1539 (E. Denison Ross, The Portuguese in India and Arabí in 1307-1517, in J.R.A.S., 1921, 545-62). Mahmúd then attempted to establish diplomatic relations with the Portuguese (see W. de C. Birch (ed.), The commentaries of the great Afoisno Dálboquerque, Hakluýt Socy., especially ii, 210 ff.) but after Albuquerque’s capture and orgiastic sack and massacre of Síndábád (Goa), the port of the ‘Adil Sháhí sultanate of Biddíjúr, Mahmúd realized the impracticability of maintaining any alliance with such an intransigent enemy of Islam and, to avoid provocation, broke the Egyptian alliance and liberated his Portuguese prisoners.

Mahmúd died at Ahmadábád on 2 Ramádán 917/23 November 1511 and was buried at Sarkhéjí. In his reign the prosperity of the Gudjarat reached perhaps its greatest height; certainly it knew its greatest internal security in the towns and in the ports. The army was efficient and well equipped, and Mahmúd was solicitous for the welfare of his troops, including the families of those killed in battle, who were provided for by continuance to them of the assets of the late soldier’s diván, and consolded the next-of-kin of the dead in person after his battles. He was a great builder, and also laid out many gardens and orchards, and is credited with the introduction of many kinds of fruit trees into Gudjarat.

Mahmúd was a tall man with a prodigious appetite and a prodigious appetite and a prodigious appetite and a prodigious appetite and a prodigious appetite. He was a great builder, and also laid out many gardens and orchards, and is credited with the introduction of many kinds of fruit trees into Gudjarat.

In the years 986-9/1501-4 the activities of Bahádúr Gíllání, a renegade from the Bahmani court who committed repeated acts of piracy from Dabhöl in the south Konkan coast and had even ravaged Khamábay, and Mahmúd caused Bahádúr to arrest him by sea and call for Bahmani cooperation by land; eventually Gíllání was killed and full reparation was made to Gudjarat.

In the early 16th century Gudjarat was one of the powers to intervene in the dynastic rivalries which arose in Khánhós on the death of ‘Adil Khán II, finally resolved in 914/1509 with the acceptance of the Gudjarat candidate, a kinsman of Mahmúd’s, as ‘Adil Khán III (for a detailed account see FARUKIDS).
Beg with the Gudjarati diminutive suffix /a, -id, “the little Beg”; the form Baykara, used in the article पाखरा, seems to be a false Mughalization. Valahab, who usurped the Maval throne from his elder brother Sahib Khan, who had been proclaimed as Muhammad II by the rebel waara, had asked for Muzaftar’s assistance in coming to his throne. His claim was favourably reported on by the Gudjarat agents in Malwa, and Muzaftar had agreed to attack Maval in his support after the rains. Muzaftar was at the time entertaining an ambassador from Şah Isma‘Il of Persia, whose mission was apparently to induce Gudjarat to accept the Şah’s faith, and who had become acquainted with Şahib Khan; one evening after a dinner party the ambassador in a moment of pederastic enthusiasm assaulted Şahib Khan, who fled in shame first to Khândesh and then to Berâr; the ambassador was sent back to Persia after a scarcely cordial reception. Şahib Khan’s claim was quietly forgotten, and shortly afterwards he was called on to invade the province on behalf of Mahmud II who found himself no more than a puppet in the hands of his minister Medini Râi and his Râdpît army. Muzaftar accordingly marched on the capital Mândû with a strong Gudjarat force which was joined by the Khândesh army, hearing of which Medini Râi sought help from the powerful Mâhârârân Sângrâm of Citawr; the fort was taken by escalade in Şafar 920/February 1518, the Râdpît garrison massacred, and Mâhârâ Madinûn to his throne. The text of a letter from Muzaftar to the Ottoman Sultan Sellm I, congratulating the latter on his victory over Persia and announcing the capture of Mândû, is given by Ferîdân (Munâqa‘î, i, 359-7).

Muzaftar had been delayed in his actions in Mâlwa by several skirmishes in and around Idrâr, where a usurper had been established on the throne of the feudatory Hindu state of Sângrâm of Citawr; this interference was ill received in Gudjarat, and armies were sent to restore the rightful heir; the usurper continued, however, to harass the northern districts of Gudjarat until Muzaftar’s return from Mâlwa. Sângrâm, incensed by insults to his name offered by the Gudjarat commander at Idrâr, raidcd Idrâr, Ahmadnagar and other towns in 925/1519; Muzaftar retaliated with a large force early in 927/1521, and compelled the Râna to pay tribute and send a son to the Gudjarat court as a hostage. In Muzaftar II’s reign there was considerable diplomatic intercourse with the Portuguese at Goa, friendly at first. A mission sent to Gudjarat in 928/ 1522-3 sought permission to build a fort at Dîw, which the sultan, on the advice of Malik Ayâz [q.v.], governor of Dijunâgarh and Dîw, did not grant. The Gudjarat cause was pressed by one Malik Göpî at the Gudjarat court, but Malik Ayâz’s wiser counsels prevailed and the defences of Dîw were strengthened. Two attempts by the Portuguese to take Dîw by force, in 926/1520 and 927/1521, were thwarted, and an attempt to take Muzaftarâbâd, 30 km. east of Dîw, and establish a fort there, was foiled when some Muslim captives were used as a munitions ship in which they were travelling.

Muzaftar II died in Dijunâgarh II 932/April 1526. His eldest son Sikandar succeeded him but was murdered after six weeks and an infant son of Muzaftar II was placed on the throne as Mâhârâm MîrânMuhammad, the second son of Muzaftar II, who was formally installed as sultan in the Râmâdân/July following, the infant Mâhârâm MîrânMuhammad II and other princes of the royal blood were quietly disposed of, except for his younger brother Cand Khan who had taken refuge with Mâhârâm MîrânMuhammad II of Mâlwa.

The principal events of Bahâdûr’s reign—the attack on the Şînâr Şâhîs of Ahmadnagar in 935/ 1528 to settle a territorial dispute with Khândesh, his conquest of Mâlwa in 937/1531, the capture of the Râdpît strongholds Urdjidnâ, Bihlá and Râsin in 938/1532-3 and Citawr in 940/1535, the defeat of the Portuguese at Dîw in 937/1531 but the loss to them of Bassein in 941/1534 and the grant of permission to build a fort at Dîw in 942/1535, the long war with the Mughal Humâyûn from 941/1534 in which Bahâdûr lost Mâlwa and was dispossessed of most of his dominions until Humâyûn returned to face the threat of Şer Khan in 942/1536, and his death through Portuguese treachery—have been discussed above in the article BAHADUR SHAH GUDJARATI: see also HUMAYUN, MALWA, MUGHALS; and add to the Bibliography of BAHADUR SHAH GUDJARATI: Philip Baldaeus, Description of the East India coast, Churchill’s Collection of voyages and travels, London 1732, iii, 430 ff.

Bahâdûr’s murder by the Portuguese took place at sea outside Dîw in Râmâdân 943/February 1537, and with his death the greatness of the Gudjarat sultanate ended. The Portuguese seized Dîw with the palace and treasury, and it thenceforth passed out of Muslim hands. Bahâdûr left no heir, and in the first confusion after his death Muhammad Zamân Mîrân Humâyûn’s brother-in-law whose refuge with Bahâdûr had provoked the war with the Mughals, aspired to the throne, entered into a treaty with the Portuguese whereby he granted them Mangrâl and Damân and a strip of coastal land in exchange for their support, and the Môwa was read in his name in the mosque of Dîw, but the nobles of Bahâdûr’s court sent an army against him, and he was defeated and fled to Dihli. Bahâdûr had in his lifetime indicated that his sister’s son Mirân Muhammad Şâh, who since 926/1520 had been the ruler of Khândesh, should succeed him, and the nobles sent for him; but within weeks he died of grief for the uncle to whom he had been a constant and loyal companion for the previous ten years, and the eleven years old Mâhârâm Khan, son of Bahâdûr’s renegade brother Lattîl Khan, was then enthroned as Mâhârâm Şâh III.

Mâhârâm and his two successors were all mirrors, and the history of the sultanate after 943/1537 is mostly one of puppet monarchies and factious and suspicious nobles plotting for power against each other and against the best interests of the state. In 944/1538 the Ottoman sultan Suleyman I, apprehensive at the growing Portuguese threat because of Bahâdûr’s death, sent a fleet from Suez to attack them at Dîw; the Gudjarat land forces, fearing that the presence of the Turks at Dîw would be no more comfortable than that of the Portuguese, failed to give full cooperation, and on receipt of a fabricated letter announcing that the Portuguese main fleet was arriving from Goa, the Ottoman fleet raised the siege and sailed away; the Gudjarat generals negotiated a peace treaty with the Portuguese, and built a wall separating the fort from the town of Dîw (see further KÂNÂM SÜLEYMÂN PASHA).
In 950/1543 Mahmud III escaped from his custody at the hands of the powerful regent Darya Khan and fled to the protection of 'Alam Khan Lodhi, the sultan of the Mughal empire, who had fled to Gujarat. 'Alam Khan was a great-great-grandson of Ahmad I, whom Akbar's forces had taken prisoner on his first invasion of the Mughal empire, where apart from the commercial traffic there was a busy pilgrim traffic to the Holy Cities. The trade suffered a great loss in the Satya-siśa of 1687, 1040-1/1630-1), and took at least ten years to recover; an interesting account of Mughal famine relief is given by 'Abd al-Hamid, Bādāsh-nāma (text, Engl. trans., and comment in F. Saran, Provinciaal government of the Mughals, Allahabad 1941, 432-3).

The peace and prosperity of Gujarat under Mughal rule gave way to disorder after the death of Aurangzeb at the beginning of the 12th/18th century. Previously there had been sporadic raids on Gujarat territory, especially Surtah in 1074/1664 and 1081/1670, by the Marāthā chieftain Shivaji; now the Gāṅkār family rose to prominence in Gujarat affairs and wielded more power than the Mughal sāhābdar; by 1172/1758 they had started a reign of terror. Villages and towns were plundered, and in the next ten years the Marāthās had overrun almost all the province; eventually, with the fall of Ahmadābād in 1171/1758, Mughal rule was extinguished. For the history of the province to the Mughals see MUGHAL. The importance of the province to the Mughals was largely commercial. The region was famous for its silk weaving and, especially at Ahmadābād and Surtah, the production of velvets (although sericulture never seems to have been practised in the region; the silk was imported from Bengal and from China); fine cotton cloth (bafta) was produced at the coastal towns, Bāhārūn in particular producing fine bleached calico; Sarkhedj was the principal centre for indigo production in the Mughal empire; saltpetre was refined at Ahmadābād and Surtah; and salt was prepared by evaporation from many districts bordering on the Rāj of Kābūt. The conquest of Gujarat also gave ports to the Mughal empire, where apart from the commercial traffic there was a busy pilgrim traffic to the Holy Cities. The trade suffered a great loss in the Satya-siśa, the "famine of eighty-seven" (the Vikram year 1687, 1040-1/1630-1), and took at least ten years to recover; an interesting account of Mughal famine relief is given by 'Abd al-Hamid, Bādāsh-nāma (text, Engl. trans., and comment in F. Saran, Provinciaal government of the Mughals, Allahabad 1941, 432-3).

The peace and prosperity of Gujarat under Mughal rule gave way to disorder after the death of Aurangzeb at the beginning of the 12th/18th century. Previously there had been sporadic raids on Gujarat territory, especially Surtah in 1074/1664 and 1081/1670, by the Marāthā chieftain Shivaji; now the Gāṅkār family rose to prominence in Gujarat affairs and wielded more power than the Mughal sāhābdar; by 1172/1758 they had started a reign of terror. Villages and towns were plundered, and in the next ten years the Marāthās had overrun almost all the province; eventually, with the fall of Ahmadābād in 1171/1758, Mughal rule was extinguished. For the history of the
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In 950/1543 Mahmud III escaped from his custody at the hands of the powerful regent Darya Khan and fled to the protection of 'Alam Khan Lodhi, the sultan of the Mughal empire, who had fled to Gujarat. 'Alam Khan was a great-great-grandson of Ahmad I, whom Akbar's forces had taken prisoner on his first invasion of the Mughal empire, where apart from the commercial traffic there was a busy pilgrim traffic to the Holy Cities. The trade suffered a great loss in the Satya-siśa of 1687, 1040-1/1630-1), and took at least ten years to recover; an interesting account of Mughal famine relief is given by 'Abd al-Hamid, Bādāsh-nāma (text, Engl. trans., and comment in F. Saran, Provinciaal government of the Mughals, Allahabad 1941, 432-3).

The peace and prosperity of Gujarat under Mughal rule gave way to disorder after the death of Aurangzeb at the beginning of the 12th/18th century. Previously there had been sporadic raids on Gujarat territory, especially Surtah in 1074/1664 and 1081/1670, by the Marāthā chieftain Shivaji; now the Gāṅkār family rose to prominence in Gujarat affairs and wielded more power than the Mughal sāhābdar; by 1172/1758 they had started a reign of terror. Villages and towns were plundered, and in the next ten years the Marāthās had overrun almost all the province; eventually, with the fall of Ahmadābād in 1171/1758, Mughal rule was extinguished. For the history of the
Marathā wars and their rule of Gudjārat see MARĀTHĀS. Some tracts of the province were not, however, under the Maratha rule of the Gākjātwar or the Khān prepared for battle in the absence of imperial support was unable to take effective action, and Maratha rule continued until Gudjārat was ceded to the British by the Gaikwar in 1817.

For the ethnology of Gudjārat see HIND, Ethnology. For religious developments see DAVN, PĀRṢ; for Islamic sects see BOHORAS, KHODJAS, IMĀM SHĀH, ISMĀ'ILIYA, MU'MIN, SĀPFANTI.

For the coinage of Gudjārat see SIKKA. For the monuments, see HIND, AḤṢ AHMADĀRĀD, BHAROČ, ČĀMPĀNĀR, DJUNAGĀR, KHAMBAYAT, MAḤMŪDĀBĀD, SÜRĀT.

**Bibliography:** Sources for Gudjārat history under the Dehil sultanate have been given in the bibliography to DILĪ SULTANĀT; especially important for Gudjārat are Dīyā' al-Dīn Barānī, Ta'Rikh-i Fīrūz Shāhī; Īsānī, Ma'n al-saldānī; Aḥmad Khān, Aṣṣ al-futūh; 'Abd al- Kaḍum Hamdānī, Ta'Rikh-i Maḥmūd Shāhī; 'All b. Maḥmūd al-Mīrmānī, Ma'āṣīhir-i Maḥmūd Shāhī, Bodi. Elliot 237.


Modern works: M.S. Commissariat, History of Gujarat, i, London 1938; ii, Bombay 1957; well documented with much cultural information. A research project of the history of Gudjārat under the Muslims is currently being undertaken at the M.S. University of Baroda, from which there has appeared S. C. Misra, The rise of Muslim power in Gudjārat, London 1963, which covers the years 697/1298 to 845/1442; idem, Muslim Communities in Gudjārat: preliminary studies in their history and social organization, New York 1964; both these with extensive bibliography. Pearson, 20164-80. Much general information in Bombay Gazetteer, i-x, xii, xiv; Baroda state gazetteer, 2 vols., Bombay 1923. On the coins of the Gudjārat sultanate, especially G. P. Taylor, The coins of the Gudjārat sālānat, in JBBRAS, xxi (1903) 278-383; and Pearson, 10482-97.

**GUDJĀRĀṬI,** language spoken in the state of Gudjārat (population 20,623,474) and in the communities of Gudjārātis which have settled in various parts of India; it has always been the first language of the many Gudjārti speakers in the region bounded by Dhāysalmer to the north, Mālwa to the east and Sawráshtra and Gudjārat to the west and south. It became a direct predecessor of modern Gudjārātī. Some of the dated documents of the 12th century are in Sawráshtra, the Ismā'il Khodias of Sawráshtra among the occupational jargons are the speech of the educated upper caste population. See also barsānī, also barsānī, also barsānī, also barsānī, also barsānī.

**Bibliography:** Much general information in Bombay Gazetteer, i-x, xii, xiv; Baroda state gazetteer, 2 vols., Bombay 1923. On the coins of the Gudjārat sultanate, especially G. P. Taylor, The coins of the Gudjārat sālānat, in JBBRAS, xxi (1903) 278-383; and Pearson, 10482-97.

**GUDJĀRNĀVĀLA,** an industrial town of West Pakistan and headquarters of the district of the same name, situated in 32° 9' N. and 74° 11' E., on the main railway line between Lahore and Peshawar [qq.v.]; population (1961) 196,754. The town, a mere village till the middle of the 19th century.
century, owes its origin to a tribe of the Gūḍjars [q.v.] who were expelled by Sāhī Bāzām from Amritsar [q.v.]. On changing hands the village was renamed Khālpur, after the head-man of the Sārisī. But this name never gained popularity.

It was of little importance during Mughal days and consequently finds no mention in the Āḍīn-ī Akbarī. Early in the 19th century it was captured by Carat Singh Dījāl, grandfather of the Sikh ruler Randjīt Singh, who made it his headquarters. Randjīt Singh himself was born here and it continued to be the capital of the rising Sikh power until 1799, when the seat of government was shifted to Lahore. The Sikh general Harī Singh Nālwā, who led many punitive expeditions against the Áfricaños of the Khyber, was also a native of this place. His house, in a narrow street of the town, is still preserved.

The father and grandfather of Randjīt Singh both have their Samādhs, last resting places, in this town. The town remained quiet during the military uprising of 1857 but was badly disturbed during the Non-Cooperation and Khilafat movements of 1919-22, when rioters uprooted the railroad track, burnt down the railway station and indulged in widespread arson and looting. By way of punishment the new railroad was built at a considerable distance from the town. It is now used as a halting station for good trains while the passengers alight at the site of the destroyed station, which was rebuilt by the British Government. Politically unimportant, the town is a flourishing centre of iron, steel, copper and hand-loom industries and is rapidly expanding.


(A. S. Bazīm Ansārī)

GUDJĀRAT, a town, tahsīl and district in the northern plains of the Pākistān Panjāb lying between the rivers Dījjām and Cānāb. The district is thought to have once formed part of the ancient Gudjār town kingdom; but it is not specifically referred to in Islamic historical writing until the time of Bālāl卓 (855-941/1451-89) when the town of Bālāl卓pur, 36 km. north-east of Gudjārāt town, was founded; the settlement of the district was continued by Sāhī Dījāl in the middle of the 16th/17th century, and completed by Akbār with the refounding of Gudjārāt town.

There seem to have been at least two successive cities on the site of what is now Gudjārāt. Gudjārāt town was garrisoned by Gūḍjars to restore Gudjārāt and made it the headquarters of a large district; the local population is predominantly Dījāl [q.v.], but the fort (Gudjārāt-Akbārābād) was garrisoned by Gūḍjars.

The town and district remained under efficient Mughal control until the death of Awrangzēb, records of the period having been preserved by the hereditary kānīngōs of the region. In 1711/1738 it was ravaged by Nādır Sāhī [q.v.]; the Gakhkars of Rāwalpindī, under Sūlān Mūkarrāb Khan, established themselves there in 1711/1741, but the country was an open prey from 1711/1741 to 1725/1726 to the marauding armies of Aḥmad Sāhī Dūrrānī [q.v.] on whose route it lay. Mūkarrāb Khan was confirmed in his possessions by the Dūrrānī ruler, and nominally administered them on his behalf; but "nothing was left to the people but the food and drink in their mouths; the rest was Aḥmad Sāhī's". This nominal rule lasted until 1779/1785, when Gudjārāt fell to the Sikhs. The district came under British rule in 1846.

The town is largely agricultural, and produces some timber. Gudjārāt town has some reputation as a centre for fine furniture making, and had previously some renown as a centre of iron damascening. The shrine still exists of the pir Shāh Dāwā [b. 975/1370, d. 1725/1721 according to the local tradition], a saint whose intercessions were said to remove the curse of barrenness if the first-born were dedicated to his service. These children attached to the shrine are invariably freaks, of low intelligence and with absurdly pointed heads—deliberate distortion of the heads in infancy has been suspected; they are known as Čūh-i Shāh Dāwā, "Shāh Dāwā's rats".

The name Gudjārāt used here reflects the conventional spelling Gujarāt, adopted to distinguish this district and town from Gujarāt (Gudjārāt [q.v.]); the two names are really identical. For the etymology see GUDJARAT.

Bibliography: Imperial Gazetteer of India; Punjab District Gazetteers, XXV-A, Gujrat District, Lahore 1931. For Shāh Dāwā's Rats see J. Wilson Johnston in Indian Medical Gazette, May 1866; also reference in Indian Antiquary, 1879, 176; letter in JRAS, 1896, 574-5, 793; M. Longworth Dames, Shāh Dāwā's Rats, in Man, xv (1915), 88-9. (J. Burton-Page)

GUERSIF [see GARSIF].

GUILD(S) [see PUTUVWA, SINIF].

GUINEA, an independent republic on the West coast of Africa (246,000 sq. km), bounded on the north by Portuguese Guinea, Senegal and Mali, on the east by the Ivory Coast, and on the south by Liberia and Sierra Leone. Within these limits, between 7° and 15° N., and between 17° and 17° E., every type of terrain and climate is to be found, starting with Lower Guinea which has a width of from 40 to 90 km, and extensive deltas have been formed by the neighbouring rivers, often lined with mud-flats or streen with islands; Central Guinea corresponds with the Fûta Dîallon, dominated by residual high ground from 1200 to 1500 m. and distinguished by the bowal, a cap of laterite isolated by erosion, and where the introduction of cultivation has increased the sterility. Upper Guinea corresponds with the upper basin of the Niger, where the climate becomes continental; further south, in the Guinea forests, lies the mountain barrier containing Mount Nimba.

Guinea probably derives its name from the Berber ignawwn, pl. of agnaw, which means "mute" and does not imply any notion of colour (see G. S.
Colin in GLECS, vii, 93-5), contrary to the view expressed by M. Delafosse (Haut-Sénégal-Niger, ii, 377), the population of Guinea numbers about 3 million.

There are still some centres of population that are either indigenous or were established in very early times, Coniagu and Bassari in the north, Kissi and Guerze in the south.

The Baqa, Landuman, Mani or Mendenyi, and Nalu have been driven back from the Futa towards the coast by Mande, Sarakole, Malinke and Sussu elements, and by the conquering Fulani. The history of these settlements corresponds in general outline with the history of Islamization.

This process was accomplished only slowly, under the pressure of political and military events in the Nigerian Sudan, first with Malinke elements, and then through the Fulani who, as soon as they believed themselves to be sufficiently strong, were to proclaim a holy war and to maintain their ascendancy over the Futa until the French conquest.

It was in 1427/1030 that Baramendana Keita, the sovereign of Mali, was converted to Islam. From the end of the 9th/10th century the first Diola to be Islamized by the Sarakole penetrated into Guinea and began to spread Islam into the Futa and along the kola-nut routes leading to the coast. In the 6th/12th century, the Soninke Morikubala Dore introduced Islam into the Konian, Awrodugu and Kossadugu. In 1528/1230 Amari Sonko, one of the commanders of Mansa Ule, king of Mali, conquered and converted the Kangaran.

In the first half of the 10th/16th century came the Pouli from Macina and Tichitt, commanded by Bambi Diade. These first Fulani invaders were Kâdiriya Bakkâya (of the Kunta of Timbuctu). They set about converting or expelling the refractory elements. Koli Tenguela or Koli Pouli, great-grandson of Bambi Diade, created the first kingdom of Futa. Attracted by the mountain pasturages, the Fulani came in ever increasing numbers from Macina at the end of the 11th/17th century, and Islamization became more marked. However, the Muslim Mandingo, coming from Diafonou in particular, founded Kankan and the villages of Bate, Kufodie and Timbuktu. In 1528/1230 a powerful force of Fulani arrived from Macina, led by a certain Seri or Sidi. In about 1515/1700 leadership passed to Muhammadu Salî and then to Kikala, a man renowned for his piety. On the death of his son Sambigu, his grandsons Nuhu and Malik Si disputed the succession (1132-8/1720-6).

The Muslim penetration was, at that date, on so extensive a scale that it was tempting to make use of the religious pretext to evict the proprietors of the land. It was Ibrahim Musu, still known as Karamoko Alfo, a man of immense piety, who was called on to fight against the pagans. He inaugurated the permanent state of holy war which was one of the constant and fundamental policies of Futa. The first victories fell to the aggressive Fulani, but the pagans recovered and their chief, Pouli Garme, occupied Timbuktu when Karamoko became insane and died. In his place was chosen Ibrahim Sori ("the Wakeful"), known as mawo (= the Great), who in practice was to be the great war leader of Futa, defeating the Wassulonke and the Sulima in succession. He compelled the Fulani chief of Labe to recognize his authority over the Mandingo province of Niokolo in Upper Gambia, and forced Maka, Coniagu and Bassari to recognize Futa.

The progress of Islamization was thus advanced notably; in 1830 al-Hâdidji ‘Umar had established the Dinguiraye (cattle-park) before carrying out his conquests in the north, and his adherents had penetrated the frontier zone of the present northern Guinea. From 1830 a former Mandingo pedlar, Samory Toure, set up the empire of Onassubu, the capital of which, Bissimilah (or ‘Ilimah), occupied Timbuktu, and his 1500 warriors were defeated at Poredaka. It was the end of the independence of the Futa Djallon.

The progress of Islamization was thus advanced notably; in 1850 al-Hâdidji ‘Umar had established the Dinguiraye (cattle-park) before carrying out his conquests in the north, and his adherents had penetrated the frontier zone of the present northern Guinea. From 1830 a former Mandingo pedlar, Samory Toure, set up the empire of Onassubu, the capital of which, Bissimilah, was his place of refuge after expeditions to what later became Ghana and the Ivory Coast.

Samory's invasions produced a renewed Islamic infiltration. By the treaties of Kenieba-Koura (March 1886) and Bissandugu (1889), Samory made himself secure from the direction of the French Sudan and, to protect himself from the British, he requested a French protectorate. Operations started again from 1891. In 1898 Samory, captured by the Gourand force, was deported to Gabon where he died two years later.

French Guinea was established by a decree of 17 December 1891, and its boundaries were fixed in 1900 with the neighboring states, French Sudan (now Mali) and the Ivory Coast. Being included in 1904 in the Federation of West Africa, it became a
The Islamization of Guinea was continued throughout the whole French period with the frequent help of the President, although himself a Muslim.

In conclusion, we may say that in Guinea as a whole, according to the judgements of the anthropologist J. R. Molard, "the Fulani are Muslim born, the Mandingos are adopting Islam, while the forest peoples (Kissi, Toma, Guerzé) have remained hostile."


**GÜLBABA**, a Turkish title, with the sense of head of a Muslim cloister (tekke) of the Bektâşî Order; the name of a tekke at Buda and of another tekke in the neighbourhood of Edirne; the name of a legendary personality.

The name Gûlbaba, in connexion with the tekhe and the türbes so designated at Buda, appears in Turkish documents of 974/1566 with the form *Giilbaba* (Vienna, Flügel 1924); on a manuscript skecth-map of 1684 (E. Veres, *Marsîgı jileşmesi énd têktêpesi Budavêdê 1684*, 1686. evi âstomûrdâv [Report and maps of the fortress for the years 1684 and 1686], in Budaêst rûçõesâl [Antiquités of Budapeste], ix, 142) it occurs four times in the same form, though in each case without vocalization. Written in the same manner, it is found in several Turkish authors, e.g., in *Peçevlî* (ii, 141), *Ewwiîlî Cebeli* (vi, 244) and *Naîmînî* (i, 289); and in Silâhđâr it occurs a number of times in the form *Gülbulabî* (ii, 401, 799, 801). In the writings of European authors the name is encountered as Julipapa in G. Wernher and E. Brown, as Gûylpapa in the superscription—from a European hand—on the above-mentioned manuscript sketch-map, and as Ghiul Baba in the text of L. Marsigli; about 1830, after the rendering of a derishv from India, it was written down as Tülbaba. The forms given in the Latin script leave no doubt that the name, in its first syllable, has to be pronounced Gûlbaba, with the vowel ü. A man with the name Gûlbaba is known from the time of Mehemmed II (Baîbingê, GOW, 213) and a locality near Edirne is also called Gûlbaba. The word gûlî, as a component of personal names, is known, too, in other instances, e.g., Gûl Toûmâxî Khân, Gûl Rûstêm Khân.

The expression gûlî, in names of this kind, has not yet other partners. See for example the indexes in *Gr. I. Ph.*; Gibb, *op. cit.*; Browne, ii, iv. Further material might be provided by catalogues of oriental and western manuscripts, further Edwards, *Cat. of the Printed Books in the British Museum*, London 1922; A. J. Arbery, *Persian Books* (*Cat. of the Library of the India Office*, ii/6), London 1937, and similar works. From Persian poetry might be mentioned *Gül u Khusraw or Khusraw u Gül* (usually *Khusraw-nâmê* by Farâd al-Dîn Muhammâd ʿAttâr (d. 627/1231) [see *EP*, i, 755; H. Ethê, *op. cit.*, 286; in more detail H. Ritter, *Philologika*, opp. cit., i, 7 (1938), 160-72; *Gül u muli* ("Rose and Wine"); see *IA*, i, 734; *Gul u Naw-rûs* by Djalal al-Dîn Ahmad Tabbaj in 1734/1733, and the same title by Khâdhî Khirmanî in 1742/1741-2 (see H. Ethê, *op. cit.*, 249); *Gul u Sanawar* "Rose and Spruce", in prose and several times translated into Urdu (see H. Ethê, *op. cit.*, 321 and 323); Garac de Tassy, *Histoire de la Littérature Hindoue et Hindoustanie*, Paris 1870, i, 157 ff.; and translated by him in *Revue orient. et amer.*, vii, 69-130). From Ottoman poetry, *gül ili Khusrev* by Āhî (d. 923/1517; Gibb, *op. cit.*, ii, 291); *Gül u Şahâ, "Rose and Zephyr"*, by Neğdî (d. 914/1509; see Gibb, *op. cit.*, ii, 101); *Munâsara-i Gül u Khusrev*, "Contest between (the) Rose and Khusrev", also by Neğdî (see Gibb, *op. cit.*, ii, 100), and *Gül u Şahâ* (as to *Gül dâvul* by Mu'âdî (16th century); see Gibb, *op. cit.*, i, 160).


**GÜLBABA**, a Turkish title, with the sense of head of a Muslim cloister (tekke) of the Bektâşî Order; the name of a tekhe at Buda and of another tekhe in the neighbourhood of Edirne; the name of a legendary personality.

The name Gûlbaba, in connexion with the tekhe and the türbes so designated at Buda, appears in Turkish documents of 974/1566 with the form *Giilbaba* (Vienna, Flügel 1924); on a manuscript skecth-map of 1684 (E. Veres, *Marsîgı jileşmesi énd têktêpesi Budavêdê 1684*, 1686. evi âstomûrdâv [Report and maps of the fortress for the years 1684 and 1686], in Budaêst rûçõesâl [Antiquités of Budapeste], ix, 142) it occurs four times in the same form, though in each case without vocalization. Written in the same manner, it is found in several Turkish authors, e.g., in *Peçevlî* (ii, 141), *Ewwiîlî Cebeli* (vi, 244) and *Naîmînî* (i, 289); and in Silâhđâr it occurs a number of times in the form *Gülbulabî* (ii, 401, 799, 801). In the writings of European authors the name is encountered as Julipapa in G. Wernher and E. Brown, as Gûylpapa in the superscription—from a European hand—on the above-mentioned manuscript sketch-map, and as Ghiul Baba in the text of L. Marsigli; about 1830, after the rendering of a derishv from India, it was written down as Tülbaba. The forms given in the Latin script leave no doubt that the name, in its first syllable, has to be pronounced Gûlbaba, with the vowel ü. A man with the name Gûlbaba is known from the time of Mehemmed II (Baîbingê, GOW, 213) and a locality near Edirne is also called Gûlbaba. The word gûlî, as a component of personal names, is known, too, in other instances, e.g., Gûl Toûmâxî Khân, Gûl Rûstêm Khân.

The expression gûlî, in names of this kind, has not
the meaning of rose (i.e., the flower), but a mystical sense, in that it alludes symbolically to fiery zeal on behalf of the (Muslim) faith. This meaning underlies, moreover, the compound composed of the words dervish-kebek. In the life of the dervish, giil has the sense of "glowing iron rose", "particular ornament on the top of a dervish cap, especially in the case of the Kâdirî order"; it is the mark which distinguishes the head of a house of the order and which is to be worn on the cap (tâdî). M. d’Ohsson writes (Tableau général de l’Empire Ottoman, 1834, p. 134) that the red-hot iron is called giil, which the Rifâ’î dervishes grasp, kiss and bite in the ecstasy of their religious dances. Th. Menzel observes (Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Dervisch-tâg, in Festschrift G. Jacob, Leipzig 1932, 179 n.) that one of the objects in use amongst the dervishes is named "seneghî şîz = giil, scharb (Nadel spitze mit Kugel und Kettchen)", that part of the dervish cap is called giil, and this is regarded as the damgha of the erens (ibid., 191); and that, furthermore, giil in various contexts is the badge of different dervish orders and of distinct grades within the orders.

In elucidating the name Gulbaba we have therefore to set out from this mystical sense of the word giil, with the result that giilbaba means "a zealous dervish, a rose on the branch of his order", i.e., a man who, at the ceremonies held in his house, holds the red-hot iron as of a rose breaking into bloom—the iron whose touch is as pleasing as the fragrance of roses, one who keeps and handles this iron, a man who bears the mark of a religious head (giil) on his cap fashioned from wedge-shaped pieces of cloth, etc. Ewliya Celebi (vi, 244) alludes to this sense of the word, when he addresses Gulbaba, in verses composed in his honour, as giil-baba, i.e., as little father of the roses, as the baba recognizable by the rose. This meaning is also to be found in E. Brown, who notes that the head of the Buda tekhe was "called fulphpa, or Father of the Rose" (Edward Brown, A brief account ..., London 1673, 34, quoted in Budapest régiségét [Antiquities of Budapest], ix, 115); and in L. Marsigli, who remarks that the Turks, by means of the compounds giil-tesbiji, giil-benk, giil-baba, giil-tesbiji-ben, giil-tesbiji-ben, giil-tesbiji, the orders.

Gulbaba is therefore a Turkish title. It is only on the evidence of Ewliya Celebi that Gulbaba would seem to be a personal name, referring to a historical personage. Ewliya Celebi remarks (vi, 225) that Gulbaba died at the Ottoman conquest of Buda and that Sultan Süleyman had his corpse laid to rest and commended the fortress of Buda to his protection. Of such an important event no trace is to be found in the official historians of the campaign. Djalal-zade, the official historian of the campaign, states (in Ahmadi-ziid-i-Atywdl-i-i Akbar-ndma, the official memoirs, the seat of Babur’s government, Agra on 6 Dhu ‘1-Hididja, ion/7 May, 1603 at the age of 82 lunar years. Akbar himself accompanied and performed the hajj four times. She returned to India in 990/1582 after a perilous voyage involving a shipwreck off Aden, where she had to stay for a whole year. It was after her return home that she was asked by Akbar [q.v.] to write her personal memoirs, the Humayûn-nâma or Awal-i Humayûn Pâdghâh; as material for Abu ‘l Fadl’s Akbar-nâma. Only one incomplete copy, recording the events up to 960/1553, of this work survives; it is in the British Museum. It was published with a lengthy introduction and English translation by Annette S. Beveridge (London 1902). Another, but inferior edition containing only the Persian text, was published at Lucknow in 1925 under the title Humayûn-nâma-i Gulbadan Bégam. She died at Ágra on 6 Dhui ‘1-Hijdrya, 1011/7 May, 1603 at the age of 82 lunar years. Akbar himself accompanied and shouldered her bier a little distance from the city.

She was well esteemed both in Turk and Persian and was good at calligraphy and the art of insha’. She used to compose in Persian and two lines of hers still survive in manuscript (cf. A*m-i Akbari, TOEM, ii/926-5; On, Isparta 1935)."
have been quoted by Mahdi Shahriz in the Tadhkirat al-Khawdtin (not seen by me).

Bibliography: Nizam al-Din Ahmad, Tabakdt-i Akhbar-nama, Bibl. Ind., iii, 568, 815, 827; Muhammad b. Mu'tamaad Khán Badakhshí, Taiírigí Muhammadí (MS.), sub anno 1012 A.H.; Rieu, i, 147a, ii, 10934; Annette S. Beveridge, The History of Humayun (Humayún-náma), London 1902, introduction 1-79; Storey, i/s, 538-9; Mu'tamaad Khán, Iblí-í-námí, Džahángírí (MS.); Abd al-Haýy, Nizam al-Khawdtí, Haydar-ábád 1357/1937, v, 318-9 (the only notice in Arabic known to me).

(A. S. Bazmee Ansari)

GULBÁNG, a Persian word meaning the song of the nightingale, and hence by extension fame, reputé, and loud cries of various kinds. In Turkish usage it is applied more particularly to the call of the muezzin [see ADHAN] and to the Muslim war-cry and loud cries of various kinds. In Turkish usage it is an ancient name. It is applied to the region where the town of Gulbargá is situated.

Bibliography: Pakaln, i, 638-5; Ismail Hakkí Uzuçuñaslı, Osmanlı devleti tekhiddinden kapılıklı ocahlar, i, Ankara 1945, 249, 375, 421-2, 533-4. See further MEKTÉRKHÁNE and NAWBAH.

GULBARGA, a town and district in the north of Mysore state in India on the western borders of what is known as the Deccan (Dakhkan [q.v.]); the town is situated at 17° 21' N., 76° 51' E. Of some antiquity in the Hindú period, it formed part of the domains of the Káthiyás of Warnagul before the Islamic conquest. It was annexed for the Dihli sultanate by Úzugh Khán, the future Muhammad b. Tughláq, early in the 13th-14th century, to pass first to the Bahmani dynasty on its establishment in 848/1447, whose first capital it became under the name Absahábád. It fell to the ʿAdil Sháhís of Bījpúr in 909/1504, and although it was recovered by Amir Barid ten years later it was soon retaken by the ʿAdil Sháhís; they held it until 1667/1657, when Mir Qámínia besieged and captured it for the Mughuls.

The majority of the monuments of Gulbargá belong to the period when it was the Bahmani capital, and have already been described in the article BAHMANIDS. Of the monuments not mentioned there the following are of some importance: Kalandár Khán's mosque (see Report of Archaeological Department, Hyderabad, 1335F./1925-6, 7 ff., Plates IIa, Xb), built by a Bahmani governor after the transfer of the capital to Bida; the mosque of Afḍal Khán, an ʿAdil Sháhí general of the late 10th/16th century (Mírzá Ibráhím, Basátíí Saládíín, 130 ff.), which stands in the court of the dargáh of Gésú Daráz, in the later stone Bījpúr style [see SĪJAPUR, Monument], similar to the mosque of Maliká Džélán, with hanging stone chains below the cornice (Report ... 1335F./1925-6, 8, Plates IIb, XIa), with a large chhánda mosque, possibly pre-Bahmani, with a vaulted arch-shaped ceiling with wooden ribs recalling the style of the Buddhist cave-temples (Report ... 1346F./1936-7, 7 ff., Plate Vla); a group of 5 mausoleas at Holkonda, once a suburb of Gulbargá on the Homnabad road, similar to those of the Haft Gunbadh (Report ... 1346F./1934-5. 1); the mosque and dargáh of Ḥadrát Kamál Mujdárrad (ibid. 5-6 and Plates IIIa and b); the tomb of Cánd Bbí, of Nízám Şáhí style (ibid., 6, Plates IVa and b).

Bibliography: and see Bibliography to the article BAHMANIDS.

GÜLEK BOĞHÁZ, Turkish name for the Cilician Gates, for which see CILICIA, col. 35a.

GULİSTÁN [see ʿAṢĪD].

GULİSTÁN, the name of a place in the Caucasus where, on 12 October 1813, a peace treaty was signed between Russia and Persia. In 1800 the Russians had annexed Georgia, and the Persians, in an effort to check their further advance southward, had suffered two defeats in 1812, at Aslandí and Lankurán, and had been forced to sue for peace.

The terms of the Treaty of Gulistán, which was negotiated through the mediation of the British ambassador Sir Gore Ouseley, were disastrous for Persia. The regions of Georgia, Kárábág, Şahkí, Şirwán, Darband, Bákí, Qádšgírán, Gandhiá, Múkán, and part of Táškí, were ceded to Russia, and the Sultan of Turkey was paid a subsidy of 500,000 piastres. The terms of the treaty provided for the navigation of the Caspian Sea by vessels of the Ottoman Empire, but they were never ratified. The ambiguous nature of the Article relating to the territorial settlement led to disputes and to the renewed outbreak of war in 1826.

Bibliography: A. Wahíd Mázarándarání, Ráhnamá-yi ʿUhad, Tehran 1341F./1962, 294, 306. For an English translation of the Treaty, and additional bibliography, see J. C. Hurewitz, Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, i, 1956, 84 ff. (R. M. Sávory)

GÜLKİHANÉ, (modern Turkish Gülhane) the "House of roses", or Gülháne Meydání, is the name of a part of the gardens which lie along the sea of Marmora on the east side of the Topkapí Sarayí in Istanbul [q.v.]; the name is derived from the fact that in olden days the building, in which the rose sweetmeats for the use of the court were prepared, stood there. The place is famous in history because the celebrated firman of Sultan ʿAbd al-Majíd, the so-called Khálí-i šerif promulgating the reforms, was publicly proclaimed there on Sunday 26 Şabán 1255/November 1839; cf. the description in G. Rosen, Geschichte der Türken, ii, 14 ff.; Latif, Taiírigí, vi, 59 ff.; E. Lewis, The emergence of modern Turkey, London 1965, 104 ff., and article TANZÍMÁT; on the place itself cf. White, Three years in Constantinople, i, 110, and TOEM, i, 291 ff.: it is now a park.

(J. H. Mördtmánn*)

GULPÁYÁGAN, district and town in the fifth Ustán (Luristán). The central chain of the Zagros range traverses the district; the highest peak is Hájjí Dár (3650 m.). The district lies partly in the cold region and partly in the temperate one. The chief town, Gulpáyagán, which is situated in Long. 50° 18' W. and Lat. 33° 26' N., is 1924 m. above sea level and therefore has a cold climate in winter. It is an ancient town containing some buildings dating from the Sáḷdágó era. In 1931 the population of the town and the surrounding villages amounted to 22,000. The Arab geographers gave the name of the town as Gurbósghákán, i.e., Gurbósghakán. It is only in comparatively recent times that frequent mention of the town occurs. The Arab geographers referred to it merely as a stage or station on the
route uniting Isfahan with Hamadan. The chief industry of the town and its surroundings is agriculture.

Bibliography: Yākūt, ii, 40; Le Strange, 210; Ritter, Erdkunde, ix, 63; E. Stack, Sons monrhs in Persia, London 1882, ii, 114; Rashīd al-Dīn and Nawštāb. Farhang-i Diwānī-yi Irān, v, 316; for a discussion of the etymology of the name, see Āhmād Kārsāv, Nāmā-yi shahkār u dīhā-yi Irān, Tehran 1335/1556, 68. (L. LOCKHART)

GULSHANI (Turkish: Gülşen), İbrahim b. Muhammad b. İbrahim b. Şihāb al-Dīn (?-940/1534), Turkish mystic, a successor of Djīlāl al-Dīn Rūmī and a prolific poet. He came of a family settled in Diyarbakr, where his father Muhammad al-Āmidī's türbe and a prayer-hall said to have been built by him still stand some 500 yards outside the Mardin gate (see Aʿl Ėmirī, Dīvānshīr u dīhā-yi hāšerī, 16; for the report that he came from Barda in Ādharbāyjān, see M. ʿAll Tārībiyāt, Dānīmāndān-yi Ādharbāyjānīyān, 318). Muḥyīʾī Gūlşenī, whose Mendībī-ʾī Bahāqel Gūlşenī and another source on İbrahim Gūlşenī’s life and circle, continues the genealogy given above with four more names: b. Aydoğhmush b. Gūndoghmush b. Kutlugdomhush b. Oghuz, thus making him a descendant of Oghuz Ata, but gives no information on his ancestors beyond his father and his grandfather. His father Muhammad al-Āmidī was the author of works on fīkh, hālām and māniḥ; his paternal grandfather İbrahimī wrote a shayḵī (on the Fārābī), completed the Faḵk al-muqaddab (on the solution of various problems in fīkh), composed much-esteemed works on ṭasawwuf, and was for a time kādī of Diyarbakr (Muḥyīʾī, Mendībī, fol. 63); his maternal grandfather Şahar al-Dīn was descended from a certain Kādī ʿĪsā and was a muḥaddīsī (Aynābī, Mendībī, fol. 67).

The date of Gūlşenī’s birth is not exactly known. Muḥyīʾī’s statement (Mendībī, 159v.) that when he died in 940/1534 he was 114 years old implies that he was born in 826/1422-3; but elsewhere he states that his father had survived into the reign of the Aḵsāʾīs (Mendībī-i İbrahim, fol. 63v.); he was present when Sultan Yā’qūb b. Iṣḥāq b. Saḥīḥ al-Muṣṭafī died in 940/1534 he was 114 years old implies that he was born in 859 or 860/1455 or 1456, but for reasons which will appear this statement on his age is unacceptable. Most probably he was born between 838 and 840/1434-7. His father dying when he was two, he was brought up by his paternal uncle Sayyīd ʿAll, who, according to the Mendībī (77r.), had more than 200 murīds. While still a child, Gūlşenī began to learn the Kurʿān and to read Turkish books of tafsīr and ṭadbīḥ. Concerning his later education the Mendībī gives only vague and confused information: it relates that he set out alone to study in Mā warā al-nahr, but when he reached Tabrīz he was adopted by Īzūn Ḥasan’s kādīʾīšakār, who told him that all the ūlāmāʾ of Īzūn Ḥasan’s realm would obey his guidance, and appointed him taḥfīzī. The stipend he received enabled him to help his uncle at Diyarbakr and, probably at this time, to buy his wāḥel (Mendībī, 77v., 78r.). (That he was given the post of taḥfīzī and still more important posts and was recognized already as a famous shaykh shows that the statement, also in the Mendībī, that he was only 15 when he went to Tabrīz must be rejected.) Elsewhere (13rv.-v.) it is stated that he travelled to Hārāt to resolve a dispute between Īzūn Ḥasan and Husayn Bāyḵārā and, on a similar mission, visited Shīrāzwī who, when he met Djīlāl al-Dīn Dāwānī (see Aʾl Ėmirī, he gives the impression to have been at this period a government official with an inclination to tašawwuf, who enjoyed special inward experiences and was searching for a suitable murīd has; soon afterwards at Karabakh, by the good offices of Īzūn Ḥasan’s brother Uways, he was introduced to and became the murīd of Dede ʿUmar Rūkhānī (q.v.), d. 892/1486 of Aydnī, who was the khalīfa of Sayyid Yābāʾī Shīrwānī, the piri-i ḥānī (‘second piri, i.e., founder’) of the Khwāṭitiyya. These encounters Gūlşenī devoted himself to taḥfīz and to ascetic practices: he would walk in the streets with a wine-cup in his hand to demonstrate his attachment to mādīnī doctrine and wore a sheepskin tālī (Mendībī, 28r.). After Īzūn Ḥasan’s death (882/1478), his successor Khaḷlād had little esteem for Gūlşenī, but the respect and fame which he enjoyed during the reign of Yā’qūb (883-97/1479-90) are demonstrated by a poem of Idrīs Bīdīlī (see Aʾl Ėmirī), quoted in the Mendībī (30v.-31t.); this respect was increased by the reverence in which ʿUrūbī’s ʿabd-i ḥadsakah, ʿĪsā b. Jā汗, held him. Gūlşenī, assuredly attended the sermons of ‘Urūbī Rūkhānī, who had come from Karabakh to settle at Tabrīz (Mendībī, 26v.); he was present when Sultan Yā’qūb b. Iṣḥāq besieged Akhiska, settled various disputes within the royal family, and witnessed the rise of Sayyīd Ḥaydar. When ‘Urūbī Rūkhānī died (894/1486), he succeeded him (not without opposition) as post-nishīn (q.v.) and began to teach his disciples in the Mursafīyya mosque at Tabrīz. This period of taḥfīz and taḥfīzī did not last long: Yā’qūb’s successors had little respect for him and even persecuted him. In 900/1495 he performed the Pilgrimage together with a numerous company of disciples and adherents. At Mecca he met some ‘ūlāmāʾ of Egypt and wished to visit Egypt on his homeward journey, but gave up the plan out of consideration for his family waiting for him at Tabrīz (Mendībī, 78v.-79r., 83r.). The Şafawī occupation of Tabrīz, consequent persecutions, and Alwand Beg’s defeat by Şaḥ ʿĪsā ʿĪsāʾī (907/1502) obliged him to hasten from Tabrīz with his family. He came to Diyarbakr, then governed by Kāsim Beg, but when, after Alwand’s defeat (910/1504-5), Diyarbakr too fell to the Şafawīs (912/1507), he was obliged to flee again to Persian territory where he spent a forty day retreat (see KHALWA) and then to Egypt, where he settled at Birkat al-ḥadidjī near Cairo. Timurtash, a Khwāṭti shaykh who had earlier come from Shīrwānī to settle there, procured for him the possession of Kubbat al-Muṣṭafī; while living there he met Sultan Kāṁṣaw al-Ghawrī while he was out hunting, and the Sultan granted him living-quarters at the Muʿāyyadīyya mosque by Bāb Zuwayla. Though deprived by the Ottoman invasion under Selim I of the patronage first of Kāṁṣaw al-Ghawrī and then of his successor Tuman Beg, Gūlşenī was held in great honour by the Ottoman troops (Shaʿrānī, Tabakāt, ii, 163), many of whom, encouraged perhaps by Gūlşenī’s old acquaintance Idrīs Bīdīlī, became his murīds; indeed his quarters at the Muʿāyyadīyya mosque could no longer accommodate his followers and students. Many of the students from Arab shaykhīs also lodged there. This enormous popularity was the cause of anxiety to the successive Ottoman governors, who feared a rising; and indeed when İbrahimī Pasha came to Egypt to investigate the situation after the rebellion of Ahmed Pasha (Khāʾīn [q.v.]) his adverse report to Sultan Suleyman prompted the Sultan to summon Gūlşenī in 934/
GULSHANI

1357-8 to Istanbul (see ‘Ali, Kunh al-akhbdr, Istanbul Un. Lib. MS T 2359, ii, fol. 24v.). The Sultan interviewed him, and his work Ma’nawi was sent to Istanbul with a reply, and on his return to Egypt, Gulshan died during an epidemic of plague on 9 Shawwl 940/24 April 1534; he was buried in a türbe at his convent, which still stands. Of his two sons Ahmed Khayîl and Mehmend, the former, whose Persian Divân contains many pleasing poems, succeeded him.

Works. Ibrahim Gulshani was a poet so prolific that he is said to have dictated poems in three languages (Persian, Turkish and Arabic) to three scribes at once. A. His works in Persian are (i) Ma’nawi: written in imitation of the Mathnawi of ‘Alî al-Dîn Rûmî, this work of 40,000 couplets was begun at Diyarbakr and finished in 10 months; like the Mathnawi, it contains many stories, and many couplets from the Mathnawi are quoted in it verbatim. There are also poems in the form of madâm. B. His works in Turkish are (i) Divân: in this collection of 17,000 couplets (almost as long as Djalal al-Dîn’s Divân-i kabîr) the influence of Djalal al-Dîn, Hâfiz, and sometimes Yûnûs Enme is to be detected; it has not been printed or thoroughly studied. MSS in Turkey: Istanbul, Fatih 8366 (copied 931); Millet, farşaça manzûm 418 (?) 10th/16th century; Ankara, Dil ve Tarhi-Coğrafya Fakültesi library (unnumbered, 19th century). (iii) Kazâ qlâzâshîr, a work of about 7,500 quatrains, some in rubûd, some in buyûk rubûd, some in fairly simple language, on the themes of Divine Love, fana2 and babâ2, and the author’s devotion to his murshid, ‘Umar Rûgjânî. Only one MS is known: Istanbul Un. Lib. F 1233 (according to the Menâbîb, 167, Gulshanî’s rubûdîn in Turkish, Persian and Arabic, amounted to 12,000 couplets). (iv) Sinmûrg-nâma, a work of 30,000 couplets, known only from references in the Menâbîb (83v., 167v.). B. His works in Turkish comprise only a Divân of about the same length (17,000 couplets) as his Persian Divàn. In some of his Turkish poems, Gulshani is clearly under the influence of Yûnûs Enme and Nesîmi (qq.v.). The work deserves study, both for its literary and for its linguistic interest. The best and fullest MS known is in the Library of the Dil ve Tarhi-Coğ. Fak. (Université kütüphanesi kitapları 928). Selected poems from the Divân are found in various libraries, e.g. Dil ve Tarhi-Coğ. Fak. (Mustafa Çon 289); Istanbul Millet (Carullah 1661 and manzûm 379); Istanbul Un. Lib. (T 890). Some of his ghazals were translated into Persian with a commentary by İdris Bîdîsî (Menâbîb, 30r.). C. The Arab ‘ulâmâ and poets of his day regarded Gulshânî as ‘ummîm’, and perhaps he did not speak Arabic well (Şa’rânî, Taḥâbat, ii, 163). His Arabic poems are to be found in 5,000 couplets (Menâbîb, 167v.). In form and content they are influenced by his Persian poems. The only known MS (of selections) is in the Library of the Dil ve Tarhi-Coğ. Fak. (Université kütüphanesi collection).

In his poetical works, especially in the final couplets of his ghazals, Gulshânî mentions, together with his own ma’khas or nisba, that of his murshid ‘Umar Rûgjânî, whose thought so strongly influenced him. Gulshânî did not escape criticism, any more than his murshid, who, under the influence of the works of Muḥyî al-Dîn al-‘Arâbî, adopted an extreme doctrine of wudûd-i wududî and, for his efforts to spread in Karabagh and its neighbourhood the ideas of the Fuṣûs al-khâm, was condemned and persecuted as a ‘Fuşût’. Condemnatory fatwâs were issued concerning Gulshânî and his murîds and successors, who preached the same extreme wudûd-i wududî (see Fatâz-yi Abû Swâd, Istanbul, Millet Lib., MS şer’îye 80, fol. 267v.).

Gulshânî’s tarîkh. The Gulshânîyâ tarîkh, which took its name from his nisba, was a branch of the Khaṭwâyiyya. It assumed its characteristic form only after Gulshânî had settled in Egypt and built his famous convent there. It diverges from the Khaṭwâyiyya, based on the principles of khaîla and ḍîhr, especially in its rules of behaviour (aḍādî). The Gulshânîyâ tarîkh, which at first adopted sama‘ and other practices of the Mawlawîyya (Şâhîb, ‘Menâbîb-i ‘Ilmînâ’-i islâmîn, 167), later absorbed practices from the Baktashîyya and other orders, and was thus regarded as having placed itself outside the tarîkh (Karaqâş-zâde ‘Omer, Nür al-hudâ li-man ithâdd, Istanbul 1286, 7). The rules of daily life in Gulshânî’s convent in Cairo, the weekly ceremonies held there and the practices of the tarîkh as a whole now appear peculiarities which may deserve study (see Şehmîlî-zâde, ‘Omar-i tarîkh-i Gulshânîyeyî, Millet Lib., MS şer’îye 888; for the convent and its buildings, see ‘Ali Bâshî Mübârak, Al-Khâlîf al-qâdîda, guv‘ vi, 54.).

Bibliography: Muḥyî-lī Gulshânî (d. 1026/1617), Menâbîb-i Ibrahimî-lî Gulshânî (references in the text are to the foliation of my own MS; for other MSS see Istanbul Kitâbîhînîn Tarîh-Coğ. yazmaları katalogları, 16, Istanbul 1940, no. 370); Şâhîb, ‘Menâbîb-i ‘Ilmînâ’-i islâmîn, 167 (details from Muḥyî’s work, much abridged); Huwî, Lamasât, Istanbul Un. Lib. MS 1894; ‘Ali Emin, Diyarbekirî bo’ld’i hâdetîn terdîme-i hâlâtî, Millet Lib.; idem, Tedhîkh-i ‘uṣur’-i ‘Amîd, Istanbul 1258; Latîfî, Tedhîkh, Istanbul 1314, 52-4; ‘Atâhî, Hâdî‘-î al-‘Abhâhî, i, 66; Ewîyî ğeberî, Seyyâh-nâme, i, 320, 325, 389, x, 243-6; Şâdîq ‘Iwûdî, Sâsîl-nâmê-i Khâlîstâyeyî (Tomar-i turkî-i ‘ilîye); M. Tâhir, ‘Othmânî mû‘elîfîzî, i, 15; M. ‘Ali Tarbiyât, Dânîşîm-î Adîgarbeydîn, Tehran 1314; Şà’rânî, Taḥâbat, Cairo 1299, ii, 163; ‘Ali Bâshî Mübârak, Al-Khâlîf al-qâdîda, Bulûk 1306, iv, 54; Mrs. R. L. Devonshire, Rambles in Cairo, 332.

GULSHANI (GULSHENI) ŞARUKHANI, Ottoman poet who flourished in the reign of Memmed II, was born in Şarûkhân, and lived a life of religious seclusion and devotion. His Ma’dalîî (variously entitled in the MSS Râz-nâmê, Pend-nâmê, Esrâr-nâmê) is written in seven chapters in the ma’shû‘în form, containing 950 couplets; completed in 864/1459, it consists of homilies, stories and parables. After each homily or admonition, Gulshênî includes stories to illustrate the point.

He is the author of a Persian divân: the text of the kâsides addressed to Memmed II and Bâyezîd

Encyclopaedia of Islam, II
GULSHANI — GOM

II is reproduced from the unique MS (Istanbul, Bayezid Um. Küt. 5280) by Tahsin Yazici (see Bibl.). He wrote also a poem celebrating the Prophet's birthday (mawlid). Bibliography: Lafif, Teşkere, s.v.; Bursali Tahir, "Othmanlı Müellifleri," ii, 388; Gibb, Ottoman Poetry, ii, 378; Hammer-Purgstall, Gesch. d. osm. Dichtkunst, ii, 286; T. Yazioğlu, Gümüş, eserleri ve Fâtih ve II. Bayezid hâkemâdâvi kasideleri, in Fâtih ve Istanbul, ii, 172 (1954), 82-137.

(GÖNAY ALPAY)

GÜLSHEHRİ, a Turkish poet of the beginning of the 8th/14th century. Hitherto, his personal name was taken to be Ahmed, on the evidence of a single entry in a manuscript of his poem Manṭik al-tayr. Recently, on the strength of several points in the same work, he has been identified with a certain Sheyk Süleyman, whose türbe is in Kırşehir. It can be easily supposed that this town from which as a poet he took his name Gülshehrı was his home. The date of the poet's death is unknown, but it must have been after 717/1317, the year when his work Manṭik al-tayr was completed.

Gülshehrı wrote two great didactic sâtı poems, melhewisi in remel metre, one in Persian entitled Falâk-nâmâ (completed 701/1301-2), of about 4,000 distichs (bayts), of which the so far unique manuscript is now in the Public Library (Genel Kitaplık), Ankara, as no. 817. The other work is written in Turkish and is entitled Manṭik al-tayr; this likewise consists of about 4,000 distichs, and now exists in a facsimile edition with introduction by Ağah Sırrı Levend (Ankara 1957). A dissertation on this work, by Mülçgan Cunbur, has not yet appeared in print. Gülshehrı's Manṭik al-tayr ("Speech of the birds") is a free adaptation in verse of the poem of the same name also in the remel metre, by the Persian poet Farid al-Din At'târ [q.v.], and not really a translation. The ideas and construction of the work are the same as with "Attâr; it is an allegory of sâtı monism (wahdani-i wudjud), in the form of a story of a journey by the birds under their leader, the hoopoe (hidâkûd), to their queen, the Simûrugh [q.v.], whose eyrie was far off on Mount Kaf, and their arrival there, after the hardships of the journey only thirty of them actually arrived (melhemet), whether they were finally compelled to recognize themselves to be the "Si mûrugh"—"thirty birds". In matters of detail, however, Gülshehrı often goes his own way.

In one place in his work Manṭîḫ al-tayr (text, ed. A. S. Levend, 297, l. 14), the poet names the Gülşenâme, as a work written by himself; it is, however, probable that the Manṭîḫ al-tayr itself is meant. Another small melhemet is also in existence, probably by Gülshehrı, consisting of 167 distichs and also in remel metre, by Ahkî Ewrân/Evrân (Kermâdî—Ahkî Ewrân tâba thârîhû), which is very closely linked with the Manṭîḫ al-tayr since they have whole verses in common. There is some difference of opinion as to whether this short melhemet on Ahkî Evrân derives from Gülshehrı himself, or whether it was composed by another poet who may have been a follower of Ahkî Evrân and who made use of lines from the Manṭîkh al-tayr and misappropriated the then famous name of Gülshehrı. It is a striking fact both that in the melhemet on Ahkî Evrân the Falâk-nâmâ is in fact named (verse 159b), but not the Manṭîḫ al-tayr, and also that the name of Ahkî Evrân does not figure in the latter work [see AHKî EWRA].—In another place in the Manṭîḫ al-tayr (text, A. S. Levend, 296 l. 12) Gülshehrı also speaks of a verse translation of a work by the poet Kudürî in Turkish as his own work. A manuscript of a further work of Gülshehrı, Arûd râdîsî, is in Istanbul (Millet Kitaplığı, All Emini, Farşa yazmalar, no. 517).—Finally, another small melhemet has been taken to be Gülshehrı. These have been collected together by Fr. Taeschner in his article Zwei Gazels von GÜLSHEHRİ, in Faûd KôÔRIû Armaγâns (Mélanges Faûd KôÔRIû), Istanbul 1953, 479-58.


(GÖNAY ALPAY)

GUM, GUM ARABIC [see TANGIINO]

GÜM (Arabic kawm; French goum), the usual form and pronunciation, in the Arab countries of North Africa, of the name given to a group of armed horsemen or fighting men from a tribe. The derivative güm signifies "a levy of gûms, troops, a plundering foray", "sedition", "revolt".

It was the Turks who, in the former Regencies of Algiers and Tunis, gave the gûms an official existence by making them the basis of their system of occupation of the country. All the tribes had been divided by them into makhzen or auxiliaries, who were exempt from most taxes, and ra'iyya, who were liable to all taxes. The latter were the more numerous. One or more of the latter tribes refused to pay a tax or revolted for some reason, the Turkish army rapidly advanced to the insurgents' territory. Though small in size, this army was reinforced by the exceedingly mobile cavalry groups of the gûms.

Soon after their occupation of the Algiers Regency, the French learnt how to make best use of the gûms. But once the country had been pacified, the makhzen tribes disappeared. The system of gûms was then extended to all tribes, without exception. Under the command of the chiefs, kudur or aggas, appointed by the French authorities, the gûms had to operate with the military police in the maintenance of peace in the country, and in protecting the migrations of the nomadic tribes and the safety of caravans.

In territory under military administration, the number of "goumiers", i.e., members of the gûm of a tribe, varied according to regional needs. The goumiers received a monthly wage and encamped on certain State lands whose revenues went to them, but they were obliged to equip and mount themselves at their own expense. On active service they were also entitled to the mu'ma, a special allowance for food.

In civil territory, the goumiers equipped and mounted themselves at their own expense. They did not draw any pay but, when called up, they received the special allowance for food. In civil territory gûms were called up only in the event of insurrection or European war. They were, in fact, a territorial militia under the command of the tribal chiefs and subject to the orders of the administration. The gûm from each mixed commune consisted of 120 horsemen. The goumiers had the right to carry arms. Their distinctive badge was a green and red cord fixed round the turban. The goumiers' horses were not subject to any tax charges, and the goumier himself was exempt from the tax on livestock.
After the inauguration of the French Protectorate in Morocco, a similar organization was created, and the Moroccan gourmiers particularly, distinguished themselves during the second world war, in Italy and the south of France [see also MAGIZEN].


GUMRÜK [see Maks).

GÜMÜSLİNFİA [see Supplement]

GÜMÜŞ-KHANE (modern spelling Gümüşha- ne), literally "the house of silver, the town of silver", mining centre and town of Asia Minor, principal town of a vilayet, on the road from Trabzon to Erzurum. The evolution of the town went through two distinct phases. (1) As a mining centre. It is probably Gümüş-khana to which Marco Polo refers when he writes (xxii) of silver mines in the region of Bayburt. In any case the town was known by this name (Kumish) in the time of Ibn Battuta (tr. Gibb, Cambridge 1962, ii, 436). Situated at an altitude of about 5,000 ft., built in an amphitheatre on the steep slopes of the Musalla deresi (a left tributary of the Harşit çayı), the ancient town, which during the whole of the Ottoman period was a busy centre: for the mining of argentiferous lead, under a system of state encouragement and supervision (see N. Çagatay, in AÇTDCD, ii (1943), 124), was "important and lively" in the 17th century (Hadjid Khalifa, Dikınınmümâ, 622, 623). But by the beginning of the 19th century the mines were in complete decline; in 1836, they employed no more than 50 or 60 workers and it was no longer profitable to work them. They were therefore closed, particularly because of the lack of fuel due to the dearth of wood in the region of Bayburt; then, after a last attempt to work them in 1853, closed finally a few years later. (2) As a town on a main route. The main centre of the town then gradually moved towards the Harşit valley 21/2 miles away, along which at first were scattered country houses surrounded by gardens and orchards, which provided at the end of the 19th century an important export of dried and preserved fruit (pears, plums, apricots, etc.). Gradually a commercial, and then an administrative, centre arose there along the main route from Trabzon to Erzurum. The decline of the old town was completed by the Russian occupation in 1916-18, which left it half in ruins, and by the exodus of the important Greek and Armenian minority (even so late as the beginning of the 20th century, the Greeks formed half of the 3,000 inhabitants). Today all the commerce and administration is concentrated in the new town. Pop., 1960, 5,312.

Bibliography: apart from the works cited and the articles of J. H. Mordtmann in ETI and of B. Darkot in IA, see Ewliya Celebi, Seyahatname, ii, 343. Gümüş-hâne, situated on the main route from Trabzon to Iran, was visited and described in the 19th century by many European travellers; see especially W. J. Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor, London 1842, i, 168-9, ii, 234-8 (detailed analysis of the position of the mines before they were closed); Th. Deyrolle, L' voyage dans le Lassitan et l'Arménie, in Le tour du monde, Paris 1875 (xxix), 22-4 for the period of the growth of the new town and the trade in fruit in 1869.

GÜMÜŞTEGİN, name of various Turkish chiefs, particularly the Dânishmandid prince known also as Amîr Ghâzi [see DÂNİSHMENDİS] and the atabeg of Aleppo [see ZANDİS].

GUNBAHİ [see KUBRA].

GUNBAHİ-KAÇOS, the second town of Gurgân province, Iran, 110 km by road north-east of the provincial headquarters at Gurgân [q.v.], with an estimated population of 10,000 in 1956. Five km west of Gunbad (as it is popularly called) lie the ruins of the mediaeval city of Durgân, near the shrine said to be that of the 'Aldî Yahyâ b. Zayd. The modern town is named from the mausoleum of the Ziyârid Kâbus b. Washmîre, still standing at the northern end of the main street. It is a cylindrical brick tower 167 feet high, placed on an artificial mound 32 feet above the plain. Angular buttresses divide the sides into ten panels, the exterior diameter being 48 feet. Above the door a band of Arabic inscriptions in simple Kufic philosophically name the structure as the kaşr ('palace') of Kâbus, ordered during his lifetime in 397/1006-7, or 375 by solar reckoning (i.e., the Era of Yazdagird III commencing A.D. 632). The monument is nowadays much admired for its structural strength and simplicity.


GUNS, GUNNERY [see BARGE]

GÜNTÊKÎN, RESAT NÜRİ [see RESHAD NÜRİ GÜNTÊKÎN].

GÜRÂN, an Iranian people, now reduced to between 4,000 and 5,000 houses, inhabiting an area north of the main road from Kûrmânshâh to the Persian frontier near Kâş-i Şîrîn and comprising the slopes of the Kûh-i Şâhân—Dâlâhâh mountain. The Gûrân 'capital' is Gâhwarâ, lying 60 km. due west of Kûrmânshâh in the valley of the Zîmkân, a southern tributary of the Sîrwan. An isolated community occupies the village of Kandôla, 40 km. north-east of Kûrmânshâh, near the site of Dînavar. Other, more numerous branches are formed by the Bâdâlân and the tribes of the Haurmân [q.v.].

An older form of the name was certainly Gûrân (q.v. Gwârân), as it is so preserved in Kurdish dialects, while Gûrân itself has undergone the sound-change ğ > ʃ, ʃ > r, respectively (n. infra). It is thus difficult to reconcile the name with that of the Gûrâvîs, mentioned by Strabo, xi, 14, 14, as neighbours of the Medes. The origin of the name is more probably to be sought in a form *gaw-bûr-a-hân 'ox-riders' (n. Minorsky, op. cit. infra). This name is connected with the Caspian provinces, as also is the place-name Gîân, which is of frequent occurrence among the Gûrân. The inference that their original home lay near the Caspian is further supported by the evidence of their language. Just as the closely related Zâzâ [q.v.], or Dînîlî, people moved west into classical Armenia, so the proto-Gûrân appear to have migrated south and peopled the whole southern Zagros area. Later they were largely submerged by an expansion of the Kurds, also from the north, but their language has left its mark on the ('Central') Kurdish of their conquerors.

Ibn Khurrašâdhibîb, 14, preserves the older form
Gürân — Gûrâni

of the name as Diabaraka, and similar forms are used by Ibn Fakih and al-Masudi, always in close connexion with Kurds. Ibn al-Athir, ix, describing the rise of the Hanafîyyah principality (ca. 1005/1596), still uses the term Gûrân as if referring to the populace of Ardalan and Kirmâhâgh, and Sharaf Khan, in the Sharâr-nâma (1005/1596), still uses the term Gûrân as if referring to Sharazur, frequently mentions the exploits of Molla Khusraw in this office in 872/1467-68). In 885/1480-81 he was elevated to shâykh al-islâm, and he remained overlordship, however, have completely surrendered a regiment of between 1,000 and 2,000 men for the influence of the Khazir. These 'Seven tribes', as they evidently been transported from the Kirmâshah—ydwa, w-: H(awrami)

K(andulal)

K

v-: das-u wem (ca. 744/1343), mentions 'Kurds called al-

misken, m(a)-: B look for, 'blood', (b) initial w- < hw-: all wârd- 'eat', H, K war 'sun', warm 'sleep', (c) initial h-<s-: H, K har 'donkey', hâna 'spring', (d) -rd- > -r-, in words unmistakably NWIr.: H well 'flower', K stil 'heart'. In general H and B have preserved the mdâhîl vowels ě, ĕ, lost in the other Guram dialects: H ĕl[a, K hîla 'egg', H B ĕle, K ĕl[e 'ear', where ĕ generally becomes ğ: K dâr 'far', ğ 'quick'. In the nominal system masculine and feminine gender, and direct and oblique case, are normally distinguished. Most dialects have a defining suffix -akd, F. -âkhi (akhî). The indefinite suffix, generally -i, is -îu, F. -ûau, in Hawramî. H also preserves a genitive ëdâlâ form ù: das-i ûm 'my own hand', beside the epithetic i: yânêh-i kôm 'an old house'. The copula is characterized by the presence of an -n-, thus Sg. t. -and(n), 2. -amî, 3. -anî, etc. With the present tense the durative prefix is generally m(a)-: B makaro, K makara, but H karô 'he does', B, K mâchî, H mâchî 'they say (wâlî-). H has, in addition, a proper imperfect tense formed from the present stem: karênh 'I was doing', wâlî 'he was saying'. The majority of dialects have preserved the inverse formation of the past tenses of transitive verbs: H, B ēdêh- 'what did you say?', K bêwardane 'he has brought it'. Passive stems are formed in -ya: H wâlîyô 'it is said', K kîrîdn 'it has been made'.

Gûrân has attained literary status in the form of a xoûnî which, besides being the vehicle of a number of Ahi-i ūîk writings, was cultivated at the court of the Bursan. As such, the grammar of this literary language has been given by Rieu, Cat. Pers. MSS., ii, 728 ff. Poets of name range from Yûsuf Yâska (fl. 1010/1600) to Mavlaviw (d. 1300/1882). All Gûrân verse, epic, lyric and religious alike, is in a simple decasyllabic metre. Its former popularity is reflected in the fact that gûrânî is the common word for 'song' in the neighbouring Kurdish.


Gûrânî, Shamâf (or Shâbâf or Shams) al-Dîn Ahmad b. Ismaiîl b. Othman, known as Mollâ Gûrânî, 9th/15th century Ottoman scholar and shâykh al-islâm. [Sakhawi sometimes found his name given as Ahmad b. Yûsuf b. Ismaiîl et.; and in one place (ii, 1486) Hâddîl Khallîa mentions him with the kunya Abu 'l-'Abbas.] While noting that Mâkîzl gives another date and place (the latter obviously a copyist's error), Sakhawi in his copy of Bâbârî, ca. 1410-11 in the Gûrân district of the Shahrizor province of upper Irân, and it is probably only by inference from the ethnic character of this region that F. Babinger makes him a Kurd (Mehmed der Eroberer und seine Zeit, Munich 1953, 518). After having studied under local teachers, he pursued his further education in Hîn Kaytâ, Baghdad, Damascus (where he arrived in 830/1426-27), Jerusalem and, finally, Cairo (835/1431-2). Here he studied under such famous scholars as Ibn Haddîr and Kalkashandî, and he gained a reputation for learning which led to the patronage of important men and a teaching appointment at Bârkûkîyya madrasa. Because of an unseemly quarrel with another scholar, he was dismissed his post and exiled to Syria in 844/1440-41 whence, in the course of his further journeys, he went over to the Ottomans and changed his madhîbîî from Shâhî to Haranî. His first appointment was to the Kapîdîa madrasa in Bursa, and in 854/1450-51 he succeeded Karâdja Ahmad Efendi as professor at the Yildirim in the same city (Belifgï, 283). Later he was made tutor to Prince Mehmed of Magnisa, and when the latter ascended the throne in 855/1451 he received the post of bâdî 'l-'ashkar. He was present at the conquest of Constantinople ('Allî, Kûnî al-akhbâr, v, Istanbul 1277, 227) and composed in elegant Arabic a letter to the Sultan of Egypt announcing this great victory (Ferîdûn Beğ, Mûnshâ'î al-sâlûtîn, Istanbul 1274, 235). His intractable independence of attitude proving an annoyance to the new Sultan and his statesmen, he was removed from the centre of affairs by appointment to the bâdî-ship of Bursa, but here, too, he acted in defiance of the royal will and was finally dismissed from office. He left Ottoman territory for a while, but returned in 861/1457 after having performed the Pilgrimage and was once again appointed bâdî of Bursa with lavish monthly supplements to his salary from the Sultan. In 867/1462-63 he succeeded Mollâ Khûsraw as bâdî of Istanbul (Belifgî, 286), but of Taghprûzîdâ-Medîdî, 149 margin, where it is said that Kh*adîa-zåde succeeded Mollâ Khûsraw in this office in 872/1467-68). In 885/1480-81 he was elevated to shâykh al-islâm, and he remained
in this office until his death in the latter part of Radjab 983/1488. He is buried in the mosque he built in the quarter of Istanbul which still bears his name.

The independence of mind which he exhibited in his public life is also to be found in his works. Thus, in his commentary on the Kur'an entitled Kawthar al-d/irdi, which Hadidji Khalifa (i, 536) compiled his notes on the Kanz al-ma'dini of al-Djibari, the famous commentary on al-Shatibi's Hizr al-amami (Broekelmann, S I, 725; Hadidji Khalifa, i, 646); his Kadh al-arar, etc. (not completed in 890/1485 as Haidi Khalifa, ii, 1487, says, for a ms. of it in the Süleymaniye, No. 472, is dated 874/1469-70) is a commentary on al-Djazarl's Dihistan in the north. The rivers Atrak and Arizm, which Hadidji Khalifa (i, 553) implies is a palace in 795/1392-3 on the bank of the river, Bulak 1299, i, 143-51; Turkish version by Medjl, Istanbul 1269, nos. 11); German translation from the Arabic by O. Rescher, Istanbul 1927, 48-53 (see also 114). Despite his fame and importance, he is scarcely mentioned in the historical works of the period: see the bibliography to the article by Ahmed Ates in IA, viii, 406-8, and add: Bellgh Efendi, Güldes-i riyâdí-i irfân, Bursa 1302. For his buildings in Istanbul and elsewhere, see Husayn Aywânsarâyl, Hâdidai al-djâwâmi, Istanbul 1281, i, 187, 207, and Ekrem Hakki Ayverdi, Fâth devri mimarisi, Istanbul 1953, Nos. 73, 85, 90, 171, 199, 244, 384 and 416. He figures in a miniature among the illustrations to Sâmâh Ayverdi, Edebî ve Manevi Dünîyasî şinde Fâtih, Istanbul 1953, 10. (J. R. Walsh)

GORANJ [see Supplement]

GORJISTAN [see KURD]

GURGÂN, Old Persian vâkâna, Arabic qurban, the ancient Hyrcania, at the South-east corner of the Caspian Sea.

The province, which was practically equivalent to the modern Persian province of Astarâbâd [q.v.] (now part of Usân II) forms both in physical features and climate a connecting link between sub-tropical Mâzandaran with its deep heat and the steppe of Dihistan in the north. The rivers Atrak [g.v.] and Gurgân, to which the country owes its fertility and prosperity, are not an unmixed blessing on account of their inundations and the danger of fever which results.

Gurgân played an important part in the Sânsânid period, being the frontier province against the nomads press-ing in from the north. The fortresses of Şahristân-i Yazgidir and Şahr-i Pêroz (see Marquart, Erninâr, 51, 56) were built as a defence against the nomads of the Dihistan steppes; a long wall was built along the northern frontier to defend the lands. Sa'îd b. al-Âs is said to have left levied tribute from the "Malik" of Gurgân as early as the year 30/650-1; but the real conquest of the country was the work of Yazid b. al-Muhallab (98/176). At that time the ruler of Gurgân was a Marzbân but the real power seems to have been in the hands of the Turkish chief Şîl.

After punishing the unruly population of the valley of the navigable Andarâz, the modern Gurgân river, Yazdî founded the town of Gurgân, which henceforth was the capital of the province. It must have been a very prosperous place in the 3rd/9th and 4th/10th centuries. The gardens around it, irrigated by the waters of the river, were famous; its chief product was silk. Gurgân was also a station on the caravan route to Russia. The town was divided in two by the river, which was crossed by a bridge of boats; on the eastern side was the town proper of Şahristân, whose nine gates are detailed by Mukâddasi, and on the western, the suburb of Bakrâbâd (called after a settlement of the Arab tribe?). The prosperity of the town seems to have been early threatened by internal dissensions. Alîd propaganda had found a congenial soil in the lands along the Caspian, and the "Alîd dynasty of Tabaristân included Gurgân in its sphere of influence. In Gurgân itself the tomb of Muhammân b. Dja'bân al-Sâdîk, commonly known as Gür-i Şurkh (the Red Tomb) was an object of great reverence. The constant unrest in these lands enabled Mârdâvâdî b. Zîyâr in 316/928 to found a kingdom of his own in Gurgân with the help of the Daylamites: it survived for over a hundred years, although nominally dependent on the Sânsânids and later the Qâzânavids (see zivârîs). The dome-shaped tomb (Gurbânâl-Kâbûs [q.v.]) only the outer of the ruler Kâbûs b. Wasmâr (316/928-29/1032-3) still exists as a memorial of this period.

The population was massacred at the time of the Mongol invasion and Mustâwîfî (transl. Le Strange, 156) writing in the 8th/14th century describes the town as a heap of ruins. Timûr is said to have built a palace in 795/1392-3 on the bank of the river, but Gurgân never again attained its former prosperity. Hâdidii Khalifa (Dihân-numâ, Istanbul 1414/1732, 339), however, mentions Gurgân, which had been rebuilt since the Mongol period, as inhabited by fanatical Shîfs.

The position of Gurgân in the angle formed by the confluence of the Gurgân River and the Murmûr-rûd is marked only by extensive mounds, which have not yet been investigated. The very name of the town has recently been transferred to Astarâbâd. Only the Gunbad-i Kâbûs, about 2 miles to the north-east and about a mile away from the river, has withstood the ravages of time.

Bibliography: As in the article Astarâbâd. (R. Hartmann [- J. A. Boyle])

GURJAND, called by the Arabs Dûrjândiya, and also in the period about 600/1200 described as Khârazm (like the country round), the economic centre of the Khârazm [g.v.] area and for a long period also the political capital of the territory, lay to the west of the lowest reaches of the Oxus (Âmû
Daryā). The town, whose age is unknown, was captured by the Arabs in 93/712. They attempted to deprive Gurgandj of its importance, by founding a city, Fil (Fīl), on the lower bank of the Oxus; but the new settlement was gradually inundated by the river (for details see Kārg). In order to maintain their domination over Khārīzām, which was an area at that time on the outer fringe of the world of Islam, the Arabs divided the territory; the native dynasty, the Afrighids, who bore the title of Khārīzām-Shāh, were allowed to retain the northern part, with Kārg as their capital; Gurgandj became the residence of an Arab amīr, who had power over the south-west (Hudūd al-Ālam, 122, § 25, and 371; Gardizī, ed. M. Nāṣīmī, 1930, p. 57). This state of affairs lasted for over 250 years, until 385/995 (for details see Khārīzām). Then the Arab amīr of the time, Maʿmūn b. Muḥammad, was able to expel the old dynasty and unite the whole of Khārīzām under his own rule. From that time he took over the ancient title of the rulers of that country, Khārīzām-Shāh. Thereafter Gurgandj ranked after Kārg as the second principal city, but after the overthrow of Maʿmūn’s successors by the Ṣaljūqs in 434/1043, it exceeded Kārg in importance and became once more the real centre of the territory as well as the intermediary for commerce with the Oghuz and other northern Turkish tribes (Gardizī, 95; Iṣṭakhrī, 299f., 341; Ibn Ḥawkal, 350f., 477f.). At this period it had four gates and a large palace near the Bab al-Ḥududījā, on the edge of a huge market place, and consisted of an outer and an inner city (Hudūd, 122). According to Mukaddasī, 288, in the 4th/10th century the town ranked after Kārg as the second principal city, but after the overthrow of Maʿmūn’s successors by the Ṣaljūqs in 434/1043, it exceeded Kārg in importance and became once more the real centre of the territory as well as the intermediary for commerce with the Oghuz and other northern Turkish tribes (Gardizī, 95; Iṣṭakhrī, 299f., 341; Ibn Ḥawkal, 350f., 477f.). At this period it had four gates and a large palace near the Bab al-Ḥududījā, on the edge of a huge market place, and consisted of an outer and an inner city (Hudūd, 122). According to Mukaddasī, 288, in the 4th/10th century the town ranked after Kārg as the second principal city, but after the overthrow of Maʿmūn’s successors by the Ṣaljūqs in 434/1043, it exceeded Kārg in importance and became once more the real centre of the territory as well as the intermediary for commerce with the Oghuz and other northern Turkish tribes (Gardizī, 95; Iṣṭakhrī, 299f., 341; Ibn Ḥawkal, 350f., 477f.). At this period it had four gates and a large palace near the Bab al-Ḥududījā, on the edge of a huge market place, and consisted of an outer and an inner city (Hudūd, 122). Immediately thereafter, in 618/1221, Gurgandj was attacked by the Mongols and after a siege of many months was razed to the ground (there is a lengthy account in Djuwānī, i, 55; Barthold, Turkestān, 349f.) and at the beginning of the 7th/13th century it was included among the most prosperous cities of the Islamic Empire (an account dating from the period 613-6/1216-9 is given in Vāyūt, ii, 54, 486; ili, 933; iv, 260 f.). Shortly after, this verse romance which consists of a continuous narrative, but containing all manner of strange words, lacking in ideas and maxims—that is to say a prose narrative without any poetic ornament (perhaps like the Georgian translation of the poem). The governor having invited him to translate this story into Persian, “to embellish it as one adorns a flower-bed in April”, Gurgānī set to work, and finished, in 447/1055 or shortly after, this verse romance which consists of 8905 bayt in ḡazād, the metre most often adopted later by those who composed romances in the same genre. The question arises whether Gurgānī knew Pahlavī. It is impossible summarily to deny this after having read his account, imprecise though it is, of the conversation with the governor, and it is possible to conclude from one of the verses of the poem that he had some, though not a complete, knowledge of the language (“For one who knows Pahlavī, Khurāsān signifies the place from which we receive light”, ed. Minovi, 35; cf. also Mahdījūb, 60; tr., Massé, 431 bottom) that the author of this conversation, however, he refers to the prolixity and the strange (i.e., archaic) words of the Pahlavī text. For the question whether he worked directly from it or through a Persian translation, see Mahdījūb, 60.
GURGANI — GWALIYAR

1143

introd., 20. The important thing is that he gave new life to an original which otherwise would have disappeared like so many other Pahlavi texts. In his poem the subject of love is treated particularly in the frequent allusions to the divine or the evil powers, to the sacred fires (mentioned by their names) and to their maintenance, to the ancient months and feast days, and to legendary features; there is in it a case of trial by ordeal, and one of the seven noble families of the Parthian period.

In Gurgani's poetry there are realistic features contributing to knowledge of customs and folklore. At times his style is affected and precious (tr., 20-1), especially when, like other Persian poets, he is describing feminine beauty in conventional terms (ibid., 34) and some words which are close to the Pahlavi forms (ibid., 43). The poem had a lasting influence. Mahdjub points out similarities between some verses of Gurgani and those of later poets, and even some borrowings (introd., 98 ff.). The ten passionate letters written by Wits to Ramun (Minovi, 347-83; Mahdjub, 259-86; tr. 348-51) were imitated by the poets Awbadi, Ibn Imad, A'rif, ‘Imad Fakhi (ten letters), Amir Husaynii, Khatibi and Salim-i Savidji (thirty letters). Of more significance is the similarity evident in the plan of Nizami's rendering of the Gurkhans based on Eastern and Western sources; in written collaboration with K. H. Menges; K. Menges in Byzantion, xxvii/l (1951), 104-6; idem, in RO, xvii (1950), 61; Spuler, Iran, 360 n. 8. For the history of the Gurkhans see also the Biblia to Karya Khitay and Kirmân (13th century).

(B. Spuler)

GURGANI [see DURQAM].

GWALIYAR, formerly capital of the Sindh state of Gwalior, now a town in Madhya Pradesh.-"Tradition assigns the foundation of the city to one Suhla Sen who was cured of leprosy by an ascetic named Gwalia. The latter inhabited the hill on which the fort now stands, and this was called Gwalior after him". The early history of Gwalior is, however, shrouded in myth and romance. The Huna adventurers, Toramana and his son Mihirkula, who partially overthrew the Gupta power in the 6th century A.D., are considered to be the first historical holders of this place. Later Raja Bohdi of Kanawdi, the Kachwaha Rathiputs and the Parhtars respectively held sway over it.

In 413/1022 when Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna marched against Ganda, the ruler of Kalingar, he passed the fort of Gwalior. Since the Raja of Gwalior was a feudatory of Ganda, the Sultan stormed the fort. The Raja, despite his successful resistance, was so alarmed that he sued for peace (Zayn al-akhdr, 79). In 592/1196 Kutb al-Din Aybak took the fort from the Parhtars (Tabakat-i Nasri, 145; Eng. tr., Raverty, i, 545-6, with note on other versions). Iltimish's first territorial appointment was as the amir of Gwalior (Tabakat-i Nasri, 609; Eng. tr. i, 604). It appears to have been lost to the Turks because in 629/1231 Iltimish is reported to have reconquered it and made appointments of the amir-i dād, the kolwāl and the kādd. But the history of the Muslim occupation of Gwalior is a chequered one. Early in her reign Rūdīyya (634-7/1236-40) had to send an expedition towards Gwalior against Tamur Khan, but the position became untenable and the fort had to be abandoned to Čahardeva. In 649/1251 Balban led a full-scale expedition against Gwalior, but does not seem to have achieved any permanent success, for the numismatic evidence shows that...
Gwalior was independent up to at least 657/1259. In the disturbances caused by Timur's invasion (809/1358) it was seized by the Tonwar Râjdûts. In 894/1489 Sultan Abūd-dîn Bahâlû Lûdî marched against Gwalior and forced the Râjdût, Mân Singh, to submit. When Sikandar Lûdî (894-923/1489-1517) shifted his capital to Ágrâ he considered the annexation of Gwalior necessary for the consolidation of his power, but he could not achieve his objective. Though subjected to frequent attacks by the rulers of Mâlwa, Džawnpur and Delhi, the Tonwars managed to retain it till 924/1518, when the fort was surrendered to Ábrên Lûdî. When Bâbûr turned his attention to the Áfghân principalities after his victory at Pânîpat, he found Tâtâr Khân Sarang Khân occupying the fort along with all its dependencies. It was through the help of Áfghân Muhammad Gwâth, a celebrated Şahtârî saint, that he succeeded in establishing his hold over it. In 934/1528 Bâbûr visited Gwalîyâr and spent some time examining the palaces of Mân Singh and Vikramâdîtya. He was impressed by their size and splendour although he grumbled a little at their want of taste and elegance. In 949/1552 Gwalîyâr fell to Shâh Shâh Sîrû (945-55/1528-45) who forced Áfghân tribes to settle there in large numbers (Rûkn al-Dîn, Latâ'if-i Kuddûsî, Delhi 1311, 85). This attack at Gwalîyâr conception in Gwalîyâr was closely linked up with his policy of consolidation in Râjdûpâtânâ. Besides, Gwalîyâr was also important as one of the principal stages on the great route from the Deccan which was passed by Sîrûndî, Narwar, Gwalîyâr and Dholpur to Ágrâ. His descendants practically made it the capital of their dominions.

In 965/1558 Gwalîyâr passed to Akbar. Abû 'l-Fadl* mentions it as a sârkâr in the province of Ágrâ and refers to its 'exquisite singers', 'lovely women' and 'iron mine'. Gwalîyâr was one of the 28 mint towns of Akbar for copper coins. Deuîrî rice for Akbar's kitchen was brought from here. There was a quarry of red clay for Akbar's kitchen. The shrine of Baba Kapûr (d. 979/1571), scientific Tânsên the Mughals used it in Gwalîyâr, and musicians from Malwa, the Deccan and other parts of India were hired to its courts. It was due to Mübâriz Khân, the future Sultan 'Abîl-Šâh, that music received great encouragement in Gwalîyâr, and musicians from Mâlwa, the Deccan and other parts of India were hired to its courts. One of the most important of these was the celebrated Shâtûtî saint, that he succeeded in establishing his hold over it. In 934/1528 Bâbûr visited Gwalîyâr and spent some time examining the palaces of Mân Singh and Vikramâdîtya. He was impressed by their size and splendour although he grumbled a little at their want of taste and elegance. In 949/1552 Gwalîyâr fell to Shâh Shâh Sîrû (945-55/1528-45) who forced Áfghân tribes to settle there in large numbers (Rûkn al-Dîn, Latâ'if-i Kuddûsî, Delhi 1311, 85). This attack at Gwalîyâr conception in Gwalîyâr was closely linked up with his policy of consolidation in Râjdûpâtânâ. Besides, Gwalîyâr was also important as one of the principal stages on the great route from the Deccan which was passed by Sîrûndî, Narwar, Gwalîyâr and Dholpur to Ágrâ. His descendants practically made it the capital of their dominions.
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routed and put to flight at Gumbai and this was the turning point of the *djihad*. Shehu Usmanu was never again in serious danger and the Fulani forces, despite occasional reverses, proceeded to subdue most of an area in size approximate to (but not co-terminous with) that of the present state of Nigeria. Shehu Usmanu, the leader and inspiration of the *djihad*, fell sick in 1806 and remained in Gwandu, leaving the conduct of his campaigns to his Fulani commanders. His son, Muhammadu Bello, built a wall around the village to strengthen it and for the next two years it served as the capital of the incipient Fulani empire.

In 1808 Alkalawa, the capital of Gobir, was taken and Shehu Usmanu left Gwandu in favour of Sifawa. He then divided the administration of the conquered territories between his brother, Abdullahi dan Fodio, and his son, Muhammadu Bello. Abdullahi became responsible for the western dominions and Muhammadu Bello for the eastern. Gwandu was under Abdullahi’s authority but he preferred to build the town of Bodinga, close to Sifawa, for his headquarters so that he might remain near his brother. From Bodinga, however, he led a series of victorious campaigns until, in 1810, he administered most of Kebbi (but which the Fulani were able to subdue entirely) and had exacted allegiance from Nupe, Ilorin, Yauri, Gurma, Arewa and Zabarma.

In 1809 Muhammadu Bello created a township of the hamlet Sokoto, and built a wall around it so that it might serve as the administrative headquarters of the eastern dominions and it was there that Shehu Usmanu died in 1817. Abdullahi, on hearing of his brother’s death, hastened the fourteen miles from Bodinga to Sokoto, but found that Bello had been proclaimed *Sarkin Musulmi* (Commander of the Faithful) and the gates of the town were closed against him. By Fulani custom succession passed to a brother rather than to a son and Abdullahi withdrew to Gwandu aggrieved. On his arrival he found that the nearby town of Kalembena was in revolt, hoping to profit from his weakness after his rejection by Sokoto. His position was desperate but Bello went to his aid. In a celebrated scene, the two met outside the walls of Kalembena; Bello, the warrior and chief architect of the Fulani empire, mounted on a charger, Abdullahi astride the mare which as a *mallam* (Arabic: *mu'allim*) he always rode. In accordance with Fulani custom, Bello, as the younger man, went to dismount but his uncle waved him back into his saddle, and himself bent forward to salute his nephew as Commander of the Faithful. Together they put down the revolt. Thereafter Abdullahi retained the administration of the western dominions subject to the recognised authority of the *Sarkin Musulmi*, Bello, of Sokoto. This situation established in effect a dual empire which they bequeathed to their heirs, and led to a close friendship between the *amirs* of Gwandu and the Sultans of Sokoto which lasted unbroken until the British occupation of Nigeria and which still endures.

Abdullahi, who was born in 1766, was twelve years younger than his illustrious brother Shehu Usmanu and was instructed in the Kur’ân and the Mâlîkî rite by Mallam al-Hâjîdji Dîbrîlla, as was his brother. He was some thirty-eight years of age when, in 1804, he was the first to pay homage to Shehu Usmanu as *Sarkin Musulmi* and was instructed in the Kur’ân and the Mâlîkî rite by Mallam al-Hâjîdji Dîbrîlla, as was his brother. He was some thirty-eight years of age when, in 1804, he was the first to pay homage to Shehu Usmanu as *Sarkin Musulmi*. Deeply religious, he nevertheless played a prominent part in the Fulani wars of conquest; in the early campaigns he often served, as did Bello, in a subordinate capacity to other Fulani commanders but distinguished himself by bravery in hand-to-hand fighting. Always of a literary bent, he would celebrate his victories with an Arabic ode and may be said to have been the poet laureate of the *djihad*. After the submission of Kalembena in 1819 he left administrative matters in the hands of his son Mohammad (who was to succeed him) and his nephew Bohari and devoted his last years to study and writing. He did not himself adopt the title of *amir* but preferred the simple style “*mallam*” (which he retained until his death in 1828).

All these principal figures of the Fulani *djihad*,
Shehu Usmanu, Abdullahi and Muhammadu Bello, were prolific writers in Arabic but Abdullahi had the most felicitous command of the language. For lists of his works, both those which have survived and those whose titles are known but which may be no longer extant, see the writer's *Field notes on the Arabic literature of the western Sudan* (Abdullahi dan Fodio), in *JRSA*, 1956, and *A catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts preserved in the University library, Ibadan, Nigeria*, Ibadan 1953-58.

The mosques of Abdullahi in Birnin Kebbi and Gwandu, and his tomb and the tomb of a Shaykh Haliru in Gwandu, are important monuments of Fulani religious architecture (cf. J. Schacht, in *Travaux de l' Institut de Recherches Sahariennes*, 1954, 13 and pl. v, and in *Studia Islamica*, viii [1957], 136).

After the initial conquests of the Fulanis the various dominions of the dual empire were placed under the direct authority of Fulani amirs; those of the western empire paid tribute to Gwandu, and those of the eastern empire to Sokoto. However, neither empire was for long at peace and revolts were constant, especially among the Kebbawa and Gobiwara, whose total submission was never obtained. By the end of the 19th century the direct authority of both Gwandu and Sokoto extended little beyond the boundaries of their own amirates and when the British forces occupied the country in 1902 they found the Sarkin Kebbi sturdily maintaining the independence of Argungu, and the Gobiwara from Sabon Birni and Chibiri attacking the eastern and north-eastern districts of Sokoto itself. Argungu, the Kebbawa stronghold, was never occupied by the Fulani despite the fact that it lay between the twin capitals of Sokoto and Gwandu, being fifty miles from the former and less than thirty miles from the latter. The outlying dominions of both empires, however, still recognized the spiritual leadership of the descendents of Shehu Usmanu and a degree of temporal suzerainty pertaining to Sokoto and Gwandu.

The walled town of Gwandu remained the capital of the amirate until in 1860, the amir Aliu, the fourth of Abdullahi’s sons to succeed to the throne, transferred his headquarters to Ambursa in order to protect the towns along the south bank of the Gulbi against the attacks of the Kebbawa of Argungu. The other princes of the royal house continued to reside in Gwandu.

In 1864 Aliu died and was succeeded by his brother Abdulkadiri, the last of Abdullahi’s sons to reign over Gwandu. By this time the power of the Kebbawa had so increased that Gwandu was obliged to seek an end to the constant hostilities and Sarkin Musulmi Ahmadu Rufai, in 1866, negotiated a peace treaty, known as the Lafiyar Toga, between Abdulkadiri and Sarkin Kebbi Toga. The principal terms of the treaty were (a) that Argungu should be recognized as an independent state, (b) that all towns then held by Argungu should be retained by Argungu, and (c) that all slaves bitherto captured in battle should remain the property of their captors.

The peace obtained by the Lafiyar Toga lasted for eight years, when hostilities were resumed which were to continue until Argungu was occupied by British troops in 1902.

In 1876 Maliki, son of Mohamman and grandson of Abdullahi, acceded to the throne and reigned for twelve years, during which he was visited by Mr. Joseph Thomson on behalf of the Royal Niger Company, and was presented with cloth to the value of forty million cowries. The Company’s present to the Sarkin Musulmi was cloth to the value of sixty million cowries. After the death of Maliki in 1888, Umaru Bakatara, son of Mallam Halliu (1833-58) and grandson of Abdullahi, came to the throne and was visited by Sir G. Goldie and Mr. Wallace (afterwards Sir W. Wallace) who brought more gifts from the Royal Niger Company. In 1898 Bayero, son of Aliu (1860-64) and also a grandson of Abdullahi, came to the throne. He offered no resistance to the British occupation and died, two months later, in 1903.

To-day, Sokoto Province of the Northern Region of Nigeria is divided into three administrative divisions, Sokoto, Gwandu and Argungu. The headquarters of Gwandu Division is Birnin Kebbi (pop. 10,000) and the Division comprises the emirates of Gwandu itself (area 6,207 sq. miles, pop. 350,000) and Yauri (area 1,306 sq. miles, pop. 57,000). The present Emir of Gwandu, al-Muhammad Haruna, is President of the House of Chiefs of the Northern Region.


GYPSIES [see ÇINGANE, LÖHI, NÜHI, ZUTT].

GYPSUM [see DÜSS].